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This meeting was conducted as a conference call. Participants included: Sue Abeles, Mike Allred, Jim Corkill, John Ellis, Bobbi McCracken, Bruce Morgan, Matt Hull, Eric Vermillion, Jorge Ohy, Adam Cohen, Pixie Ogren, Jane Meyer, Steve Hunter, and Jon Good.

Discussion Topics:

Introductions

Eric Vermillion introduced Matt Hull, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Resource Management and Analysis at Riverside. Matt will be “tag teaming” with Eric to represent the Budget and Planning Officers on the Management Group.

Review of 11/14/2007 Meeting Notes

The November 14, 2007, meeting notes were accepted as written.

Project Status

Steve Hunter reported that Release 9.0 is just about ready for release, and includes improvements to compliance monitoring reporting which will make the reports easier for everyone to use as well as cleaning up numerous bugs.

Requirements Committee Update

Jon reported that the Requirements Committee met via conference call on November 15th. One issue requiring Management Group attention was raised on the conference call: on effort reports where more than one project is presented and certification by more than one individual is needed, late pay impacting the effort report requires all certifiers to have to recertify, even if their portion of the effort was not impacted by late pay.

Pixie Ogren noted that the Requirements Committee would like to have pervious line certifications carry-forward where the certified line had NOT changed. The primary example that was presented in the Requirements Committee discussion is when an individual is initially paid on 19900 funds for a sponsored project, and then a transfer of payroll expense is made to charge that time to the appropriate sponsored project. The number of instances where multiple recertification occurs still needs to be determined.
Pixie pointed out that the issue raises a question of controls on the effort reporting process, whether all of the cases of carrying forward prior certifications can be practically identified so there can be assurance that controls on certification aren’t being compromised.

Jorge Ohy suggested that allowing line certifications to carry forward might depend on the magnitude of the pay changes (e.g., a change from 5% to 6% versus a big chunk of time moving from 19900 funds to sponsored project funds). Issues such as the effect on cost sharing offsets, and the need to review the entire report in terms of meeting the requirements for minimum amount of time spent on teaching, patient care, and other duties, were raised as concerns.

Sue Abeles suggested, and John Ellis agreed, that erring on the side of caution and requiring everyone to recertify as a control on managing effort reporting proactively would be appropriate.

Mike Allred asked whether there was unanimous support from Requirements Committee. Pixie responded that there was not unanimous support but that the Requirements Group did lean toward supporting the request., and said that Davis and San Diego in particular expressed strong interest. Mike commented that, before expressing an opinion, he would like to have an analysis in writing, including risks and benefits. Mike and Sue both commented that it would be better to have more experience with effort reporting before making any kind of judgment on this issue. The Management Group agreed to revisit the issue in six months after campuses have had more experience and a review can be done to determine how often the situation occurs.

The Requirements Committee will next meet via conference call on Thursday, January 10th.

Technical Advisory Group Update

Adam Cohen reported that the Technical Advisory Group did not meet since the last Management Group meeting.

Actions When Effort Is Not Certified

Sue Abeles reported that she had sent the letter to Anne Broome and Larry Coleman right after the November 14th con call. There has been no further communication on the subject. Jorge will follow-up with Research.

Jorge suggested waiting to publish the policy changes for any policy changes resulting from the discussion on certification time limits (next agenda item).

Time Limits for Generating/Certifying Effort Reports

Following up from the November 14th discussion, Jorge has sent a draft proposal to Sue suggesting that language about the 45/30 day limits be modified to include the expectation that
full certification would occur no more than 45 days after the 45/30 deadlines. This would effectively give 120 days as had been requested by San Diego.

Pixie pointed out that the recommendation is okay for certification, but what about the deadlines for pay processing? John Ellis mentioned that the timing of corrections is a big concern to Berkeley departments, and he would be comfortable with an extra 30 days.

It was pointed out that from a federal audit perspective, not keeping to the specified 45/30 day deadlines could be present problems.

Jorge will send around his draft to the Management Group for consideration and discussion via email. Feedback is to be provided to Jorge by February 1, 2008. A follow-up discussion with the Controllers will occur afterwards.

Non-sponsor Campuses - Status

There was no news to report.

Campus Status Reports

Davis – Mike Allred reported that Davis has installed the latest version of the Base ERS software. There are 100 or so reports to finish off from the previous cycle (out of a total of 6,500 reports). Davis is now into the January 1 through September, 2007, cycle (about 7,000 reports); about 25% of those reports have been certified. Davis is trying to wrap up the current reporting cycle by the end of January.

Berkeley – John Ellis reported that Berkeley is in the pilot phase. There were a few hiccups early on, but those have been resolved. So far, there have been no showstopping issues. Berkeley continues to plan to come up in production for the whole campus in February and is working to educate a lot of folks about the new process.

Riverside – Bobbi McCracken reported that Riverside is working on getting the funding for UCOP ERS Hosting.

San Francisco – Eric Vermillion reported that ERS at San Francisco is going well. There’s progress on getting reports certified in a timely manner and getting exception cases worked out.

Los Angeles – Sue Abeles reported that Los Angeles is working on getting a lot of small units into compliance. Recently there was a meeting with the School of Medicine regarding problems
with access to effort reports. There is also some concern because ERS functionality is somewhat limited at UCLA because of the UCLA integration with DACSS (role management/authorization mechanism). There are no technical issues with ERS, but rather limitations in UCLA’s DACSS (DACSS doesn’t have certain role definitions that map to roles in ERS). UCLA is working on resolving the administrative and functionality issues caused by the limitation in DACSS.

Santa Barbara – Jim Corkill reported that Santa Barbara is working on getting the SLA for UCOP ERS Hosting signed. Everyone at Santa Barbara who has seen ERS is looking forward to implementation, so it’s just a matter of working through the usual funding process. Current plans are to begin with the fall or winter cycles.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled as a conference call for **Wednesday, February 13, 2008, from 1:00pm-3:00pm.**
# Effort Reporting System Go-Live Plans

January 9, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Effort Reporting Period Start</th>
<th>Calendar Start</th>
<th>UCOP Hosting?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Status/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>July-December 2006</td>
<td>March 2007</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Production March 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Spring quarter 2006</td>
<td>Mid-August 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Production September 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>April 2007</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Production 4/16/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Using UCLA ERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Using UCLA ERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>ERS Overview presented 12/5/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Q1 2008</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working out UCOP Hosting SLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Q1 2008</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working out UCOP Hosting SLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Using Davis ERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>