

**Effort Reporting System  
Requirements Group  
Notes of the February 9, 2006 Meeting  
Accepted March 9, 2006**

Attendees: Cynthia Kane (UCB), Erica Webber (UCSF), Buck Marcussen (UCD) Rochelle Caballero (UCLA), Rick Valdivia (UCLA), Mark Cooper (UCSD), Erica Webber (UCSF), Dan Gilbreath (UCSD), James Ringo (UCD), Jorge Ohy (UCOP), Pixie Ogren (UCLA), Adam Cohen (UCOP), and Jon Good (UCOP)

Review of 1/12/2006 Meeting Notes

Jon Good mentioned that Rochelle Caballero had not been listed as a participant in the January 12<sup>th</sup> conference call and that would be corrected in the notes.

The 12/8/2005 meeting notes were accepted without further changes.

Follow-ups from Previous Meetings

Management Group Report

Jon briefly reviewed key discussions of the Management Group, which had met via conference call the same morning:

- Base ERS Release 1 was posted to the project web site on January 6th
- Base ERS Maintenance Funding Model
- Feedback on revisions to the Accounting Manual and Contracts and Grants Manual – Jorge Ohy reported that comments on the proposed changes to the Accounting Manual and Contracts and Grants Manual had recently been received from Academic Senate and Vice Chancellors for Research. An FAQ responding to these comments has been prepared and is being reviewed by the Management Group. When finalized, the FAQ will be sent to Larry Coleman for distribution.
- Training Materials are being formatted by NIIT – Pixie Ogren elaborated.

Buck Marcussen asked about variations in the training to accommodate variation in campus implementation of ERS (e.g., campus-specific logos, FAU). Jon responded that while the ERS can accommodate variations in the web “skin”, and the FAU will certainly be different for each campus, the training has proceeded under the directive of the Management Group to be a single UC set of training materials. This means that screen samples in the training materials will essentially be that of the Base ERS.

James Ringo asked about what was involved in changing the training at the campus – will campuses get all of the components? Jon responded that all components of the training materials will be made available to the campuses. This

**Effort Reporting System  
Requirements Group  
Notes of the February 9, 2006 Meeting  
Accepted March 9, 2006**

includes plain text files, powerpoint files with each training “module”, all Captivate screen shots, audio files, and the assembled Breeze final product.

Fund Table Code Definitions

Jon reported that there had been no feedback from campus technical staff to the Management Group on the addition of values to existing financial systems’ fund table data elements that will help campuses classify funds for effort reporting purposes. Several members of the Requirements Committee expressed concern that resolution of this issue needed to occur quickly so classification of funds for effort reporting purposes can begin soon.

Rick Valdivia asked about Barbara Yoder’s comments on not wanting a combined data element (as reported in the January 11, 2006 Management Group meeting notes). Jorge and Jon pointed out that Barbara’s comments were focused on the collection of campus data at UCOP and not about what happens within the campus context. The UCOP Research Administration Office does not desire new data elements nor changes to existing data elements in the UCOP/corporate context, so the addition of values to existing data elements in a campus system would need to be mapped to existing acceptable data element values when information is transmitted to UCOP.

Maintenance Mode Activities

Adam Cohen described a proposed contact protocol for ERS maintenance which parallels the structure used for the Payroll/Personnel System.

Each ERS installation would identify a technical contact that would receive release notifications and would have access to the problem reporting system at IR&C. The person or persons in this technical contact role would be responsible for receiving problem reports from their campus and performing first-level problem determination.

Once a problem has been isolated and researched, it would be reported to the ERS development team by the technical contact via the IR&C problem reporting system. For the time being, the existing Bugzilla database will be used as the problem tracking application but this database will be migrated to Teamtrack once that system is implemented at IR&C. Technical contacts can track the status of their reported issues via this application.

The ERS development team will respond to each problem report. Responses may include a workaround, emergency fix, scheduled fix, or reclassification of the report as an enhancement. Each release will include a release letter which describes the changes being made to the system, as well as installation instructions for the release.

**Effort Reporting System  
Requirements Group  
Notes of the February 9, 2006 Meeting  
Accepted March 9, 2006**

The role of the Requirements Group in the maintenance process will be to review, approve and prioritize enhancement requests. The membership of the Requirements Group was reviewed and it was agreed that the “functional owners” of the ERS system from each of the sponsoring campuses were adequately represented in the group. It was suggested that the Requirements Group rotate the Chair position, perhaps quarterly.

Adam reported that currently, there are twenty-five items on the Bugzilla database that are classified as enhancements. The Requirements Group will begin reviewing this list at its next meeting in March. Additional items may arrive from the pilot campuses as their testing progresses. There are another ten items that are technical enhancements that the development team will be addressing in the March maintenance release and in subsequent releases.

Jon added that the Management Group had also discussed whether campus functional owner representatives were in place and had concluded that this was the case, with Mark Cooper, Cynthia Kane, Erica Webber, James Ringo, and Rick Validivia being those representatives.

Rochelle Caballero inquired as to the best way for the Requirements Committee to understand and work through potential enhancements. Adam responded that the use of web meeting tools, such as had been used for demonstrations in the past, was an appropriate way to work through the issues.

Adam noted that the next meeting likely would have some discussion about enhancements. It was suggested that this first meeting to discuss enhancements should be an in-person meeting.

James asked whether the decentralized security administration component was part of the enhancements discussion. Adam responded that decentralized security administration function is being developed by the Davis campus and will be included in Base ERS Release 2, in March. Rick asked whether the decentralized security administration function in the Base ERS in Release 2 would impact the UCLA implementation of ERS. Adam replied that the Base ERS includes an option setting which instructs ERS to either use its own decentralized security administration functions or campus-local security administration; if the option is selected to use campus-local security administration, then the ERS built-in security administration functions are not presented to any user.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 9, 2006 from 1:00pm-3:00pm. Decision will be made and announced by Tuesday, February 28, whether this meeting will be via con call or in person.