

**University of Wisconsin – Madison  
Grants Project  
Monthly Status Report**

<b>Project</b>		<b>Reporting Period</b>	
University of Wisconsin – Madison Grants Project		August 1 – August 31, 2006	
<b>Phase</b>	<b>Project Manager</b>		<b>Technical Project Manager</b>
Fit Gap	Mark Sweet		Elise Barho

<b>Project Status Dashboard</b>			
<b>Assessment Category</b>	<b>Previous (green, yellow, red)</b>	<b>Current (green, yellow, red)</b>	<b>Rationale (issues, changes)</b>
<b>Overall Project Status</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Green</b>	
Environment	Green	Green	Configuration issues have been resolved. New environment will be created for configuration in October.
Site Readiness	Green	Green	Continued involvement from all constituents in follow up and analysis meetings
Project Management	Green	Green	Operating as envisioned in project plan and project charter.
Project Coordination	Yellow	Yellow	JPMC and JPMS have been established, but progress on issues remains slow. Additional coordination needed with campus groups and PIs
Training and Security	Green	Green	Initial security discussions planned for Analysis Phase.
Data Conversion	Green	Green	Strategy has been drafted and source systems identified.
Testing	N/A	N/A	
Reporting	Green	Green	Reporting sessions progressing as planned; Overall Reporting Strategy currently being reviewed to help guide future activities.
Business Process Readiness	Green	Green	Business Process Redesign sessions to be executed by RSP staff. Documentation template approved.
<p>"Assessment" is rated in terms of a color code, where <b>Green</b> means 'no issues' or 'issues that are being addressed are under control'. <b>Yellow</b> means there is/are issue(s), current or emerging, which may impact the project if not addressed. <b>Red</b> means that there is an issue, current or emerging, which has impacted, or will impact, the project unless immediate management action is taken.</p>			

<b>Accomplishments For This Period</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completed follow-up sessions on all Fit Gap sessions to ensure completeness of business process review</li> <li>• Completed all Fit Gap Analysis sessions to identify potential solutions to system gaps and selected a proposed solution based on</li> <li>• Continued updating Fit Gap documentation for review by project constituents (MIL, EXT, UWSA, etc)</li> <li>• Began executing fit gap estimation sessions to determine level of effort required for completing technical design and development</li> <li>• Fully participated in all JPMC discussions and meetings, completing all required documentation requests</li> <li>• Continued meeting with Campus Reporting group to define and document end user reporting requirements</li> <li>• Drafted Organizational Change Management Plan</li> <li>• Drafted Conversion Strategy</li> <li>• Drafted Reporting Strategy</li> <li>• Continued participation in LAST Edits project, fully transitioning responsibility to the LAST project team.</li> </ul>

**University of Wisconsin – Madison  
Grants Project  
Monthly Status Report**

• Completed first executive committee meeting
•
•
•
•

<b>Key Milestones/Activity Status/Results</b>				
	<b>Milestone/Activity/Results</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Forecast</b>	<b>Status</b>
1.	Complete all Follow Up and Decision Sessions	8/25/06	8/25/06	All follow-up sessions have been completed for business processes
2.	Complete Business Process Gap Analysis Sessions	8/31/06	8/31/06	All analysis sessions have been completed.
3.	Complete Gap Effort Estimation Sessions	9/15/06	9/20/06	Several areas may require additional estimation sessions to complete all necessary reviews.
4.	Finalize Fit Gap Documentation	9/9/06	9/11/06	Majority of documents completed prior to deadline. Several business processes required additional review.
5.	Complete Fit Gap Phase	9/15/2006	9/20/2006	Working towards completing majority of phase tasks for all business processes. Certain additional analysis may be continue into Analysis Phase for SIPs and CPDs.
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				

**University of Wisconsin – Madison  
Grants Project  
Monthly Status Report**

NOTE: the Joint Project Managers Committee is the group that is coordinating these strategic interoperability points (SIP) and cross project decisions (CPD)

