CCB Meeting
Decision Summary

Thurs., June 5, 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	Chanath Ratnanateher	Grants Folder	Defect Fix	High	CCB.06.06.item1
02	Steve Fitzgerald	TA Module	Requirements Clarification	High	CCB.06.06.item2
03	Jim Tucker	CRISP-on-the-WEB	Requirements Change	High	CCB.06.06.item3
04	Chanath Ratnanather	PGM	Requirements Change	High	CCB.06.06.item4
05	Mark Weiser	Common / FSR	Algorithm Change	Low	CCB.06.06.item5
06	Daniel Fox	Web Query Tool	Scope Reduction	Low	CCB.06.06.item6
07	Johnie Pearson	Web Query Tool	Supplementary Specification Document Change	Low	CCB.06.06.item7
08	Tracy Soto	Peer Review	Defect Fix	High/Med	CCB.06.06.item8
W1	Michael Cox	Nightly CD Order Creation Process	Defect Fix	High	Walk-In
R1	Krishna Collie	Committee Management	Requirements Clarification	No	05-29-2003 Item 02
R2	Steve Fitzgerald	ICO	Bug fixes & Req. Change	Yes	Walk-In from 05.15.03 Revisited

Decision Summary

	Submitted By	Area Affected	Type Of Request	Cost/Schedule Impact	Document Title
01	Chanath Ratnanateher	Grants Folder	Defect Fix	High	CCB.06.06.item1

Request:
Feedback from PGM users indicated that the PI history-brief and PI history-detailed reports were missing from the new J2EE grant folder. A comparison of the old and new grant folder for several grants indicated that the PI-brief and detailed are available in the old, but not in the new grant folder. Development later identified this as a bug.

Decision: Denied

Notes:
1. Reports were not needed in web Grant folder.
2. Dianna Dixon will be removing from client/server Grant Folder in October and adding to Peer Review.

	Submitted By	Area Affected	Type Of Request	Cost/Schedule Impact	Document Title
02	Steve Fitzgerald	TA Module	Requirements Clarification	High	CCB.06.06.item2

<table>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="5">Request:
This CCB request is an update to an earlier request submitted to modify the payback calculation. The earlier request described a requirements change (involving the payback calculation) to evaluate activity code instead of degree information when determining if a fellowship was a post doc or pre-doc appointment. This is necessary due to problems with degree data quality that are causing APACs to be sent to individuals that should not be getting them, as well as other payback problems.

It was thought the original scope would be confined to a back-end PL/SQL fix only, but after further investigation, it has been determined that 2 TA screens will need to be changed to reflect the correct fellowship degree status, as well as the payback snapshot report.

It has been determined that the TA1030 and TA1070 screens and the payback snapshot report will have to be modified to correctly display the degree status of fellowship records by evaluating the activity code, rather than looking at degree information. This change is required to be consistent with the payback calculation.

Where degree information is displayed, instead of looking at degree information.
The following activity codes/degree types should be used:
F30/F31 - Predoc
F32 – Postdoc.
Summary: The TA programs will need to be changed to evaluate activity codes of appointments for fellowships, rather than degree data, to be consistent with the payback calculation change.

Decision: Approved</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">03</td><td>Jim Tucker</td><td>CRISP-on-the-WEB</td><td>Requirements Change</td><td>High</td><td>CCB.06.06.item3</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Request:
This request is to clarify existing requirements and to remove maintenance requirements for the July 2003 release. The original requirement was to Automate the CRISP Replication process. In designing this process, it was determined that the process was not fully automated, unless it could send a notification at the end of Replication. Therefore, e-mail functionally was incorporated into the design document. However, the original time estimates were given without e-mail functionality. Therefore, in order to complete the Automation process by the code freeze deadline, it is necessary to remove some of the maintenance items from the July release.

