

State of Florida ASPIRE Project Assessment

This assessment by Oracle Corporation is at the request of the Aspire project team at the State of Florida. It is an assessment of modifications, interfaces and configurations that are considered high priority by the Aspire project team, but does not include all such items. Since some ADMLs affect others, we have tried to assess related ADMLs, as directed by the Aspire project team.

Documentation provided by the Aspire project team was reviewed and some interviews with project team members is used as the basis for the assessment. However, particularly in the Functional evaluation, the assessment was made without access to the design and development team to fully understand the scope of the issues being addressed or the alternatives considered. As a result, in some cases there is not sufficient information to make an assessment. In other cases, the assessment may be based on an inaccurate understanding by the assessment team of the issue that is being addressed. While in other cases, advice is given with regard to how the function is performed in a newer release of the applications in order allow the design to be a compatible as possible.

The recommendations given should only be taken keeping the limited scope of the assessment in mind.

Functional Evaluation of Enhancements, Interfaces, and Conversions

Infrastructure

- Financials 8.8 SP1 Bundle 13
- Oracle 10g 10.1.0.3
- PeopleTools 8.46.06
- Bea Tuxedo & Weblogic

Project Status: Pre-System Test, Go-Live estimated in 18 months.

Terminology

ADML – Application Development Master List

Aspire – PeopleSoft Financials System

FLAIR – Financials Legacy System

PeopleFirst – SAP HR System

MFMP – My Florida Market Place, Ariba System (Requisitions and Purchase Orders)

LAS/PBS – Legacy Budgeting System

BOSP – Legacy Payroll System as well as name of Agency that does Payrolls

TDS – Technical Design Specification, I – Interface, C – Conversion, E – Enhancement

FL_ -- All Custom Objects begin with this designation

ADML 17 FLAIR to Aspire General Ledger Bridge

General: Currently a requirement exists to map legacy FLAIR chart fields to the new Aspire chart fields. The results of the Chartfield mapping will be leveraged by conversion programs for FLAIR to Aspire data conversions. The mapping exercise will also provide data that agencies can leverage when interfacing unremediated business systems into Aspire.

Viability: The design is clever and addresses many competing functions concurrently. Volume testing will determine is viability.

Recommendations: Governance of the maintenance of chart fields in Aspire and new requirements for chart fields in the unremediated applications needs to be defined. This may require development of some level of automation and approval processes.

ADML 128 Interunit Transaction Processing

General: The delivered Aspire functionality for InterUnit Accounting automates the process of accounting for related-party transactions that impact multiple Business Units concurrently. The system automatically creates the Due From/Due To transactions for the Source and Target Business Unit's InterUnit Journals. However, the functionality as delivered does not meet the requirements of the state of Florida. This is primarily due the fact that an agency initiating the transaction may not be allowed to create and finalize/post transactions that affect another

agency's books and records. Also, the state agencies want to affect budgeted spending authority by creating encumbrances to be used by the InterUnit transaction process.

Viability: This enhancement is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: The approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: None.

ADML 31 Inbound Payroll Transaction Interface

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to create accounting entries in Aspire to record the financial impact of payroll related transactions for all agencies and departments, regardless of when those agencies and departments transition to the Aspire system. The Bureau of State Payrolls (BOSP) will supply transactional files (known as 'Salary Detail' files) to Aspire from which this enhancement will derive accounting entries. This derivation will be based on payroll information contained in the file, such as Earnings Codes, Position information and Deduction Codes, combined with configuration data created by this enhancement.

Viability: This interface is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: It may have been easier to have interfaced to the PeopleSoft HCM and have it, in turn, generate the transactions to the General Ledger.

ADML 1790 Cash Checking in Aspire GL

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to enforce cash-checking prior to any 'cash-impacting' transaction being completed/posted. Before a warrant is issued, cash needs to be checked and this will occur in P2P through ADML 124. The cash balances in the Cash-Checking Commitment Control ledger need to be subsequently reduced by the warrant amount and this ADML enables this process. The Delivery Functionality section indicates that normally, Aspire does not budget-check entries coming into the General Ledger (GL) from the Accounts Payable (AP) module.

Viability: This approach is viable based on the state of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: This is a comprehensive and well thought out design for concurrent cash basis accounting, utilizing as much reusable code and common design processes from the delivered applications.

Recommendations: The budget checking process option that can be invoked during journal generation of transactions from the Payables and Receivables feeder systems should be reviewed to determine if it is applicable to this State of Florida requirement.

ADML 1853 Cash Basis Ledger

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to produce cash basis financial statements and reports. The underlying data for the reporting consists of cash receipts and disbursements transactions.

Viability: This enhancement is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: This is a comprehensive and well thought out design for concurrent cash basis accounting, utilizing as much reusable code and common design processes from the delivered application software as possible.

Recommendations: None.

ADML 124 PP-30 / Cash Checking during Pay Cycle process

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to provide a cash checking mechanism for disbursements originating from within the Payables module and disbursements being interfaced into Aspire from other 3rd party sources. This includes all Pay Cycle disbursements (paper warrants and EFT's), Express Checks and manually recorded payments. Cash checking will ensure that sufficient funds are available for each voucher's distribution line at the GL business unit, Budget Entity and Fund Code combination before the disbursement is created. For some voucher transactions, the Budget Entity field may be blank. All vouchers that do not pass the cash checking process will be excluded from the current Pay Cycle. These vouchers will need to be noted in Aspire as having failed cash checking so they can be researched and the problem resolved.

Viability: This enhancement is viable based on the State of Florida requirement that the cash checking mechanism for disbursements originates from within the Payables module.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: None

ADML 81 MFMP Pre-Encumbrance Status

General: The State of Florida requires an outbound, real-time interface to send the pre-encumbrance status of Requisitions to MFMP, which will be used to validate whether or not the encumbrance will be successful. It will run one time right before the MFMP PO Generation process, working in conjunction with the inbound interface (ADML 83) that sends all approved MFMP requisitions to Aspire for budget checking. Once the requisition passes all save validations through ADML 83, the budget checking process will be kicked off immediately. This interface will be triggered to run at the completion of the budget process, sending back a message based on the outcome.

Viability: This interface is viable based on the State of Florida requirements and an alternate approach is suggested.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements and an alternate approach is suggested.

Recommendations: The eProcurement Marketplace Gateway functionality should be reviewed to determine if it can be used instead of an outbound interface. In this case, the Marketplace Gateway would send the purchase orders created in eProcurement to MFMP for the MFMP Requisitions submitted in the inbound interface (ADML 83) that sends all approved MFMP requisitions to Aspire for budget checking. The purchase orders would be created in Aspire and sent to MFMP via the eProcurement Marketplace Gateway. The pre-encumbrance and the encumbrance budget check would then occur in Aspire. The eProcurement Marketplace Gateway would pass the supplier's response to the purchase order from MFMP to eProcurement. In a marketplace, the supplier responds by accepting or rejecting the purchase order. This response is passed to PeopleSoft eProcurement where it is inserted in the PO Dispatch Message Log page. The status of the PO in eProcurement changes to *Dispatched*.

ADML 83 MFMP – Purchase Requisition Data

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to interface requisitions created in MyFloridaMarketPlace (MFMP) to Aspire to validate the data and budget prior to committing the encumbrance. Although pre-encumbrances are no longer required by policy, ASPIRE will use the pre-encumbrance functionality to perform this budget validation. Aspire can be thought of as the Final Approver of the MFMP Requisition, which allows the PO and encumbrance to be generated.

Viability: This interface is viable based on the State of Florida requirements and an alternate approach is suggested.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements and an alternate approach is suggested.

Recommendations: The Aspire Purchasing application provides a delivered Requisition Enterprise Integration Point (EIP) for loading Purchasing requisitions from third-party applications. The Requisition EIP imports requisition data using an asynchronous batch subscribe message from external software applications. This data is loaded to the PO_REQLOAD_RQST and PO_REQLOAD_CMT staging tables. The Purchasing Requisition Loader process (PO_REQLOAD) takes the data loaded to the staging tables and creates the requisitions.

