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1. **Introductions of Members and Guests** *(Daryl Weinert)* [3:00 - 3:05]

Daryl welcomed everyone and the group went around the room for introductions.

2. **Presentation**: RAAC Training Subcommittee Update *(Judy Carrillo)* [3:05 – 3:35]

Appendix #1

Judy thanked everyone for the opportunity to present to the RAAC Committee-at-Large (CAL). Judy went over the RAAC Training subcommittee update.

New members include Kim Angelopoulos (LSA), and working with Med School and Engineering for replacements, and also open positions in ORSP and Sponsored Programs.

**Current Projects:**

- **Research Administration Mentoring Program (RAMP)**: The 3rd Cohort is winding down. Had the Brown Bag Lunch and Chris DeVries and David Mulder *(Ed: Raquel de Paula Silvius filled in for David at the Brown Bag Lunch)* discussed RAAC and subcommittees, as well as additional Navigate training activities. 4th Cohort will begin in September 2017 and communications will go out in late spring. Chris is reaching out to Advisory Board members to determine their desire to continue, and if we need to fill any positions will work with the RAAC Executive Committee (EC) and CAL groups.

- **Navigate: Fundamentals** is running now *(March 14 - May 16)*. Course was over-subscribed and continues to improve. David met with the module designers and trainers to make a few tweaks to the program. We are looking to identify alternate trainers and the current training modules are
New training opportunities:

- **Uniform Guidance Cost Principles**: The pilot was last fall, and the first course was offered in February 2017. The trainers are: Cory Livingston (Sponsored Programs), Donna Boyer (Med School), and Jacob Schlag (LSA). The collaboration of unit level research administrators (RAs) as well as central office staff contributed to the success of the program. The course will be offered again in July and October/November 2017. The course is limited to 30 participants, and was oversubscribed by 30 applicants for the last cohort. We will continue to evaluate the need for the course to determine how often we will offer it.

- **Advanced Budgeting I** - The pilot was last fall. It was originally designed to be one course, but it was decided to break it into three courses based on individual training needs. The course is an intensive three-day hands-on budgeting course including budget salary, and task order hour budgets. The three courses will move the learner through increasingly more advanced budgeting topics. The trainers are: Cathy Seay-Ostrowski (Biomedical Engineering), Kerri Cross (ISR), Marlie Bartow, and Ruth Halsey (both Med School). Had to delay the start to Fall 2017 due to design team lead having to step down. The course is limited to 15 participants, and participants are required to bring a laptop.

- **Lunch & Learn** - Will offer a series of one-hour Lunch & Learn sessions. Leads will be the Navigate administrative team, RAAC Training subcommittee and other selected experts. Topics will come from recent RAAC Training survey. Possible content could come from the short content job aide workgroups. Participation can be either in person or remotely (Google Hangout or Bluejeans). Expected launch is May 2017. Daryl asked what the topic is for the first Lunch & Learn. David indicated there were two contenders; the budget allocation process, and effort certification. Scott thought the May timing was perfect for effort certification.

Work in Progress:

- Based on feedback from the RAAC EC and CAL, we have begun to take some of the modules from the Fundamentals course and develop stand-alone courses. An outline has been created to help aid the design. The Design Team leads are Judy Carrillo (Med School) and Cathy Seay-Ostrowski (Biomedical Engineering). Judy and Cathy will seek additional design team members and potential training topics. We expect to launch some of the stand-alone courses in 2017.

- **Advanced Budgeting II** - This is the second course in a series of three. The Design Team members are: Trina Bailey (Med School) and Kim Mann (Engineering). The course will focus on: how to budget a salary pool; GSRA stipend and tuition; and, cost share requirements and match. We expect to launch the pilot in Fall 2017.

- Established workgroups for **short content job aides / best practices**:
  - Unfunded Research Agreement
  - Budget Allocation Tool
  - Procurement

The purpose of the workgroups is to conduct fact-finding to identify knowledge gaps, and provide information to the research community. These could that the form of short job aides or be included in the Lunch & Learn series.
Unfunded Research Agreements - We will identify lead(s) for this workgroup soon. Judy and David got a central office perspective and they need to reach out to the research community to see whether there is a need to assemble a workgroup. Kathy suggested adding someone from IRB to the workgroup. Craig asked whether the discussions with central office personnel included anyone who handles non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) at ORSP. David and Judy did not believe that NDAs came up in their conversations. Craig suggested reaching out to the clinical trials team or Tom Zdeba.

