

April 2023 Research Administration Forum Q&A

Contents

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

Contract and Grant Administration

Q1: Do the new F&A rates affect existing funds that were tagged with the 56% F&A? Or does the new F&A rate only apply to new funds after 7/1/23?

A1: In some cases, active fund accounts will be adjusted to the new rate (e.g. industry-sponsored research). In cases in which the sponsor will not accept a rate change (e.g. NSF), we will continue using the old rate for the remainder of the project period. If you have a specific example, please let us know so we can give you a definitive answer.

Q2: Please send us the info for the training you just mentioned.

A2: Here is a link to the [Monthly OCGA Training Calendar](#) web page. Reminders are also communicated using ORA News. If you have not done so already, you can [subscribe here](#).

Q3: When will the new F&A agreement be posted on the OCGA website?

A3: The current F&A agreement is now available on the [Facilities and Administrative Costs \(F&A\)](#) web page.

Q4: Do you have an updated F&A breakdown for CIRM?

A4: CIRM rates will be forthcoming.

Q5: Can you please explain how we will deal with situations with proposals that have been already submitted with old rates and if they are awarded after July 1?

A5: Once determined, information will be provided to campus.

Q6: What is OCGA's policy on answering phones during WFH? As you know, sometimes the direct interaction of a phone call is the only way to sort out a complicated issue. It seems to me that people should be just as available to answer phones as when we were all in the office yet, during WFH, some OCGA personnel refuse to pick up the phone, and even refuse to acknowledge email requests to talk.

A6: Please bring this matter to the Assistant Director or Senior Director with any specifics that you have.

Q7: On ASSIST do we have to break it to 2 lines for F&A rates or just 1 line to show the average rate? I am working on a PPG submission via ASSIST, start date is 4/1/24.

A7: Rates should be used as indicated on the Rate Agreement – do not combine or average F&A rates; Yes, you should use two lines in ASSIST to display the rates just as they appear in your internal budget.

Refer to Chapter 5.19 of the ASSIST User Guide for detailed instructions.

Q8: If a proposal was submitted at the current rate and an award is received on or after July 1, what rate is applied, the proposed old rate or new rate?

A8: Once determined, information will be provided to campus.

Q9a: How would the \$25,000 exclusion work for a subaward? Do we apply the entire \$25k exclusion to the start of the budget period, or do we need to wait until the subaward invoices for their work? If the latter, then would we not be able to budget the F&A rates during budget creation?

A9a: Because the F&A assessment is based on the transaction date, we cannot provide an exact estimate in the proposal budget. When preparing proposal budgets, you need to consider both the amount and programmatic requirements of the subaward to provide a best estimate. If a subaward budget is \$250,000 for one year, you would likely want to exclude the \$25,000 at beginning or lower rate. However, if the budget is \$25,000 for one year, you would likely distribute the exclusion across the entire year.

Q9b: The problem with budgeting during a split year with the rate increasing, if we have the \$25k for a subaward budgeted in the initial period where the rate is 57%, but the subaward can't get set up until we are in the 57.5% period, the F&A will start charging in the system based on the expense posted date, so we would have budgeted for 57%, and by the time we receive an invoice, we're being assessed 57.5%, and are overcharging F&A.

A9b: Same reply as 9a above.

Q10: Where is the post of CIRM current F&A and IDC rates with UCLA?

A10: CIRM has a slightly different base than the federal negotiated definition of MTDC. The following is the current CIRM definition of the F&A Base: "These rates are applied to the Adjusted Project Costs which exclude Equipment, Tuition and Fees, Research Patient Care Costs, and the total cost of each service contract, Subcontract and Consultant agreement in excess of \$25,000." CIRM also allows for "Facilities Costs" of 14% and 16% and indirect of 20% and we have a standard F&A Waiver for CIRM.

CIRM's facilities (category A and category B) rates are based on UCLA's federally negotiated F&A rate agreement. We will look into the rate for Operation/Maintenance Expenses, rate for Library Expenses, rate for Depreciation or Use Allowances, and rate for Interest on Capital Debt in Exhibit A of the new F&A rate agreement.

Q11: Should we start using the new F&A breakdown for the proposal with the few years project periods, starting today?

A11: Yes - as long as you have time before the deadline to recalculate and update the budget.

Q12: Does Department of Energy review the F&A rates?

A12: Yes

Q13: For NIH proposals submitted in Cayuse: If we don't have any exclusions, but the rate is split during the budget period, do we need to split the rate in Cayuse, or can we use a single average rate?

A13: Whether there are exclusions or not, you do need to display both rates in the S2S Grants (Cayuse) application, just as they appear in your internal budget. The UCLA institutional profile has been updated in S2S Grants (Cayuse) to reflect our current rate agreement.

