

Deliverable 147.1.1 IPMS Non-Case Management Requirements Comments Tracker



ID #	Section	Page #	Comment	Author	Status	Notes	Reviewed by Molly Wyatt	Date Completed
1	1.1 Background	15	"Other Areas of Investigation" - Since the OIG and OPE were listed here should we not also include GAPS and IPEDS. FSA is not the system owner for either of these but we do utilize their data to support Title IV.	Jay R. Long	See Notes Column	These two areas are different in two key ways. They are not controlled by FSA and they do not utilize any IPM data or functionality. Jay R is correct that the data is used to support Title IV and would be used in some way in IPM, but this data and it's use was described in the eCMO deliverable.	Yes	3/5/2004
2	1.3 Methodology	19	"Office of the Inspector General (OIG) Access Email" and "Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE) Email" - Both of these offices have online access to the PEPS database and utilize PEPS data to support their functions. PEPS is not listed as a Meeting Participants/Email Recipients for either of these. Is this an oversight or typo?	Jay R. Long	Change to Deliverable Text	It was an oversight not to include the PEPS staff in the table on page 19. PEPS information was attained through both the OPE and OIG email, Molly Wyatt's and Jay R. Long's names have been added to the table.	Yes	3/5/2004
3	1.4 Assumptions	21	3rd bullet does not mention Accreditors as a Trading Partner. Is this an oversight or are Accreditors not viewed as a Trading Partner?	Jay R. Long	Change to Deliverable Text	Accrediting Agencies was added to the list of trading partners.	Yes	3/5/2004
4	2.1.1 Routing ID (RID)	23 - 24	3rd paragraph states that the RID will replace all legacy identifiers in due time. I thought there was an agreement between FSA and the community that the OPE ID will continue to function along with the RID. Has this changed?	Jay R. Long	Change to Deliverable Text	The language has been changed to read, "One of the main goals associated with utilizing the RID is to replace the myriad of existing legacy identifiers within the FSA enterprise aside from the OPEID, Grantee and Payee DUNS Numbers, and Tax Payer Identification Number (TIN). The DUNS Number and the TIN Number will always be required and the OPEID will be maintained for an indefinite period."	Yes	3/5/2004
5	2.1.1 Routing ID (RID)	26	Req. #2.1.1.13 - PEPS contains OPE ID's for all schools that were eligible for Title IV in 1978 to the present including those that applied to Title IV but were denied. Between 1965 and 1978 there were around 2,400 schools that were assigned an FFEL ID but lost eligibility prior to 1978. These schools were never added to PEPS, however NSLDS has these. In addition, when NSLDS first came online around 1992 the system would accept records with an OPE ID that did not match an OPE ID currently in NSLDS. NSLDS would just create an OPE ID and store it without double checking to see if the number reported was in error. Will there be an effort to correct the fake OPE IDs before migrating data to the new system.	Jay R. Long	See Notes Column	As discussed during the RID High-Level Design (Deliverable 123.1.25), a data cleanup effort will need to be conducted prior to implementation.	Yes	3/5/2004
6	2.1.1 Routing ID (RID)	26	Req. # 2.1.1.19 - When COD was initially populated to create the CSID (now known as the RID) multiple CSID's were created for schools which had undergone a Change in Affiliation prior to the COD initial load. Will there be an effort to correct the CSIDs created in error before migrating all this bad data to the new system?	Jay R. Long	See Notes Column	As discussed during the RID High-Level Design (Deliverable 123.1.25), a data cleanup effort will need to be conducted prior to implementation.	Yes	3/5/2004
7	2.1.1 Routing ID (RID)	27	Req. # 2.1.1.24 - I assume that the LID is a Lender ID. Lender ID's begin with an "8". PEPS stores the Lender ID by adding two "00's" to the end. I really don't see why all the next RID could not be used in sequence when creating identifiers for these other entities. If FSA chooses to use the method listed of adding two "00's" at the beginning or end of a LID (or any other ID), there must be a check to ensure that the RID does not match a current RID.	Jay R. Long	See Notes Column	During the Initial Load and Startup phase these types of issues need to be taken into consideration.	Yes	3/5/2004