ADML 85 MFMP – Purchase Order Data

General: The State of Florida requires a real-time interface (inbound) to bring the MFMP purchase order information into Aspire. It should bring the purchase order information into Aspire's purchasing tables through a component interface in order to utilize Aspire's delivered system validations, including chartfield combination edits. The interface will run once the PO is generated (requisition is converted into the purchase order) and dispatched in MFMP. Upon successful save, Aspire will automatically kick off the budget process.

Viability: This interface is viable based on the State of Florida requirements and an alternate approach is suggested.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements and an alternate approach is suggested.

Recommendations: The eProcurement Marketplace Gateway functionality should be reviewed to determine if it can be used instead of an inbound interface. In this case, the Marketplace Gateway would send the purchase orders created in eProcurement to MFMP for the MFMP Requisitions submitted in the inbound interface (ADML 83) that sends all approved MFMP requisitions to Aspire for budget checking. The purchase orders would be created in Aspire and sent to MFMP via the eProcurement Marketplace Gateway. The pre-encumbrance and the encumbrance budget check would then occur in Aspire. The eProcurement Marketplace Gateway would pass the supplier's response to the purchase order from MFMP to eProcurement. In a marketplace, the supplier responds by accepting or rejecting the purchase order. This response is passed to PeopleSoft eProcurement where it is inserted in the PO Dispatch Message Log page. The status of the PO in eProcurement changes to *Dispatched*.

ADML 87 MFMP – PO Changes & Cancellations

General: The State of Florida requires interfaces for requisition changes, purchase order changes, purchase order cancellations and closes, contract closes, contract changes, and requisition cancellations.

Viability: These interfaces are viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: None.

ADML 88 MFMP Contracts Data

General: The State of Florida requires a real-time interface is to enable contracts from MFMP to be fully encumbered upfront, before releasing any purchase orders. In order to accomplish this, the MFMP contract data needs to be sent to Aspire's PO tables where budget checking can be processed and the encumbrance can be recorded. Once the encumbrance is recorded successfully in Aspire, MFMP can continue processing the contract as either a Voucher or PO Contract. The PO releases from an encumbered contract will not be interfaced to Aspire since the encumbrance has already been recorded. The vouchers will be submitted to Aspire though, via ADML 90. The associated encumbrance will be released at this time, as it would with a regular PO.

Viability: This interface is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: None.

ADML 90 MFMP – Payment information (voucher related)

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to load MyFloridaMarketPlace (MFMP) Invoices in order to accomplish the following: edit voucher details, perform voucher audit, create the expenditure and release any associated encumbrance, perform cash checking, create both paper warrant and electronic fund transfer disbursements, and create all accounting entries. The purpose of this ADML is to define the functionality of the interface that loads MFMP Invoice information into Aspire’s tables for further processing.

Viability: This interface is viable based on the State of Florida requirements and an alternate approach is suggested.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements and an alternate approach is suggested.

Recommendations: The Aspire Payables application provides a delivered Voucher Enterprise Integration Point (EIP) for loading Payables vouchers from third-party applications. The Voucher EIP uses PeopleSoft Application Messaging and the `VOUCHER_BUILD` message definition to populate the voucher staging tables with the necessary information for building voucher record sets. The Payables Voucher Build process takes the data loaded to the voucher build staging tables and builds voucher records from the staged data and writes them to the PeopleSoft Payables voucher tables. If external parties send bad data (for example, an invalid business unit) as part of the message, the subscription process flags the message as being in error. Manual intervention is required using the application messaging error correction feature to correct the data before the message can be processed successfully. When the data is corrected, the message status is automatically set to *Reprocess*. The Voucher Build process assigns voucher IDs if they aren't passed by the application message. Once the Voucher Build process finishes processing a staged record, the record is deleted from the staging table.

ADML 1940 Year End Close

General: On June 30th, all incurred obligations (encumbrances and payables) will be considered certified-forward and allowed 90 days to issue payment. After the certified-forward deadline has passed on Sept 30th, all outstanding encumbrances from the prior fiscal year budget need to be fully released and vouchers fully paid so that the Total Available Budget reflects the true undisbursed dollar amount.

Viability: There is no definition of the proposed modification.

Analysis of Approach: There is no definition of the proposed modification.

Recommendations: Find and review the modification definition.

ADML 11 LAS/PBS Certified Forward File

General: The State of Florida requires an interface to address the Certified/Carry Forward processing within Aspire as well as the information that is to be sent to LAS/PBS. The carry forward of operating appropriations allows Agencies to use prior fiscal year appropriations for prior fiscal year obligations during the current fiscal year. The outstanding obligations are accounts payable, encumbrances and selected receivables. If the operating appropriations carried from the prior fiscal year are not expended by September 30th, the funds will automatically revert. Agencies must also request the certification forward of fixed capital outlay appropriations. The certification forward request must identify the fixed capital outlay appropriation amounts by applicable Project IDs and Program Components. The Office of Policy and Budget will send reversion amounts for fixed capital outlay appropriations via ADML 1425, Budget Load.

Viability: This enhancement is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: None.

ADML 151 Labor Redistribution Timesheet Interface

General: The State of Florida requires a custom labor hour detail record and interface will be created to upload and store timesheet information from PeopleFirst. Employees, whose labor redistribution is based on hours worked, will enter timesheets in PeopleFirst and record their hours worked against a TRC. Records from PeopleFirst that do not contain hours recorded to TRCs will not be loaded into Aspire because the Labor Redistribution process only redistributes costs based on the hours worked method when a TRC is used. Total Hours will be sent to Aspire to account for hours not recorded to a TRC.

Viability: This enhancement is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: It may have been easier to interface to the PeopleSoft HCM system and have it, in turn generate the transactions to the General Ledger.

ADML 45 Department Row-level Security

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to restricted users to making transactions only against the orgs for which they are authorized.

Viability: This enhancement is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: None.

ADML 129 Link Scanned Warrants to Vouchers

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to record, store, and link electronic images of paid warrants to the payable transaction that generated the warrant within the Aspire application so that inquiry functionality will include the retrieval and viewing of the cleared warrant image.

Viability: This enhancement is viable based on the State of Florida requirements. The Aspire system provides a delivered document attachments objects that can be leveraged in the enhancement to achieve the desired functionality. The purpose of the delivered objects is to allow customers to leverage this functionality in lieu of their differing business processes. The document attachments objects can be added to the Payables voucher component.

Analysis of Approach: An approach was not provided.

Recommendations: The FILE_ATTACH_SBR and FILE_ATTDET_SBR subrecords and the FILE_ATTACH_WRK work record can be added to the Payables voucher component. The FILE_ATTACH_SBR subrecord can be added to the desired Payables voucher page. The PeopleCode Developer's Guide provides detailed instructions on how to incorporate the attachments functionality.

ADML 130 Minority Vendor Codes

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to record or store from other business systems the minority vendor codes necessary for preparing minority vendor statistical reports. The Gap Description indicates that Aspire does not contain all of the State's required minority vendor codes.

Viability: This enhancement is viable and a different approach is recommended.

Analysis of Approach: The VENDOR_TYPE record's key structure is Set ID, Vendor ID, Vendor Location, Effective Date, and Vendor Type. The purpose of the VENDOR_TYPE field in the VENDOR_TYPE record is to categorize a vendor's type by location. A vendor's minority classification code should be the same across vendor locations.

Recommendations: The State of Florida should consider using the Government Classifications functionality on the Vendor Identifying Information page to identify a vendor's minority classification code. The fields in the Government Classifications section of this page are configurable to the State's needs. With this approach, a customization is not required except securing access to the fields on the page.

ADML 131 P-Card Sub-Vendors

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to capture multiple sub-vendors for each P-Card transaction (Employee travel and expenses).

Viability: The information provided is insufficient to determine the viability of this enhancement.

Analysis of Approach: The information provided is insufficient to perform an analysis of the approach.

Recommendations: The delivered procurement card functionality provides functionality for loading and reconciling the procurement card's monthly transactions into PeopleSoft. The information included in the monthly transactions includes the procurement card (ex: Visa), the procurement card transaction and date information, the amount, the merchant/vendor, and other information related to the transaction. Since the procurement card transaction reconciliation includes the merchant/vendor, additional requirement information is necessary to ascertain the necessity to capture multiple sub-vendors for each procurement card transaction.

