



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

DAY ONE

Tuesday, February 7th, 1:00pm to 5:15pm

MEETING GOALS

1. Update on Kuali transactions processing and understanding of parameter tables
2. Transference of knowledge on how releases will be done and cost involved
3. Shared understanding of shortfall of resources
4. Review of options available for cutting scope

PRESENT

University of Hawaii	Kathie Egami, Henry Ito
Michigan State University	Dave Brower, Vince Schimizzi
rSmart	Dick Barber Tony Potts (Lead Developer GL)
San Joaquin Delta College	Claire Tyson, Lee Belarmino (Board Member), Dave Sartain (Technical Support)
Indiana University	Kathleen McNeely (Chair, Functional Council) Joan Hagen Ailish Byrne (Configuration Manager) Brian McGough (Lead Architect, DM Financial Transactions, DM Workflow) Phil McKown (Project Analyst) Sterling George (GL Subject Matter Expert) Jim Thomas (Project Manager) Scott Heise (Quality Assurance Manager) Jeff Morris (DBA/Developer) Jay Sissom (Development Manager GL) Laura Kress (Development Manager EPIC)
University of Arizona	Kymber Horn, Mark McGurk Mary Vega (scribe)
NACUBO	David Lyons
Cornell University	Steve Lutter, Arthur Mintz, Mary Wheeler Aaron Godert (DM Nervous System, DM Financial Transactions)



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

AGENDA

- A. Introductions and Announcements
- B. Demo of Kuali transaction processing system
 1. Disbursement Voucher – parameters tables
 2. PDP/Accounts Payable/GL interface
- C. Releases (including demo site discussion)
 1. March 31st vs. Phase I
 - a. Has the realignment of deliverables worked
 2. What do releases look like – Proposal by Jim Thomas
 3. How often will they occur
 4. How resource intensive are they
 5. How do we define success of releases
- D. Priority Setting and possible deferment Phase II
 1. Based on current estimates, how many hours have to be cut
 2. Review of enhancements for possible deferment
 3. Review of Modules for possible deferment
- E. Brief report from Development Managers

DECISIONS MADE

- Change the payment reason code to a two character field length.
- Maintenance document for the Disbursement Voucher will not be restricted for Kuali Test Drive.
- If no progress on post-award is made by the KRA subcommittee by the end of March, the KFC agrees to split pre- and post award.
- Commit to update Kuali Test Drive after each release.
- Functional Council agrees that between AP, the DV and PDP we have the components for a full AP functional process/system.
- Check writing will not be part of the PDP process.
- Priority Setting and possible deferment Phase II
 1. Based on current estimates - hours will not be cut.
 2. Review of enhancements that have been deferred for possible re-inclusion in Phase II will be deferred for six months.
 3. Review of Modules for possible deferment – reaffirmed that modules were prioritized correctly – no deferment.

ACTION ITEMS

- Brain McGough will send Jerry Neal a request to change the payment reason code from one to two characters.
- Usability subcommittee will meet to discuss and prioritize usability issues submitted.
- Demo Travel DV and discuss override functionality for amount; start and end dates vary by institution (based on travel policy).



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- Expansion of data dictionary information
 - Phil McKown will populate a spreadsheet with existing FIS information.
 - Jim Thomas will provide an hourly resource to finish the task.
- Program Code
 - Claire Tyson will prepare a document that shows the relationship between the GL, Chart, and edocs. Claire will forward the document to the Chart and GL/TP subcommittees for review.
- PDP Process
 - Arthur Mintz to revise diagram – detail functionality.
 - KFC will review and finalize revised diagram at next meeting, February 16th, 2006.
 - Kathleen will request to add PDP process to Board agenda – marketing issue for EPIC.
 - KFC to confirm with Epic subcommittee – the ease and capability of the AP component of EPIC being a full AP system.
- Releases
 - Discuss Setup Documentation/Functional Configuration Documentation with the Kuali Board.
 - Request that the Kuali Board formalize future decisions (option B was a straw vote.)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

A. Introductions and Announcements

1. Everyone introduced themselves (name, institution, role)
2. Brad Wheeler has been announced as IU's interim CIO. Brad's new position will not affect his role and responsibilities with Kuali.

B. Demo of Kuali transaction processing system

1. Disbursement Voucher – parameters tables (Kymber)
 - a. Payment reasons and object codes; parameters are built behind the scenes to drive the process.
 - b. Access to document is limited to people in DV group.
 - c. The APC DV process document covers the parameter definitions, etc.
 - d. Testing will start in approximately one week.
 - e. Using the parameters table, institutions can add rules.
 - f. Table for payment reasons, payment reason code is currently one character; [request to change the payment reason code to two characters. Brian McGough will send Jerry Neal a request.](#)
 - g. Naming scheme for the DV – flexible but requires the need for good documentation.
 - h. The DV subcommittee has identified a list of payment reasons that will be delivered “out of the box”. Customization will be simple – just add to the list. Payment reasons can be inactivated.