Q14: Has the off-campus rate changed?

A14: No

Q15: For RPPR that's due, there is a question about F&A rate change. We should answer that question Yes, correct?

A15: The RPPR question states, "Is there a change in performance sites that will affect the F&A costs". If the performance site remains the same, the answer would be No.

Human Research Protection Program Hot Topics

Q1: Is UCLA getting a whole new IRB system/platform? When will it launch?

A1: UCLA is changing to a new system for IRB submissions. It's not completely new, as it's from the same vendor and many functions work the same. We are in the middle of the transition. For details on the current stage of the transition, please visit the [Electronic Submission Systems](#) web page.

Extramural Fund Management Hot Topics

Q1: Will expense approval workflow to FMs or Purchasing?

A1: When a transaction posts to Oracle it will be the responsibility of the department to approve the transaction. The expected process is that departments will set up assignments in PAMS and these assignments will interface to specific roles in Oracle. Users with the appropriate role will then be expected to review and approve transactions in Oracle.

Q2: With respect to NPEAR for example, what are we relying on: PPM or GL?

A2: There will be a new Cost Transfer tool to replace NPEAR and the user will be able to look up transactions using either POETAF or CoA depending on where the expense is currently charged. From there, users will enter the applicable chartstring where the expense should be transferred to, which will be POETAF when moving an expense to PPM.

Q3: Will the billing section provide invoice templates for clinical trials?

A3: Invoicing for industry sponsored Clinical Trials will continue to be completed outside of Oracle and templates for CTs will not be available in Oracle. We are currently working with CT staff to determine what changes will occur due to the transition to Oracle and how this will impact CT billing.

Q4: Transferring from PPM to CoA, is it because it's easier to be audited by a CPA Firm, or is it easier for outsourcing the fund management? Just curious, because it seems to be a large change.

A4: Yes, this is a large change. The reason behind it is that the chartstring is designed based on the location of the transaction. POETAF is designed to include segments relevant to transactions which will be posted within the PPM

subledger, while CoA is designed for a General Ledger. There are segments within the POETAF chartstring which are not available in CoA and essential for the management for sponsored projects.

Q5: As far as Object Code is concerned, is it no longer used or is it replaced by Commodity Code?

A5: For Contract and Grant expenses, Expenditure Type will replace the Object Code used today, and Expenditure Type is a segment in the POETAF. We will map all Object Codes to Expenditure Types as part of the conversion process. Transactions posted in PPM using POETAF will then map to the Account segment within the CoA.

Q6: Can you please clarify the purpose of having task since it is same as Project Number?

A6: Task is a required field within the POETAF chartstring used in PPM, and is required to be managed centrally. At UCLA, the Project field will provide the granularity needed to manage C&G awards so task has been mapped to this value.

Q7: For expenditure type, do we type in the description "project supplies", or will we use numeric codes as we do now?

A7: The Project team is currently working with each individual boundary system (e.g., Concur, JAGGAER) to design the interface. More information on how expenditure type will appear and be selected in each system will be shared as it becomes available.

Q8: For training grants where we separate out stipends on 78XXXX vs. other admin expense 40XXX, how would that be reflected on POETAF & CoA?

A8: For conversion all Account-CC-Fund combinations will be set up as separate Projects in PPM. The Project segment will map to the Portfolio segment in the CoA. This means the segregation for expenses currently charged to 78xxxx and 40xxxx Accounts will remain.

Q9: In a nutshell, in future Monthly Statements run, should we go by Portfolio/Award? Or in other words, just for practice, what Identify (now it is FAU) are we going to look for?

A9: In PPM, Award will correspond to the PATS Institution Number which is identified on the Award Snapshot. Awards will then be broken down by Projects, which correspond to Account-CC-Fund today. For conversion, all Account-CC-Funds will convert to separate Projects in POETAF and the Project segment will map to the Portfolio segment in the CoA. To get an overall view of the entire award, in the same manner as Fund in current state, you will look at the Award within PPM. To isolate an Account-CC-Fund combination you will refer to Project.

Q10: Will there be a permanent report somewhere in the Ascend environment that will show the FAU, POETAF, and CoA? I'm sorry, but how are staff expected to remember the linkage between POETAF and CoA for 100+ research funds?

A10: Staff will not be expected to remember the FAU, CoA and POETAF values. We will share this feedback with the Project team and look into the options available for users to easily understand the relationship between values.

Q11: Could you explain in what occasions we will use the POETAF vs the CoA with contracts and grants accounts?