<b>Interaction with other Project (SIP/CPD)</b>			
	<b>Issue</b>	<b>SIP/CPD</b>	<b>Status</b>
1.	SFS Edits	SIP	Charter created.
2.	IAA for Effort System	SIP	Charter created. Team kick-off scheduled
3.	IAA for SFS	SIP	Charter created.
4.	IAA for WISDM	SIP	Charter created.
5.	Person Data	SIP	
6.	ACH	SIP	Charter created.
7.	Commitment Control	SIP	Charter created.
8.	SFS Chartfields, Attributes, Source Codes, and Shared Tables	SIP	
9.	Salary Cost Transfer	SIP	
10.	AR/BI Functionality	SIP	
11.	Workflow	SIP	On Hold
12.	WISDM	SIP	Charter created.
13.	DOA	SIP	
14.	Non-sponsored projects	SIP	Charter created.
15.	Service Level Agreement for SFS	SIP	
16.	Service Level Agreement for ECRT	SIP	
17.	Security Administration	SIP	
18.	SFS 8.9 Upgrade Timing	CPD	Decision matrix created.
19.	Project Numbering in SFS	CPD	CPD document created. Meeting scheduled.
20.	Cost Sharing	CPD	CPD document created.
21.	Tracking Commitments	CPD	CPD document created. Meeting scheduled

<b>Immediate Visibility – Emergent Issues and Risks</b>				
	<b>Issue / Risk</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action By</b>
1.	None at this time			

“Action By” person listed first has assigned responsibility. Second person assists / reviews and follow up.

<b>Ongoing – Issues and Risks</b>				
	<b>Issue / Risk</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Consequence</b>	<b>Action By</b>
1.	User Acceptance of Functionality	Major		Jason Moebius
2.	Large Project	Major		Jason Moebius
3.	Process Change	Major		Mark Sweet
4.	Gaining consensus	Major		Mark Sweet
5.	Ownership and Involvement	Major		Mark Sweet
6.	Effective Communication	Major		Mark Sweet
7.	Multiple Concurrent System Implementations	Major		Elise Barho
8.	Business Disruption	Major		Jason Moebius

**University of Wisconsin – Madison  
Grants Project  
Monthly Status Report**

9.	Grants.gov vendor solution	Major		Stephanie Gray
10.	Cost Sharing	Major		Jason Moebius
11.	Cost Overruns	Major		Mark Sweet
12.	Control and Monitoring of Project Budget and Expenditures	Major		Jason Moebius
13.	Cost Transfers	Major		Elise Barho
14.	Letter of Credit Management	Major		Jason Moebius
15.	Cash Management	Major		Jason Moebius
16.	Accuracy and Timeliness of Reporting	Major		Mark Sweet
17.	Effort Project Impact on Grants Resources	Major		Elise Barho
18.	SFS Change Control Process Not Defined	Major		Elise Barho
19.	RSP Staff Workload	Minor		Mark Sweet

"Action By" person listed first has assigned responsibility. Second person assists / reviews and follow up.

**Issue Log Statistics:**

- 

OPEN PeopleSoft Cases			
PeopleSoft Case #	Status	Description	Date Created
		None at this time	

Decision Log	
Decision	Description
How to handle non-Cumulative Billing? (3.02)	How to handle non-Cumulative Billing? How to segment billing for individual years (most common on federal awards)? Option Paper may be necessary here to outline the pros and cons. Huron already has something similar to an options doc that can be tailored to UW. Recommend to Project ID or Activity ID, but budget reference is also an option (but requires more system modifications to be able to bill).
Where and how will the E-T-Form be developed?	A decision needs to be made on how the E-T-form is to be developed, and on what system.
How will cost share be entered and tracked in PeopleSoft?	How will cost share be entered and tracked in PeopleSoft? For the purpose of reporting, cost share process must be identified in order to identify the cost share and waived cost share reports needed in PeopleSoft. opened 6/21/06
Fund codes needed for Regents reporting but are considered non-	Regent report details funding information for funds: 133, 134, 135, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 161, 162, and 533. Funds 147, 162, 183, and 533