Deliverable 147.1.1 IPMS Non-Case Management Requirements Comments Tracker



ID #	Section	Page #	Comment	Author	Status	Notes	Reviewed by Molly Wyatt	Date Completed
8	2.1.1 Routing ID (RID)	28	Req. #2.1.1.30 - eCB should never have an OPE ID that PEPS does not have. If eCB somehow does have OPE ID's which do not match OPE ID's from PEPS, these should go to an error file for resolution.	Jay R. Long	Change to Deliverable Text	Per this feedback, the comment field of the Req. # 2.1.1.30 was deleted.	Yes	3/5/2004
9	2.1.1 Routing ID (RID)	30	Req. #2.1.1.44 - Search by Name alone will not catch potential duplicates. PEPS currently performs a search of Name and Address to weed out possible duplicates.	Jay R. Long	Change to Deliverable Text	Added the following text to the comment field for Req. # 2.1.1.44, "The intent of this requirement is not to provide an all inclusive list of specific information to search on. Instead, this requirement just points out examples of the type of data that could be used to weed out duplicates."	Yes	3/5/2004
10	2.1.1 Routing ID (RID)	30	Req. #2.1.1.47 - Need to include "Location to Location" COA type. This is needed for Default purposes.	Jay R. Long	Change to Deliverable Text	"Location to Location" COA type was added to Req. #2.1.1.47. It now reads "The solution shall process Location to Location, Location to Freestanding, Merge/Consolidation, Merge/Absorption, and Redesignation Change of Affiliation requests."	Yes	3/5/2004
11	2.1.1 Routing ID (RID)	36	Req. #2.1.1.99 - I believe this should state "Location to Freestanding Change of Affiliation".	Jay R. Long	See Notes Column	The language should remain "Role to Freestanding". Please see Section 6.5 - Additional Change of Affiliation Scenarios in Deliverable 123.1.25 for additional detail on this topic.	Yes	3/5/2004
12	2.1.2 eCMO	49	Req. #2.1.2.16 thru 18 - Clarification - Additional Locations may draw down funds independently of the Main Campus for Direct Loans. Some Additional Locations are setup as Pell reporting but do not draw down funds independently of the Main School.	Jay R. Long	Change to Deliverable Text	Changed the phrase "eligible school" to "additional location" in Req. #'s 2.1.2.16, 2.1.2.17, 2.1.2.18.	Yes	3/5/2004
13	2.1.2 eCMO	65	Req. #2.1.2.132 - Clarification - The entering of "Future Dates" should apply to all date fields. Not just those that pertain to School Closures and Eligibility Actions. When future dates are used they should not appear in Production until the date is met.	Jay R. Long	Change to Deliverable Text	Changed the text in Req. #2.1.2.132 to read "The solution shall provide the ability to enter future dates for school closure, future eligibility action, and other fields for which business requirements specify a need."	Yes	3/5/2004
14	2.2.4 PEPS	114	Req. #2.2.4.36 - Starting with the 2002 Draft default rate cycle, PEPS will begin to archive "Draft" default rates. In the past years Draft default rates have not been kept.	Jay R. Long	Change to Deliverable Text	Req. #2.2.4.36 has been reworded to read "The solution shall store draft, recalculated and final default rates."	Yes	3/5/2004
15	2.2.4 PEPS	117	Req. #2.2.4.57 - PEPS currently performs an automated check of the debarment list for new officials. What needs to be added is a continuous check of all current officials within PEPS to see if any have been added to the debarment list.	Jay R. Long	Change to Deliverable Text	Req. #2.2.4.57 has been reworded to read "The solution shall perform continuous matching of officials and debarment lists."	Yes	3/5/2004
16	2.3.1 Central Processing System (CPS)	119	I just want to clarify that PEPS currently stores a Federal School Code School Name, Address, Contact, Phone & Email Address which may be different than the "Official School Name, Physical Address and Contact data used for Title IV eligibility."	Jay R. Long	See Notes Column	This concept warrants further discussions as more detailed discussions are held and requirements documented.	Yes	3/5/2004