Budget Allocation Tool - The lead for this workgroup is Sue Kelch. The group started meeting in January and will present findings to the RAAC Training subcommittee in May. There may also be a need to advise the RAAC Process subcommittee about potential process changes. The workgroup members are: Lea Tune, Jake Schlag, Amy Brooks, Cathy Howell, Maggie Herron, and Ann Taylor.

Daryl asked if, in addition to identifying knowledge gaps, are the workgroups proposing how to bridge the knowledge gaps (i.e., what type of course/product to offer). Judy said they will identify what best training solution might be for the given topic area. Scott would like to reach out to Sue Kelch before the Budget Allocation Tool job aide is presented to the RAAC Training subcommittee as he teaches this module in Fundamentals. Judy thought that was a great idea.

Daryl would like to clarify how it all fits into the structure of training. The workgroups are designed to identify broad gaps across the RA community, and ascertain if there are specific and targeted training or tools to help bridge the gaps. David concurred, adding that the results of work groups could affect any venue, and we will need to identify these venues. Daryl asked if the workgroups are temporary (e.g., 4-6 months), and Judy answered that they are. If more time is needed to create the solution to the knowledge gap(s), we will look for design team members and trainers to aid with full course development.

Procurement - Lead: Linda Chadwick (LSA). Members: Scott Stanfill (School of Social Work), Shelly Feldkamp (Engineering), Beth Brant (Medical School), Colin Anderson, and Bob Johnson (both Procurement).

David and Judy met with Colin Anderson and Bob Johnson to get a central office perspective, and they were excited to work with RAAC. Just getting started to determine gaps.

What’s Next:

- We will continue to develop mini-course/stand-alone training opportunities from Fundamentals modules. Looking for Design Team members and trainers. We will also be developing a faculty training program. We received feedback on what training topics to include for faculty, and also conducted a survey after the last RAN meeting to assess what RAs thought would be useful for faculty topics.

The RAAC Training subcommittee is determined to provide high-quality programs for the research community. Judy thanked the group for their participation in the subcommittee and its workgroups to help improve training as a whole.

Kathy asked if training grants came up in the list of potential new training topics. Judy answered that this has come up in discussion with David as well as the Med School. It is on our radar and we are looking to see if we should add this to a Fundamentals course.

Yvonne asked how often the Lunch & Learn sessions will be offered, and how they will be advertised (e.g., RAP or RAPid). Judy responded that it will be advertised through RAPid, and no decision about frequency
has been made. We are looking at every other month to begin. Melissa asked if lunch will be provided at the Lunch & Learn. Judy clarified that these will be brown bag lunches.

Ken asked about the response from the RAAC Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) about faculty training topics. Judy said there was a desire for more information about indirect costs and research portfolio accounting and management. Chris added that there was a clear split among the FAC in terms of what should be offered to junior versus seasoned faculty. For junior faculty, the FAC thought that training modules would be beneficial. However, more seasoned faculty wanted one central site where they could go for all research administration information. Currently, many rely on their RA for information, so we need to make sure information is given consistently to RAs and faculty.

Beth asked if there is any sense about how long it will take to work through the waitlists on those courses that are over-subscribed. David indicated that the waitlists are being tracked. We need to strike the right balance between offering courses on a consistent basis to meet the needs of the research community against the need to respect the time of the trainers, all of whom are volunteers.

Melissa asked whether there are plans for courses for more seasoned RAs. Judy responded that the group considered a project management course, but this is a very complex and broad topic, so it has been placed on the back burner for now. The need is there, but resources are the issue. Daryl added that the goal of Navigate is to mirror career progression. The first goal was to address basic needs by offering training courses for new RAs. The second goal is to offer one-off topics, and we will need to track participants to see where to go next. We are looking for a natural progression in the training courses offered.


Craig said we have been working for a year now discussing the deadline policy. Craig wanted to give an update to the RAAC CAL on the questions that were submitted via the Google Sheet where questions are being gathered. Craig mentioned that the answers to the questions are not set in stone, and that we are still in the stakeholder engagement phase. We want to make sure we get your concerns, and review as other conversations happen.

