

**Effort Reporting System  
Requirements Group  
Notes of the March 8, 2007 Meeting  
Accepted April 12, 2007**

The meeting was convened as a conference call. Attendees: Evelyn Balabis (UCLA), Connie Brown (UCLA), Surya Gangireddy (UCLA), Maurice Taylor (UCLA), Vadim Krifuks (UCB for Cynthia Kane), Erica Webber (UCSF), Zoanne Nelson (UCSF), Buck Marcussen (UCD), James Ringo (UCD), Debra Henn (UCD), Mark Cooper (UCSD), Ashley Clipson (UCSD), Xui Mei Wang (UCSD), Jorge Ohy (UCOP), Pixie Ogren (UCOP), Steve Hunter (UCOP), and Jon Good (UCOP)

In addition, UCSD department guests Mike Bloom, Joe Czech, and Joy Long were present on the call.

Review of 2/8/2007 Meeting Notes

The February 8, 2007, meeting notes were accepted without revision.

Follow-ups from Previous Meetings

Management Group Report

Jon Good and Steve Hunter briefly reported the highlights of topics discussed by the Management Group at its 3/7/2007 meeting:

- Project Schedule – Compliance monitoring reporting is in review and is still on track for a March release. The focus of activity in the past few weeks has been on performance testing of the hosted environment, and making modifications to improve performance and fix bugs uncovered during performance testing.

Multiple Co-Principal Investigators (Requirements Review)

The committee reviewed the draft requirements document prepared by Pixie Ogren. After a brief discussion of how the ERS currently handles co-PI's, the committee approved the requirements. Steve will schedule work on implementing requirements for completion by June, 2007.

Enhancements Requests Review

#515 Certification Summary Form – Ashley Clipson had emailed a description of the request and a sample screen on March 7<sup>th</sup> in preparation for this discussion. The request is for a summary screen on which a PI can indicate approval of effort for many individuals without having to click through to each individual effort report (simplifying

**Effort Reporting System  
Requirements Group  
Notes of the March 8, 2007 Meeting  
Accepted April 12, 2007**

navigation and reducing mouse clicks). The problem that this request is intended to address is one where a PI has one or more grants with many people on each grant. San Diego cited the Super Computer Center as an example of a department with as many as 80 grants and approximately 200 people, most of whom put effort into multiple grants. The sample screen showed different categories of effort and associated, much in the same way as the detailed effort report, but only the total effort and not the full detail.

The discussion was lengthy and everyone on the call contributed to the discussion. There was consensus on two points. First, everyone liked the idea of streamlining navigation if possible. Second, there was recognition of the importance of adequate controls and being able to withstand an audit. The key points of the discussion, based on the request document and the sample summary screen:

- ERS was designed to enhance accountability for certifications, with the certification action designed to occur in the context of the detailed effort report display. ERS must strike the appropriate balance: ease of use versus controls and accountability.
- As proposed, the summary would allow for certification to occur absent the presentation of all detail from an effort report. Is this appropriate from a controls and accountability perspective?
- If the proposed summary were to move forward, a PI challenged under audit for certifying inaccurate effort could legitimately say “I didn’t see the details” before certifying.
- Should all of the detail (original and adjusted payroll and cost sharing) from each effort report be displayed in the “summary”?
- How would effort reports requiring multiple certifications be handled?
- As proposed, the summary could well become the path of choice for certification instead of going to the individual detailed effort report. If the summary presents a subset of information on the detailed effort report, why would anyone go to the detailed effort report to certify?
- How would comments about changes made to the underlying effort report be presented? Some of the comments provide valuable information needed for certification.
- How would re-issued effort reports be handled?

Next steps in this discussion:

1. Ashley will put together an example showing more of the navigation and detail of how the proposed summary could work, taking into account the issues identified above.
2. Jon and Pixie will put together a highlight list of issues.
3. Both of the above will be circulated to the Requirements Committee via email for discussion.

**Effort Reporting System  
Requirements Group  
Notes of the March 8, 2007 Meeting  
Accepted April 12, 2007**

Implementation Status

San Diego – Ashley Clipson reported that San Diego still is in the process of beta testing and are working through some issues with Work Study payments. San Diego is planning on going live with selected departments in June.

Los Angeles – Connie Brown reported that Los Angeles is in production and is now testing with Release 7.4 and addressing concerns with Work Study. UCLA is preparing to run separate fall and winter quarter cycles simultaneously.

Berkeley – Vadim reported that Berkeley is preparing to test pilot at the end of March (Fall semester for academics and second quarter for staff). Berkeley is working through apparent issues with the financial interface file and with training materials. Vadim asked whether other campuses were using the Base ERS training materials. (It was noted that Davis and San Francisco had both prepared new training materials.)

San Francisco – Zoanne Nelson reported that San Francisco is hoping to go live this month, but ERS performance in the mainframe environment needs to be addressed before that can happen. UCOP is looking at alternative environments to meet performance objectives.

Davis – Debra Henn reported that Davis has been in pilot for a couple of weeks. Certifications are taking place in select departments. A lot of time is being spent making sure that reviewers have appropriate access to effort reports. Deployment to the entire campus will take place in the next few days.

Enhancements Requests Review

There were no new enhancement requests for review by the Requirements Committee.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, April 12, 2007** This meeting will be a conference call from 1:00pm-3:00pm.