Deliverable 147.1.1 IPMS Non-Case Management Requirements Comments Tracker



ID #	Section	Page #	Comment	Author	Status	Notes	Reviewed by Molly Wyatt	Date Completed
17	2.3.2 Common Origination and Disbursement (COD)	122	Second paragraph, COD currently receives a condensed version of the PEPS Daily School File via the EAI Bus. The EAI Bus creates the condensed version by providing COD with changes only.	Jay R. Long	Change to Deliverable Text	Text on page 122, second paragraph, has been changed to read "COD currently receives a condensed version of the Daily School File created by PEPS through the Enterprise Application Integration (EAI) Bus containing all changes to school demographic and eligibility data. These changes to demographic and/or eligibility information for a particular School as indicated within the Daily School File requires updates to COD."	Yes	3/5/2004
18	2.3.2 Common Origination and Disbursement (COD)	122	Third paragraph, COD also currently maintains the Pell Mailing Address and Direct Loan Mailing Address (these are identified as a form of Contact in COD).	Jay R. Long	Change to Deliverable Text	The text on page 122, third paragraph, has been changed to read, "Additionally, COD currently maintains Direct Loan and Pell contacts and mailing addresses for each School outside of the current PEPS application."	Yes	3/5/2004
19	2.3.3. Common Services for Borrowers (CSB)	124	Third paragraph, DLSS does not receive the PEPS Daily School File. Direct Loan - Loan Consolidation Services receives the PEPS Daily School File.	Jay R. Long	Change to Deliverable Text	The text on page 124, third paragraph, has been changed to read "Currently, the Direct Loan Consolidation System (DLCS) receives the Daily School File from PEPS containing all School demographic and eligibility data."	Yes	3/5/2004
20	2.4.5 Office of the Inspector General (OIG)	137	OIG School Audits are currently manually entered into PEPS via DMAD staff. Should look into giving OIG the capability of entering their own audits into IPM.	Jay R. Long	See Notes Column	This concept warrants further discussions as more detailed discussions are held and requirements documented. This is currently on the list of future eZ-Audit requirements and, when the eZ-Audit functionality is absorbed by IPM, these requirements will be discussed in detail.	Yes	3/5/2004
21	2.4.6 Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE)	139	PEPS currently stores Accrediting Agency data however, OPE is the office within the Department of ED responsible for the oversight of Accrediting Agencies. Some thought should be given to provide OPE the capability to assist FSA as it pertains to Accrediting Agencies.	Jay R. Long	See Notes Column	This concept warrants further investigation as more detailed discussions are held and requirements documented.	Yes	3/5/2004
22	General	N/A	In addition, I truly believe that GAPS (OCFO) and IPEDS (NCES) should also be looked at. FSA relies on both of these entities to provide data to support our oversight efforts.	Jay R. Long	See Notes Column	These two areas are different in two key ways. They are not controlled by FSA and they do not utilize any IPM data or functionality. Jay R is correct that the data is used to support Title IV and would be used in some way in IPM, but this data and it's use was described in the eCMO deliverable.	Yes	3/5/2004
23	General	N/A	When we mention having access to our Title IV systems using one ID and password, does that include our websites, such as NSLDS? If so, that may need to be clarified, as I didn't see anything regarding that. (I may have missed it.)	Michaelyn Milidantri	See Notes Column	The intent is to limit the number of userIDs and passwords that a Trading Partner is required maintain. Task Order 143 - Identity and Access Management Tools Analysis is currently underway to expand on this concept.	Yes	3/5/2004
24	Executive Summary	4	The document mentions previous preliminary IPM requirements efforts. There may be some useful information from the Consistent Answers analysis/requirements gathering that might also be helpful if they were reviewed/included.	Michaelyn Milidantri	See Notes Column	We did utilize documentation from the Consistent Answers effort to help us understand the functions and needs of the CSCC.	Yes	3/5/2004