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- i. No concept of payment reasons in EPIC. The payment reason method will be used in GL and other modules – framework for rules data will be integrated with others.
 - j. In the future – Phase I and beyond, the maintenance documents to create payment reasons will be restricted. **For Kuali Test Drive, the maintenance document will not be restricted.**
 - k. **Usability issue with scrolling – the usability committee needs to review the issue and prioritize.**
 - l. **Travel DV will be demoed for the group in the near future.** Some schools may want the ability to override the dollar amount. This functionality request will be discussed at the Travel DV demo.
 - m. The following schools plan to use the DV: Arizona, IU, MSU.
2. Transfer of Funds (Aaron)
- a. Data dictionary information needs to be expanded. **Phil McKown will populate a spreadsheet with existing FIS information; Jim Thomas will provide an hourly resource to finish the task.** The expansion of data dictionary information will assist testers but is not necessary for March 31st release.
 - b. Override functionality is not currently available. In the future, a check box under the value will exist for overrides.
 - c. Parameters table exists for TOF – mandatory and non-mandatory transfers. Object type codes will be available soon.
 - d. The Program Code has not been added; the Program Code needs to be added to the accounting line on all financial e-docs.
 - 1) If the Program Code exists, it is an attribute of the account.
 - 2) If the Program Code exists, the code and description should display once a user tabs out of the account field.
 - 3) The Chart team has done some work on program code and it will be available post 03/31 and part of the Phase I deliverables.
 - 4) The Program Code affects the GL and should display balances by program.
 - 5) Searching by program code is also required. Lookup screen for program code; enter account number and search for program code. If available it will display both code and description.
 - 6) The Program Code needs to be added to the search criteria – need a placeholder for the future.
 - 7) **Claire will prepare a document that shows the relationship between the GL, Chart, and edocs. Claire will forward the document to the Chart and GL/TP subcommittees for review.**
 - e. Budget year only stores the 4-digit number (free-form) The Budget Year is similar to a custom attribute; only available as a display.



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

3. PDP/Accounts Payable/GL interface (Sterling)
 - a. Goals
 - 1) Understand how PDP works and identify fundamental problems (What is AP? What is GL? What is cash disbursement?)
 - 2) What is Phase I and Phase II?
 - 3) If an institution runs a centralized payable system, what are the commonalities?
 - b. The assumption is that PDP acts like a funnel for payments (one system). Outbound payments are many. The only exception is IU's payroll – payroll bypasses PDP and the information goes straight to PayBase.
 - c. Per Mary Wheeler, we need to define what Kuali is going to call AP. Kuali AP: all disbursements engine vs. PDP application. The current issue is terminology.
 - d. Per David Lyons, the system needs to be able to write checks.
 - e. We can recommend a vendor solution (i.e., a comparison with PayBase). In the future, we may have an open source application (long-term) or someone could contribute (short-term).
 - f. How do we bring this all together? What should it look like? Payables with purchase orders – pull in a subgroup and review the work that has been done.
 - g. Review of Arthur's picture: high-level functional view of the subset functional processes. We can use Arthur's picture in addition to Sterling's picture; use as a conceptual diagram.
 - h. Miscellaneous direct feeds are missing from both diagrams. Miscellaneous direct feeds are not a problem for IU. Will it be a big issue for other institutions? The check printing portion is the only difference between Arthur and Sterling's diagram.
 - i. PDP is a separate database from EPIC.
 - j. Per Steve Lutter, we need to draw a boundary around the GL; what is the set and marketing part?
 - k. DV and PDP: the current scope is the current part of AP that exists in EPIC. PDP is creating the offset entries – this is the problem.
 - l. For a small school, they would need someone to code GL entries and maintain PDP.
 - m. What is the scope of Phase II? "Kualify" Epic and "Kualify" AP.
 - n. **Functional Council agrees that between AP, the DV and PDP we have the components for a full AP functional process/system.**
 - 1) **KFC needs to confirm with Epic subcommittee – the ease and capability of the AP component of EPIC being a full AP system.**



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- 2) PDP will be at the very back end of the AP system – will receive data from both AP and DV.
 - 3) We have the DV and AP but PDP will be an integral part and mandatory for schools if they choose to implement the EPIC AP system.
 - 4) In absence of implementing the EPIC AP system, if they choose to use the DV, they will have to interface the DV with their AP system to make it work.
 - 5) **Check writing is not delivered; every institution will have to deal with check writing on their own (write their own module, third party or outsource)**
- o. **Arthur will realign diagram.**
- 1) **Arthur to diagram detailed functionality; will not use IU terminology.**
 - 2) **KFC will review and finalize revised diagram at next meeting, February 16th, 2006.**
 - 3) **Kathleen will request to add PDP process to Board agenda – EPIC marketing issue.**
- C. Releases (including demo site discussion)
1. Discuss release options (see handouts of the three options)
 - a. The Board supports a subset of deliverables for March 31, 2006 – “Kuali Test Drive”.
 - b. Next steps were to layout options of the reality triangle – Options A, B and C. *Note: Contracts and Grants is not KRA or Grants.gov (pre-award side). OSU (3), IU and MSU (.5) resources are not allocated for in the diagram for Contracts and Grants (pre-award). If no progress is made on post-award by the KRA subcommittee by the end of March, the KFC agrees to split pre- and post award.* Endowments and KRA are not included in the estimates.
 - c. **Option A:** assume scope and resources are fixed – time adjusts; pushed out timeline to December 2007. This option was not an attractive choice for the Board.
 - d. **Option B:** assume resources and time are fixed – scope adjusts; July 2007 is a subset of modules delivered (based on priority of modules for Phase II). The Board likes this option; we deliver as promised, including full QA releases. Catch: we have to continue with resources for 5 months of development and 3 months for QA. The Kuali Board voted unanimously for Option B. Kathleen is concerned about continued resources for the next nine months. **The Board did “straw vote” but KFC would like an official vote.**
 - e. **Option C:** assume time and scope are fixed; amount of resources increases. Difficult to manage the additional resources (training, etc.)
 2. What do releases look like – Proposal by Jim Thomas (Release Options)



