Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 – Gateway User Group Meeting Minutes

Attendees:  Sara Bard, Christine Griffin, Ron Hirst, Lisa Klock, Mike Moore, Hannah Morand, Calli Price, Adriana Perez, Kathy Scheidemen, Daniel Stack, Tedi Tehrani, Robin Testa, Luisa Velez

Not Present:  Karen Cisneros, Kara Kaneda, Terri Jo Ortega

Introduction

A few “house-keeping” items were discussed by Christine:

Hannah and Christine have been working on invoice troubleshooting. Please continue to send and encourage departments to send problem invoices to the Helpdesk for Hannah and Christine to work on.

If there is no further feedback or discussion surrounding the electronic copy of the Audit Transaction Document that was sent out following the last meeting, Christine will submit that copy to the Auditors and it will be considered the final draft.

Christine briefly went over the Enhancement Log excel file. She asked the group to go through the file and prioritize their Enhancements for our records. The group asked if Christine and Hannah could first re-organize the file to list which Enhancements could be completed on campus and which Enhancements would need to completed by Sciquest in order for them to better prioritize based on the reality of the feasibility and ability of the Enhancements occurring quickly. This document will be sent out electronically to the group as soon as Christine and Hannah have completed re-organizing the Enhancements.

Issue:  Contracts Workflow

Discussion:  Christine discussed with the group further detail of the upcoming Contracts Workflow that will be in Gateway in the coming months. She explained that the new workflow will be comprised of two parts: function and invoicing. The new workflow step will come after Commodity Approval (currently Equipment Management) and Campus Purchasing Review. Contracts review will be triggered two ways: by selection of a custom field (Business Contract = Yes) or a Request for Services Form. On the invoicing side, suppliers marked with the tax reporting and tax exempt supplier class will trigger a review in Accounting so that 1099 reporting can be fulfilled. All of this is in the TEST environment right now between AP and Purchasing. Group members inquired about the process for obtaining signatures. Calli verified that that will be handled through Docusign, outside of Gateway. Calli mentioned that most contracts actually do not need signatures and can be handled through Gateway, using the requisition number as the identifier and the PO number when it is enacted. She clarified for group members that the PO will be on the same current number wheel. The Request for Services Form is still a .pdf and will be modified before moving into Gateway for clarification.

Summary/Action Items: Continue testing.
**Issue: Furniture Services – Recharge Pilot**

Discussion: The group was made aware of requests that we have been getting in Purchasing and at Gateway from some recharge operations on campus to move into Gateway. Furniture Services was the first to inquire and Instructional Development has also volunteered. The structure will be most likely based on obtaining a quote from Furniture Services and utilizing a specialized form in Gateway to build a requisition/purchase order that would be distributed to Jeff Goldman. On the backend, a recharge would still be journaled rather than an invoice since we do not cut checks to UC Regents; the PO would just close so that it would not be invoiced against. Many group members liked this idea as it solved their issues with capturing approvals on recharges (which was the point of moving recharge into Gateway). There would not be a static catalog to choose from – just a specialty form and quote combination. Some group members were interested in setting up a different number wheel for these types of purchases. Christine could look into this and could possibly even break it down by supplier. Some group members were concerned about having to receive. There would not be any receiving on these orders. They would simply be there to capture the approval chain before auto-closing. A few group members felt that there could be some issues with change to larger recharge chains and it could get complicated, but that it would depend more on looking at details closer to when proposed implementation would occur. Christine also mentioned that campus audit committees are reviewing these proposals as well.

Summary/Action Items: Bring more details to the group as they become available for their review.

**Issue: Entertainment in Gateway**

Discussion: Entertainment purchases are currently not allowable in Gateway, but Purchasing and Accounting are looking to expand this to allow programmatic expense purchases through Gateway. Since entertainment approvers are in many cases different from Account Approvers in some departments, we are looking at a way to capture Entertainment approvals through the use of a form (most likely hard copy) that would be signed and uploaded to show the approval. The review would not be up front on purchase order, but by review on the invoice and by pulling specific object codes. This would only be for programmatic expenses and not other entertainment expenses in order to narrow reimbursements. Gateway will not be auditing the forms; the purpose would just be to standardize between Flexcard processes. Flexcard is currently 100% audited for programmatic expenses.