Deliverable 147.1.1 IPMS Non-Case Management Requirements Comments Tracker



ID #	Section	Page #	Comment	Author	Status	Notes	Reviewed by Molly Wyatt	Date Completed
25	Executive Summary	5	Lists the other areas of investigation.... Should we add Control Mail, Jeff Baker's PLI policy repository system, and inquiries answered by regional staff? The document does mention the PLI system once and (as I recall) the Control mail system, so they should be added to the "other areas" list. It also seems logical that the regions should use the same system to record inquiries they receive. Also suggest that the IFAP Subscription Service be added to the "other areas."	Michaelyn Milidantri	See Notes Column	The intent for "Other Areas of Investigation" was to examine groups or systems that not previously been investigated. During the eCMO initiative, the need to track control mail (termed controlled correspondence) as well as access to policy information was documented. See requirement #2.1.2.41 for the requirement discussing Jeff Baker's database and requirement # 2.1.2.66 for the requirement discussing the need to track controlled correspondence.	Yes	3/5/2004
26	1.1 Background	17	"There are functions, processes, and customer touch points that will reside outside of the actual IPM solution since they will exist at the enterprise level rather than for the IPM solution alone.... [although] a high level of integration will be necessary." I am a little confused by this statement. Why is there an assumption that many of the customer touch points will be outside the actual IPM solution? Why couldn't they be built within? Are we still considering building separate 'customer touch points' such as separate inquiry tracking systems, one for CSCC, one for Policy, one for EZ audit, etc?	Michaelyn Milidantri	See Notes Column	This statement is referring to tools or capabilities that will exist at the enterprise level such as workflow and document management, but that the IPM solution will need access to and require a high-level of integration with. These enterprise tools will be customized for each group or system, however will exist as a single tool.	Yes	3/5/2004
27	1.1 Background	17	Mentions again various initiatives which documented functions and processes. Might want to consider referencing Consistent Answers, here, too	Michaelyn Milidantri	See Notes Column	In this section, the reference is to previous efforts intended to help shape the IPM solution. The Consistent Answers work took place before the introduction of IPM.	Yes	3/5/2004
28	2.1.2 eCMO	46	Not sure if this fits here, but I would recommend that we make mention of the IFAP subscription service. It should be MANDATORY that every school signs up for that service, as part of their administrative capabilities requirements. As we list the email addresses of the FAAs or other responsible staff, at least one person at each school should be signed up for the IFAP subscription service, and that should be part of the IPM solution.	Michaelyn Milidantri	See Notes Column	This concept warrants further investigation as more detailed discussions are held in order to determine whether there is a business need for this requirement.	Yes	3/5/2004
29	2.1.2 eCMO	52	Req. #2.1.2.41 - This item mentions a knowledge base of CMO case-related policy and policy interpretation information. Would this include inquiries received from financial aid professionals? Maybe that was what was intended for 2.1.2.42. Would recommend you add CSCC, or any other guidance provided as a result of incoming inquiries.	Michaelyn Milidantri	See Notes Column	The knowledge base described in this requirement is meant to describe the needs of CMO. There is also a requirement in the CSCC section (Section 2.4, Req. #2.4.1.9) referencing a knowledge base that would include CSCC inquiry-related information. This capability will be one in the same for both groups, however, they are described in both sections for the purposes of addressing the needs of each group separately.	Yes	3/5/2004
30	2.1.2 eCMO	53	Req. #2.1.2.51 - Mentions tracking all CMO work assignments. CMO is mentioned throughout this document, but it appears this system affects a wider group of FSA staff, more like it becoming an ASEDS-wide workflow tool. We would want any inquiry to be entered into the workflow and be tracked.	Michaelyn Milidantri	See Notes Column	According to the IPM framework (p. 3), the workflow tool will exist at an enterprise level. Because this is the CMO section of the deliverable, these requirements are all specifically related to the needs of CMO. CSCC would utilize the same workflow tool as CMO and cases and inquiries could be tracked in the same manner.	Yes	3/5/2004
31	2.1.2 eCMO	55	Req. #2.1.2.64 - What's the purpose of building in the ability to create and route meeting agendas? Isn't that what Microsoft Calendar is for?	Michaelyn Milidantri	See Notes Column	The intention is to utilize a workflow tool that could automate the process of selecting items ready for team meetings by routing to a queue based on the status.	Yes	3/5/2004