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- a. Kuali Test Drive:
 - 1) Should we keep it up to date? Jim likes the idea; keep the test drive site up to date with progress.
 - 2) Test Drive will include balance inquiry functionality.
 - b. Full QA – what does this mean?
 - 1) Full QA is Phase I deliverable sheet and Scott's input – testing and signoff (QA).
 - 2) Full QA is bug fixing and documenting – no new development.
 - c. Per Kathleen, Kuali Phase I Deliverables item IV would be a good discussion topic with the Kuali Board – it is bordering on consulting. Should we be providing Kuali advice? This should be the role of 3rd party vendors. Some work will be done by rsmart – scope needs to be defined.
3. How often will the releases occur?
- a. Three public releases October 2006, July 2007 and March 2008.
 - b. What are internal releases? Test drive is an internal release; not a packaged release.
 - 1) Aaron Godert requested a document from the KFC or Board that outlines the internal deadlines for releases (releases to Kuali Test Drive.org “X” amount of times)
 - c. Within each module, there will be a freeze date and time allocated for testing.
 - d. July 2006 is the next freeze date. Within each task you need an interim deadline.
 - e. Commit to update Kuali Test Drive after each release. Jim Thomas will work with the development managers – pressure comes from the testers. Looking for internal pressure from the testers; KFC to ask testers for update – hold testers accountable for progress and forward movement.
 - f. Will need to push the Board to formal signatures in the future.
4. How resource intensive are they – all developers “hands on deck”
5. How do we define success of releases – refer to Scott's QA summary for specific details.
- D. Priority Setting and possible deferment Phase II
1. Based on current estimates, how many hours have to be cut – **hours will not be cut; overall we are in good shape.**
 2. Review of enhancements for possible deferment – **deferred discussion for six months.**
 3. Review of Modules for possible deferment – **reaffirmed that modules were prioritized correctly.**
- E. Brief report from DMs – test drive release and June 30th release.
1. Aaron Godert



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- a. Things are going well with 03/31 deliverables. Aaron is sure team will hit the date. The major barrier is the authorization permissions; workflow issues - combination of bugs and workflow. The other issue is sufficient funds checking. The work plan for TP docs side is done.
 - 1) Cash receipts is 50% done and deposit has some work done. Aaron will work with Wes to have the cash receipts completed by the 3rd of March.
 - 2) Balance inquiries – JV, TOF, cash receipt and deposit doc done.
 - a. Nervous System tasks are small; testing is identifying bugs that need to be fixed.
2. Brian McGough
- a. Disbursement Voucher looks good; 1 to 2 weeks before testing starts; a couple of weeks for bug fixing.
 - b. Integration of PDP beyond DV – preliminary work will start soon.
 - c. Workflow is integrated with IU; workflow is ok but the team needs to digress from workflow requirements; this will not impact edoc work.
3. Laura Kress
- a. Epic is going well; fixing bugs on invoice processing side.
4. Randall Embry (update was provided via conference call on Wednesday)
- a. Randall is feeling good about the 03/31 date.
 - b. The chart has included all chart objects with the exception of global.
 - c. The Project code will be in place between 03/31 and 06/30 – it is possible that some chart resources will be used for edocs.



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

DAY TWO

Wednesday, February 8th, 8:00am to 5:00pm

MEETING GOALS

1. Identification of any items that need to be deferred to meet time-line
2. Priority setting of enhancements and modules
3. Creation of a time-line for Phase II
4. Discussion and finalization of policy process
5. Discussion and finalization of FDS process

PRESENT

University of Hawaii	Kathie Egami, Henry Ito
Michigan State University	Dave Brower, Vince Schimizzi
rSmart	Dick Barber Tony Potts (Lead Developer GL)
San Joaquin Delta College	Claire Tyson, Dave Sartain (Technical Support)
Indiana University	Kathleen McNeely (Chair, Functional Council) Joan Hagen Ailish Byrne (Configuration Manager) Brian McGough (Lead Architect, DM Financial Transactions, DM Workflow) Phil McKown (Project Analyst) Sterling George (GL Subject Matter Expert) Jim Thomas (Project Manager) Scott Heise (Quality Assurance Manager) Jeff Morris (DBA/Developer) Jay Sissom (Development Manager, GL) Laura Kress (Development Manager, EPIC)
University of Arizona	KyMBER Horn, Mark McGurk Mary Vega (scribe)
NACUBO	David Lyons
Cornell University	Steve Lutter, Arthur Mintz, Mary Wheeler Aaron Godert (DM Nervous System, DM Financial Transactions)



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

AGENDA

- A. Priority Setting and Deferment (development team meets separately)
- B. KRA Enhancement Request – Semesters vs. Quarters
- C. AP/Purchasing – FYI, enhancement requests may be coming
- D. Policies
 - 1. Role of NACUBO
 - 2. Role of KFC
 - 3. Option for Subcommittee
 - 4. Who has final approval
- E. Fiscal Development Series
 - 1. Does there need to be a subcommittee w/Kymer chairing
 - 2. Role of KFC
 - 3. Discussion on deliverables
- F. GASB/FASB Reports
- G. KFC Joint Meeting with Kuali Days in November 2006
- H. Ongoing KFC Meetings
- I. General Ledger “Back-office” functionality
 - 1. How will the process be tested
 - 2. What is the schedule
 - 3. What will be tested
 - 4. Who are the testers and how will non IU testers work
- J. Time-line Discussion
 - 1. Timeline for each module
 - 2. When development teams will be assigned
 - 3. Communication with subcommittees before assignment of DM
- K. QA Role

DECISIONS MADE

- Phase II priority is correct
 - 1. Contracts and Grants
 - 2. Kuali Purchasing and AP
 - 3. Labor Distribution
 - 4. Budget
 - 5. Accounts Receivable
 - 6. Capital Assets
- Review of enhancements that have been deferred for possible re-inclusion in Phase II will be deferred for six months.
- Approved the KRA enhancement request for quarters/semesters; this enhancement is part of the pre-award budget creation and is in scope.
- Policies Template – NACUBO has agreed to create the templates.
 - 1. Deliverable is a general guidance checklist
 - 2. Kim Dight at NACUBO will head the subcommittee
- Fiscal Development Series is due June 30th, 2006.