**University of Wisconsin – Madison  
Grants Project  
Monthly Status Report**

<b>Decision Log</b>	
<b>Decision</b>	<b>Description</b>
sponsored projects.	are non-sponsored and are not in scope for Grants project. How will UW deal with such funds that are required for Regent reporting but are considered non-sponsored projects?
How many years of inactive ESIS award information will be converted into PeopleSoft?	There exists a need to report on inactive ESIS award information for Regent reports. How many years of inactive ESIS award information will be converted into PeopleSoft?
How will the post award team capture unobligated balance for the SF269 report?	Currently, un-obligated balance information is manually entered into the financial status. How will the post award team capture un-obligated balance for the SF269 report moving forward? Will the extract encumbrances from Purchasing module or continue manually calculating the data enter and entering that value into the SF269.
Will encumbrances be utilized in PS??	The consensus amongst the Campus group is that encumbrances are confusing and meaningless particularly towards the end of a project. Currently campus run project summary report in WISDM and then perform offline manual manipulation to remove encumbrances from their balance in order to provide PIs with their true available balance. How will encumbrances be utilized in PS?? The way encumbrances are utilized impacts what PIs see on their expenditure reports.
Campus identified a need to see budgets at category level for reporting	Due to the level of resources required by RSP to enter budgets at the detail category level, the Pre-Award team decided that budgets will be entered at a high level - direct and indirect level. However, this is in conflict to reporting requirements of the Campus group. They identified a need to see budgets at the category level for reporting purposes.
Tuition remissions that have been allocated off the project cannot be ignored when a salary adjustment is processed on the original charge.	Tuition remissions that have been allocated off the project cannot be ignored when a salary adjustment is processed on the original charge.  This decision is being tracked in Jira because we closed a gap saying that we would prevent non-billable tuition remission charges from going through on an invoice via an allocation to net out the amounts. The solution of going with allocations is contingent upon ensuring that the salary transfers are not performed without ensuring that the associated tuition remission is also adjusted (if necessary).
How will research related revenue be entered into the GL for Clinical Trials?	This nbquestion came up as a part of the gap analysis for the CMT team.
What is the production support structure between Milwaukee and Madison once we go live? (3.12)	What is the production support structure between Milwaukee and Madison once we go live?
What level does UW want to track deferred revenue vs. invoicing in the GL? (3.05)	What level does UW want to track deferred revenue vs. invoicing in the GL? At the project level? and enter the distribution in automatically (chartfield string)  Possible GAP - It can be difficult/time consuming to enter all the chartfields in manually so defaulting values in on the prepaid line based on the budget may be beneficial.
Need to meet with EXT to determine Invoicing Approach (3.05)	Need to meet with EXT to determine Invoicing Approach (Use this process or outside of system as they do currently)
Can 133 be separated into multiple funds (gifts, grants, contracts) (3.03)	Can 133 be separated into multiple funds (gifts, grants, contracts)  If there is a decision to split this fund it may be cleanest to do so before go live
Principal Investigators need to forecast expenditures.	PIs use blanket encumbrances in the legacy system to forecast expenditures such as salary. How will future salary expenses be recorded in PeopleSoft? Available options are: set up accruals, set up

**University of Wisconsin – Madison  
Grants Project  
Monthly Status Report**

<b>Decision Log</b>	
<b>Decision</b>	<b>Description</b>
	blanket encumbrances in Purchasing, or use the UW paydata system.
Employee-level payroll cost data required for billing and reporting for certain sponsors.	Need to decide our approach to meet the requirement for person-level payroll costs.
Configuration and support of additional GM/PC/CA/BI/AR Business Units beyond MSN, MIL, and EXT.	Need to document procedures for setting up additional PC business units for other campuses?
Approach to automating notifications of award modifications	Need to decide our approach to automating notification of key personnel of all changes in funding, dates, terms, conditions, milestones, budgets, and other key award/project data.
How will Regents reporting be handled for fund 533?	Fund 533 is used for gifts to the athletic department, and new gifts must be included in Regents reporting. No project IDs are currently used for these gifts; they are tracked by fund and DeptID (UDDS). They will not be treated as sponsored projects, and will not have any award in SFS. The planned method for Regents reporting will be based on Award Modifications, which won't work for fund 533. RSP currently handles the Regents reporting for fund 533 outside the automated process in ESIS. Doug Tilghman and Bob Andresen discussed this requirement on 8/31/06, and decided not to try to change this business process in the Grants suite. New gifts in fund 533 will still have to be added to the report outside the automated process.
Ownership of future reporting datamart	Who will have ownership and be responsible for maintenance of future reporting datamart? PeopleSoft, DoIT, UW System.