Summary/Action Items: When this is decided, a campus announcement will be sent.

**Issue: Apple Punch-out**

Discussion: The group was informed of the current existence of a fully functioning Apple Punch-out that is hidden in Gateway. At the directive of the Vice Chancellor, we are not to open the punch-out as there is a concern that it will take spend away from the Bookstore, which is the current campus authorized Apple seller. The bookstore needs to maintain a certain level of spend to maintain their license and the
concern is that if the punch-out existed, it would take away a resource for the students. We have asked Apple if they would consider combining spend through the two entities to maintain the bookstore’s license, since a bulk of the Bookstore’s current spend is by Faculty and Staff, and they declined as they felt it was a difference of a B2B vs. Retail branch. Many group members echoed the sentiment that the Bookstore is really for student needs and doesn’t really support departmental needs well and the overwhelming response when asked if this was something that the group felt that they would want and that their departments would want was “YES”. Some group members did voice concerns over their experience with the Bookstore and that a punch-out would service their department better. Other group members chimed in that Apple is notorious for bad customer service, so of course it is hard on the Bookstore to be the middle man in that situation! Christine also stated that we are one of two other campuses that have ever been able to successfully enable Apple.

Summary/Action Items: Christine is currently working on further statistics on Apple spend on this campus for proposals for the punch-out.

**Issue: Bookstore Invoices**

Discussion: We recently switched the UCSB Bookstore to electronic invoicing to work on their legibility. Group members noticed a difference in issues with their invoices.

Summary/Action Items: N/A

**Issue: Daniel Stack– Need for AP Training Manual/Invoice Issues**

Discussion: Daniel Stack mentioned an agenda item for today: the need for standardization among AP processors in the form of a training manual. He mentioned examples of invoicing issues as the cause of this agenda item. Christine mentioned that there are currently weekly meetings between the Gateway Team and Accounting to conduct training, troubleshoot, and answer questions. Hannah uses that time to work on refreshing a manual for the team with the help of a manual that is already in place from Ron Hirst. Many of the group members echoed Daniels sentiments and brought up their invoicing examples. Christine again asked for the examples to be forwarded to the Helpdesk so that troubleshooting can occur.

Summary/Action Items: Hannah and Christine to troubleshoot this afternoon. AP manual is already in the works in addition to ongoing training.

**Issue: VB Matching Proposal**

Discussion: After the last meeting, Christine contacted Sciquest to plan the proposed change for the Vendor Blanket receiving matching proposal. She learned that she is not able to create a rule for
invoices over $2,500+ to stop for receiving; it will have to be all invoices will continue to pay until the limit of the Vendor Blanket is reached. Her recommendation is to still move forward as planned as this will still match the previous method of green-blocking that the campus was used to (keeping in mind that there will still be the “10 day Hold for Receiving” period). The group was split on this; some were uneasy and were still pushing for training to fall on AP and Christine/Hannah, while the other half was comfortable moving back to the green-blocking system. You also have the ability to add suppliers to the 3-way match category (Air Liquide is currently in that category).

Summary/Action Items: Ask other campuses for their advice and what they are doing. Campus announcement when decision is made. Continue working with departments on their receiving issues.

Issue: Sara Bard - International Supplier Class

Discussion: Sara Bard brought up the point that many international vendors need specific customs attention and should be routed to campus purchasing for review and help. Calli Price was in agreement.

Summary/Action Items: Hannah to create International Vendor Supplier Class in TEST and PROD environments for Christine’s workflow.

Issue: Small Change to Emails from the System

Discussion: Christine was able to change the emails received from the system when a cart is returned or rejected. It will now include any comments from users or the system in the email for help or guidance. Please look for this at the bottom of the email.

Summary/Action Items:

Issue: Splits on the VBs

Discussion: There are some issues with splits on Vendor Blankets. The best way to make it clear is to write on your invoice if you can your intent on the split because many of them are not making sense for the processors (i.e. – percentages trying to be turned into amounts on invoices, etc.). The invoices need to stay in line with the original intent of the Vendor Blanket. Special Handling fields will also be open soon for departments, which will also alleviate some issues for departments that need special help with invoices.

Summary/Action Items: N/A