All PAFs and final proposal documents need to be received by ORSP three (3) business days ahead of sponsor deadline. If not, proposal will not be submitted unless there is an approved exception by ORSP Managing Project Representative (PR).

Craig noted two-thirds (70%) of the proposal deadlines is well known a year in advance (e.g., NIH and NSF proposals). We know we can manage at least this portion of the work.

Exceptions to receive additional business day:

- Medical emergency of principal investigator (PI) or family member.
- Natural disaster
- Emergency closing of U-M due to severe weather
- PI was notified of funding opportunity less than X days/weeks prior to deadline.

Exceptions must be approved by the school/college/institute and an ORSP Managing PR. Proposals granted an exception will not be submitted at the expense of other applications for the same deadline who were timely.

The RAAC FAC will be consulted on what is a reasonable number of days/weeks (i.e., “X”) a PI was notified prior to the deadline for an exception to be granted.
Kathy asked if the “X” days/weeks is determined by the date in the actual funding opportunity or when the PI hears about it from direct or prime sponsor. Craig responded that this would be the date on which the PI hears about the opportunity.

Melissa asked if it would be possible to track exceptions by PI. Craig answered that this would be helpful as a management tool, and the idea would be to do this during the soft launch period. A lot depends on the system requirements for doing so.

**Exception Questions:**
What type of proposal will qualify for meeting the X days/weeks exception?
- Proposal with outgoing subcontracts?
  If subcontractor (e.g., Johns Hopkins) cannot get data to us in time, will that be exception? Craig said they will look at it. Scott said subcontractor will also tell when they want information at what time (e.g., guidelines). Tell the PI they need to adhere to the “guidelines.”
- Proposal where we are the subcontractor?
  Depends on what “X” is if it will be an exception.
- Submissions following a pre-proposal competition?
  ORSP will look at how many days there are prior to the deadline and will determine if an exception is warranted.
- Submissions following a limited submission competition?
  When did they receive from UMOR - will determine if under exceptions.
- NSF I-CORP proposals?
  We know that these require a 4-day turnaround and will likely be granted exceptions.
- Proposal submitted under NIH’s continuous submission policy?
  Need to put in 3 days prior to deadline date.
- End of year “money dumps”?
  We will look at exceptions for these as we don't want to turn down money.
- Complex proposals?
  These type of proposals need the most time for ORSP to review and will not constitute an exception.
- Simple proposals?
  There is not an easy way to delineate a simple from a complex proposal, and there is not an easy way to program this into the system.

Melissa asked about holidays/season days, especially as they relate to Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) proposals. These are generally due immediately after the holiday break. Jan added that there are many other instances of funding opportunities that arrive over the holiday break. Craig noted this and will look into it.

Kathy asked about pre-proposals and letters of intent. There are many instances where faculty don't read them and don't think they have to go through PAF process even though policy is reviewed with junior faculty during orientation. Daryl responded that this should be considered a faculty training matter and will need to be communicated as the deadline policy is implemented.
Exception Questions (cont.):
What other types of situations will qualify for an exception?

● RA emergency?
  If lightly staffed department, we will look at these issues.

● RA staffing/workload issues?
  This is not an exception and want to work with school/colleges to work through policies.

Jan brought up an example where her department is currently down 2 people unexpectedly. While they are working to fill their open positions, this has put a strain on the department’s ability to review proposals. Daryl responded that ORSP is sometimes in the same situation, yet their standard is to review proposals regardless. The idea of the deadline policy is to try to build some breathing room so these situations (and all emergencies) are manageable.

Melissa asked whether it is possible (via PAF transparency or otherwise) to have units cover other units in situations where there is an emergency staffing need. Cathy Handyside said technically you could add someone to review PAFs for temporary time. Craig agreed that this may lead to the development of a “mutual aid society” among units.

● Can we just pay a late fee instead?
  No late fee will be offered. Would not be fair to those departments that do not have money and it would be inappropriate to use a policy to generate revenue.

Teresa added two related questions that were brought up by the Small Schools and Colleges Research Administrators Group (SSCRAG). Namely, will there be assurance from ORSP that there will be a complete review of the proposal, and if the proposal is sent back to the study team for corrections, how will units have assurances that the proposal will still be processed timely? Craig responded that ORSP will still conduct a complete review. Additionally, ORSP will look at workload levels to ensure that proposals with corrections are processed before the sponsor deadline. ORSP will shift workloads accordingly.

