

# CCB Decision Summary

Thurs., May 8, 2003  
 9:00 a.m.  
 Rockledge 1  
 OER Conf. Rm., Third Floor

## Requests Covered

	Submitted By	Area Affected	Type Of Request	Cost/Schedule Impact	Document Title
01	Sara Silver	R&R	Defect Fix	Yes	05-08-2003 Item 01
02	Krishna Collie	CM WEB		Yes	05-08-2003 Item 02
03	Krishna Collie	CM WEB	Requirements Clarification	Yes	05-08-2003 Item 03
04	Krishna Collie	CM WEB	Requirements Clarification	Yes	05-08-2003 Item 04
05	Michael Wilson	IMPAC II Development Environment	Environment Change	N/A	05-08-2003 Item 05
06	Alastair Thomson	Peer Review	Scope Reduction	None	05-08-2003 Item 06
07	Chanath Ratnanather	ICO/PGM	Requirements Change	Yes	05-08-2003 Item 07
08	Sara Silver	Persons Maintenance-Degrees	Requirements Clarification	Yes	05-08-2003 Item 08
09	Mark Siegert	eSNAP	Bug Fix	N/A	05-08-2003 Item 09
10	Mark Siegert	eSNAP	Requirements Change	Yes	05-08-2003 Item 10
11	Mark Siegert	eSNAP	Requirements Change	N/A	05-08-2003 Item 11
12	Lee Brewer	Devluster; SAN controllers	Environment Change	Yes	05-08-2003 Item 12
*	Krishna Collie	CM WEB	Defect Fix		Emergency
**	Sara Silver, Amir Venegas	R&R	Defect Fix		04-17-2003 Item 03

## Requests Covered

	Submitted By	Area Affected	Type Of Request	Cost/Schedule Impact	Document Title
01	Sara Silver	R&R	Defect Fix	Yes	05-08-2003 Item 01
	<p><b>Request:</b>                      Receipt and Referral uses the 901 screen to reinstate a withdrawn application, based on requests from Review users. The 901 functionality is correctly changing the status of the reinstated application, but it is not associating the reinstated application with the meeting. Review users are unable to see the application on their screens. There are between 50 and 100 reinstatements per council round.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved for July Release</p> <p><b>Action Items:</b>                      1. (Mike Wilson) Review resource allocation and designate developer.                      (Mike Wilson, Sara Silver) Look for scope reduction opportunities to free up development resources.</p>				
02	Krishna Collie	CM WEB		Yes	05-08-2003 Item 02

	<p><b>Request:</b> Move the collapsing of header information into the 1<sup>st</sup> iteration, this was originally slated for the 2<sup>nd</sup> iteration but due to a technologically significant breakthrough by the development team we request moving this feature into the 1<sup>st</sup> iteration to minimize risk.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Pending</p> <p><b>Action Items:</b> 1. (Krishna Collie, Kalpesh Patel) Verify that development resources in CM and Web QT are using similar strategies to accomplish the collapsing function. Agree on approach and report back to the CCB team.</p>				
03	Krishna Collie	CM WEB	Requirements Clarification	Yes	05-08-2003 Item 03
	<p><b>Request:</b> Users have requested the retention of query parameters that they entered under two conditions –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ If no data is returned, show the query parameters, user might have incorrectly entered a group code or SRA designator code.</li> <li>➤ If the user expressly hits the “Return to Query Screen”, show the query parameters that they originally entered</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved for July Release</p>				
04	Krishna Collie	CM WEB	Requirements Clarification	Yes	05-08-2003 Item 04
	<p><b>Request:</b> The UC requirement does not specify the types of applications to be displayed. Currently only withdrawn and 901 applications, as determined prior to the meeting, are displayed. GTA and SRA pilot users have requested that the view show applications that were reviewed at the meeting. This change would allow users to view applications appropriate to the point in the review cycle.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved for next release</p> <p><b>Action Items:</b> 1. (Krishna Collie) Request Type should be Requirements Change (code changes involved).</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> 1. Once this change is made, the module will act differently than its client/server predecessor.</p>				
05	Michael Wilson	IMPAC II Development Environment	Environment Change	N/A	05-08-2003 Item 05
	<p><b>Request:</b> Off-hours refresh of development environment with a full size, current database. Needed by May 13 in order to adequately test for performance during the coding phase of the next release and to support production performance issues that may occur.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved. Timing of change is dependent on results of actions below.</p> <p><b>Action Items:</b> 1. (Ali Ghassemzadeh) May 13 is not feasible. Revisit Operations schedules to determine if May 20 is a feasible new target without impacting Big IP work in progress. 2. (Ali Ghassemzadeh, Mike Wilson) Review alternative proposal from Operations to determine if it meets development needs. Send proposal to CCB team. 3. (Ali Ghassemzadeh, Mike Wilson) Review proposal with Dave Carter to address security concerns regarding sensitive data. What data must be “scrubbed”? Is a non-disclosure document necessary?</p>				
06	Alastair Thomson	Peer Review	Scope Reduction	None	05-08-2003 Item 06
	<p><b>Request:</b> Due to resource availability, SPEC20.2 – “Replace current summary statement ftp process with J2EE UPLOAD SERVICE” needs to be deferred reducing development time by approx. 320 hours.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved, the requirement will be deferred.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> 1. Development staffing hours for this requirement was not included in the numbers provided to the Program Office for the July release, so this deferral has no impact on development staffing.</p>				
07	Chanath Ratnanather	ICO/PGM	Requirements Change	Yes	05-08-2003 Item 07