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- GASB/FASB Reports will not be part of the “out of the box” deliverable.
- SQR is the standard for Kuali – the re-write of the trial balance will be delivered June 30th, 2006; report writing will be done by an IU FMS resource - no development hours are needed from the Kuali developer pool.
- KFC Meetings will alternate between San Francisco, California and Phoenix, Arizona.
- Mardi Leonard will assume all future administrative responsibilities for KFC face-to-face meetings.
- Subcommittee for test data has been established – Scott Heise is the chair. Alternative set of data is due June 30th, 2006.
- Kuali Board is responsible for marketing the Kuali Test Drive site.
- Confluence is the official site (central location) for all functional specification documentation.

ACTION ITEMS

- Kathleen and Phil will meet with the budget office to solidify development hours.
- Phil McKown will update Phase I – II Option B slide and appropriate spreadsheets to reflect Budget Module as priority 4.
- Kathleen will ask to add Release Option B to the board agenda.
 1. Where are the resources going to come from after the July 2007 date?
 2. What about when people joined – when does the two year commitment stop?
- Phil McKown to review change process for the resource spreadsheets at the next Functional Council meeting.
- KFC will follow-up with the KRA subcommittee on the project plan and deliverables for the module.
- Policy Template subcommittee
 1. Send contact information for subcommittee participants by 2/17/2006 to David Lyons; copy Mardi Leonard.
- Fiscal Development Series – due June 30th, 2006
 1. Send contact information for subcommittee participants by 02/17/2006 to Kymber Horn; copy Mardi Leonard.
 2. Kathleen will ask Mardi Leonard to serve on the subcommittee.
- FASB/GASB Reports
 1. Aaron at IU will draft a document on IU's process. In 6 weeks, approximately March 21, 2006, a net meeting will be scheduled – Aaron will demo IU's process and the document can be reviewed at that time.
 2. Mary Wheeler will review the document from a FASB perspective.
- KFC Joint Meeting with Kuali Days in November 2006
 1. Julie Dreesen will work on finalizing the dates; talk with key people about November 13th and 14th, 2006.
- Ongoing KFC meetings



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

1. Mardi and Kathleen will work on San Francisco, California and Phoenix, Arizona for the May 2006 and August 2006 meetings.
- IU – FMS will check into server for hosting separate environment for unit testing and user testing.
- Subcommittee for test data will provide update in 6 weeks (March 23rd, 2006).
- Kuali Test Drive
 1. Website information – Phil and Kymber will provide a draft by March 15th, 2006.
 2. Brian McGough and Ailish Byrne will provide a minimal recommendation based on the objective (what are the intervals to refresh the data?)
- Kuali Timeline
 1. Jim Thomas will meet with DM's; Jim will assign a Development Manager to each module for Phase II – this will be their contact until further notice. Jim will report assignments back to the KFC.
- QA Role
 1. Functional Council will need to send an email to lead SMEs - use Confluence for posting all functional specification documentation.
 2. Everyone to think about business analyst for the chart of accounts.
 3. Business analyst needs to be assigned for the Nervous System.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

- A. Priority Setting and Deferment (development team meets separately)
 1. Standard reports – FMS and IUIE will be providing resources for DSS basic reports. The resources and hours are not included in the spreadsheet. Steve Lutter has concerns – more discussion needs to occur.
 2. We are in good shape overall; we need to work on details to reconcile.

	Test Drive	Phase I	Phase IIa	Phase IIb
Balance [hours]	1,762	(2,942)	1,574	1,928

- a. COA-H1 was deferred; Phil made the adjustment to the spreadsheet – savings of 700 hours.
- b. Reaffirm modules that were prioritized in Phase II; **all agreed that the original priority is correct.**
- c. Review of the surplus – estimates for development hours are turning out to be correct. Should we add more scope to eliminate the surplus? It was decided to wait based on some of the “unknowns” at this time.
 - 1) Not sure of budget year enhancement time – time allocated is only an estimate. Jay Sissom needs further discussion before providing an accurate estimate.
 - 2) MSU is hiring another resource; the target date is June 1st; this will be another tendered resource (4 total). One additional resource is not built into plan.



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- 3) The Endowment module is huge and development hours are not known; the KEM module is not factored into the spreadsheet.
 - 4) Budget module development team (Gary Palmer and Fred Peterson) are not tendered to Kuali; they will be available in October 2006. The development hours are included in the release option diagrams. Per Phil, we need a better assessment for scope for the budget module. It is too early at this point – schools are reviewing processes. The current estimates looks low per Kathleen - see baseline for estimates. [Kathleen and Phil will meet with the Budget Office to solidify hours.](#)
 - 5) [Labor Distribution and Budget were prioritized as 3 - Phil will change priority for the Budget module to 4, AR to 5 and Capital to 6.](#)
3. [Review of enhancements that have been deferred for possible re-inclusion in Phase II will be deferred for six months.](#)
 4. [Kathleen will ask to add Option B to the board agenda. Kathleen is concerned about resource commitment.](#)
 - a. [Where are the resources going to come from after July 2007?](#)
 - b. [What about when people joined – when does the two year commitment stop?](#)
 5. [What about Mellon funding for Phase IIb? Per Mark McGurk, we can ask for an extension; money may not last until March 2008. Per Kathleen, we need to review financial reports to answer these questions.](#)
 6. [Phil McKown wants to review change process for the resource spreadsheets at next Functional Council meeting.](#)
- B. Research enhancement for KRA
1. This enhancement is a 60 hour enhancement to accommodate quarters.
 2. KFC needs to understand the overall project for KRA, we need a project plan. The KRA subcommittee has been tasked to provide a project plan, including deliverables, to the Functional Council for review. The KRA subcommittee has been focusing efforts on specification documents for pre-award; this has been allowed but the post-award work needs to start. Bethany Davis has started the analysis work for post-award.
 3. [Approved period /quarters enhancement request; this enhancement is part of the pre-award budget creation and is in scope.](#)
 4. [KFC will follow-up with the KRA subcommittee on the project plan and deliverables for the module.](#)
- C. AP/Purchasing enhancements may be coming. The enhancement requests will be written and hours allocated for the scope. KFC will review and vote on enhancements.