Deliverable 147.1.1 IPMS Non-Case Management Requirements Comments Tracker



ID #	Section	Page #	Comment	Author	Status	Notes	Reviewed by Molly Wyatt	Date Completed
32	2.1.2 eCMO	62	Req. #2.1.2.109 - Not sure what the purpose is for the system to report vacancies, names, grades, etc....	Michaelyn Milidantri	See Notes Column	These requirements reflect the desires of CMO staff. A scoping exercise should take place to determine the feasibility of each one.	Yes	3/5/2004
33	2.1.2 eCMO	69	Req. #2.1.2.172 - Suggests we track students by name and SSN in the audit.... If we collect Privacy Act data such as this, the system will have to be listed published as a System of Records in the FR.	Michaelyn Milidantri	See Notes Column	This concept warrants further investigation as more detailed discussions are held and requirements documented.	Yes	3/5/2004
34	2.1.2 eCMO	71	Req. #2.1.2.189 is a duplicate of Req. #2.1.2.187 on page 71.	Michaelyn Milidantri	Change to Deliverable Text	Deleted Req. #2.1.2.187.	Yes	3/5/2004
35	2.2.2 eZ-Audit	99 - 103	Suggest you add some Communication Log functional requirements descriptions for eZ-Audit, similar to those identified under e-CB (2.2.1.6 -- 2.2.1.10)	Michaelyn Milidantri	See Notes Column	Although the Communication Log-specific requirements are in the eCB section, the intent of the IPM solution is to have one integrated solution providing the same capability to all areas that require them.	Yes	3/5/2004
36	2.2.1 eCampus Based (eCB)	104 - 106	Suggest you add some Communication Log functional requirements descriptions for Participation Management, similar to those identified under eCB.	Michaelyn Milidantri	See Notes Column	Although the Communication Log-specific requirements are in the eCB section, the intent of the IPM solution is to have one integrated solution providing the same capability to all areas that require them.	Yes	3/5/2004
37	2.2.4 Postsecondary Education Participants System (PEPS)	107 - 118	PEPS - suggest an operations functional requirement to require each school to sign up for and receive the IFAP Subscription Service notices, at least once a week.	Michaelyn Milidantri	See Notes Column	This concept warrants further investigation as more detailed discussions are held in order to determine whether there is a business need for this requirement.	Yes	3/5/2004
38	2.4.1 Customer Service Call Center (CSCC)	132	Req. #2.4.1.1 - Under "Comments" change any reference to 'call' to 'inquiry' which would include emails, letters and faxes.	Michaelyn Milidantri	Change to Deliverable Text	The wording has been changed to read 'inquiry' instead of 'call'.	Yes	3/5/2004
39	2.4.1 Customer Service Call Center (CSCC)	132	Req. #2.4.1.4 - Change the word 'scanned' to something like 'imported' so it reads, "The solution shall utilize a document management system to enable emails and faxes to be imported." (not necessarily scanned... Emails aren't scanned.)	Michaelyn Milidantri	Change to Deliverable Text	The wording has been changed to read 'imported' instead of 'scanned'.	Yes	3/5/2004
40	2.4.1 Customer Service Call Center (CSCC)	132	Also impacts all parts of the work flow. Suggest the following requirement be added, "The solution shall present a 'dashboard' for each staff person using the system (when they log into the system) presenting alerts of pending or overdue tasks."	Michaelyn Milidantri	Change to Deliverable Text	Added Req. #2.4.1.11.	Yes	3/5/2004
41	2.4.1 Customer Service Call Center (CSCC)	133	Also impacts all parts of the work flow. Suggest the following requirement be added, "The solution shall track overdue tasks (based on established rules) and escalate notices of overdue tasks to appropriate supervisors."	Michaelyn Milidantri	Change to Deliverable Text	Added Req. #2.4.1.12.	Yes	3/5/2004
42	2.4.1 Customer Service Call Center (CSCC)	131	Also impacts all parts of the work flow. Suggest that, "The solution be web based and not client based."	Michaelyn Milidantri	See Notes Column	This concept warrants further investigation as more detailed discussions are held and requirements documented.	Yes	3/5/2004
43	Before 3 Next Steps	141	Add other areas of investigation, as follows --> Control Mail, Jeff Baker's PLI policy repository system, and inquiries answered by regional staff	Michaelyn Milidantri	See Notes Column	The intent for "Other Areas of Investigation" was to examine groups or systems that not previously been investigated. During the eCMO initiative, the need to track control mail (termed controlled correspondence) was documented.	Yes	3/5/2004
44	2.2.2 eZ-Audit	99	First sentence, add last word: electronically. Change also in the first paragraph from "deemed deficient for further case review" to "that need further case review"	Randy Wolff	Change to Deliverable Text	Changed wording as requested in first and third paragraphs on page 99.	Yes	3/5/2004

