

- I. A demonstration of the Enterprise Reporting System (ERS) was presented by Amber Jones.
  - A. If we have ideas on simplifying the ERS report, please send them to Amber Jones at [amber.jones@ucr.edu](mailto:amber.jones@ucr.edu).
  - B. By having access on EACS you can subscribe to ERS.
  - C. You must have desktop SuperDope, UCRFStotals, and Excel in order to run ERS.
  - D. Control K will delete all the worksheets that have been produced, but keep the ERS report open.
  - E. ERS workbook tabs; EO = Expenditure Overview, OS = Operating Statement (Sales and Service), OE = Operating Income (Sales and Service). For OS and OE do not need to indicate function 20.
  
- II. Mitch Boretz made an announcement about proposal writing.
  - A. Mitch belongs to the Association of Proposal Management Professionals. His group has a speaker on the evening of Thursday, April 17. Dr. Tom Sant, an APMP Fellow and an expert on effective writing. The meeting will be free to members and guests (and anyone from UCR can be my guest). We do the meetings as webcasts with venues around Southern California. The closest location to UCR is at ESRI in Redlands. However, if we get a lot of UCR people, we can create a venue here. Although the meeting is free, reservations are required because we need to keep records of attendance and because some of the venues have strict security requirements. People will be able to RSVP starting late in March through the web site, when I get the web site working again -- [www.socal-apmp.org](http://www.socal-apmp.org).

### III. e-CAF FAQs

- A. Web site has been reorganized. Questions have been grouped together.
- B. Millie reviewed the new format with new questions and answers to elective rerouting, deleting attachments, marking documents, resubmission option to NIH, and changing the lead time when changing from “non-standard” to “standard” proposal. There was also a question and answer about a ‘recall button’ – no decision has been made at this time.

### IV. OR Update.

- A. The Subaward Monitoring letter that was in draft form is now the official letter. Charles Greer distributed the official copy. Refer to page 3.

NEXT MEETING – April 8, 2008 at 1:30pm in Bourn’s A265

## **Guidelines for Subrecipient Monitoring by Principal Investigators**

### **Background**

Whenever UCR subawards to another entity, the University must monitor the subrecipient to ensure its compliance with federal laws and regulations. As part of a monitoring program, UC Riverside relies on Principal Investigators and departmental staff to review and determine the allowability, allocability and reasonableness of subrecipient project expenses. Although Principal Investigators have primary responsibility for monitoring subrecipients, it is understood that this responsibility is frequently delegated to departmental staff or administrators. The following guidance is provided to assist Principal Investigators and those to whom they have delegated this responsibility.

### **Definitions**

**Subrecipient** is a legal entity that receives Federal assistance via a subaward from UCR to carry out or administer a program, including responsibility for programmatic decision making.

**Subaward** is defined, for the purpose of this guidance, as the legal agreement between UCR and a subrecipient that transfers a substantive portion of the scope of work and federal financial funding under an award to UCR. A subaward does not include procurement of goods and services.

### **Monitoring Guidelines**

Below is general guidance for monitoring subrecipients. If there are specific concerns or questions please contact the Office of Research for more detailed advice.

- A) Periodic progress reports should be reviewed, comparing results delivered against the subrecipient's statement of work. The reports should be compared to invoices to determine that the expenses match the progress of the project.

Examples of instances that could raise concerns include, but are not limited to:

- A subrecipient invoices the University for 90% of project expenses in the first few months of a project and the progress reports do not match the level of expense being reported.

University of California, Riverside  
Contract and Grant User Group  
March 11, 2008

- A subrecipient does not invoice the University during the first year of the project but a progress reports indicate substantial work has been performed.
- B) Invoices should be reviewed for allowability, allocability and reasonableness of costs. They should be in enough detail to determine how the funds were utilized. Approval of expenses should be in writing on the invoice by the Principal Investigator and any supporting documentation should be retained. Costs which differ materially from the approved budget, or appear unusual or unallowable should be questioned, and payment should be withheld until a satisfactory explanation is received or an appropriate audit review is performed.

Examples of when an invoice should be questioned include, but are not limited to:

- An invoice indicates the purchase of equipment where equipment is not in the approved budget.
  - An invoice lists only the total costs claimed without providing any categorical breakdown/detail.
- C) Final invoices should be identified as such and should not be approved for payment until all deliverables have been received.
- D) The Principal Investigator or department staff should promptly contact the Office of Research with any concerns about a subrecipient. Some examples of situations that may require further inquiry by the Office of Research include, but are not limited to:
- Suspicion of subrecipient non performance, (e.g. late progress reports).
  - Fraud or non-compliance with Federal regulations and laws.
  - Any indication that the subrecipient is not fulfilling it's obligations under the subaward.