ADML 132 Vendor on hold reason code / vendor hold resolution

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to record a "Reason Code" to describe why the vendor is on hold or provide online instructions on procedures or contacts to resolve the vendor hold.

Viability: This enhancement is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: An approach was not provided.

Recommendations: A new Vendor Hold Reason code field should be created and added to the Additional Payables Options section of the Payables Options page. The User Productivity Kit (UPK) should be used to provide the online instructions on procedures or contacts to resolve the vendor hold.

ADML 133 Viewing payment status and history online

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to allow payment recipients, including vendors as well as agencies, to view their payment status and history online and to print proof of payment (e.g., scanned copy of paid warrant, EFT confirmation and remittance advice). The Gap Description indicates that Aspire provides the ability to view payment status and history. End user must have a Logon ID and password to view this data in Aspire.

Viability: The information provided is insufficient to determine the viability of this enhancement.

Analysis of Approach: An approach was not provided.

Recommendations: The eSupplier Connection module provides vendors with a secured online access to their information and transactions with the State of Florida. The functionality in this application provides for vendor self-service and in this case the ability for vendors to view their proof of payment status, payment information, and payment history online. The module also provides vendor self-registration functionality that minimizes vendor on-boarding administration.

ADML 134 P-Card Requests and Changes to Card Provider

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to allow P-Card administrators to send new card requests, make changes to existing card and cardholder information, send replacement card requests, and close cardholder accounts and Business Unit Address changes in the system. The Gap Description indicates that ASPIRE does not deliver the functionality to communicate with the bank for P-Card maintenance. In order to accomplish this within ASPIRE, a complex enhancement and two new interfaces will need to be developed which will essentially duplicate the State's current functionality.

Viability: This enhancement is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: The approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: None.

ADML 135 Maintain Merchant Category Code Groups

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to maintain merchant category code group (MCCG) profiles associated with each cardholder. The Gap Description indicates that Aspire does have the ability to maintain the merchant category codes; however it does not have functionality to set-up the MCCG's and assign them to a cardholder.

Viability: This enhancement is partially viable and a different approach should be considered.

Analysis of Approach: The Expenses module does have the functionality to set-up, maintain, and map Merchant Category Codes and Merchant Category Code Groups. The setup and maintenance of this information is accomplished with the following navigation: Setup Financials/Supply Chain→Product Related→Expenses→Configure Expenses System→Map Other→Merchant Category Group. In addition, the procurement cardholder profile functionality does provide the ability to set restrictions on the card by limiting the amount that the cardholder can spend on a specific commodity code. An Unauthorized Commodity Codes report provides information about employee procurement card purchases involving unauthorized commodity codes.

Recommendations: The information in the Analysis of Approach section should be considered to determine if the functionalities mentioned above can be leveraged to reduce the amount of modification related to this enhancement.

ADML 136 Voucher Audit

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to re-route transaction / document / business event for Chief Financial Officer's pre-audit approval based upon user defined criteria such as dollar thresholds or random selection for statistical sampling purposes. The Gap Description indicates that Aspire does not have the functionality to route vouchers based on the Account chartfield.

Viability: This enhancement is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: The approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: None.

ADML 138 Voucher Sub-Vendors

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to provide for recording sub-vendors and associate amounts on transactions (Pay and Charge). This function would allow individuals and vendors benefiting from the payment / reimbursement to primary vendor (payee) to be recorded in Aspire for travel cost and minority vendor reporting.

Viability: This enhancement is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: The approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: None.

ADML 139 Recycled Content

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to specify if purchased items contain “recycled” content.

Viability: This enhancement is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: The approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: None.

ADML 140 Fields Required on a Procurement Contract

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to allow end-user agencies to maintain descriptive / profile information on contracts, including but not limited to: Contractor / Vendor, Original contract amount, Change order / adjustment amount, Work Order / change order, Contract number, Contractor's control number, funding source(s), Contract period, Contract Execution date, Service dates, Project ID, Program, Activity, Renewals, Amendments, Contract manager / administrator, Service type, funding type, Contract type, Contractor's contract number, Grant Number, Compliance audit requirements and results, Monitoring exclusions, Type of Procurement used, Federal or non-Federal participation, Payment criteria, Deliverables and / or items, Units of measures, Minimum order, Method of Payment, Advertisement date, Award date, Notice to Proceed Date, Budget Ceiling, Procurement number, Performance bond / insurance information, Liquidated Damages, Retainage, and Additional comments / notes. The Gap Description indicates that Aspire’s delivered contract pages do not capture several of the agency-specific fields in the State’s current contract system, the Contract Information File (CIF).

Viability: This enhancement is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: An approach was not provided.

Recommendations: None.

ADML 141 Ability to store scanned/electronic procurement documents

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to append / attach / store the electronic invoice, contract manager's approval, and contract to the contract disbursement transaction and forward via Aspire to the Office of the CFO. The Gap Description indicates Aspire has several document imaging and management solution partners. Aspire only has the ability to associate a file's location on the file server. This requires all applicable parties to have read/write access to the file server where the attachment resides. The solution must have the Voucher Comments page modified to function in the same manner as the delivered PO Comments or Requisition Comments pages.

Viability: The information provided is insufficient to determine the viability of this enhancement.

Analysis of Approach: An approach was not provided.

Recommendations: The detailed requirements related to this enhancement should be reviewed to determine the enhancement's viability.

ADML 142 Suspended Vendors

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to maintain information on suspended, discriminatory, or public entity crime vendors and support dates of suspension. The State needs the ability to suspend vendors from receiving new orders, yet still receive payments. The Gap Description indicates that Aspire can prevent a vendor from being selected on a requisition or a purchase order, but does not provide reason codes or effective dates for the suspension.

Viability: This enhancement is viable and a different approach is suggested.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: The vendor comments or the effective-dated vendor conversations functionality can be used to describe the detailed reason for which a vendor is placed on suspension. If specific reason codes are required for reporting purposes, then the new reason codes should be used, as suggested.

ADML 144 FLAIR Property Master to Aspire AM Conversion

General: The vast majority of the State of Florida's fixed assets reside on the FLAIR system's Property Master file. This functional specification documents the procedures to be used to convert the data from the FLAIR Property Master file into the Aspire System's Asset Management (AM) module.

Viability: This conversion is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: None.

ADML 150 Tracking Asset Condition

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to maintain detailed property information required to identify, properly account for, and safeguard all assets. The Gap Description indicates that there is no field delivered with AM that serves to track asset condition.

Viability: This enhancement is viable and a different approach is recommended.

Analysis of Approach: The asset management module provides other fields that can be used to track an assets condition.

Recommendations: As an example, the locations/comments/attributes page can be used to track an asset's condition.

ADML 154 Grants Master File – Inbound Interface

General: The State of Florida requires a Grants master inbound interface functionality to upload award specific data from state agency systems into the Aspire system. This interface is for cost reimbursable grants only. Fixed amount grants must be entered in Aspire. The interface will receive the grants information from multiple agency systems in a pre-determined format and it will map individual attributes to proposal and award information in the Aspire system. The interface will load the mapped agency information into Aspire. After the agency information has been loaded into Aspire, end-users will be able to navigate to proposal and award pages in Aspire and look up the proposal and award information that was interfaced.

Viability: The information provided is insufficient to determine the viability of this enhancement. The cost reimbursable grants can also be entered directly into the Aspire Grants application. Aspire provides cost reimbursement billing of these grants via integration with the Project Costing, Contracts, and Billing applications.

Analysis of Approach: An approach was not provided.

Recommendations: The detailed requirements related to this enhancement should be reviewed to determine the enhancement's viability. The cost reimbursable grants should be entered directly into the Aspire Grants application. Aspire provides cost reimbursement billing of these grants via integration with the Project Costing, Contracts, and Billing applications.