08	Sara Silver	Persons Maintenance-Degrees	Requirements Clarification	Yes	05-08-2003 Item 08
09	Mark Siegert	eSNAP	Bug Fix	N/A	05-08-2003 Item 09
10	Mark Siegert	eSNAP	Requirements Change	Yes	05-08-2003 Item 10
11	Mark Siegert	eSNAP	Requirements Change	N/A	05-08-2003 Item 11
12	Lee Brewer	Devcluster; SAN controllers	Environment Change	Yes	05-08-2003 Item 12
*	Krishna Collie	CM WEB	Defect Fix		Emergency
**	Sara Silver, Amir Venegas	R&R	Defect Fix		04-17-2003 Item 03

## CCB Request & Decision Summary

01	<p><b>Request:</b> Receipt and Referral uses the 901 screen to reinstate a withdrawn application, based on requests from Review users. The 901 functionality is correctly changing the status of the reinstated application, but it is not associating the reinstated application with the meeting. Review users are unable to see the application on their screens. There are between 50 and 100 reinstatements per council round.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved for July Release</p> <p><b>Action Items:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(Mike Wilson) Review resource allocation and designate developer.</li> <li>(Mike Wilson, Sara Silver) Look for scope reduction opportunities to free up development resources.</li> </ol>
02	
03	<p><b>Request:</b> Users have requested the retention of query parameters that they entered under two conditions –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ If no data is returned, show the query parameters, user might have incorrectly entered a group code or SRA designator code.</li> <li>➤ If the user expressly hits the “Return to Query Screen”, show the query parameters that they originally entered</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved for July Release</p>
04	<p><b>Request:</b> The UC requirement does not specify the types of applications to be displayed. Currently only withdrawn and 901 applications, as determined prior to the meeting, are displayed. GTA and SRA pilot users have requested that the view show applications that were reviewed at the meeting. This change would allow users to view applications appropriate to the point in the review cycle.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved for next release</p> <p><b>Action Items:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(Krishna Collie) Request Type should be Requirements Change (code changes involved).</li> </ol> <p><b>Notes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once this change is made, the module will act differently than its client/server predecessor.</li> </ol>
05	<p><b>Request:</b> Off-hours refresh of development environment with a full size, current database. Needed by May 13 in order to adequately test for performance during the coding phase of the next release and to support production performance issues that may occur.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved. Timing of change is dependent on results of actions below.</p> <p><b>Action Items:</b></p>

	<p>4. (Ali Ghassemzadeh) May 13 is not feasible. Revisit Operations schedules to determine if May 20 is a feasible new target without impacting Big IP work in progress.</p> <p>5. (Ali Ghassemzadeh, Mike Wilson) Review alternative proposal from Operations to determine if it meets development needs. Send proposal to CCB team.</p> <p>6. (Ali Ghassemzadeh, Mike Wilson) Review proposal with Dave Carter to address security concerns regarding sensitive data. What data must be “scrubbed”? Is a non-disclosure document necessary?</p>
06	<p><b>Request:</b> Due to resource availability, SPEC20.2 – “Replace current summary statement ftp process with J2EE UPLOAD SERVICE” needs to be deferred reducing development time by approx. 320 hours.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved, the requirement will be deferred.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Development staffing hours for this requirement was not included in the numbers provided to the Program Office for the July release, so this deferral has no impact on development staffing.</li> </ol>
07	<p><b>Request:</b> The PGM analyst has received consistent feedback regarding the ICO’s inability to grant Pos and Program Analysts/Program Assistants the same privileges, predominantly sign-off authority. The new J2EE modules, PGM and Checklists, also employ the same security privileges as ICO. This request is to add a new role for Program Analysts/Program Assistants. This would alleviate many of the concerns of Ics/Pos attempting to crossover to using ICO, PGM and Checklists. Adding a new role would require changes in PGM, ICO and J2EE Checklists.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved, pending identification of reduction in scope to free resources.</p> <p><b>Action Items:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. (Sherry Zucker, Mark Ziegert, Chanath Ratnanather) Look for scope reduction opportunities to free up development resources.</li> <li>2. (Sylvia Dutcher) Role changes generally require extensive testing. Review proposed change and alert team of scheduling concerns.</li> </ol> <p><b>Notes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Must modify user admin in conjunction with role changes – approved with this request.</li> </ol>
08	<p><b>Request:</b> For the July release, there is a baseline requirement for “degree earned” data. It has been determined that there needs to be a requirements clarification for the corresponding data conversion. To make sure we don’t affect trainee or payback records negatively, we need to change our treatment for degree status codes that are currently null, and for setting degree status codes when there is more than one degree on a profile with the same code, with both an ‘N’ and a ‘Y’ degree status code.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved</p> <p><b>Action Items:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. (Sara Silver, Alistair Thomson) Update requirements in ReqPro to reflect changes.</li> </ol> <p><b>Notes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The training activities module should be tested in conjunction with the change to see if any problems are introduced. The GM budget screen should also be verified.</li> </ol>
09	<p><b>Request:</b> CWG members who are participating in the eSNAP pilot have reported 3 formatting and/or typographical errors from the eSNAP report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The grant number consistently displays a dash (“-“) after the support year;</li> <li>b. The title “Research Accomplishments” should appear at the beginning of the section when a research accomplishments file has been uploaded but does not.</li> </ol> <p>The first question in the SNAP Questions section of the report should read “Has there been a change in the other support of key personnel since the last reporting period?” The eSNAP report displays the word “order” in place of the word “other.”</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved</p> <p><b>Action Items:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. (Mike Wilson) Confirm with Harsha that there is no impact on schedule to absorb the request. Completed 05/08/03 - Mike has confirmed the request can be absorbed.</li> </ol>

