

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the January 10, 2008 Meeting
Accepted February 14, 2008**

The meeting was convened as a conference call. Attendees: Adam Cohen (UCB), Cynthia Kane (UCB), James Ringo (UCD), Debra Henn (UCD), Buck Marcussen (UCD), Connie Brown (UCLA), Maurice Taylor (UCLA), Guy Stocks (UCLA), Connie Feeley (UCSB), Ashley Clipson (UCSD), Bronwen Halacy (UCSD), Wendy Hom (UCSF), Jorge Ohy (UCOP), Pixie Ogren (UCOP), Steve Hunter (UCOP), and Jon Good (UCOP)

Review of 11/15/07 Meeting Notes

The November 15, 2007, meeting notes were accepted as written.

Follow-ups from Previous Meetings

Management Group Report

Jon Good reviewed highlights of the Management Group meeting of 1/9/2008:

- In November, the consequences statement was sent to Larry Coleman and Anne Broome for coordination with Vice Chancellors for Research, Controllers, and Academic Council for adoption in policy. Nothing has been heard in response as of yet. Jorge Ohy will be following up to get a sense of where the consequences statement is in this coordination process.
- Discussion continued from the November 14th conference call about possibly revising the policy statement on timing (45/30) requirements for completion of effort report certifications. Jorge has proposed language that suggests the 45/30 days as guidelines and that full certification would need to occur no later than 45 days after the combined 75 days (effectively allowing up to 120 days from the end of the reporting period to achieve full certification). The Management Group will review this proposal and discuss again at their February 13 meeting and with the Controllers soon thereafter.

Jorge asked the Requirements Committee what changes to 45/30 would be practical for the campuses. Ashley Clipson indicated that San Diego is proposing issuance within 75 days to facilitate two ledger close cycles allowing departments to get caught up with pay adjustments, and then 45 days to capture the certification. San Diego users feel that this is the minimum time in which certification is achievable.

Cynthia Kane noted that there have been internal discussions at Berkeley on this topic, and that the campus would like to see enough time for a minimum of 2

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the January 10, 2008 Meeting
Accepted February 14, 2008**

ledger closes before generating effort reports. If that were to be happen, then having 30 days to certify after generating the effort reports would be okay.

Pixie Ogren asked for confirmation that users were not processing adjustments as a result of the effort report, but for other reasons BEFORE the effort report was generated. Berkeley, Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Francisco responded that this was true.

Pixie asked why 45 days is insufficient time to process pay adjustments. Ashley remarked that San Diego departments do their review and submit adjustments to central office, and other factors in the central office chain may leave only 7 work days to get those adjustments done. Ashley noted that at San Diego online transfers go along a high-risk or low-risk path, with high-risk transfers undergoing greater scrutiny before being processed. All transfers involving sponsored projects go along the high-risk review path. Pixie noted that at Los Angeles, transfers are reviewed after the fact only. Cynthia mentioned that at Berkeley, fund managers must review the transfers and fund managers have fluctuating activity that sometimes prevents a more timely review of the transfers.

Pixie commented that one of the operating assumptions stated at the beginning of the requirements phase of the ERS project was that online transfers of expense processing would be in place at each campus before implementation of ERS. It has been acknowledged throughout the project that delays in processing transfers of expense would almost certainly result in significant problems with effort reports, making it difficult to complete the certification process in a timely manner. Pixie suggested that an campuses consider the possibility of implementing online transfers of expense as a solution rather than simply changing the timing of the effort reports.

- Carrying Forward Line Certifications When Unaffected by Late Pay

Pixie reported that the Management Group discussed the request discussed by the Requirements Committee on November 15th which asked for carrying forward line certifications that are not impacted by late pay changes (refer to Enhancement Requests #1318 and #1319). The Management Group expressed concern that such a change could reduce the controls on the certification process, and agreed to wait six months for more experience with ERS in departments and preparation of a more detailed analysis for review by the Management Group.

Project Status

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the January 10, 2008 Meeting
Accepted February 14, 2008**

Steve Hunter reported that Release 9.0 is just about ready for release, and includes improvements to compliance monitoring reporting which will make the reports easier for everyone to use as well as cleaning up numerous bugs.

Implementation Status

- Berkeley – Cynthia Kane reported that Berkeley is in the process of completing its pilot phase. There were some issues shortly after the November start of the pilot that required restarting the pilot in December. Because of this timing change there was immediate feedback that the pilot deadline of 1/4/2008 was not going to be achievable. The certification deadline is now been extended to mid-January. There has not been a lot of feedback to date from people participating in the pilot, though some expected issues have been raised. Currently planning on February 2008 implementation for the entire campus, with a deadline of April 30 for certification to give all first-time ERS users an opportunity to become familiar with ERS.
- San Diego – Bronwen Halacy reported that San Diego is just getting underway with the July-September cycle. The January-March 2007 is at 87% certification, while the April-June cycle is at 45%. Rollout to the full campus will occur in March. Bronwen mentioned that San Diego has some difficult PIs and asked for suggestions. Buck suggested department coordinators have one-on-one sessions with the difficult PIs to address their questions.
- Davis – Debra Henn reported that Davis is on Release 8.1 and getting ready for the next cycle which covers January-September 2007.
- Los Angeles – Maurice reported that UCLA is in the process of wrapping up Spring and Summer 2007 quarters next week.
- Santa Barbara - Connie Feeley reported that Santa Barbara is still in the early stages of implementation planning.
- San Francisco – Wendy Hom reported that San Francisco is moving along reasonably well. Fall 2006 is at 97% certification, Winter 2007 at 96%, Spring 2007 at 92%, and Summer 2007 at 77%.

Enhancements Requests Review

Adam Cohen pointed out that Enhancement Request #682, which asked for hierarchical permissions, shows up in Bugzilla as having been completed. [#682 will be included in

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the January 10, 2008 Meeting
Accepted February 14, 2008**

Base ERS Release 9]. However, there was a comment in the bug report requesting a wildcard feature that would reduce the number of detailed permission rules to enter even further. The wildcard feature appears not to be included in the enhancement. After a brief discussion, Adam will submit a new enhancement request for this feature and the Requirements Committee will discuss further on the next conference call.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, February 14, 2008** This meeting will be a conference call from 1:00pm-3:00pm.