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

1. Hawaii's issue is decentralization; meet with Hawaii separately to discuss issue.

D. Policies

1. Per David Lyons, **NACUBO will be responsible for the policy template.**
 - a. David Lyons is requesting a small committee to advise on the template and present. **If interested let David know next Friday 2/17 – copy Mardi Leonard. Mardi will record the names for the subcommittee; David will work with Sue Menditto (NACUBO) for a small school representative;** small schools will benefit largely from the policy template.
2. What are the deliverables?
 - a. **General guidance (checklist) of institutional decisions.** Cash handling, etc – a core set of policies. Specifics vary from institution to institution.
3. **Kim Dight at NACUBO is primary for the project.** The subcommittee will have conference calls and brainstorm. For example, what should a policy include?
4. Final approval – this needs to be a Kuali product; we welcome APC's comments.
 - a. Sue Menditto (NACUBO) wants to review the checklist (correlate with APC) to identify missing items before it is finalized.

E. Fiscal Development Series (Kymber)

1. Does Kymber need a subcommittee? **Yes**
 - a. The subcommittee will be a group of trainers that establish and develop the program.
 - b. **Kathleen will ask Mardi Leonard to serve on the subcommittee.**
 - c. **If others are interested, send Kymber contact information by next Friday 2/17/2006; copy Mardi Leonard.**
 - d. Meetings will be held every three weeks.
2. What is the deliverable?
 - a. The deliverable is the topics (curriculum – course outline with a brief paragraph describing the benefit). Kymber wants to involve other departments to develop a program for larger schools that are decentralized. **The deadline is June 30th, 2006.**
 - 1) What is available for training?
 - 2) What is the purpose of the training?
 - 3) Who will perform training?

F. GASB/FASB (David)

1. What is our requirement?
 - a. Per Vince, in April 2005, it was decided that the building blocks were there – custom attributes. We decided to provide a trial balance and the schools will customize as needed.



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- b. Per David Lyons, we need to show a pathway (cross-walk); we are not responsible for providing the actual report that comes with the system.
 - c. Aaron Pritchett at IU will draft a document on IU's process. In 6 weeks, approximately March 21, 2006, a net meeting will be scheduled – Aaron will demo IU's process and the document can be reviewed at that time.
 - d. Mary Wheeler will review the document from a FASB perspective.
 2. SQR is the standard for Kuali – the re-write of the trial balance will be delivered June 30th, 2006; report writing will be done by an IU FMS resource - no development hours are needed from the Kuali developer pool.
- G. KFC Joint Meeting with Kuali Days in November 2006
1. KFC agrees a back-to-back meeting is a good idea; efficient use of time.
 2. November 13th and 14th, 2006 are the tentative dates for Kuali Days; KFC will start November 14th at noon and end November 16th at noon.
 3. Julie Dreesen will work on finalizing the dates; talk with key people about November 13th and 14th, 2006.
- H. Ongoing KFC meetings – two more may and august.
1. Different schools hosting is too expensive.
 2. It was decided to pick one or two locations (San Francisco and Phoenix) and work on fixing the contracts. Mardi and Kathleen will work on San Francisco, California and Phoenix, Arizona for the May 2006 and August 2006 meetings. Mardi Leonard will take the administrative responsibility for all future KFC face-to-face meetings.
- I. General Ledger “Back-office” Functionality
1. Status
 - a. We are in good shape for 03/31 – see chart.
 - b. Scrubber – hard coded values will be removed by June 30th, 2006.
 - c. Still working on integrating Balance Inquiry into edocs.
 - d. June 30th deliverables; still have a lot to do. The effort is based on GL testing and the size of the Budget Year enhancement.
 - e. All hard-coded values will be removed by June 30th, 2006.
 - f. No final decision on the Development Manager for June 30th, 2006. Jim Thomas is working on a transition plan for Jay Sissom.
 2. Testing process
 - a. Batch testing – working on getting them automated; they are available in Confluence.
 - b. Sterling will be creating more complicated test scenarios – need to identify institutions to assist with enhancement testing. Institutional data can be added to the test scenarios.
 - c. Testing issue – GL is different; other schools are not able to test the GL.
 - d. Online testing



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- 1) Full account cycle testing can begin March 6th, 2006. Edocs can be created and approved (involves people testing entire process).
 - 2) Pending ledger entries will be extracted and posted each night.
 - 3) Balance inquiry screens can be used.
 - 4) Will there be an opportunity to test institutional specific data by March 31st, 2006? Not likely; each institution will need to walk through testing.
 - 5) Full cycle testing is part of the testing process; includes cross institutional data. The resources for full cycle testing are part of the full QA deliverable; need to coordinate March 31st deliverables to pass entries – full load testing for normal operations.
 - 6) During QA, all development will be frozen. Data will be loaded on an institutional server to test locally. Installations will be needed at each institution or we can use the existing testing environment with different data. Testing environments and test data
 - e. Do we need a separate environment for unit testing and user testing? IU hosted an environment for parallel and volume testing. Is there a problem with IU hosting? We need to build a separate environment - we need a separate instance of data and Kuali; we need hardware. [Temporarily, IU's FMS will check into the server issue.](#)
3. What will be tested? IU Specific values or other institution's values (or both)
- a. Between now and 6/30, we need to create a chart of accounts that can be loaded to use for testing; go through test cases and translate. Scott Heise (chair), Kymber Horn, Mary Wheeler, Steve Stein and GL subcommittee are tasked with determining an alternative set of data for testing by June 30th, 2006. The purpose is to learn functionality while testing. [In six weeks, the team will provide an update.](#)
4. Timeline
- a. By June 30th, 2006 we need a version of Kuali that is pointing at a clean database; population of the database will start.
5. Testing participants
- a. Multiple balance scenarios – MSU
 - b. ICR encumbrance – IU
 - c. Flexible claim offsets – Cornell
 - d. Flexible claim – bank – SJDC
 - e. Budget Year – Cornell, Hawaii
 - f. Back Office functionality - IU