Decision: Approved

Note:
1. Operations impact – 4 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">04</td><td>Chanath Ratnanather</td><td>PGM</td><td>Requirements Change</td><td>High</td><td>CCB.06.06.item4</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Request:
The March 03 release of PGM combined Type 5 non-competing grants, active grants, and competing/non-competing post award grants in one page. This has caused confusion to a lot of users. For the July 2003 release, Type 5 non-competing grants will be on one page, and active grants/competing/non-competing post award grants on another page. Initial requirements indicated that these separate pages would have the same columns. While debugging a related issue, the analyst realized that users have no need for 2 columns in the post award page, and the one of the columns in the pending type 5's page should be renamed.
Summary:
Drop type 5 receipt date and e-SNAP due date columns from Post Award page
Rename “e-SNAP due date” to “Type 5 Due Date” in Pending Type 5's page

Decision: Approved</td></tr>
<tr><td>05</td><td>Mark Weiser</td><td>Common / FSR</td><td>Algorithm Change</td><td>Low</td><td>CCB.06.06.item5</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="5">Request:
The original business rule to calculate total awarded amount failed to account for the same application serial numbers being used for more than one activity code. This practice is no longer done, however older grants (those being used in the FSR system) need to account for this to calculate the total award amount correctly. Since there is only a small occurrence of this happening, the correction can wait for the next release.
The FSR supp spec has been updated to include the total awarded amount algorithm.

Decision: Approved

Action Items:
1. (Mark Weiser) Supply test data to Sylvia Dutcher. This will help reduce impact on test time.

Notes:
1. Integration testing impact – 3 hours</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">06</td><td>Daniel Fox</td><td>Web Query Tool</td><td>Scope Reduction</td><td>Low</td><td>CCB.06.06.item6</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Request:
On the Text Search expanded tab in Web QT, there is a text box (i.e., query parameter) that allows users to specify the maximum number of records to return (sorted by relevance score) for the text search being run against Project Title, Summary Statement, and Abstract. This feature currently exists in QV and CRISP Plus, but does not exist in ICSTORe. The development team is having problems incorporating this functionality so that QT Engine can handle it gracefully, because it requires the dynamic creation of a user schema level table to store temporary results. Because of this added complexity, we would like to postpone this particular advanced feature until a future release. (Note: The “basic” Text Search capability is still included.) This feature will require more custom coding and we need more time to design it properly as we are now connecting to the database using one account and don't have the luxury of creating dynamic tables as easily as we did in the Forms environment.

Decision: Defer to October scope</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">07</td><td>Johnie Pearson</td><td>Web Query Tool</td><td>Supplementary Specification Document Change</td><td>Low</td><td>CCB.06.06.item7</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Request:
The existing Supplementary Specifications document contains a detailed description of the design elements that constitute both the “basic” and “expanded” query parameters in a section titled “Organizing Query Parameters On Screen.” To avoid redundancy, I would like to remove that section since that information is also going in the Web QT UI design document. The revised document is attached for review and approval

Decision: Approved</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">08</td><td>Tracy Soto</td><td>Peer Review</td><td>Defect Fix</td><td>High/Med</td><td>CCB.06.06.item8</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Request:
Carl Newcomer has researched the performance problems with REV1000 (IRG/SRG Reassignment Screen) and found the bottleneck. Although the query used when users do a reassignment has the appl_id, we are doing a full table scan on SCORES_T because there are no indexes on appl_id. SCORES_T has over 3.5 million records. An index should be created on appl_id for SCORES_T

CREATE index scores_appl_id_ind on scores_t (appl_id);

This should happen first in Dev, then Test and finally Production

Decision: Approved</td></tr>
<tr><td>W1</td><td>Michael Cox</td><td>Nightly CD Order Creation Process</td><td>Defect Fix</td><td>High</td><td>Walk-In</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="5">Request:

The Nightly CD Order Submit Procedure processes all CD orders that were submitted during the day by users through the Review Module. The nightly procedure creates a discrete ZIP file for each CD Order. The ZIP file contains all information needed for CD contractor to produce and deliver CDs.

There is a problem in the procedure where incorrect SRA information is inserted, resulting in order confirmation being emailed to wrong SRA. Recipient SRAs are then confused and non-recipient SRAs are left uninformed and unable to respond.

This problem is triggered when processing orders where SRA does not have a WRK address database record. Specifically, within the code SRA variables are not nulled from meeting to meeting as orders are processed in loop, causing information from previous order to copy into current order when SRA WRK address is missing. Defect procedure is com_dbms_cd_order_pkg.submit_order_proc.

