

**Effort Reporting System  
Requirements Group  
Notes of the July 13, 2006 Meeting  
Accepted August 10, 2006**

The meeting was convened as a conference call. Attendees: Rochelle Caballero (UCLA), Cynthia Kane (UCB), Buck Marcussen (UCD), James Ringo (UCD), Rick Valdivia (UCLA), Erica Webber (UCSF), Mark Cooper (UCSD), Ashley Clipson (UCSD), Lyle Kafader (UCSD), Pixie Ogren (UCLA), Adam Cohen (UCOP), Steve Hunter (UCOP), and Jon Good (UCOP)

Review of 5/11/2006 Meeting Notes

The notes of the May 11, 2006, meeting were accepted as written.

Follow-ups from Previous Meetings

Management Group Report

Jon Good reported on key discussions of the Management Group, which had met on July 12:

- Release 6 is planned for the end of July
- Los Angeles, Berkeley, and Davis are moving forward with implementation plans. (See Management Group meeting notes from 7/12/2006 for corresponding updates.)

Compliance Monitoring and Reporting

Jon introduced this topic by pointing out that in a past Requirements Committee meeting, the group had discussed and agreed that compliance reporting could be achieved through ad hoc queries developed by the campuses. Since UCLA was not likely to get any reporting capabilities developed locally for another year, the Management Group had agreed that the ERS Project Team could spend available time developing some kind of compliance reports, even if developed in nothing more than standard SQL, and requested that the Requirements Committee identify requirements for compliance reporting.

Buck Marcussen asked whether UCOP had any interest in certification compliance across all of the campuses. Jon responded that he was not aware of any such interest. Jon did mention, though, that an Enterprise Risk Management initiative that is underway might make benchmark measures of campus certification appealing.

Erica Webber and Mark Cooper suggested that a common reporting solution would be preferable to ad hoc solutions at each campus, particularly if university-wide benchmark measurements were needed.

**Effort Reporting System  
Requirements Group  
Notes of the July 13, 2006 Meeting  
Accepted August 10, 2006**

James Ringo suggested everyone should come up with list of valuable compliance monitoring reports.

Some of the purposes of reports, as described during the discussion:

- Monitor timeliness of completion
- Monitor completion rates
- Monitor volume of re-opened effort reports
- Monitor the effort recording process by examining the volume of effort report changes occurring before certification

Some of the specific reports requested during the discussion:

- A list of Effort Reports past due, by department
- A list of Effort Reports modified before being certified
- A list of Effort Reports certified by someone other than the individual for whom the effort report was generated.

Jon asked that further suggestions for compliance monitoring reporting requirements be emailed to Adam, Pixie, Jon by the end of Monday July 17th. A general description of the desired compliance report(s) is all that needs to be communicated. The Project Team will pull together some statement of requirements with detail and bring back to the Requirements Committee for further consideration.

Enhancements Requests Review

The committee reviewed the following items from the current enhancements list:

- #394 – Recertification Triggered by Local Cost Sharing System Data Changes

[NOTE: This item had been previously discussed and rejected by the Requirements Committee. UCSD requested the topic be re-opened and had prepared an overview of the issues which was distributed to the Requirements Committee for this discussion.]

UCSD has a cost sharing system which is used to manage and record how the cost sharing commitment will be fulfilled for each period of time, and the system is updated to reflect the expected cost sharing effort for given periods of time. This is done as a way of managing time on projects to the original cost sharing commitments. This detailed cost sharing information is updated frequently, even though the original cost sharing commitment from the grant proposal remains the same. UCSD plans to import the more detailed cost sharing information rather than the actual cost sharing commitment into ERS and would like changes in past cost sharing detail to trigger recertification of previously certified effort reports,

**Effort Reporting System  
Requirements Group  
Notes of the July 13, 2006 Meeting  
Accepted August 10, 2006**

based on effective dates, in a manner similar to transfers of payroll expense triggering re-certification.

Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, and San Francisco do not manage cost sharing to this level of detail, instead relying on the commitments made in the grant proposals. For these campuses, cost sharing commitments will change infrequently and, when changes do occur, will be reflected as a change to the original proposal and handled in ERS on a go-forward basis only.

Key points from the discussion:

- Just about everyone thinks of cost sharing as commitment over the life of the project, as opposed to more detailed in a time-period context.
- It is generally assumed that cost sharing commitments are not necessarily consistent with the way in which the effort was expended during a given reporting period.
- Faculty don't think of cost-sharing on a month-to-month basis, but more over the life of the project.
- In ERS there is no weighting of cost share commitment based on reporting period as there is for payroll information.
- No one other than San Diego appears to have interest in drilling into cost-sharing data in the same manner as Payroll data. (Note: ERS does have an optional magnifying glass icon on the effort report for drilling into cost sharing detail, even though there is no functionality behind this icon.
- Los Angeles doesn't have cost sharing system to feed ERS and will input cost sharing commitment information directly via ERS screens.
- San Francisco collects the cost sharing commitment data only once for each award. If the commitment is changed, it's changed on a go-forward basis only.
- Berkeley's cost sharing system tracks life-of-award cost sharing commitments and changes are handled on a go-forward basis only.

At the conclusion of the discussion Ashley and Mark indicated that they would take this issue back to the campus and rethink whether what they were requesting continues to make sense in light of what the other campuses are doing with cost sharing information.

- #482 – Certifier information on certified reports without PPS Changes

James Ringo reported that Release 5 eliminated the display of the name of the person who certified a report where there were no changes to effort percent derived from Payroll. There was swift and unanimous agreement that this identification needed to be restored to the ERS.

**Effort Reporting System  
Requirements Group  
Notes of the July 13, 2006 Meeting  
Accepted August 10, 2006**

Other Topics

Buck asked whether the Contracts and Grants Manual revisions and Accounting Manual revisions would be available on the project web site. Jon responded that web homes for these two manuals already existed so it didn't make sense to replicate the content on the project we site. Instead, links to the manuals could be put up on the Project web site.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 10, 2006 from 10:00am-2:00pm. A decision on whether this will be an in-person meeting or a conference call will be made by July 31, 2006, after assessing the kinds of issues that need to be reviewed. An in-person meeting will be from 10-2. A conference call will be from 1-3.