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

6. Issues
 - a. Limited set of test data in Kuali test environment – maybe solved. Kathleen received blessing for using data on test drive.
 - b. Separate automated testing from user edocs testing - changed this weekend and we have a separate testing site.
7. Kuali Test Drive Discussion
 - a. Test drive for GL – works like production at IU; mock transactions will be used and effort for implementation will be needed. Test drive will need maintenance after March 31, 2006.
 - b. What is the objective for Kuali Test Drive? Test drive is a billboard for Kuali – “To provide information to our external interested community on the functionality and viability of Phase I.”
 - c. Brian McGough and Ailish Byrne will provide a minimal recommendation based on the objective (what are the intervals to refresh the data?)
 - d. Scale of demo does not need to go to the board for decision. The **Kuali Board is responsible for marketing the Kuali Test Drive demo site.**
 - e. Kuali Test Drive will be announced at Kuali Days. The Kuali Board should talk to NACUBO about marketing.
 - f. Information on Kuali Test Drive web pages – [Phil McKown, with assistance from Kymber Horn, will provide the information for the web pages; draft is due March 15th, 2006.](#)
 - g. QA plan: what about bugs found in the software? Disclaimer should be clear on the website and reporting of bugs should be made available.
- J. Time-line Discussion
 1. Timeline for each module
 - a. Subcommittees are starting to work on Phase II; they need a contact person. [Jim Thomas will meet with DM's; Jim will assign a Development Manager to each module – this will be their contact until further notice. Jim will report assignments back to the KFC.](#)
 - b. Labor Distribution - development work is scheduled to start in October 2006. A business analyst has not been assigned; Suzanne Zimbardo needs to discuss filling the role with the SME group.
 - c. Budget – no business analyst has been assigned
 2. For Option B, KFC is fine with the priority order of the modules. The budget module will be a separate entry from labor; budget has a priority order of 4 – [Phil McKown will update documents.](#)
 3. After reviewing the spreadsheet of resource allocation, KFC made no decisions given the surplus of approximately 3,000 hours. Deferred enhancements will be revisited in 6 months. At that point we will see where



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

we are at; if we still have a surplus then we will have discussions about moving enhancement back in.

4. There was a discrepancy for Phase I, Chart of Accounts. The 700 hour was moved out of the ledger – deficit is now approximately 2,200 hours.
5. Between Test Drive and Phase I, we have a 500 (approximate) hour deficit. How will this be dealt with? Per Jim, we are working off estimates. After March 31st, Jim and Phil will look at the numbers again. NOTE: developers for Chart and DV will be free, they can assist with edocs for Phase I. If a deficit still exists, we will have to revisit the reality triangle.
6. The Budget Year enhancement development resource hours is still unknown; the 1,400 is a place holder. The functional team will have answers by March 31st, 2006 – we will be able to get a better estimate.
7. Flexible claim on cash – the bank specific entries are still under discussion; side conversations are needed for the bank code. Specific bank code – should it be created before the accounting cycle? We need confirmation – if the specific bank code is not needed before the accounting cycle, then we need to add to the work plan. This will also effect financial transactions.

K. QA Role

1. What are Scott's plans – refer to the QA site in Confluence
 - a. Scott reviewed his proposal – Framework for Quality Assurance.
 - b. Signoff – the Development Manager, Testing Coordinator, QA Manager, Lead SME all review and agree that the module is ready. An announcement will be made at the next FC meeting – module has been signed-off and is ready for distribution.
 - c. Kathleen asked who was responsible for preparing the functional specification documents. In some cases we have original documents. Without functional specs it will be difficult to signoff for QA.
 - d. Jim made the recommendation to use Confluence for posting documentation – **Confluence will be the central location for all documentation.** Functional Council will need to send an email to lead SMEs - use Confluence for posting all functional specification documentation.
 - e. Who is the business analyst for chart of accounts? Need to prepare functional spec document needs to be prepared – FMS may have some resources for the next 5 months; the chart is most pressing – **everyone was asked to think about a business analyst.**
 - f. QA will also be needed on the Nervous System.



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

DAY THREE

Thursday, February 9th, 8:30am to 12:00pm

MEETING GOALS

1. Revalidation with Development Team that Tuesday decisions are all valid
2. Review of Testing Process
3. Identification of problems to be fixed in Testing
4. Decision on GASB/FASB deliverable
5. Transference of knowledge on special routing that will be available

PRESENT

University of Hawaii	Kathie Egami, Henry Ito
Michigan State University	Dave Brower, Vince Schimizzi
rSmart	Dick Barber Tony Potts (Lead Developer GL)
San Joaquin Delta College	Claire Tyson, Dave Sartain (Technical Support)
Indiana University	Kathleen McNeely (Chair, Functional Council) Joan Hagen Ailish Byrne (Configuration Manager) Brian McGough (Lead Architect, DM Financial Transactions, DM Workflow) Phil McKown (Project Analyst) Sterling George (GL Subject Matter Expert) Jim Thomas (Project Manager) Scott Heise (Quality Assurance Manager) Jeff Morris (DBA/Developer) Jay Sissom (Development Manager, GL) Laura Kress (Development Manager, EPIC)
University of Arizona	Kymber Horn, Mark McGurk Mary Vega (scribe)
Cornell University	Steve Lutter, Arthur Mintz, Mary Wheeler Aaron Godert (DM Nervous System, DM Financial Transactions)