ADML 155 Grants Master File – Inbound Interface

General: Florida state agencies utilize customized standalone software to manage sponsored grants and projects. Due to reporting and compliance issues, it is required that agencies maintain award level information in the Aspire system. Further updates to awards may be performed in the Aspire system making it imperative to keep the two systems (Aspire and external agency system) synchronized. The State of Florida requires a Grants Master outbound interface to provide award specific data from the Aspire system for agencies to use as necessary in their business systems.

Viability: The information provided is insufficient to determine the viability of this enhancement. Where possible, the Florida state agencies should leverage Aspire's true Grants Master to centralize the state's grants business processing and reporting.

Analysis of Approach: An approach was not provided.

Recommendations: The detailed requirements related to this enhancement should be reviewed to determine the enhancement's viability. The Florida state agencies should leverage Aspire's true Grants Master to centralize the state's grants business processing and reporting. This approach will minimize the total cost of ownership of managing multiple disparate grants business systems and provide for a centralized system and approach for training employees on a common Grants application. In this case, a grants master file inbound interface would not be required.

ADML 156 Grant Definition

General: The State of Florida requires a Grants master conversion program to convert open and active cost reimbursable grants and grant-related projects from FLAIR, agency business systems, spreadsheets, other manually kept sources, or any combination of the aforementioned sources either by 1) manually keying the grants and awards into Aspire, or 2) using the Grants Definition conversion program. This conversion program will not convert cost reimbursable and fixed amount revenue contracts, nor fixed amount grants. These types of contracts and grants will be manually keyed into Aspire. Agencies with a low volume of grants and projects are also expected to convert manually.

Viability: This conversion is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: Aspire provides component interfaces to help load data from existing State of Florida systems into Aspire tables. The Excel to Component Interface utility can be used where possible in conjunction with the delivered component interfaces to populate Aspire tables. A list of the delivered component interfaces is provided in PeopleBooks.

ADML 157 Convert Life to Date Expenditures/Amounts

General: The State of Florida requires a Grants/Projects Life to Date (LTD) Conversion that will upload Life to Date balances for Projects that are active and open as of the go-live fiscal year. This conversion is necessary in order to facilitate complete project and grant reporting. The conversion will populate the PeopleSoft delivered interface table, INTF_PROJ_RES. The delivered application engine, PC_INTFEDIT, will load the LTD expenditure data into the PROJ_RESOURCE table.

Viability: This conversion is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: None.

ADML 159 Project Definition

General: The State of Florida requires that all active projects must be converted into the new Aspire system. Active projects include both open projects and closed projects that are tied to assets that are not yet fully depreciated. All active and open non-grant related projects and closed grant related projects that are tied to assets not yet fully depreciated will be converted from FLAIR, agency business systems, spreadsheets, other manually kept sources, or any combination of the aforementioned sources either by 1) manually keying the projects and grants in Aspire, or 2) using the Projects conversion program. Agencies with a low volume of projects are expected to convert manually.

Viability: This conversion is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: None.

ADML 162 CFDA Verification

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to provide an edit/validation that ensures that a CFDA number is a valid number when entered by the end-user. The Gap Description indicates that CFDA numbers can be entered on the award profile, however, the field is not validated against a list of valid values. The State has requested that these IDs be validated against a look-up table to avoid the entry of invalid CFDA's.

Viability: This enhancement is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: An approach was not provided.

Recommendations: A new record, page, and component are required to store and maintain the CFDA's. The CFDA field on the award profile can be updated to validate against the data values in the new record.

ADML 163 CSFA Verification

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to provide an edit / validation that ensures that a CSFA number is a valid number when entered by the user. The Gap Description indicates that the system does not come delivered with CSFA number. Users need to be able to assign CSFA numbers to state funded projects where required. These numbers must be valid values as defined by LAS/PBS and should be validated against a defined list when entered.

Viability: This enhancement is partially viable.

Analysis of Approach: An approach was not provided.

Recommendations: The Project Costing application provides multiple user-definable fields associated with a project. A user-definable field can be used for the CSFA number. A new record, page, and component are required to store and maintain the CSFA's. The user-definable CSFA field on the project can be updated to validate against the LAS/PBS data values in the new record.

ADML 164 Cash Basis Billing

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to provide the ability to generate a project billing based on transactions / documents / business events that have been disbursed instead of at the point that expenditure has been recorded. The Gap Description indicates that Grants functionality in Aspire requests LOC draw totals for cost reimbursable items on a modified accrual basis (the LOC draw process pulls expenditures that have been entered and posted as a voucher, regardless of being paid). While some agencies use this delivered method, other agencies are required to request the LOC draw on a cash basis. The process that takes Aspire AP information to the Project Resource table is the Project Costing Application Engine (PC_AP_TO_PC). As delivered, it selects the cost row from the voucher table and calls the Pricing Application Engine, which then creates a billing row from that cost. At the completion of Payables to Project Costing Application Engine process, the PROJ_RESOURCE table has two new rows: a row with an analysis type of ACT; and a row with an analysis type of BIL. Those rows that have BIL are then available for the LOC draw even if the voucher itself has yet to be paid.

Viability: This enhancement is partially viable and an alternate approach is recommended.

Analysis of Approach: An approach was not provided.

Recommendations: The process that takes Aspire AP information to the Project Resource table is the Project Costing Application Engine (PC_AP_TO_PC). As delivered, the PC_AP_TO_PC process selects vouchers in the VCHR_ACCTG_LINE table that carry a PC Distribution status of N and pulls them into the Project Resource table in Project Costing. The VCHR_ACCTG_LINE table is populated via the Voucher Post process. The Payables 8.8 Voucher Post process does not provide a voucher post option to post vouchers that have been paid. The Payables 8.9 voucher post process does provide a voucher post option to post voucher closed for payment. Therefore, depending on the volume of vouchers paid in a payment cycle, this enhancement could be deferred for release 8.9. In the interim, if feasible, vouchers could be posted individually after payment. A query could be used to report on the vouchers paid during a Pay cycle. The Voucher Post process could post individual vouchers immediately after the Pay Cycle payment process. In this case, an enhancement to the system is not depending on volume.

ADML 165 Project-ID Prefix Numbering

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to allow the values for grant or State grant / subgrant to be assigned sequentially by the system or assigned by the user agency. The Delivered Functionality indicates that since Project IDs might be shared over many business units (agencies), there can only be one SetID. It also indicates that PeopleSoft does not deliver the functionality to automatically place the first 4 alphanumeric characters on the Project ID based on the agency. The Gap Description indicates that agencies will now be required to have similar naming conventions for awards and projects to maintain standardized data entry and definitions of Projects, Grants, and Contracts. In Aspire, Project IDs are BU keyed, yet are restricted from duplication due to inter-unit transactional relationships. Agencies wish to "smart code" their IDs to have meaningful information in the ID. Conceptually, two different agencies could select the same coding string causing duplication. Consequently, each Project ID will need to have a characteristic to uniquely identify projects for each agency. The PROJECT_ID (Project / Grant chartfields) offers 15 alphanumeric characters. In FLAIR, the Project ID, Grant ID, and Contract ID are each five characters. The current recommendation is to use the first four

characters to provide a "uniqueness" code for each agency, the values relating to the project owning agency. Delivered functionality enables auto numbering of the Project ID or end-user definition, but it does not provide the first four characters "smart code."

Viability: This enhancement is viable but an enhancement is not required.

Analysis of Approach: While this approach is possible an enhancement is not required. The agency's Business Unit provides the project's "uniqueness" code or "smart code". The Gap Description indicates that two different agencies could select the same coding string (for a project) causing duplication. This statement is inaccurate because the Delivered Functionality indicates that there will only be one SetID, therefore, the PROJECT_ID for each agency business unit will always be unique with no duplicates across agency business units. Hence, the agency's Business Unit provides the project's "uniqueness" code or "smart code".

Recommendations: The State of Florida should use the agency's Business Unit field for the project's "uniqueness" code or "smart code".

