**Effort Reporting System**
**Requirements Group**
**Notes of the August 10, 2006 Meeting**
*Revised  September 14, 2006   Accepted  September 14, 2006*

The meeting was convened as a conference call. Attendees: Rochelle Caballero (UCLA), Jorge Ohy (UCOP), Evelyn Balabis (UCLA), Connie Brown (UCLA), Maurice Taylor (UCLA), Cynthia Kane (UCB), Buck Marcussen (UCD), Kathy Hass and  Deborah Henn (UCD –for James Ringo), Ashley Clipson (UCSD), Adam Cohen (UCOP), Steve Hunter (UCOP), and Jon Good (UCOP)


Review of 7/13/2006 Meeting Notes

The notes of the July 13, 2006, meeting were accepted as written.


Follow-ups from Previous Meetings

Management Group Report

Jon Good reported that the August 9, 2006, ERS Management Group conference call was cancelled for lack of a quorum. The next Management Group meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 14.


Compliance Monitoring and Reporting

Adam described the draft "requirements" (emailed to the group on August 8) as a very preliminary document pulling together the requirements articulated by the Davis and San Diego campuses following the July 13th meeting, and including some general requirements as well as an excerpt from the original requirements document.

Review of the document generated the following points of discussion:

- Rochelle Caballero asked, in the context of creating reports on demand (page 1, paragraph 2) whether this might have an impact on the performance of the ERS. Adam responded that there is the potential for performance impact.

- Buck Marcussen asked whether recertification of effort reports on which the cost sharing amount had been changed (page 6, last bullet) was what San Diego had asked for in the July 13th meeting. Ashley Clipson responded that is different from what San Diego had asked for, which was to trigger recertification of effort reports when updated cost sharing information is imported into the ERS.

- Deborah Henn noted that Davis intends to have compliance review by department effort reporting coordinators, Dean's offices, as well as the central office. The general requirements (page 1, 3rd paragraph) appear do not identify Dean's offices. Deborah asked whether it would be possible to include Dean's offices as

users of these compliance reports. Adam asked whether Dean's offices would have a role in reviewing individual effort reports, in the manner of department coordinators. Buck responded that Dean's offices would have such a role. It was suggested that using the security roles might also work, similar to what is currently done to assign notifications to groups of users. Both Davis and Berkeley voiced the desire to be able to make use of campus organization structures to designate individuals for whom the compliance reporting capability would be made available.

- Ashley asked whether there would be any value in generating snapshot reports as of certain dates. There was consensus that this was desirable, since there is a need to run some standard reports "as of" certain dates, across the board. The "as of date" capability will be added to the list of general requirements.

- Adam suggested that the numbered requirements from Davis, on pages 3-5, would be a good guide for "Report Types" to include in the requirements, and wants to find overlap in the other requirements to fit into these groupings. Jon suggested that items 1, 2, and 5 are compliance reporting, item 3 is business process analysis, and item 4 is security administration. Kathy Hass remarked that Davis is willing to table item 4, but see all the other items as compliance reporting. The group agreed that item 4 (roles and permissions audit listing) could be deferred until the compliance monitoring requirements are addressed.  The group agreed that item 3 (certification statistics) should be included as a compliance monitoring requirement.

- Adam asked for elaboration on item 5. Kathy responded that it is desired to find payments for types of pay which are not reported as sponsored research on the effort report, but were charged to research funds. The report would guide transfers of funds to move those charges to appropriate funds. An example is an honorarium which should not charged to sponsored project funds. Jon suggested and the group agreed that this is more appropriately a payroll clean-up task and that reporting from the system of record, PPS, would be more appropriate. Jon will inquire about a Base PPS enhancement.

- Adam pointed out that the San Diego requirements overlap with the Davis requirements except for the last, unnumbered, item on page 5 (report of awards requiring an adjustment and the amount so the ERS Coordinator would not have to drill down into each report for the details). Buck asked why is it this is needed. Ashley responded that San Diego was trying to find an easier way than drilling down into individual effort reports. It was agreed that this approach won't work since the process of generating appropriate expense transfers requires drilling into the details of the effort report. Ashley agreed, and withdrew the requirement.

- Adam asked whether the original requirement calling for a report of cost sharing by employee by sponsored project is more appropriate in local cost sharing systems than in ERS. Cynthia Kane and Ashley agreed. Rochelle commented that UCLA doesn't have a cost sharing system and that, perhaps, that's why this was in the original requirements. Buck pointed out that the cost sharing that is certified on the effort report is what really counts, since this is the PI saying what actual cost sharing occurred as opposed to the commitment recorded in the campus cost sharing system. Kathy Hass commented that the purpose of this report is to cross-check local cost-sharing systems. The group agreed that effort reports which are certified with changes to cost sharing should be listed on a report using a format similar to the report listing effort reports certified with payroll changes.

Adam will take the comments and guidance from this discussion and put together revised and more detailed requirements document, including identification of what data will be on the reports. Once a draft is available, review will occur via email and follow-up discussion will take place at the next meeting.

Enhancements Requests Review

Adam noted that there had been no new enhancement requests since the last meeting, though a couple of bug reports had come in since then.

Ashley mentioned that the San Diego pilot testing group had expressed a concern that if a PI has to certify for a number of people working on that PI's project, then the PI would have to open up each individual effort report for certification. They had suggested having a single, consolidated, "effort report" showing the particulars of each individual so the PI could certify for multiple effort reports at one time. Adam asked whether the pending enhancement to allow navigation from one open effort report to the next would be a reasonable alternative. Ashley agreed that this might be a possibility and that San Diego would look at the pending navigation enhancement before pursuing this item further.

Other Topics

The NSF has issued its audit report on Penn (link: http://www.nsf.gov/oig/UPENN_06-1-010_final.pdf ). Jorge noted that one particular highlight of the audit was that the NSF faulted Penn for allowing department mangers to certify effort reports without having a process for documenting how managers have the appropriate knowledge of what the individuals for who effort reports were certified actually did. It was suggested that this topic be brought up with the Management Group for further discussion.

A question was raised about when Base ERS Release 6 would be issued. Adam responded that Release 6 will be coming out soon, possibly as early as Monday, August 14.


Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 14, 2006. Because the Management Group is scheduled to meet that morning, the next meeting will be a conference call from 1:00pm-3:00pm.