Reviewing proposals under the new policy:

● Does ORSP guarantee it will conduct a complete review?
  Yes, we will give complete review. We will triage work within ORSP group, but will be all-hands-on-deck approach to get them done.

● Will schools/college/depts have a chance to implement their own policies?
  Yes.

● What if schools/colleges/depts identify corrections that aren't completed by deadline?
  Craig advised that schools should have their own internal deadline policy to accommodate corrections and still meet the 3 day ORSP deadline.

● Can we have separate “administrative shell” and final proposal review?
  ORSP is not interested in a two-tiered approach and this is consistent with peer institutions.

● Can reviews can be done in parallel?
  ORSP does not care except ORSP will need to be the last review. Units should think about roles and responsibilities for reviewing proposals when they are done in parallel.

Kathy asked about proposals with multiple units. Sometimes departments take 2-3 days to review and don't get proposal in enough time to get to ORSP. Will these have exceptions? Kerri voiced some hope that the deadline policy will help correct the problem of units sitting on proposals. Becky added that the
deadline policy may be a catalyst for communicating to faculty that they need to make RAs aware of upcoming submissions. Melissa mentioned that having more transparency regarding the workload at ORSP and where a proposal is in the queue would be valuable.

Implementation Issues:

- What is your timeline?

- Can you extend the soft launch period to 12 months?
  Originally, we were looking at September 2017 to implement, but the feedback indicates that this may be too soon. We also need to consider system changes and ITS resources. The implementation date is still TBD. The soft launch period has expanded since the policy was envisioned. We will be going to the RAAC FAC to get their feedback on a reasonable soft launch period.

4. **ORSP Update:** *(Craig Reynolds)*  
   [3:55 - 4:05]

Constance Colthorp is working on a communication regarding the Research Terms and Conditions. These are federal conditions which agencies are looking to adopt. NIH and NSF have already adopted, and other agencies are slowly adopting. The prior approval matrix (Appendix A) is available on the NSF website.

Micro-purchase Threshold - still waiting for the final word from the federal government. Procurement standards should go into effect on July 1, 2017, and we still feel the threshold will be $10K.

New NSF pilot to use collaborator spreadsheet goes into effect the April 24th.

5. **ITS Update:** *(Cathy Handyside)*  
   [4:05 – 4:15]

   *Appendix #3*

   Huron/Click Framework Portal Upgrading:

Conducting two-stage system update (upgrade to latest vendor version (8.0.2)).
- Stage 1 - completed weekend on March 24, 2017
- Stage 2 - Scheduled for weekend of May 5, 2017.

The system will be unavailable during the weekend of the upgrade; Friday, May 5 starting at 5:45 p.m. to Monday, May 8 at 6:00 a.m. Will bring up earlier if upgrade is completed before Monday morning.

We will have updated Microsoft technology, and this should help reduce performance issues. Also, this is a critical path for the Award Management project. That is, the software for Award Management is in this upgrade.

Cathy mentioned there will be a go/no-go decision by April 28 and asked if pushing the update to the following week would it affect anyone, in the case of a no-go decision. Kerri mentioned that ISR has a big deadline on May 16, and Karen indicated that Nursing has big NIH deadline on May 8. Cathy responded that we will keep the timeline as-is, and if a no-go decision is reached, she will follow up with ISR and Nursing.

Cathy reviewed a layout of the new interface changes, which will come about from the upgrade. The fonts and appearance of navigation buttons have changed and the layout is meant to be more mobile friendly. There is a new breadcrumb to show where you have been. An overview of the changes will be sent via RApid.
Melissa asked if there will be any changes to the NIH form sets. Cathy mentioned that there will be font style changes, but nothing functional in the forms will change.

6. **Sponsored Programs Update:** *(Debbie Talley)*

Debbie said the single audit was submitted on March 31. She reminded everyone about the equipment disposal, inventory of equipment, and Fly America Act issues noted in the audit.

The NSF audit is nearing completion. It has been submitted and the University agreed to return $82K (for travel, equipment, some misc. costs) out of $2.4M in original findings. We are still waiting to hear from NSF on approval of overdrafts for some of the projects. Hopefully will only have to return $60K. Once we have agreement from NSF we will communicate to departments affected.