ADML 168 Row-level security and Inter-agency grants

General: The Delivered Functionality indicates PeopleSoft does not deliver row level security at the Project ID level. The Gap Description indicates that based on the State Chart of Accounts and requirements for row-level security at the BU and SetID level, a modification to ensure that inter-agency grants can be shared if necessary. When BU security is turned on at either the User ID or permission list level, end-users can only create transactions against their identified BUs. For purposes of interagency grants, the future state process is the utilization of Integration Templates to define access to shared Project IDs. The primary agency will associate an Integration Template that identifies what GL BUs can use a specific Project ID. This way, if DCF is the prime on a grant, they will set up an Integration Template that allows both DCF and AWI to use a Project ID.

Viability: The information provided is insufficient. The system does deliver row level security on projects and grants, however, additional information is required to determine the viability of this enhancement.

Analysis of Approach: Additional information is required.

Recommendations: The detailed requirements related to this enhancement should be reviewed against the systems projects and grants security to determine the enhancement's viability.

ADML 169 Labor Redistribution

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to capture labor hours and payroll costs from external systems and allocate across Aspire accounting chartfield combinations. Labor redistribution will allow data to be interfaced to the Projects module to reflect accurate project and grant costing. The Delivered Functionality indicates that there is no delivered functionality in Aspire to perform labor redistribution. The Gap Description indicates that the State's current Payroll system allocates an employee's salary to one FLAIR code combination from the Salary Detail file. In Aspire, this equates to one chartfield accounting redistribution. As a result, there

is a lack of detailed costing information available. The State needs to be able to allocate payroll costs down to the project level in order to reflect true project and grant costing.

Viability: The information provided is insufficient. The system does deliver labor redistribution functionality in Project Costing and with the Allocations functionality; however, additional information is required to determine the viability of this enhancement.

Analysis of Approach: Additional information is required.

Recommendations: The detailed requirements related to this enhancement should be reviewed against the systems Project Costing allocations and General Ledger allocations functionality to determine the enhancement's viability.

ADML 170 Aspire Deposit Interface

General: The State of Florida requires an interface to receive deposits from the agency business systems into Aspire.

Viability: This interface is viable based on the State of Florida requirements; however, the Financial Gateway functionality delivered in Cash Management 8.9 should be reviewed to determine the viability of this enhancement. The Financial Gateway in Cash Management 8.9 is a centralized electronic financial platform across the applications with real-time communication with financial institutions or 3rd parties for deposits, payments, and receivables.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements; however, the Financial Gateway functionality delivered in Cash Management 8.9 should be reviewed to determine the viability of this enhancement.

Recommendations: The Financial Gateway functionality delivered in Cash Management 8.9 should be reviewed to determine the viability of this enhancement.

ADML 173 Billing Interface

General: The State of Florida requires an interface of billing data from agency external billing system to Aspire that will utilize the delivered billing interface in Aspire. Agencies selected to implement Aspire Billing that wish to print invoices out of Aspire will be required to use this interface. The delivered interface will not be modified to accept agency specific data or to perform any agency specific data validations. Bills generated in agency external systems will be interfaced into Aspire for invoice generation by agencies implement Aspire billing.

Viability: This interface is viable based on the State of Florida requirements; however, the Florida state agencies should leverage Aspire's Billing application to centralize the state's billing business processes and reporting.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: The Florida state agencies should leverage Aspire's Billing application to centralize the state's billing business processes and reporting. This approach will minimize the total cost of ownership of managing multiple disparate billing business systems and provide for a

centralized system and approach for training employees on a common Billing application. In this case, a billing interface would not be required.

ADML 176 Customer Conversion

General: The State of Florida requires a customer conversion for agencies that will be processing accounts receivable data in Aspire.

Viability: This conversion is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: None.

ADML 177 Accounts Receivable Open Items

General: The State of Florida requires the conversion of outstanding customer balances for agencies processing accounts receivable data in Aspire.

Viability: This conversion is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: None.

ADML 181 Agency indicator for customer requirement of a security deposit

General: The State of Florida requires the ability for agencies to indicate that an accounts receivable customer is required to have a security deposit or some other form of collateral in lieu of extending credit.

Viability: This enhancement is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: An approach was not provided, but the customer user defined fields were referenced in the Delivered Functionality section.

Recommendations: As interpreted, a delivered one-character, user-defined field can be used for the security deposit indicator. If the customer user-defined page is used, then this enhancement is just a simple field label change.

ADML 182 Bar Code on Invoice Generation

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to print a bar code or scan line on remittance stubs to aid in remittance processing. The Gap Description indicates that Aspire as delivered does not support printing a bar code or scan line on invoicing documents.

Viability: This enhancement is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: An approach was not provided, but the SQR print-bar-code-commands were referenced in the Delivered Functionality section.

Recommendations: As interpreted, the SQR print-bar-code commands can be used.

ADML 183 Direct Journals – Customer and Voucher Reference Fields

General: The State of Florida requires that agencies that do not process receipts in subsystems or business systems need the ability to associate a Customer name to non-accounts receivable cash receipts received in Aspire at a detail level. These customers may not represent accounts receivable customers, but one time renewal customer, individuals applying for licenses, permits, or fee payments, etc. Agencies also need the ability to associate the original voucher number with the deposit received for expenditure refunds.

Viability: This enhancement is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: An approach was not provided.

Recommendations: Since an approach was not provided, additional information is required to make recommendations.

ADML 184 View Deposits Reconciliation Status

General: The State of Florida agencies require the ability to determine deposit statuses online. The future business process for managing cash receipts for accounts receivable requires that agencies apply the payments to increase their fund cash when the deposits are reconciled by Treasury. Therefore, one of the requirements is to provide a page that agencies can use to view deposit statuses. This will allow agencies to easily identify when a particular payment has been reconciled by Treasury.

Viability: This enhancement is viable and a different approach is recommended.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable from a Receivables perspective; however, the Cash Management bank statement reconciliation functionality should also be reviewed.

Recommendations: The Cash Management bank account manager, cash position manager, reconciliation manager, and book to bank reconciliation functionality should be reviewed to satisfy this requirement.

ADML 740 Receiving, Merging, Formatting Bank Files

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to read and parse an EDI 820 file format from BOA that has remittance data included in one file and create an ACH Detail Listing report which lists all the ACH Deposits for a particular agency.

Viability: The information provided is insufficient to determine the viability of this enhancement.

Analysis of Approach: An approach was not provided. The information provided is insufficient to perform an analysis of the approach.

Recommendations: The Cash Management application provides functionality for receiving, merging, and formatting BOA files and information into Aspire. This functionality should be reviewed to determine if the functionality addresses the requirement.

ADML 741 SPURS Commodity Code to Aspire Category

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to convert the SPURS commodity codes to Aspire item categories.

Viability: This conversion is viable based on the State of Florida requirements, however, it does not require a modification to the system because the Excel to Component Interface utility can be used.

Analysis of Approach: An approach was not provided.

Recommendations: Aspire provides component interfaces to help load data from existing State of Florida systems into Aspire tables. The Excel to Component Interface utility can be used where possible in conjunction with the delivered component interfaces to populate Aspire tables. A list of the delivered component interfaces is provided in PeopleBooks.

ADML 89 Receipt of goods from MFMP

General: The State of Florida requires that all My Florida Marketplace (MFMP) receivers that have not been matched to an invoice at the month-end processing cut-off will need to be accrued in Aspire. Only receivers for purchase orders will be accrued in Aspire at month end; all non-PO related receivers will not be accrued.

MFMP will provide a month-end interface file to load into Aspire's receiver accounting line table (RECV_LN_ACCTG). The information on this table will then be selected by Aspire's journal generator to create MFMP receipt accrual journal entries.

This interface will create balanced, double-sided entries for each MFMP receiver's distribution line. One line of the double-sided entry will represent a debit to the expense distribution of the receiver (DST_ACCT_TYPE = 'DST') and the other will represent the credit to the receipt accrual offset (DST_ACCT_TYPE = 'RAC'). No budget checking or encumbrance liquidation will be triggered by this receipt accrual process; only journal entries will be created.

Viability: This interface is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Analysis of Approach: This approach is viable based on the State of Florida requirements.

Recommendations: The eProcurement Marketplace Gateway functionality in releases 8.9 and 9.0 provides functionality to load or create receipts using advanced shipment receipt (ASR) and load or create vouchers/invoices for purchase orders between a Marketplace and PeopleSoft eProcurement.