AGENDA

- A. Releases – correlate with testing (Kymber and Claire)
1. How is testing going
 2. What problems are we having



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

3. Do both teams, function and DM, believe it is going well
 4. Do we need testing coordinators for every module
- B. Regroup with Developers to see if problems identified
- C. Workflow
1. Special conditions
 2. Organization routing
 3. Additional attribute routing
- D. DSS
- E. GASB/FASB reporting deliverable update
- F. Next KFC Face-to-Face Meeting

DECISIONS MADE

- Release Signoff Process
 1. The official signoff will be an agreement between the QA manager, project manager, development manager, testing coordinator and lead SME
 2. 1-2 weeks before release deadline, the group of 5 will report to KFC with a “go or no-go” decision.
- Meetings will alternate between San Francisco and Phoenix; Mardi will start working on the dates.
- Basic workflow requirements will be met for March 31st, 2006.
- Sample of IU reports will be published on the test drive site.
- DSS
 1. In scope per Steve Lutter, a small set of SQR reports and data structure – no data warehouse.
 2. Sample of IU reports will be published on the test drive site.
 3. All institutions agreed reports are written in SQR – will need to purchase license.
 4. IUIE – decision supports; IU is willing to provide “as is”. The reports will not be changed to run against new tables.
 5. FASB and GASB – sample queries will be provided but no reports.

ACTION ITEMS

- Kymber will modify the testing scripts for Transfer of Funds and Journal Voucher when the Disbursement Voucher is ready for testing.
- Testing will be added to the weekly KFC meetings as a standing agenda item.
- Mardi Leonard will schedule meeting for March 31st release.
- Management of expectations: response time, Jim Thomas will research and report back.
- Brain McGough will make an announcement in 2 weeks via Damon Dorsey. Training activity via web plus documentation. Brain will schedule a training effort on how to setup Kuali installation. Training will be scheduled in one to one and ½ months.



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- KFC meetings will alternate between San Francisco and Phoenix; Mardi will start working on the dates.
- DSS IU Reports - set up meeting and engage Mardi Leonard and Chris Shelton - IU will prepare a timeline a make a proposal.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

- A. Releases – correlate with testing (Kymber and Claire)
1. Kymber discussed the testing process.
 2. Kymber will modify the testing scripts for Transfer of Funds and Journal Voucher when the Disbursement Voucher is ready for testing.
 3. Disbursement Voucher testing - testing functionality and business rules.
 4. Overall, Kymber feels that the testing is working. There is not duplication in testing scenarios between the schools. Kathleen is looking to Scott for guidance. Per Kymber, the testing scripts/scenarios are variations of the same functionality. Scott is fine with the testing process.
 5. Aaron commented on needed pressure for timelines. Aaron wants to know if tester can help. For example, the functional team/testers want something delivered by “xx/xx/xxxx” date. Aaron wants to know if KFC can help with establishing pressure for timelines. Ultimately, we need to have a product that can be moved into production.
 - a. Should this be a standard agenda item for KFC? How are we doing with testing? Report status back to Jim Thomas.
 - b. Aaron is looking for small deadlines – possibility a subgroup? Aaron is not sure if this requires KFC oversight; maybe this is the role of the subcommittee testing group?
 - c. KFC has set the framework – a logical order for the developers.
 - 1) The first deadline must come from the developers to KFC as a proposal – all agreed.
 - 2) KFC review periodically to see if we are still on target; currently we are using the status reports from the DMs.
 - 3) KFC cannot measure if a deadline is not given.
 - 4) Jim Thomas has asked the DMs to establish goals for the week in addition to significant milestones; Jim will continue with this process.
 6. Per Kymber, testing in general includes both the testers and functional teams. The goal is to release a new candidate weekly and enter information into JIRA. We are now at release 14. Testing timelines do exist - Gantt charts on edocs; Kymber will start to review more closely.
 7. Are the lead SMEs working closely with DMs to set priorities? We need to more tightly coordinate the work with DMs and lead SMEs in addition to Scott (priorities, bugs reported, and usability).
 8. With EPIC, the DM meets weekly with the functional team to see if progress is right.



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

9. Basic question – what do we want our developers working on? Not looking for an answer or resolution but Aaron wanted to start the discussion. Aaron wants to meet with the functional team more often.
10. Arthur sees this as the responsibility of the testing coordinator - valued judgment of the reported bugs.
11. Proposed process: One person (testing coordinator) is responsible for prioritize bugs and sending to the team for review/feedback. The list of prioritized bugs is due the day after testing has been completed for the release candidate. Review of the prioritized list will be a standing agenda item between the testing coordinator, DM, and Lead SME.
12. Chart testing will be similar to edoc testing; COA will start with the maintenance document – it is too early to start testing at this point. Claire Tyson, Bill Overman and Randall Embry will prioritize and have as a regular agenda item.
13. Aaron Godert and Joan Hagen will work closer together - prioritize bugs for 03/31.
14. Arthur Mintz: for March 31st and later, we need approval for production releases. Who decides to approve limited scope and does the application work as expected? Scott has answered these questions in his proposed QA plan: the prerequisites for signoff are
 - a. All critical bugs have been resolved.
 - b. We have completed all the QA processes: first level of approvals.
 - c. For March the list is limited: code review is required in addition to functional testing. Based on Scott's proposal, signoff will be up to the DM, lead SME, testing coordinator, PM and QA to review logs and come to a consensus.
15. Arthur Mintz: Scott's plan identifies the objectives for QA but when and how to they involve the project manager and quality assurance manager to identify production releases? Per Scott, the test plan will be a joint effort between Scott and the testing coordinator; Scott will review the testing plan and measure against the functional specs. The official signoff will be an agreement between the QA manager, project manager, development manager, testing coordinator and lead SME.
16. This project is date driven – dates are very important; the steering committee must meet to decide on what will be released or not. A few weeks prior to release, a meeting will be scheduled with the DMs and KFC to make a decision on a release. DMs will meet regularly with the Lead SME and testing coordinator.
17. Testing will be added to the weekly KFC meetings as a standing agenda item.
18. Release Signoff Process