Sponsored Programs will have nine new hires starting on May 8, 2017.

Melissa asked if there are any plans for training/documentation on equipment, given that it is a consistent issue in audits. Debbie responded that Bryan VanSickle and David are working on possible training opportunities. External auditors give list of items we should be doing better: Effort certification came up as well as equipment and recharge activity.

7. **Closing and Future Meetings:** *(Daryl Weinert)*

Thanked Jane for hosting and Judy for update. Note time change for May 16 meeting at SNRE to 1:30 - 3:00pm. Will meeting regular time on June 20 at College of Engineering.

---

**RAAC Committee-At-Large Meeting Dates**

- Tuesday, May 16, 2017, **1:30 - 3:00 pm** @ SNRE *(Becky O’Brien, RAAC Communications Subcommittee)*
  - **Note meeting time change.**
- Tuesday, June 20, 2017, 3:00 - 4:30 pm @ College of Engineering *(Chris Allan, RAAC Metrics Subcommittee)*
- **NO JULY MEETING**

**Executive Committee Meetings**

*Wolverine Tower, Conference Room 1025*

- Tuesday, May 9, 2017, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
- Tuesday, June 13, 2017, 3:30 - 5:00 pm
- Tuesday, July 11, 2017, 3:30 - 5:00 pm
AGENDA:

● Update on Subcommittee membership

● Ongoing Projects
  ○ Research Administration Mentoring Program - RAMP
  ○ Navigate Fundamentals
  ○ Navigate Uniform Guidance Cost Principles (new)
  ○ Navigate Advanced Budgeting I (new)
  ○ Navigate Lunch & Learn (new)

● In Progress
  ○ Advanced Budgeting II
  ○ Budgeting Basics
AGENDA (continued):

- **In Progress** (continued):
  - Workgroups established for
    - Procurement
    - UFA
    - Budget Allocation Tool

- **Future Projects**
  - Continue to develop Fundamentals mini-courses
  - Faculty Training

Current Subcommittee Membership

- Judy Carrillo, Chair, Medical School
- David Mulder, ORSP/Sponsored Programs
- Chris DeVries, ORSP; Sponsored Programs
- Raquel de Paula Silvius, ORSP/Sponsored Programs
- Kim Angelopoulos, LSA (new)
- Lori Deromedi, UMOR
- Cathy Handyside, ITS
- Sue Kelch, Medical School
- Kullie Kennedy, ORSP
- Melinda LaRocca, Public Health
- Susan Powell, CoE
- Cathy Seay-Ostrowski, Biomedical Eng
- Pat Turnbull, U-M Dearborn
- Open, ORSP
- Open, Sponsored Programs
Research Administration Mentoring Program (RAMP) Update

3rd Cohort Almost Complete

Program Overview

• 22 participants / 11 matched pairs
  o Mentors have > 5 years of research administrative experience at UM
  o Mentees have > 6 months of research administrative experience at UM

• Fourth Cohort will run September 2017 - June 2018
  o Information about the next cohort will go out end of spring

• Advisory Board
  o Confirming future participation
- Spring 2017 now in session
  - March 14 - May 16
- Course content continues to be updated based on participant/trainer feedback
- Alternates for each module identified or will be identified
- Will be offered again in Fall 2017

Course Limit: 30 participants (Fee: $400.00)
New Navigate Professional Development Opportunities

- Uniform Guidance Cost Principles
- Advanced Budgeting I
- Lunch & Learn

Navigate: Uniform Guidance Cost Principles

- First course offered February 2017
  - Received an overall rating of 4.88 out of 5.0
    - Trainers: Cory Livingston (Sponsored Programs), Donna Boyer (Med School) & Jacob Schlag (LSA)
- Will be offered again in July and October/November

Course Limit: 30 participants (Fee: $95.00)
Navigate: Advanced Budgeting I

- First in a series of three that will move the learner through increasingly more advanced budgeting topics
- Will be offered Fall, 2017
  - Trainers: Cathy Seay-Ostrowski (Biomedical Engineering); Kerri Cross (ISR); Marlie Bartow (Med School); Ruth Halsey (Med School)