ADML 150 Tracking Asset Condition

General: The State of Florida requires the ability to maintain detailed property information required to identify, properly account for, and safeguard all assets. The Gap Description indicates that there is no field delivered with AM that serves to track asset condition.

Viability: This enhancement is viable and a different approach is recommended.

Analysis of Approach: The asset management module provides other fields that can be used to track an assets condition.

Recommendations: As an example, the locations/comments/attributes page can be used to track an asset's condition.

State of Florida ASPIRE Project Assessment

Technical Evaluation of Interfaces, Enhancements and Conversions

Assumptions

- Technical Specifications are up to date.
- We are not evaluating whether the Technical approaches taken satisfy the Functional requirements of the ADML, rather how the Technical approaches impact Upgradeability and any potential Performance Issues.

Infrastructure

- Financials 8.8 SP1 Bundle 13
- Oracle 10g 10.1.0.3
- PeopleTools 8.46.06
- Bea Tuxedo & Weblogic

Project Status: Pre-System Test, Go-Live estimated in 18 months.

Terminology

ADML – Application Development Master List

Aspire – PeopleSoft Financials System

FLAIR – Financials Legacy System

PeopleFirst – SAP HR System

MFMP – My Florida Market Place, Ariba System (Requisitions and Purchase Orders)

LAS/PBS – Legacy Budgeting System

BOSP – Legacy Payroll System as well as name of Agency that does Payrolls

TDS – Technical Design Specification, I – Interface, C – Conversion, E – Enhancement

FL_ -- All Custom Objects begin with this designation

Upgradeability

If items/code were borrowed from Delivered examples to create customizations that were not directly tied to delivered objects, but the delivered code changes due to an Upgrade. Then an analysis must be done to identify the need to change the custom code based on how the Delivered code changed. The custom piece was used to mimic delivered, so even though there are no direct tie-ins analysis needed to know if changes in delivered should be mimicked in Custom pieces.

ADML 31 Payroll Interface (Salary Detail Report)

Enhancement and Interface – TDSE-031 and TDSI-031
Interface Inbound to Aspire from BOSP

General: Hundreds, if not Thousands of Custom Objects, but less than 20 modifications to Delivered Objects, of those most are minor impacts.

Upgradeability: Very Good, due to the fact that Add On Approach taken to entire mod. To PeopleSoft Delivered Functionality this is an outside black box. Analysis of changes to Budget Checking and Journal Generation needed when applying upgrades. Essentially, when core Financials changes made, need to look in General at effects on Mod. This is the cost of Upgrading for everyone, but the way they approached the coding minimized their Upgrade Analysis needed. There are touch points with KK Tables as well as calling Budget Checking. If Budget Checking and Journal Generation functionality change in later versions it can affect this ADML.

Load: Unknown, but will be significant due to the fact that BOSP performs Payroll for about 140,000 employees. Load could be spread out because there are different Payrolls in the State, Monthly, Bi-Weekly among others.

Frequency: Most of the Processes will be daily, as BOSP generally is running many Payrolls every week.

Performance: Only one CI Used (Component is Custom and very few PeopleCode on Component) so performance of that CI will generally be good. Overall Performance will be reliant on Load and how good the SQL and PeopleCode in the App Engines (and one SQR) have been coded. The Application Engines show extensive use of Temp Tables, which is a real positive. Overall coding leaves a lot of options to be able to improve performance, using AE functionality with Statistics. There are 5 or so AEs, a couple of them can run simultaneously, maybe more than that, not sure, but that will help cut overall running time.

Coding for most parts of this ADML are finished, but had we been at development stage again, would look for alternate approach due to the fact that the Customization is extremely high in effort. At higher level would have looked for alternate approach. This customization is akin to creating a new Module in the application, on a Functional level was there an alternative approach using existing code?

ADML 1790 Cash Checking in PSFT GL

State Law Requires Cash Balances do not go negative.

General: Overall a Minor Change

Upgradeability: **Very Good**, 2 Objects Created, One PeopleCode Object Modified

Load: N/A

Frequency: N/A

Performance: Change is so minor, no likely affect on Performance. If so, SQL in Views can be modified to address any performance concerns.

ADML 1853 Cash Basis Ledger

State Law Requires Cash Basis Financial Statements

Need Cash Receipts and Disbursement Data, Aspire (PSFT Financials) delivers Accrual Transaction Processing. State Law requires Cash Reporting on an ongoing basis not only on End of Year Reports. Cash Basis Accounting records transactions when Cash is paid. Modification creates a Cash Ledger in Aspire where all reports work of this modification including AP, AR and GL transactions.

TSDE-1853 Contains 3 App Engines one for each kind of Cash Ledger Entries, AP, AR & GL

General: Total number of Custom objects less than 100, Moderate sized Modification

Upgradeability: **Good**, 1 Delivered Table updated. Essentially this modification does not impact delivered Functionality. However, use of Funclib and some code (cloned) shows that it is tied to some Delivered functionality, so if that functionality changes, analysis needed. Journal Generation utilizes a custom table where the Cash Ledger Entries are inserted. So, changes to Journal Generation through upgrades should be monitored.

Load: Unknown

Frequency: Nightly

Performance: All three AEs can run simultaneously, and they are all fairly short in length. Does not utilize CI and minimal PeopleCode used, so AEs will be as efficient as the Load and the SQL & PeopleCode used. Can Utilize all the tuning techniques offered by AEs and SQL itself

ADML 124

State Law Requires validation of all Transactions to ensure budgets, releases and cash are available before posting a transaction

Modification provides Cash Checking mechanism for disbursements from within AP and from 3rd Party Sources into Aspire.

TDSE_124 -- A custom AE is created that runs within the delivered Pay Cycle AE (AP_APY2015).

Several Sub Records are created and added to delivered tables PS_VOUCHER, PS_DISTRIB_LINE, PS_OPR_DEF_TABLE_AR, PS_OPR_DEF_TABLE_AP, as well as changes to delivered pages VCHR_PAYMENT, VCHR_LINE_SBP_PIVL.

App Engines read as well as update/insert data into critical delivered tables, PS_VOUCHER, PS_PYMNT_STG_TMP, PS_PYMNT_VCHR_XREF.

General:

Upgradeability: Fair, This modification not only is dependent on Core Delivered functionality but also impacts that functionality. About 80 Custom/Modified Objects. Because this ADML updates delivered Core Functionality, regression testing is needed to ensure that modifications don't impact that Core Functionality. Scope of regression testing would need to be assessed by Functional analysis.

Load: 10,000 Vouchers

Frequency: Pay Cycle to be run twice daily.

Performance: The AE (FL_AP_CSCHK) is somewhat extensive and also is part of the overall execution of the Pay Cycle (AP_APY2015) so performance could be an issue due to load and complexity of the overall process.

ADML 81 – 90 My Florida Market Place Integrations with Aspire

General: Interface with MFMP is both Inbound and Outbound. At least 8 distinct Integration Points between MFMP and Aspire. ADML 83 includes a Synchronous connection to Aspire to create and save a Requisition. In addition, a budget check of that requisition must happen immediately thereafter. This Auto Budget Checking was identified by the State of Florida as a Gap.

The entire MFMP Integration uses extensive Error checking, not only due to usage of Component Interfaces. And when an error is registered an App Message is created and sent back to MFMP.

3 Component Interfaces used attached to the REQUISITIONS, PURCHASE_ORDER and VCHR_EXPRESS components. These three components are critical core functional pieces and are all complex, with 6 or so pages per component, including work pages. These components have Children, Sibling and Grandchildren Tables adding to the complexity.

Extensive Budget Check calls, all remote calls, can have implications on Temp Table instances, see suggestions below.

Also, Security implications as users in Ariba will call for Overrides and their Security must give them access to that capability inside of PeopleSoft.

The Technical Documentation for the MFMP Integration was extensive and well detailed, particularly the notation of what Tables are impacted by the processes.

Upgradeability: Poor, This modification is not only dependent on Core Delivered functionality but also impacts that functionality. Because this ADML updates delivered Core Functionality, regression testing is needed to ensure that modifications don't impact that Core Functionality. Scope of regression testing would need to be assessed by Functional analysis but is most definitely extensive.

