

February 2021 Research Administration Forum Q&A

Contents

Human Research Protection Program	1
Contract and Grant Administration	1
Extramural Fund Management	3

Human Research Protection Program

Q1: Please describe emergency use

A1: Please see our link to OHRPP guidance on Emergency Use: <https://ohrpp.research.ucla.edu/emergency-use/>

Contract and Grant Administration

Q1: EPASS: Is there any way to upload all documents at once, and then add the descriptions to each one? That would be much faster than uploading each one individually?

A1: Not at this time, but we can look into adding this functionality. Currently only attachments that are classified as 'Other' require a description to be added; it is optional for all other attachments.

Q2: Sorry if you said this, but I didn't hear if you clarified: Will there be a way to upload more than one attachment or can we ONLY upload one document?

A2: Only a single file is required to be uploaded to the EPASS (the Proposal, which should include the Budget, Budget Justification, and Statement of Work), but you have the ability to upload additional documents in addition to the Proposal.

Q3: If we use the electronic EPASS system and send to OCGA for review, do we still need to send an email to proposal intake team letting them know a proposal has been submitted?

A3: No email is required to proposal intake. The system auto-generates an email to proposal intake to notify them of a proposal in the EPASS system

Q4: Does the Cayuse proposal have to be uploaded as a PDF through this EPASS system? Or does OCGA just go into Cayuse?

A4: OCGA has the ability to go into Cayuse to review the proposal. We have a section to note the electronic submission information which helps us locate the proposal.

No PDF is required to be uploaded; however, you can still upload the compliance documents.

Just as a note, for the reviewers of the EPASS in the department routing, you may want to consider attaching the PDF copy of the proposal so they can review the proposal prior to approving the EPASS. Not a requirement, but a suggestion so they are aware of what they are certifying for.

Q5: Would it be possible to allow the ability to edit the EPASS (i.e. add documents) once it has been submitted for signatures?

A5: Once it has been routed to OCGA, the ability for changes are then locked. If Proposal Intake routes it back to the preparer, then changes may be made. If there are changes after PIT accepts and assigns it, the changes can be sent to the OCGA assignee (analyst or officer).

To clarify, Proposal Intake uses the routing function to return proposals that require correction or may be missing the min document requirements, such as if a blank page is uploaded for a SOW or Budget. Since it would not meet the requirements, PIT can route it back to the preparer to meet the requirements.

Q6: Is this function new? Being able to route the EPASS back to the department from OCGA?

A6: This function has been in place since we rolled out the EPASS system in Nov 2019.

Q7: If the person you route the e EPASS to is out of the office, are there work-arounds for that?

There is the ability for Departmental Admins to assign Proxy signers for a given user. A Proxy can sign for any person in the approval flow for a given EPASS except for the PI.

Q8: Currently proposals that go through TDG need to be emailed instead of sent via the system. Will we eventually be able to push the button to automatically be sent to them?

A8: Yes, we plan to work with TDG to allow submission of the EPASS and other attachments directly to TDG and not require submission to be done outside of the system.

Q9: When we do fellowship applications, the system doesn't route it to the students/postdocs to sign. It only goes to the PIs and chairs. Will the system eventually route it to them instead of us having to get their signature?

A9: One of the enhancements that will be deployed soon will allow Fellows to be selected just like PIs, so if the Fellow is a user in EPASS they can be included in the routing. If the Fellow is not in the EPASS system, their signature will be able to be manually uploaded into the EPASS by the Preparer.

Q10: I'm confused by two of the answers about the EPASS. One says "only a single file is required to be uploaded to the EPASS (the Proposal, which should include the Budget, Budget Justification, and Statement of Work)". But another says the proposal file is not required: "OCGA has the ability to go into cayuse to review the proposal...No PDF is required to be uploaded." And it also says that the OCGA needs more than just that single file ("the compliance documents.")

A10: Apologies for the confusion. If you are submitting via an electronic system (S2S Grants, Grants.gov, Research.gov, etc.) the upload of the Proposal is not required. If you are NOT submitting via an electronic system, uploading the Proposal is required as there is nowhere else for OCGA to go to obtain that document. The system has logic that will enforce this.

The document(s) required by the EPASS system are the minimum required for the EPASS to be submitted to OCGA and assigned to an Officer/Analyst which are different than those required for submission to the sponsor.

Q11: EPASS question: When we assemble a Cayuse package, we include all the internal UCLA documents (the ones not sent to NIH) under the “Supporting Info.” section (PI Exception Letter, Subrecipient Commitment form, etc.). Then, when we submit the EPASS to OCGA, we have to attach all these documents. Does OCGA’s access to the Cayuse package include the ability to see the Supporting Info section and, if so, why do we need to attach all these to the EPASS?

A11: If the additional documents are in Cayuse, no need to re-attach in the EPASS system. We can retrieve them from Cayuse itself.

Extramural Fund Management

Q1: If we are not the main recipient department on the awarded fund, can we view the full info of the AR? For example, if the main P.I. is from ECE, and Co-P.I. from Education, and we are co-managing the funding, can our assigned fund manager (on Co-PI) get access to see all info?

A1: The user has access to view AR of the funds in their cluster in PAMS. This means the fund manager of the linked department is not able to see AR of the fund administered by the home department unless the home and linked departments happen to be in the same cluster in PAMS.

Q2: Basic question: who is really chasing the money after the invoice is sent?

A2: EFM continues to take the lead in following up on the outstanding AR. Depending on the reason for a delay in payment, we reach out to the department contact for assistance to collect the payment. For example, if the payment is not made due to that a progress report is not submitted, we will need help from the PI and the department to fulfill this requirement for payment collection. AR features in PAMS are not to expect the department fund managers to take the lead in collecting the payment but making the outstanding AR and its status transparent to everyone involved in financial management of the project so all are well informed of the overall financial health of the project.

Q3: What should the department do if our EFM accountant is unresponsive in regards to expired funds? We are very eager to close them!

A3: Sorry to hear that you experienced a delay in getting responses from the EFM team. There may be some hurdles that EFM accountant experience. Nonetheless, if you experience any challenge in working with the EFM team or have feedback to share, please feel free to contact me at any time [Yoon Lee, Senior Director, yoony.lee@research.ucla.edu]. I will look into the situation and work on resolving the issue.

Q4: How should those funds that can't close because of the mass leave corrections be coded? Should EFM automatically code them as UCPATH issue related?

A4: A very good question. EFM is in fact in the process of updating all funds affected not only by MLC but VLA correction recently posted to January ledger. PAMS UCPATH issue flag was added to the “Expired Funds to Close” report as well so the fund manager can easily see which funds are not affected by UCPATH issues and can start working on those to close first.

Q5: Can we have a CRU representative be present in one of the RAF meeting to discuss to the whole community any updates/changes they have about answering all of our inquiries, as well as their structure. It seems that they are the only department that is invisible to the whole community but are very crucial to what is going on especially when contracts and grants are affected.

A5: Understood. I have reached out to one of the CRU team lead to extend an invitation and am waiting to hear back.

Q6: Is AP aware of this push? I struggle with getting things cleared so we can close. It can take months.

A6: The effort to close expired fund is not new to the campus and AP has been aware of it. I suggest that you may escalate it in the AP office when you do not receive a timely response.