Deliverable 147.1.1 IPMS Non-Case Management Requirements Comments Tracker



ID #	Section	Page #	Comment	Author	Status	Notes	Reviewed by Molly Wyatt	Date Completed
45	2.2.2 eZ-Audit	100 - 102	Functionality not currently in eZ-Audit: Req 2.2.2.5, 2.2.2.7, 2.2.2.13, 2.2.2.15, 2.2.2.16, 2.2.2.19, and 2.2.2.20.	Randy Wolff	Change to Deliverable Text	Changed Source column on those with functionality not currently in eZ-Audit to read (Req. #s 2.2.2.5, 2.2.2.7, 2.2.2.13, 2.2.2.15, 2.2.2.16, 2.2.2.19, 2.2.2.20) "New" or "New based on Release Planning Meeting"	Yes	3/5/2004
46	2.2.2 eZ-Audit	101	Delete 2.2.2.13 - redundant to 2.2.2.5	Randy Wolff	Change to Deliverable Text	Deleted Req. #2.2.2.13. Added content of 2.2.2.13 to the comments field of 2.2.2.5.	Yes	3/5/2004
47	2.2.2 eZ-Audit	100	Add to 2.2.2.4: "accept <i>electronic</i> attachments."	Randy Wolff	Change to Deliverable Text	Changed wording as requested.	Yes	3/5/2004
48	2.2.2 eZ-Audit	100	Add to 2.2.2.7 "accept an <i>automatic</i> feed."	Randy Wolff	Change to Deliverable Text	Changed wording as requested.	Yes	3/5/2004
49	2.2.2 eZ-Audit	101	Req. #2.2.2.15 - CDA in conflict w/ requirement that reads "The solution shall eliminate the need for duplicate audit / financial statement storage."	Randy Wolff	Change to Deliverable Text	Clarified that the requirement is not in conflict with the CDA by adding the following language to comments field, "The data currently stored in both PEPS and eZ-Audit should be stored in one common repository, the CDA, and be maintained by the IPM solution."	Yes	3/5/2004
50	2.2.2 eZ-Audit	101	Add to 2.2.2.16 "shall implement a NARA certified app to."	Randy Wolff	Change to Deliverable Text	Changed wording of Req. #2.2.2.16 to read "The solution shall utilize a document management system that is NARA-certified application to eliminate the need for both paper and electronic storage of records."	Yes	3/5/2004
51	2.2.2 eZ-Audit	102	Req. #2.2.2.18 is redundant to 2.1.2.112.	Randy Wolff	See Notes Column	The intent of the deliverable is create requirements specific to each group or system, however the overall solution will be the same. Therefore, the requirements in both the eCMO section and the eZ-Audit section discuss reporting for both CMO and eZ-Audit, but the reporting capability used by both will be the same and the reports will be integrated to suit all needs.	Yes	3/5/2004
52	2.2.2 eZ-Audit	102	Req. #2.2.2.18 reads that the Database tables will go (referring to "The solution shall integrate or replace the eZ-Audit audit trail.")	Randy Wolff	Change to Deliverable Text	Changed the text for Req. #2.2.2.18 from "The solution shall integrate or replace the eZ-Audit audit trail." to "The solution shall absorb the eZ-Audit audit trail."	Yes	3/5/2004
53	2.2.2 eZ-Audit	102	Add a requirement - "The solution shall display an ownership tree based on rqd external user input (exists in 2.1.1.86)."	Randy Wolff	See Notes Column	A similar requirement exists in the RID section, therefore it is intended to apply to all sections.	Yes	3/5/2004
54	Executive Summary, 1.1 Background	3, 16	Change the framework to say that Eligibility Actions (FPRD, fines, LOC) move to School On-Going Oversight section because they are actions taken against a school that do not influence the school's eligibility. Eligibility Actions (LS&T, Referrals) are areas that do fit under Eligibility Actions and should remain under Eligibility Management.	Karen Chauvin	Change to Deliverable Text	Moved Eligibility Actions (FPRD, fines, LOC) to the School On-Going Oversight section.	Yes	3/5/2004
55	1.4 Assumptions	21	Bullet pt 3: accrediting agencies - with respect to the list of trading partners, is this an inclusive list?	Karen Chauvin	Change to Deliverable Text	Reworded to include accrediting agencies. Also, clarified assumption that trading partners can be added to the list as necessary.	Yes	3/5/2004