Because MFMP and Aspire are so tightly integrated both Systems affect each other. An upgrade or patch application to either could affect both systems.

Obviously, because of this deep interactivity between the systems extensive testing is required, including Regression testing in Aspire. Aspire will be used to create Requisitions, POs and Vouchers for transactions not involving MFMP. This means that the application of this Integration cannot adversely affect these major Core delivered Functionalities from working.

In working with CIs in comparison to straight loads of data into a table using SQL less testing is generally needed because the edits that any user would encounter on entering online happen via the CI. However, there is significant amount of inserts and updates to delivered tables as part of this integration. So, more testing will be needed to ensure that those Inserts and Updates are not entering data that does not pass edit checks on components. These Inserts and Updates were very high in number counted far more than 20.

Load: 500-1000 Requisitions a Day

Frequency: On Demand and Batch Nightly

Performance: Highly dependent on interaction of both Systems. Because of the interaction between both systems one system will wait for the other until it's task is complete. Extensive error handling can send the process back to the originator, causing numerous repeated calls of specific integration points.

The Component Interfaces are complex and could likely cause Performance bottlenecks. The rule of thumb for complex components is that the best you will likely achieve on a CI save is 1 second, that is the limit, in all likelihood that process will take significantly longer. I was informed that in recent testing, the usage of ADMLs 83 and 81, that is the Synchronous call to Aspire with an XML message, the parsing of the XML, the loading of the Custom Requisitions CI, the saving of the CI, the budget checking call and the building and sending of an App Message back to MFMP took between 15-25 seconds. I think that is impressive and better than I would have guessed.

Performance Suggestions:

- Deactivate Methods on the Component Interfaces (CI) that are not used.
- On Custom CIs consider removing PeopleCode checks, analysis on importance of each would be needed.
- Alternatively, add a lot of If %CompIntfc statements to bypass PeopleCode checks that would be useful for the Component but not for the CI.
- Significantly, raise the number of Online Temp Table Instances. Delivered the application comes with 3 Online Temp Table instances. An assessment of how many concurrent calls of the different Integrations is needed. Based on that you can specify how many Online instances are needed. I.e. If 10 users call ADML 83, concurrently, then you need at least 10 Temp Table Instances for the Remote Budget Check call. N.B. This is a Global setting in Utilities, that means if you raise the number of Online instances you have to recreate all the Temp Tables in the System, so all the Temp Tables will grow by that setting in number of instances.
- Build separate App/Web Server domains to handle Application Messaging for Aspire Production instance. Therefore if Application/Web Servers that handle OLTP have to be bounced this will not affect the Publish/Subscribe services or the Integration Gateway because they are running on a separate App/Web Server Domains.

Publication and subscription of Application Messages is a serial process, unless Partitioning is used. Messages for different Integrations for MFMP were placed on separate Message Channels, this is very good. That means if messages for one ADML are stuck in queued because of an erred App Message, the messages in other Message Channels are not impacted.

ADML 1940 MFMP Aspire PO Roll Forward

State Law Requires all pre-encumbrances released by June 30th and all encumbrances full released after 90 days.

General: MFMP will interface with Aspire to close Contracts at the line level for those lines referencing a prior fiscal year budget. State identified this as a GAP because the Recon Process and Work Bench don't provide the option to close Requisitions, POs by appropriation year.

6 Custom AEs called FL_REQ_HOLD, FL_PO_HOLD, FL_PO_YREND, FL_P_CATCRL, FL_AP_VCHDEL. Most of these AEs create a report and output files as part of their processing.

More than 200 Custom objects. For the objects related to OLTP saw only 1 touch point to a delivered object.

Utilizes Workflow functionality, adequate testing of functionality needed.

Upgradeability: Good, No CIs

Highly dependent on PO, KK and Voucher Functionality. Extensive calls to tables in those areas to work on data. Touch points point back to delivered functionality.

Load: N/A

Frequency: Unknown, but will be prevalent at Fiscal Year End.

Performance: The amount of PeopleCode objects modified or created was very high for OLTP objects, particularly pages, so significant amount of testing needed to ensure that the code works correctly. Most of the code is fairly simple, usage of complicated PeopleCode is kept to a minimum. Workflow adds to make this a moderately complex ADML.

Suggestion: Extensive use of AE to create Reports, this is not what AEs are intended for, no formatting options available to AE. Would have dumped data into a Custom Table, in many cases that data is already in a custom Table, then made a remote call to Crystal. Crystal would have created necessary reports.

ADML 11 Certified Forward LAS/PBS (Budgeting)

Carry forward of operating appropriations using prior Fiscal year appropriations for prior fiscal year obligations, up to Sept. 30th.

Requires 3 steps to functionality, Tentative, Final, Reversion, and executes ADML 032 budget Journal Interface and ADML425 Budget Load

General: No Tech Spec, Can't offer a judgment to Technical Aspects.

However, requirement to essentially hold a transaction in a state before finalizing will add complexity to an interface with another system. And Reports have to be offered after each stage of the process.

Upgradeability:

Load:

Frequency:

Performance:

ADML 128 Interunit Processing

Florida Statute requires that warrants not pass between Agencies. Transactions involving multiple Agencies at the State of Florida state that the Initiating Agency can not create, finalize or post transactions that touch another Agencies books or records, they require "Simultaneous Posting" of the transaction. This requirement is tantamount to creating an Interunit framework, identified as the "Interunit Processor."

This ADML is split in two, where Part A deals with Encumbrance Entry and Part B deals with Journal Entry.

TDSE-128A - 100+ Objects Created/Modified, extensive cloning of delivered, looks laborious. Only 8 PeopleCode changes to Delivered Functionality, however the clones have extensive PeopleCode changes for Custom Components and Pages.

TDSE-128B – Utilizes Workflow and Component Interface for JOURNAL_ENTRY_IE Component, this Component is large and complex.

Extensive changes to Journal PeopleCode, as well as changes to the main Journal Entry page. Modification to the Installation Table and Page.

More than 300 Custom Modified Objects.

Enormous amount of changes to PeopleCode that was cloned for new Custom Components, clones of delivered Journal Entry Component.

AE (FL_GL_IU_FIN) to Create Interunit Settlement Journals. Rather short AE, only real complexity in the use of the CI. Calls Journal Edit during process.

TDSI_128A Read input files from Agencies, perform Validations, load Interunit Encumbrances. Less than 50 Custom Objects

AE loads from flat file to Temp Tables, then constructs CI to insert into Custom (FL_) tables. Then Calls budget Checking. 3 steps in AE, CI related step only complexity.

TDSI_128B Very similar structure to TDSI_128A

Less than 40 Custom Objects, however does do direct inserting into JRNL Tables, including JRNL_HEADER and JRNL_LN. Also, utilizes CI to populate Custom (FL_) tables as well as JRNL_HEADER.

One of the CIs for 128 is a copy of the Journal Entry Page and as such this ADML inserts into core Journal Delivered tables.

General:

Upgradeability: Fair, Use of CI means it depends strongly on Journal Entry functionality and clones of Journal Components and Extensive PeopleCode changes mean it can have an impact on how Delivered Functionality works. Meaning, again, regression testing needed, especially since Delivered Journal Entry page will be utilized for non-Interunit Processing.

Load: Unknown

Frequency: Unknown

Performance: If the load is manageable so will Performance.

ADML 151 Labor Distribution

Interface comes from PeopleFirst into Aspire.

Custom Labor Hour Detail Record (FL_LBR_TIME_DTL) and an interface created to upload and store timesheet information from PeopleFirst into Aspire.

Total Objects < 25 and saw no touch points with delivered objects.

AE (FL_PC_LBR_HRS) reads from flat file, utilizing File layouts, loads into FL_LBR_TIME_DTL. The AE is shore with 5 steps, 2 are large PeopleCode Steps. One of the steps loads the flat file into the Temp Tables the other loads FL_LBR_TIME_DTL.

