Attendees: Sara Bard, Karen Cisneros, Christine Griffin, Ron Hirst, Kara Kaneda, Lisa Klock, Hannah Morand, Adriana Perez, Tedi Tehrani, Robin Testa, Luisa Velez

Not Present: Mike Moore, Terri Jo Ortega, Calli Price, Kathy Scheidemen, Daniel Stack

Guest: Steve Kriz

Introduction

Since some group members were unable to attend the last meeting and there is an addition of a new group member, Kara Kaneda, introductions took place again.

Christine gave the group updates on the Post-Implementation Audit of the Gateway System that is currently taking place. She has been given very high-level feedback from their findings thus far including these specific areas: training, communication, and ownership & support. They are now looking at transactions, processes, tolerances and federal and regulatory rules currently in place.

We did not receive feedback from the User Group on the internal audit process paperwork handed out at the last meeting. The group asked if it could be resent electronically for the review.

We also did not receive any Enhancement Requests for any departments. Those requests will help update our current Enhancement Log and will gear the meeting agendas. Requests can either be sent to Hannah or to General Gateway Help.

Issue: Lack of Receiving on Campus – Causing Large Invoice Back Log

Discussion: As of the date of this meeting, there are currently 741 invoices held in Match exception, with a majority needing receipts to finalize payment. The goal is to get invoices through this workflow step in a week or less. We have found a large pushback for receipt creation in the system, despite the fact that receiving has been an audit standard on campus for some time.

It is primarily Vendor Blankets and Walk-In Purchase Orders that are missing receipts. Both of these Forms work on two way matching: Receipt to Invoice match to pay.

After analysis of the invoices that are “stuck”, we have found that many contain departmental signatures on them; it seems that many departments are confused over the process of releasing payment.

With this in mind, it has been proposed that we revert to the traditional “green-blocking” system that this campus is more familiar with. This could help expedite payments to vendors, where our relationships are suffering, and clear the backlog.
Moving to a “green-blocking” system in Gateway would entail the following:

- Any invoice **under** a $2,500 limit, as long as the Vendor Blanket unit price has not been reached, would pay without needing a receipt.
- If an invoice is **over** $2,500 or if the Vendor Blanket unit price has been reached/exceeded, a receipt will be required for payment.

Many members asked about the audit ramifications of moving to this system. Since this was the standard on the campus for many years through “green-blocking”, the audit standards are already in place. It is still best practice to ensure that you are receiving for all invoices, but the absence of a receipt will not default our accounts.

We also have the ability to continue to add suppliers to our current “Billing Issue Supplier Class”. This will force three way matching and require a receipt for any invoice from a particular supplier, no matter the invoice amount for the invoice to pay. The suppliers that are currently enabled with this setting are Sciquest and Air Liquide. The other suppliers under consideration are: Air Gas, Praxair, Bay Alarm and Mission Linen.

With all of this being said, departments will still have the ability to hold any invoice that they do not want to pay if it is in dispute. Our campus’ terms are Net 30, so there is always a chance to stop an invoice before it pays.

Some group members asked about any foreseeable issues that could be created by not immediately drawing down a Vendor Blanket. Since Arrowhead has always been set to pay this way, we have had the opportunity to watch and see if any issues have come from those particular Vendor Blankets and we have not to date.

The consensus from the group is that this idea would work and all would want to move forward with it after talking to their department and neighbor departments. It was felt that because it was done before and worked for this campus before, it would be well received.

Summary/Action Items: Get instructions on recurring exports for interested users. Users are asked to reach out to their departments to see the impact of this receiving change. Users are also asked to identify any suppliers that should be assigned to the “Billing Issue Supplier Class”.

**Issue: Invoice Concerns and Processor Communication**

Discussion: The previous discussion brought up many concerns that group members have had concerning past invoices in the system. Many gave examples where they had come across their departmental invoices that had been in the system untouched in particular workflow step for several days up to a couple weeks. Many reported that even when they were commenting to processors inquiring about the progress, they were not responded to or were not responded to in a timely manner.
A few users were also curious how processors selected departmental employees to contact in the system for certain actions that need to be taken on invoices. It was explained that processors are given excel spreadsheets with a breakdown of all of the “Receivers” and “Department Buyers” for each department. For anything that needs a receipt, the protocol is to contact the Receiver(s) in the department with any questions or comments. With any invoicing related questions, the comments are sent to the department’s Department Buyer(s). If there is someone specific that AP needs to contact instead of who we have on the list, please notify Ron Hirst.

There was another reiteration of the comment discussion from the last meeting for group members that were not present. It was made clear that comments to processors need to be left on the “Comments” tab on the Invoice, not the Purchase Order.

Summary/Action Items: Continue cross training with processors and promoting consistency in protocols as we are doing with our AP Manual.

**Issue: Many Vendors Are Still Billing Under the Old Legacy Purchase Order Number**

Discussion: Many vendors are still billing under the old legacy purchase order number which can cause a delay in payment if Accounting or the Department has to track down the current purchase order in Gateway. Currently, Hannah and Christine are calling vendors when asked by departments to help fix this billing issue. The thought is that a letter from Jim Corkill to all of our suppliers letting them know of the change would be the preferred method, rather than individual calls.

Summary/Action Items: Draft letter and send to suppliers.

**Issue: Airgas Mapping Address Mapping**

Discussion: Christine and Hannah are currently working with Airgas to map campus addresses in their system for their upcoming enablement in Gateway. They have found several anomalous shipping addresses that need to be addressed. Hannah will be contacting departments on campus, including some from the user group, to straighten it out.

Summary/Action Items: Hannah will contact specific departments with details.

**Issue: Tolerance Changes and Updates to Reflect Departmental Needs**

Discussion: There are currently several tolerance changes up for approval and discussion.

- Our current line item tolerance is 10% or $100, whichever is less.
- We would like to change that tolerance to match the Accounting Manual. The AP Manual lists this tolerance at 20%. The group agreed that 20% or $200 on a line item would be a good improvement to the tolerance catches that are currently in the system.
- The Shipping tolerance is currently set to $75. We suggest changing this one to match the flat rate of shipping costs to $105. We have really found an issue on partial shipments, where each invoice is way below the tolerance, but the system reads all of the invoices together as pools the shipping costs. That then usually will hold all of the invoices for review in Match Exception just due to the shipping tolerance. After some discussion of their experiences in their departments, it was felt that this would work.
  - Reminder to the group to ask for a shipping estimate to be included when you get your quote or pricing so that your purchase order can accurately reflect what the invoice amounts to. This will help keep invoices out of Match Exception due to Shipping discrepancies.
  - It was pointed out that Shoppers do not have the field open to adjust Shipping for the entire purchase order. After group discussion, it was determined that opening up that field will be fine for Shoppers.

Summary/Action Items: Open the field for the Shopper role.

**Issue: Upcoming Enablements**

Discussion: UC San Diego is moving forward with a Cardinal Health enablement. We will be able to follow with this as well down the line depending on their progress. Airgas and Xerox are coming soon to Gateway.

Summary/Action Items: N/A

**Issue: Contracts through Gateway**

Discussion: A few users asked if they could be a part of the pilot group of departments that will test contract workflow in Gateway as it becomes enabled. Right now we are focusing on establishing workflow for payments and 1099 reporting. MSI and Housing are already volunteers. Lisa Klock volunteered her department as well.

Summary/Action Items: Christine will let Calli Price know of Lisa Klock’s desired involvement.