

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the November 9, 2006 Meeting
Accepted December 14, 2006**

The meeting was convened as a conference call. Attendees: Cynthia Kane (UCB), Connie Brown (UCLA), Evelyn Balabis (UCLA), Surya Gangireddy (UCLA), Wen Tang (UCLA), Erica Webber (UCSF), Buck Marcussen (UCD), James Ringo (UCD), Mark Cooper (UCSD), Ashley Clipson (UCSD), Jorge Ohy (UCOP), Pixie Ogren (UCOP), Adam Cohen (UCOP), Steve Hunter (UCOP), and Jon Good (UCOP)

Review of 9/14/2006 Meeting Notes

The revised September 14, 2006, meeting notes were accepted without further revision.

Review of 10/12/2006 Meeting Notes

The October 12, 2006, meeting notes were accepted as written.

Pixie Ogren commented that, even though she did not participate in the compliance monitoring reporting discussion, that there were a couple of points in the meeting notes where further consideration of the requirements was needed:

o page 3, 4th paragraph: the discussion concluded that an indicator of the academic status of the individual for whom the report was created as well as for the person certifying the report. be added to the Certification Listing Report. Pixie pointed out that while most certifiers are employees, ERS allows for non-employees to certify effort reports. (usually limited to cases of employees working in affiliated facilities such as VA or Agriculture Programs) If the certifier is not an employee, the system would not have information available to indicate whether or not the certifier was in an academic title code. Adam commented that the academic indicator would not show for a non-employee certifier. The group agreed.

o page 3, 5th paragraph – the discussion concluded with access to compliance monitoring reports being available to the Coordinator role and above. Pixie suggested making access to the reports a permission that could be assigned to any role as needed. Adam noted that doing so would require security administrators to explicitly give this permission to everyone who needed it. Pixie clarified that the permission would need to be assigned to the role only once and assigning it as a separate permission would give departments flexibility. Cynthia commented that there may well be a need to give this permission to internal audit and that having it as a distinct permission would be helpful. Adam noted that there were no specific technical concerns with making this change to the requirements. The group agreed to clarify the requirements to add access to compliance monitoring reports as a permission that can be assigned to any ERS role.

ERS Users Group

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the November 9, 2006 Meeting
Accepted December 14, 2006**

Ashley Clipson reported that November 1st ERS Users Group session went well. Notes from the session are being sent out this afternoon.

Project and department representatives from all five ERS sponsor campuses, and Riverside, were present to meet their counterparts from the other campuses and discuss how best to implement the ERS.

Buck Marcussen noted that his best “take-home” from the session was that all participants thought the system will work, no one expressed any negatives about the system.

Mark Cooper commented in projects like this, when implementation gets underway, you need a fresh perspective to validate that what was delivered as part of the development effort is what was intended. UCLA provided a lot of good information from their implementation experience for consideration in UCSD implementation planning. Mark also commented that it was good to get departmental perspective in the breakout sessions(s) as that provided valuable context.

Erica Webber thanked Ashley and Mark for pulling the ERS Users Group session together. Her best “take away” from the session was understanding where each campus was in implementation work and the issues that have come up.

Cynthia Kane echoed Erica’s comments and noted that this was a good opportunity to network with others going through the implementation process. It was informative to hear the details of other campus implementations and gives Berkeley food for thought as to what issues might come up in their implementation of ERS. Cynthia also noted that Berkeley does not have department representation on the Requirements Committee any more and that this needs to be changed as appropriate representation on the Requirements Committee is important for all campuses.

Follow-ups from Previous Meetings

Management Group Report

Jon Good briefly reported on highlight issues discussed by the Management Group:

- Training – In it’s meeting earlier in the morning, the Management Group had agreed that the Base ERS training materials should be brought current and kept current for some period of time. This will be done by the Project Team instead of outsourced. Because of the kinds of changes likely to occur, the audio portion of the Base ERS training materials will not be supported moving forward. Powerpoint sources for the training materials will also be made available.

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the November 9, 2006 Meeting
Accepted December 14, 2006**

- Annual Reporting – discussion concluded with two follow-ups: identifying the cognizant agency with responsibility for endorsing annual effort reporting and a Controllers strategy discussion about pursuing endorsement.
- Release 7 – Adam reported that this release is being wrapped up and is expected to be issued early next week. The release will include 38 enhancements and bug fixes. Erica requested getting the descriptive list of items included in the release. Adam responded that the release materials include all of the details. Adam noted the Requirements Committee will be copied on release letters from now on.

Enhancements Requests Review

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

Item #672 – Add additional filter to the Funds/FAU search tab – this request was submitted by Rochelle Caballero, who was not on the call. After a brief discussion it was agreed to wait until Rochelle returns from vacation to get clarification on the scope of this issue.

Other Topics

Mark Cooper asked whether other campuses wouldn't have a problem with 9/12 and 9/9 combination on a single report Pixie commented that all other campuses produced a separate report for Off Quarter payments and so 9/12 and 9/9 were not combined on a single report.

Buck asked whether there should be a new requirement to reconcile committed cost sharing. Adam and Pixie responded that the ERS was not in a position to reconcile cost sharing commitments, as ERS is not the system of record for such commitments. Jorge Ohy commented that, ideally, ERS data is fed back to campus cost sharing systems for reconciliation in those systems.

Jon noted that the ERS Management Group was in the process of setting a schedule of meetings for the first half of 2007 and that the ERS Requirements Schedule for the first half of 2007 will follow soon.

*[Note: Keeping with the 2nd Thursday of each month for the ERS Requirements Committee meetings, the following is a **tentative list of dates** for January-June 2007:*

- *January 11, 2007*
- *February 8, 2007*
- *March 8, 2007*

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the November 9, 2006 Meeting
Accepted December 14, 2006**

- *April 12, 2007*
- *May 10, 2007*
- *June 14, 2007*

Once the ERS Management Group has confirmed dates, these dates will either be confirmed or revised accordingly.]

Mark suggested, and the group agreed, to add “Implementation Issues” as an ongoing agenda item.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, December 14, 2006**. This meeting will be a conference call from 1:00pm-3:00pm.