Course Limit: 15 participants
Fee: To Be Determined

Navigate: Lunch & Learn

- Navigate program will offer a series of one-hour Lunch & Learn sessions
  - Topics will come from recent training survey
  - Short content job aides? (Up Next!)
- Research Administrators can meet in person or remotely
- Expected Launch: May 2017
Navigate: Budgeting Basics

- Material from Fundamentals Budget Preparation module reorganized into smaller course
- Design Team Leads: Cathy Seay-Ostrowski (Biomedical Engineering) and Judy Carrillo (Medical School)
- Pilot launch expected fall 2017
Navigate: Advanced Budgeting II

- Second course in a series of three
- Under development
  - Pilot launch expected November/December 2017
    - Design Team Members: Trina Bailey (Med School) & Kim Mann (Engineering)

Workgroups Formed

- Workgroups established for short content job aides / best practices
  - Unfunded Research Agreements
    - Lead to be established
  - Budget Allocation Tool
    - Lead: Sue Kelch (Medical School)
    - Members: Lea Tune (Sponsored Programs); Jake Schlag (LSA); Amy Brooks (Engineering); Cathy Howell (SPH); Maggie Herron (LSA); Ann Taylor (Dental School; now Med School)
  - Procurement
    - Lead: Linda Chadwick (LSA)
    - Members: Scott Stanfill (School of Social Work); Shelly Feldkamp (Engineering); Beth Brant (Med School); Colin Anderson & Bob Johnson (Procurement)
What’s Next……

- Continue to develop mini-course/stand alone training opportunities from Fundamentals
- Faculty Training
U-M Internal Deadline Policy: Implementation

New Internal Deadline Policy

- All PAFs and final proposal documents must be received in ORSP three (3) business days ahead of the sponsor’s deadline.
- PAFs/proposals not received by the internal deadline will not be submitted.
- PIs (or their delegates) may request an exception for an additional business day in the event of exceptional unforeseen circumstances:
  - Unanticipated medical emergency of PI or an immediate family member
  - Natural disaster (or other force majeure)
  - Emergency closing of U-M due to severe weather
  - PI was notified of the funding opportunity less than X weeks prior to the deadline
- Exceptions must be approved by the school/college/institute and an ORSP Managing Project Representative.
- Proposals granted an exception will not be submitted at the expense of other applicants for the same deadline who were timely.
What seems to be on everyone’s mind

EXCEPTIONS
● What types of proposals will qualify for meeting the X days/weeks exception?
  ○ Proposals with outgoing subcontracts?
  ○ Proposals where we are the subcontractor?
  ○ Submissions following a pre-proposal competition?
  ○ Submissions following a limited submission competition?
  ○ NSF I-CORP proposals?
  ○ Proposals submitted under NIH's continuous submission policy?
  ○ End of year “money dumps”?
  ○ Complex proposals?
  ○ Simple proposals?

EXCEPTIONS (con't)
● What other types of situations will qualify for an exception?
  ○ Research administrator emergency?
  ○ Research administrator staffing/workload issues?
● Can we just pay a late fee instead?

REVIEWING PROPOSALS UNDER THE NEW POLICY
● Does ORSP guarantee it conduct a complete review?
● Will schools/colleges/depts have a chance to implement their own policies?
● What if schools/colleges/depts identify corrections that aren't completed by the deadline?
● Can we have separate “administrative shell” and final proposal reviews?
● Can reviews be done in parallel?
What seems to be on everyone’s mind

WHEN A PROPOSAL DOESN’T MEET THE DEADLINE

- Who will be the bearer of bad news?
- What will eRPM reflect?

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

- What is your timeline?
- Can you extend the soft launch period to 12 months?
ITS Update
RAAC Committee-at-Large

Cathy Handyside, ITS Research Administration Systems
April 18, 2017

eRPM Vendor Upgrade – April/May 2017

- Huron/Click Framework Portal Upgrade
  - Conducting two stage upgrade to latest vendor version (8.0.2)
    - Stage 1 – Completed weekend of March 24, 2017
    - Stage 2 - Scheduled for weekend of May 5, 2017
      - System unavailable during upgrade weekend
        - Friday, May 5 starting at 5:45pm through Monday, May 8 at 6:00am
      - Updated Microsoft technology
      - Updated user interface