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- a. DM, testing coordinator, lead SMEs meet regularly to review status. The group of three have to use judgment – they will go to Jim and Scott to discuss problems/issues.
 - b. **The official signoff will be an agreement between the QA manager, project manager, development manager, testing coordinator and lead SME.**
 - c. Recognize that KFC has a responsibility and deadline: 1-2 weeks before release deadline, the group of 5 will report to KFC with a “go or no-go” decision. **Mardi Leonard will schedule meeting for March 31st release.**
 - d. Kuali monthly status update meeting will be used as a check point.
19. Discussion of the QA period
- a. What is the role of the Functional Council?
 - 1) The goal is to have a June 30th production ready deliverable, in theory no new coding.
 - 2) Unit testing will be wrapping up.
 - 3) Integration testing - modules are stable; reviewing to see how they are working together.
 - 4) Performance testing – involve functional people but mostly automated
 - 5) Some documentation (technical, functional docs); this will be outsourced. KFC will be involved for feedback on the documentation.
 - 6) Testing the Kuali U application - will be stable at this point; moving towards production quality application.
 - 7) All developers “hands-on-deck”; time is reserved for issues that may be uncovered. If we reach a point that developers have time to start on coding again, we need to ensure that functional specs are ready to move development forward.
 - 8) Management of expectations: response time – Kathleen is interested in benchmarks. **Jim Thomas will research and report back;** response time is highly environment dependant.
 - 9) We have an obligation to establish hardware requirements with releases.
- B. Regroup with Developers to see if problems identified – no problems were identified.
- C. Workflow (Brian)
1. In March 2005, workflow was integrated with Kuali. This was a small integration (account and org routing – one rule); building blocks were put in place.
 2. Damon and workflow sub team identified all the WF requirements that all institutions have; this was a small change from current FIS requirements.



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

3. The workflow team has integrated Kuali workflow; their efforts were to identify and define all rules for which transactions need to operate. This effort has made available all attributes used for routing.
 4. Brain would like to schedule a training effort on how to setup Kuali installation. Training will be scheduled in one to one and ½ months. Basic workflow requirements will be met for March 31st, 2006.
 5. Workflow is independent from the code; workflow rules are defined so process changes will not involve developers. The workflow team is on target for this objective. Once people are trained on how to establish the rules; they can build edoc transactions – the functional team decides on routing rules.
 6. Kuali is #1 priority for IU team – once they understand the software and configure, they will pass the responsibility to the “functional team”. The objective is to get the development team free from supporting the workflow efforts.
 7. Configuration in workflow does not require programming.
 8. How do we prepare on training? It was requested that documentation is thorough. Brain will make an announcement in 2 weeks via Damon Dorsey. Training activity via web plus documentation. If more training is needed, Ryan Kirkendall can attend the next KFC meeting. If more resource are needed, Brain will be looking to the Kuali resources to commit to work.
- D. DSS
1. What is in scope?
 - a. A set of SQR reports, scripts to denormalize tables needed for SQR.
 - b. SQR reports, IUIE reports (IU specific – not part of Kuali). Standard are monthly run against x monthly. Ad-hoc reports are based on decision support data. Standard reports do not use DSS or denormalized tables – use real tables.
 - c. In scope per Steve Lutter, a small set of SQR reports and data structure – no data warehouse.
 2. Data model for the application is ready per Jerry; it will be used for structure of tables needed for reports. Set up meeting and engage Mardi Leonard and Chris Shelton - IU will prepare a timeline a make a proposal. Needed for 03/31? Talked about, static reports available.
 3. ODS – institution needs a mechanism to make copies of DB tables.
 4. Front –end development of trail balance report. Others will work the same.
 5. Setup meeting and engage Chris Shelton and Mardi in discussion.
 6. Sample of IU reports will be published on the test drive site.
 7. All institutions agreed reports are written in SQR – will need to purchase license.
 8. IUIE – decision supports; IU is willing to provide “as is”. The reports will not be changed to run against new tables.
 9. FASB and GASB – sample queries but no reports.
- E. GASB/FASB reporting deliverable recap – see Tuesday for details



Kuali Project

Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – San Francisco, CA February 7th – 9th, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

1. KFC discussed the obligation of deliverables and types of reports.
 2. The conclusion reached:
 - a. The data is available – from a data perspective, it is possible for people to create financial statements.
 - b. Joan Hagen will have Aaron (IU) write up FMS's process for creating report; describe the process and how to use the system attributes to build statements.
 3. In 6 weeks, Joan and Aaron will host a net meeting to walk through IU's process.
 4. **No development hours are need.**
- F. Next KFC face-to-face meeting
1. Kathleen is not in favor of skipping a quarterly meeting, especially the May/June 2006 meeting.
 2. **Meetings will alternate between San Francisco and Phoenix; Mardi will start working on the dates.**
 - a. Next meeting will be in Phoenix, May/June 2006
 - b. San Francisco, August 2006 – look into hotels downtown; work through NACUBO