Deliverable 147.1.1 IPMS Non-Case Management Requirements Comments Tracker



ID #	Section	Page #	Comment	Author	Status	Notes	Reviewed by Molly Wyatt	Date Completed
56	2.1.1 Routing ID (RID)	25	Req. #2.1.1.5 - creditors added at the end of the list of Trading Partners	Karen Chauvin	Change to Deliverable Text	Changed Req. #2.1.1.5 to include accrediting agencies.	Yes	3/5/2004
57	2.1.2 eCMO	52	Req. #2.1.2.37 - In regards to the requirement "The solution shall utilize a school view to display information regarding school accounts receivables." - this is a manual feed to SEC (XLS) and does not exist in PEPS	Karen Chauvin	Change to Deliverable Text	Confirmed with Jay R. Long that this does not exist in PEPS. Changed the 'Currently in PEPS?' column in Req. #2.1.2.37 from 'Currently in PEPS?' column to read "Data not in PEPS"	Yes	3/5/2004
58	2.1.2 eCMO	70	Are 2.1.2.176 and 2.1.2.177 duplicates?	Karen Chauvin	Change to Deliverable Text	Deleted Req. #2.1.2.176.	Yes	3/5/2004
59	2.1.2 eCMO	70	Req. #2.1.2.178 In regards to the requirement "The solution shall determine whether the FPRD shall be approved by upper management." - is this workflow?	Karen Chauvin	See Comments	A workflow tool would not perform the function of determining approval. This is a business process. The workflow tool should perform a routing function to ensure that the case reaches the queue of upper management once it has been determined that it requires approval.	Yes	3/5/2004
60	2.1.2 eCMO	71	Are 2.1.2.186 and 2.1.2.188 duplicates?	Karen Chauvin	Change to Deliverable Text	Deleted Req. #2.1.2.188.	Yes	3/5/2004
61	2.1.2 eCMO	71	Reqs. #2.1.2.189 and 2.1.2.190 - These should be edits.	Karen Chauvin	Change to Deliverable Text	Added the following text to the comments fields for Req. #s 2.1.2.189 and 2.1.2.190, "Edits could potentially be implemented to facilitate this. The determination as to the type of edits will need to be determined during the detailed requirements phase."	Yes	3/5/2004
62	2.2.2 eZ-Audit	100	Req. #2.2.2.2: In reference to trading partners, spell out "schools, GA, lenders, 3rd party source (schools & lenders)"	Karen Chauvin	See Notes Column	The list of Trading Partners is provided in the Introduction section of the document. It is meant to define the term "Trading Partner" throughout the remainder of the document.	Yes	3/5/2004
63	2.2.2 eZ-Audit	102	Req. #2.2.2.22 comments: accts receivable gap (data strategy)?	Karen Chauvin	See Notes Column	The Accounts Receivable (A/R) function will be addressed through the Data Strategy II effort.	Yes	3/5/2004