A11: POETAF will be used for the recording of transactions to the PPM subledger, which will house all C&G awards. This means all users posting transactions to C&G awards will use this chartstring. All transactions posted to subledgers will be summarized in the GL using the CoA.

Q12: Will be there a Central Place where we can draw GL, as well as Payroll?

A12: Yes, the Technical team is working on solutions to provide for the reporting needs of campus. More information regarding reporting can be found on the Technical Overview page on the [Ascend website](#).

Q13: Suppose all these new things are going to be Web based. Is campus ready for heavy reliance on the Server?

A13: Please provide additional context and/or clarifying details to ascend2@ucla.edu to help us better understand your concern.

Q14: If it was known that not using project/source codes would be an issue, why was Oracle/ASCEND selected? Why wasn't the ability to enter these (or something equivalent) part of the requirements for this software during the acquisition period?

A14: Oracle was selected as the best modern financial system to meet UCLA's complex requirements. Most modern financial systems do not contain "free form" fields like today's Project and Source fields. Free form fields are not accommodated in new systems because they hinder data accuracy and related reporting. To prepare for this upcoming change, the Program Team is working with over 300 campus mapping experts across every organization to understand how these fields are used today. Using this information, the following options exist for elements held in Project and Source today:

1. Some of the data elements will be available in the Ascend 2.0 CoA, but will be available in a standardized set of values for use across the institution to improve accuracy and reporting. For example, identifying information for a faculty member will be held in the Portfolio segment, and identifying information for a Conference will be held in the Activity segment.
2. Other data elements will not be held the CoA, but will instead be held in subledgers or other sub-systems. For example, one current use of the Source field is to identify how receipts come in (e.g., ACH, Wire, etc.). In the future, this same information will be identified in the Cash Management module of Oracle.
3. Finally, some data will admittedly be required to be tracked in separate systems, if it is not appropriate for a financial system. For example, identifying information for staff members attending a conference will not be held in the central finance systems.

Q15: It would be great if people had access to a production version of this before it goes live. Is that possible?

A15: Thank you for this suggestion and we will share this with our Project team. We are also looking for users who are interested in testing prior to go live. If you are interested, please reach out to Katie Cadle at kcadle@research.ucla.edu.

Q16: Will we still have the current tools to run financial reports? Dean's office Excel add-ins?

A16: The Project team is currently working on assessing which reporting tools will be retrofitted and which tools will be replaced. This process includes the creation of a sub-committee of the Reporting Workgroup to ensure campus users have the reports they need after go-live. More information on reporting tools specific to C&G will be shared as it is available. For general information regarding the future reporting structure refer to the Technical Overview page on the [Ascend website](#).

Q17: In PPM, will we be able to see all the projects that roll up into an award?

A17: Yes, there are pages within PPM which will allow users to see all Projects on a single Award.

Q18: How will POETAF (project number vs. fund number) appear in snapshot? Will there be a presentation on any changes (minor or major) to the snapshot with the conversion?

A18: There are expected to be minor changes to the Award Snapshot to capture the way in which Awards will be structured in PPM. We will share updates at future RAF meetings as decisions are finalized.

Q19: When is the anticipated go live date?

A19: The anticipated go-live date is early January 2025.

Q20: Will we have a rapid closeout tool equivalent? Will existing funds data migrate into PPM?

A20: The Project team is currently working on assessing which reporting tools will be retrofitted and which tools will be replaced. We have included the RAPID Tool on this list, and more information on all C&G specific tools will be shared as it is available. Yes, existing fund data will be migrated to PPM through the conversion process.

Q21: Currently, when we look at an FAU, we can see the cost center by direct inspection, and thus know which PI it belongs to. The new Project Number in the POETAF doesn't seem to allow that. Will there be an easy way to extract that information from the project number without having to run a report – e.g., a translator we can install on our computers?

A21: At the moment, PI information will have to be pulled via a report. Cost Center information can be derived from Organization which is the "O" in POETAF.

Q22: Why should we believe that Oracle will be an improvement over our current financial system?

A22: The Ascend 2.0 Program is managed completely by UCLA. We have taken the opportunity to incorporate lessons learned from UCPATH and from other UC schools' financial systems implementations. We have instituted an effective governance model, prioritized change management and the balance of internal and external resources, invested in a robust hypercare support model, and planned early for post go-live sustainment.

Q23: Are we going to be able to run historical reports after we transition to Oracle?

A23: The Project team understands that information housed within our current financial system will still be required after we go-live with Oracle. The Project team is looking into how this data will be made available and will share updates as decisions are made in the future.

Q24: Has UCPATH FAU to COA migration been discussed?

A24: Yes, this has been discussed and there is a workstream focused on UCPATH retrofit to Oracle within the Project team.