General: ADML 169 utilizes the data in FL_LBR_TIME_DTL. 169 would affect Upgradeability. Currently there is no Tech Spec, Aspire team still working on this ADML.

Upgradeability: Excellent

Load: Unknown

Frequency: On Demand

Performance: Will be highly dependent on Load. The AE itself is about as efficient as can be expected with loads directly into Temp Tables and then FL_LBR_TIME_DTL, no CI utilized. Both the PeopleCode steps are moderately complex so if Performance issues occur some tuning on the SQL level will definitely help but it is dependent on how well the PeopleCode executes.

Performance Suggestion: If loads get large enough to cause Performance issues, consider chunking data into Aspire. If the lines in the flat file are independent of one another, then split the file into multiple pieces and execute one file at a time. Largeness of data could affect PeopleCode performance if an object is so large it impacts memory usage.

ADML 17 Conversion DAC – General Ledger Bridge

General:

Inbound Interface from FLAIR -> Aspire

Purpose to translate FLAIR Chart of Accounts (COA) to Aspire Chart of Accounts.

AE (named FL_GL_BRIDGE) uses mappings to perform translation. FL_COASTRIP_TBL main table used in process. FL_COASTRIP_TBL will contain converted data from Aspire at the time the General Ledger Bridge process is run. Based on data within Aspire the AE takes the data from FL_COASTRIP_TBL and inserts into a separate Temp Table. Then takes those results and inserts rows into FL_COASTRIP_TBL corresponding to Aspire COA values. So, now there are two values in the table one set corresponding to FLAIR and the other to Aspire COA.

7 to 8 Components, 140+ Custom objects.

N.B. Phased Go-Live approach means that this process and the conversion of Flair data into Aspire will serve as an Interface and be done on an ongoing process.

The Conversions for GL utilize this GL Bridge.

Complexity of this AE is that it takes both Enterprise wide and Agency specific fields to create the COA. Functionally is this to complex?

Upgradeability: Very Good

Significant cloning of Delivered Functionality. Must look at changes in application with patches/Upgrade to see if this ADML needs to be altered. However, this ADML appears to have no direct impact on delivered functionality. Conversions for GL need to be looked at for Upgradeability, as they will have the touch points with delivered functionality.

Load: Unknown

Frequency: Unknown

Performance: The amount of data per COA line does not seem heavy. It is the Conversions that utilize this GL Bridge that will need to be looked at for performance.

Performance Suggestion:

ADML 45 Department Level Security

General: Users must be restricted to Organizations for which they are authorized for in Aspire. Aspire (PeopleSoft) will be restrict by Business Units, Setids, Projects and other functional Data, however the State of Florida will have to restrict based on Organization (Department).

This ADML will utilize Department tree and a custom view. The view will be attached to all of the transaction Distribution lines tables as a prompt view. FIN9001.sqr applies the view to records as a prompt view, and was modified for these purposes.

Upgradeability: Very Good. No of objects are limited to about 20. The modification itself is very easy so any Upgrade analysis is quick. The only downside is how many Records/Pages will be affected. If that number is large then the Compare report hits are lengthy, and the Upgrade analysis of this takes longer, however it is still a quick analysis.

Changes to the FIN9001.sqr are minor and using the user/sqr directory limits the interactivity of changes during the upgrade process. However, for this ADML if FIN9001.sqr changes an analysis of these changes are needed and a determination of whether the custom version needs to be changed.

Load: N/A

Frequency: Unknown

Performance: Sometimes the views for Row Level Security can add to performance return of data, some testing will have to be done to ensure that the views are quick enough.

Performance Suggestion: Since the core part of this ADML is the view, normal SQL tuning techniques are available, such as Stats and probably more importantly Hints.

General Comments

- The complexity of the system could be greatly enhanced with a reduction of number of environments. From the ADMLs reviewed it seemed that the number of environments and State Laws/Requirements were the reason for most of the complexity.
- Technical Specifications as a whole do a good job of Identifying Customizations and modifications to Delivered Objects, listing per object. That is helpful when assessing Upgrade impact, with the exception of the content in Custom AEs.
- Very large usage of App Engines, little use of SQRs. Large Positive, makes Comparison Process on Upgrades simpler, add flexibility if changes needed. Could use Delivered Objects (App Classes) that are delivered in later Releases, these will become far more prevalent in later releases.
- Most of the ADMLs I reviewed took the mantra of limiting interactions with Delivered objects (good for Upgradeability), MFMP would be an exception to that rule. However, keep in mind that means far more custom objects have to be created to do so. ADML 31 for instance has an enormous number of Custom objects.
- For Objects that were cloned and used as completely new objects, not modifications to existing, the team added comments to the delivered object in most cases, particularly for Component Interfaces. This enables the comment to pop-up on Compare Reports when applying Patches or Upgrades. This flag will tell an upgrader to take a deeper look at that object, likely executing a Compare Report that shows the differences, even between delivered code. Once, that is done the Upgrader can assess the changes need to the Cloned Custom object.
- My Overall impression of the State of Florida Aspire project is that it is simply overly complicated. Many interfaces, due to so many disparate systems. I think from a Technical view they will benefit from simplification, such as rolling in Legacy systems into PeopleSoft, such as the Legacy Payroll and Budgeting systems.

General Suggestions

- Add in the Tech Specs the touch points to Delivered Objects for Application Engines. What Delivered Tables/Objects does Interfaces use or change. This was done for the MFMP ADMLs but not for all of them.
- Need to add Frequency & Load information for each Interface ADML. General impression is that the team is not sure of or doesn't know the loads for their interfaces. That is not always known at coding time, but in general you know if an Interface is High, Medium or Low loads.
- Strive to use SQL instead of PeopleCode whenever possible. Every time you use PeopleCode you invoke the PeopleCode Engine, as PeopleCode is not compiled.
- Clear Temp Tables at the beginning of Processes rather than the end whenever Possible.
- Utilize Truncate Table on Temp Tables instead of Delete, whenever possible. Of course, if you utilize Truncate Table, it may mean the process can only run one instance at a time, depending on how the process is written. Many of the processes utilize PROCESS_INSTANCE as a key field in that case you'd be limited to one concurrent run at a time. The reason for this suggestion is that a Delete statement will force Oracle to recalculate Statistics on the Table. By having the removal of the Temp Table rows at the beginning of the Program, the temp tables stay loaded after the process is complete and statistics will be run against them with data present, meaning a non-zero statistics. If you

do a Delete while the program is running and Delete all the rows, then the statistics will be set to zero and likely affect the performance of any SQL involving those Temp Tables.

Infrastructure Recommendations

- Recommend upgrading to tools to 8.48 as long as it does not interfere with Project plan. A major reason is that 8.48 offers support for native PL/SQL calls within Application Engine to the Database. That flexibility offers Performance Tuners more tools to be able to improve Performance of an AE. e.g. Pre 8.48 tools calls of %UpdateStats utilize Analyze Table, a deprecated feature in Oracle 10g, however in 8.48 the %UpdateStats calls utilize the DBMS_STATS package. The DBMS_STATS package is far reaching and can offer numerous tuning approaches.
- Utilize Hub Architecture so that an Interface is defined into an Application, and is managed at the Hub Level. Any other Systems that want to use that interface access it via the Hub.
 - Oracle Fusion Middleware Certified to work with PeopleTools 8.46 and above. With Fusion Middleware you have the entire platform needed to develop, deploy and manage Web Services. It is akin to having a Hub to interact with disparate systems.
 - Oracle Application Server is certified to work with PeopleTools 8.47 and above and replaces using Weblogic.
 - Oracle Integration Adapter for PeopleSoft helps publish Services of PeopleSoft Applications so they are accessible via the Web. This means you enable that Interface to be accessible for any request it receives, so that if multiple Systems need to access, you don't redefine the Integrations for every System.
 - Getting on Oracle Fusion Middleware will enable the transfer to Oracle Fusion Apps (in the future) to be much simpler.
 - Review White Paper Extending PeopleSoft Applications with Oracle Fusion Middleware.
 - Web Service enable Customizations within the PeopleSoft Application so that they are accessible via the web from multiple systems. This may help manage the large number of Interfaces between Systems at the State of Florida.