

**New York State
Central Accounting System Redesign and
Financial Management System Integration Project**

Agency Financial Management Systems Interview Guide

Interview Questions Section

Agency Information

1. Agency Code and Name: 11000 – State Education Department
2. Name of the person responding to these interview questions:

Name: Michael DiVirgilio Phone Number: 518-486-1767
3. Number of Agency offices/locations: There are two primary offices in Albany that process transactions. Many offices in Albany and throughout the State have access to the data warehouse and will ultimately be the entry point for most transactions that will flow to our fiscal office and then onto CAS. Also, this response does not include the two State schools, agency codes 11260 and 11270, that operate there own fiscal units.

FMS Background Information

4. What system is this Agency using as its primary FMS system?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | KFMS – Department of Correctional Services |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Oracle |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | PeopleSoft |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | In-house Developed System |

In-House System Name and Brief Description:

FI – travel, advance accounts; FM – accounts payable, contracts, JVs. Please note: Case Service, Grants Finance (CAFÉ), Child Nutrition Reimbursement and State Aid have separate systems that would exist regardless of what is done centrally and each will feed payments through our primary system.

5. When was this Agency’s primary FMS system implemented (placed in production)?

FI – 1980s, FM 1995, Oracle 10/99

6. How long did it take to implement this Agency's primary FMS system (from the time the system was funded to the time it went into production)?

Oracle – 6/98-10/99, FM – about 6 months, FI - ?

7. What FMS functions were implemented with the Agency's primary FMS system? (Mark all the FMS functions from the list below.)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Purchasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Accounting
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Contract Management	<input type="checkbox"/>	Grant Management
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Accounts Payable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Receipt Management
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Travel	<input type="checkbox"/>	Budget Management
<input type="checkbox"/>	Inventory	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	General Ledger
<input type="checkbox"/>	Capital Assets	<input type="checkbox"/>	Reporting and Information Access

Note: Purchasing – Oracle; Contract Management – FM; Accounts Payable – Oracle; Travel – FI; Grant Management – CAFÉ; Receipt Management – Oracle; General Ledger – Oracle; and Reporting and Information Access – Data Warehouse.

8. Do all Agency's divisions, sections, etc. use the Agency's primary FMS system?

- Yes
 No

If No, please explain below the reason(s) why this situation exists.

9. Approximately how many users are supported by this Agency's primary FMS system?

Approximate number of "Concurrent" Users: 25
(Maximum number of users on the system at the same time.)

Approximate number of "Day-to-Day" Users: 50
(Number of users that work on the system every day)

Approximate number of "Casual" Users: 100
(Number of users that enter the system occasionally.)

10. What were the business reasons that lead your Agency to select its primary FMS system?

To improve management reporting and processing efficiency by reducing paper and automating transaction processing.

11. What lessons did this Agency learn from the implementation of its primary FMS system that may be helpful to the CAS Redesign Project Team?

See Supplemental Interview Information items noted below.

12. What are the strengths (what is working well) of your Agency's primary FMS system?

See Supplemental Interview Information items noted below.

13. What are the deficiencies (what are the system's issues, problems, and/or areas of improvement) of your Agency's primary FMS system?

See Supplemental Interview Information items noted below.

FMS Implementation Cost Information

14. For each hard dollar cost component shown below, approximately how much did it cost to implement this Agency's primary FMS system?

Hard Dollar Cost Component	Estimated Cost
Hardware	Server-unknown
Software	\$617,000
Consultants/Contractors	\$6,406,000
Other: Technical support & training	\$203,800
Other:	

15. Approximately how many Agency staff positions (FTEs – Full Time Equivalents) were involved in implementing the Agency's primary FMS system?

10 - 12

16. What is the estimated cost of the FTEs (from Question 15 above) that were involved in implementing the Agency's primary FMS system?

\$700,000 – \$800,000

FMS Ongoing Cost Information

17. For each hard dollar cost component shown below, approximately how much does this Agency spend on a fiscal year basis for the ongoing maintenance and operation of its primary FMS system?

Hard Dollar Cost Component	Estimated Cost
Licensing Agreements	
Software Support Contracts	\$110,000
Consultants/Contractors	\$60,00
Other:	
Other:	

18. For each activity shown below, approximately how many Agency FTEs are directly or indirectly engaged in performing the activity? Also, estimate the costs on a fiscal year basis of the FTEs shown for each applicable activity.

Activity	Agency FTEs	Estimated Cost
Programming and System Maintenance	7	\$450,000
Network/System Operations	1	60,000
System Security		
Help Desk/End User System Support		
Other:		
Other:		

Supplemental Interview Information

1. Oracle does not fully cover SED's needs as implemented.
2. SED actually has several "primary systems" FMS systems in use to meet all of their needs.
3. Although many Oracle modules have been purchased, but only the Purchasing, Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable and part of the General Ledger have been implemented as a result of funding constraints.
4. A major problem with the Oracle modules is their inability to integrate encumbrance processing required by CAS. Other problems included inefficiencies related to the integration of the cost center processing, changing funding sources, lapsing

problems and issues with reconciliation; taken together, these problems give an impression that their Oracle system is unreliable. To compound its reliability impression, some of the data loaded into their Oracle Data Warehouse does not have as much detail as the legacy system it replaced and the data in the Data Warehouse is viewed as inaccurate.

5. There is general agreement that the implementations of Oracle Accounts Receivables and Procurement/Payables were successful; they handle between 20-30 percent of the agencies total transactions.
6. SED had hoped to be fully implemented on the Oracle systems, but they have backed off full implementation pending state leadership direction regarding a statewide solution. The state has started initiatives to provide statewide solutions for travel, e-Procurement, e-Grants, and Contracts but none of these initiatives have resulted in solutions for SED.
7. SED is currently running several subsystems or feeder systems in addition to the Oracle modules discussed above. These systems include the following:
 - Travel;
 - Advance Account;
 - Contracts;
 - Journal Voucher;
 - Grants;
 - State Aid;
 - Vocational Rehabilitation; and
 - Child Nutrition (Web based).

Some of these systems could be eliminated with the implementation of Oracle modules while some would remain and should be considered as bolt on systems.

8. SED's Oracle modules run on Sun Server with Sun Solaris.
9. SED has an enterprise license for the Oracle RDBMS.
10. SED's general impression regarding their experience with Oracle is that Oracle was good as packages go, but it was package software and that it will never be as efficient for data entry and retrieval as a custom system especially given the differences required in State government. Many of their legal requirements were not met by the commercial packages.
11. There were mixed reviews as to which was the better alternative building custom solutions to avoid the required upgrade costs as versions are released or using a transaction engine with their bolt on modules. They reiterated the poor integration of the PaySR project requiring duplicate entry of data and the need for each agency to build its own interfaces.
12. Functionality that they would like to see added is the ability to provide "soft encumbrances." These would be encumbrances at the appropriation level instead of at the segregation level.
13. SED built and maintains its own Data Warehouse and reporting capability; it is working very well with minimal cost and maintenance. Cobol programs load data from the transactions provided from the CAS into an instance of Oracle; they use

Cognos Impromptu as their Data Warehouse reporting tool. (PowerPlay is not used since their reporting requirements do not call for slice and dice capability.)

14. Criminal Justice has benefited from the work and interfaces developed by SED.

15. SED believes that OSC should take the lead on developing a centralized system that could be used by all agencies. Many of SED's current systems could go away with the implementation of the statewide FMS, but some of the special processing systems will need to continue within the agency.