Decision: Approved

Action Items:
1. October to notify orderer that the SRA WRK address is missing.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">R1</td><td>Krishna Collie</td><td>Committee Management</td><td>Requirements Clarification</td><td>No</td><td>05-29-2003 Item 02</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Request:

We are testing the performance metrics for CM WEB. These metrics were originally taken from the metrics devise to test the Commons, since there is no global eRA supplementary specification that specifies performance metrics for eRA applications

I need to update the scope document with this info

Decision: Approved</td></tr>
<tr><td>R2</td><td>Steve Fitzgerald</td><td>ICO</td><td>Bug fixes & Req. Change</td><td>Yes</td><td>Walk-In</td></tr>
</table>

Request:
The following problems have been identified in the GPM reports, and need to be fixed.
These reports, which have replaced the Vee Moxley © reports, are required for budget closeout and are used by budget officers. It is assumed that all of the items identified require fixing. Therefore, we have not broken out each fix as a separate CCB request. Also, due to multiple dependencies with the different application components, it is more efficient/cost effective to fix all of the items at once.

1) Modify reports to include only current FY grants, except in the case where there is a skip year grant. (grant that has been awarded and has a budget period of greater than one year). This should eliminate problem of duplicate counting of grants, obligations, and commitments, due to both type 1 and type 5 records showing up. In other words, do not include previous FY grants on the reports unless the budget end date takes you into the next fiscal year.
2) Document skip year grants (awarded grants with a budget period greater than one year) by adding an indicator on the report, and add the indicator description in the footnote.
3) Fix the report headings (mechanism descriptions) (mostly for co-funded grants), currently showing up as 'Unknown' or missing, when they should contain the correct mechanism. If the administering IC or a budget office user is generating the report, then the mechanim_code in GPM_APPLS_T should be used.
If the user generating the report is not in the administering IC or a budget office user, then the default mechanism displayed should be obtained from ACTIVITY_MECHANISMS_T.
4) Fix spelling errors on several reports, including the terms 'Reimbursable' and 'sensitive' on reports 6015 and 6035.
5) Change the grant number display format on reports 6080 and 6095 so they are properly padded/justified.
6) Fix reports were both award amount and obligated amount are both showing up as '0'.
Details: Modify report logic so that if INIT_ENCUMBRANCE_DATE is null (grant hasn't been released for award), and intent to pay code ='Y', then show the total period amount in the 'to be paid' column. Currently the report appears to be incorrectly showing TOTAL_OBLGTD_AMT in the 2 be paid column.
Also, if INIT_ENCUMBRANCE_DATE IS NOT null (grant is awarded), and TOTAL_OBLGTD_AMT is null (grant has not been paid but not is awarded), show the total period amount in the FYxxxx to be paid column. Also add a '1' in the Note column to indicate that there is a discrepancy between awarded amount and amount paid.
(If award is not yet paid, show the total period amount in the 2 be paid column)
7) Fix the footnote logic for (1)' difference in dollars between awarded and DFM obligated' so that only awarded grants with this discrepancy are flagged. Currently, the report appears to be flagging unawarded grants (init_encumburance_date =null) as having a discrepancy, when it should not.
8) Modify report parameter screen/effective date logic and report headings so that if data does not exist for the chosen effective date, the user is notified that data does not exist for the chosen effective date and the most recent data will be displayed. Report header should be changed to display the correct (most recent) effective date. This is currently causing reconciliation problems.
9) Modify 6040 to fix counts. This report has columns for both trainees and FTTP equivalents. Modify trainee counts so that the institute total amount for FTTP counts are correct. Also correct report total amount for TRAINEEs.
10) Modify 6015A so that if is there is a count, that a dollar amount shows up as well. (ref, 6015A for GM, on 05/07/2003)
11) On 6040, apply new rule to avoid double counting. T35s are short term/part time appointments. New business rule: For T35 grants, under trainee totals, only show the short term qtys, do not show predoc amounts. Also, for FFP totals, don't show stipend qtys. This is causing double counting of number of trainees assigned to T35 grants.

Decision: Approved as follows:

Any changes that would require a deployment would be deferred until October, but since we had the development resources, we could do the back end development now. Then, when testing is available after the July deployment, we would make the reports available by a back -end change.
In other words, most of the report changes do not require a deployment to implement. (Only #8 requires a full deployment). So, the plan is to have the developer make all of the changes, deploy the front-end change #8 with the July release, and then deploy the rest of the reports shortly thereafter. The deployment of the reports post July release WILL NOT require a full client server deployment, and we have built into the design the ability to control report access to either just pilot users or all users.