64	2.2.2 eZ-Audit	102	General Comment - Does Data Strategy have an item for change of affiliation?	Karen Chauvin	See Notes Column	Change of affiliation is discussed in Deliverable 123.1.25 - Routing ID (RID). Refer to Section 6 - Support of Change of Affiliation and this text contained in the RID deliverable "While RID will help manage Change of Affiliation issues by tying the identifier to each Trading Partner entity rather than to a specific location, RID is not a business process change, but rather a tool that will help address current anomalies within existing business processes (e.g., Change of Affiliation). Separate re-engineering/re-examination efforts for some business processes will be necessary to explore complete resolution of Change of Affiliation issues."	Yes	3/5/2004
65	2.2.4 Postsecondary Education Participants System (PEPS)	117	Req. #2.2.4.59: In reference to requirement reading "The solution shall allow future dates for closures and integrate future work into the work management / workflow solution. This would facilitate the handling of changes of affiliation for PELL and DL schools." Comment - Why would it facilitate the handling of changes of affiliation for PELL and DL schools?	Karen Chauvin	Change to Deliverable Text	Deleted the wording in Req. #2.2.4.59 - "This would facilitate the handling of changes of affiliation for PELL and DL schools".	Yes	3/5/2004

Deliverable 147.1.1 IPMS Non-Case Management Requirements Comments Tracker



ID #	Section	Page #	Comment	Author	Status	Notes	Reviewed by Molly Wyatt	Date Completed
66	2.4.1 Customer Service Call Center (CSCC)	132	Req. #2.4.1.9 - Comments: eCMO also has this requirement (Jeff Baker). Solution should accommodate all.	Karen Chauvin	See Comments	This knowledge base capability described in this section as well as the eCMO section will be one in the same for both groups, however, they are described in both sections for the purposes of addressing the needs of each group separately.	Yes	3/5/2004
67	2.4.3 Learning Management System	136	Req. #2.4.3.1 - Need requirements to know school did pre-certification training. May need feed back from FSA University.	Karen Chauvin	See Notes Column	This concept warrants further investigation as more detailed discussions are held and requirements documented.	Yes	3/5/2004
68	2.4.6 Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE)	139	Referencing OIG when should read OPE.	Karen Chauvin	Change to Deliverable Text	Changed text to read OPE.	Yes	3/5/2004
69	2.4.6 Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE)	140	Req. #2.4.6.1: What does this mean? OCFO uses the Common Audit System (CARS) - Does OPE really have audit liabilities they want to include? (HUGE)	Karen Chauvin	Change to Deliverable Text	The text in Req. #2.4.6.1 has been changed to read "The solution shall send outstanding audit liabilities to the Audit Accountability and Resolution Tracking System (AARTS) (formerly known as the Common Audit Resolution System (CARS)) of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO)."	Yes	3/12/2004