10	<p><b>Request:</b> With the electronic submission of SNAP Progress Reports, there is no signature for the PI and Signing Official from the Grantee Institution to certify that the information provided is true and that they are aware of the consequences for providing false information. FSR is currently developing a certification mechanism that requires the user to acknowledge that the information to be submitted is correct, and the same mechanism needs to be employed in eSNAP.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved</p> <p><b>Action Items:</b> 1. (Mike Wilson) Confirm with Harsha that there is no impact on schedule to absorb the request. Completed 05/08/03 - Mike has confirmed the request can be absorbed.</p>
11	<p><b>Request:</b> The eSNAP report, which is supposed to reflect the paper PHS2590 submitted by the grantee institution, does not have any wording on it to signify that the Principal Investigator and the official from the institution's business office are aware of and accept responsibility for the certification/assurance that the information submitted to the NIH is true to the best of their knowledge. The PHS 2590 reflects this with the statements and signatures in blocks 13 and 14 on the face page. ESNAP will imply agreement based on the PI routing to the SO and the SO submitting to NIH (or granting Submit Authority to the PI).</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved</p> <p><b>Action Items:</b> 1. (Mike Wilson) Confirm with Harsha that there is no impact on schedule to absorb the request. Completed 05/08/03 - Mike has confirmed the request can be absorbed.</p>
12	<p><b>Request:</b> Our current patch level, patch level 8, for our HSG80 controllers is outdated. Compaq requests that we patch our current firmware to patch level 13 to alleviate a potential problem with disk unit labels over size 127. We have one disk that meets this requirement and that is attached to Request Pro. Not complying with this request puts this disk and the controllers to possible failure.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved for May 9 at 6:00 a.m.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> 1. Reversion clear 2. Trusted tech is scheduled to do work 3. On-line change, 10 minutes with no failover</p>
*	<p><b>Emergency Request:</b> A defect was uncovered in the CM WEB Module. The meeting_agendas_t.mtg_percentl_assignment_code is getting set to N when the default should be Y. The developer checked with all parties when developing this entity bean and no one was able to provide the developer with the default setting, therefore, the developer set the default to N. As a result, users that use CM WEB for their transactions discovered this week that the meetings did not appear in Peer Review with a percentile assignment code. In other words, meetings that were supposed to be subject to percentiles were not showing up as percentile eligible meetings.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved for this weekend during the 10 p.m. Sat. to 6 a.m. Sun. down window</p> <p><b>Action Items:</b> 1. (Krishna Collie) Document the change in ReqPro.</p>
**	<p><b>Update to Previous Request:</b> Table 30 and 31 are management reports that are run on a weekly basis in DRR (table 31 has been run on a monthly basis, but is planned to be run more frequently). Until the March release, they were each running in 4 minutes or less. Since the release, they take anywhere from 15 minutes to an hour or more to run, depending on system performance. Table 6 is run once or twice a council round; it is believed that it was running at 10 minutes before the March release, but it is now running at anywhere between one and three hours.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Redesign is necessary but staffing levels for next release cannot accommodate the hours needed. Workaround is to run the reports on behalf of the users.</p> <p><b>Action Items:</b> 1. (Sara Silver, Tim Twomey) Assign a resource in user support to run reports until the redesign takes place. Sara has been running the reports and can provide Tim with the appropriate information.</p>