



July 2025 Release Notes (date of release July 31, 2025)

Key	Audience	Components	Summary	Description
1814	Buyers	Buyers	Update Supplier Dropdown Field - Supplier Information	<p>COVA reported the Supplier Cleanup items that will help users select the correct suppliers when creating transactions. These include displaying the Doing Business As Name – this helps identify particular locations when multiples of the same company exist. The DBA name helps the user identify the correct location for the supplier they are selecting.</p> <p>Changes to be implemented: *This is a global change that applies to Supplier Dropdown field across application</p> <p>Change the fields that are displayed in the dropdown, from</p> <p><Supplier name></p> <p><Foreign Tax ID> <Vendor Customer Code> (<Supplier status>)</p> <p><Tax Address> [<Address Line 1>, <Zip Code>, <City>]</p> <p>which is currently displayed, to</p> <p><Supplier name></p> <p><Vendor Customer Code>, <Doing Business As/Location Name> (<Supplier status>)</p> <p><Tax Address> [<Address Line 1>, <Zip Code>, <City>]</p> <p>by adding the field DBA Name and removing the field Foreign Tax ID (which is only displayed for suppliers that have a value in the field).</p>
1775	Buyers	P2P	Full Approved REQ (Change Order) in Ordered Status - No PO Generated	<p>Ref: REQ1667067- Ordered Status</p> <p>Overview: COVA reported that change order was fully approved and moved to 'ordered' but no PO was generated.</p> <p>Business Impact: Change orders with deleted line items (catalog items) are going to ordered status.</p> <p>CGI Research: Upon research, it was found this issue is happening with catalog items only when doing a change order. If the item linked is in 'del' status, the new requisition gets created when it should not and processes till the 'ordered' status without actually generating the order.</p> <p>Change to be Implemented: Create a blocking alert called eva_invalid_catalog_item (Item has been deleted.) to tell users when creating change order against an order with items in "deleted" status</p>



July 2025 Release Notes (date of release July 31, 2025)

Key	Audience	Components	Summary	Description
1779	Buyers	P2P	Deactivate Invoice Alerts	<p>COVA asked to deactivate the following invoice alerts below as they should not fire or need update.</p> <p>* Under Alerts, the alert, "Discrepancy in invoice amounts between Accounting section and Totals section" is also incorrect. On this invoice, the amount in Accounting matches the Total.</p> <p>* Under Alerts, I don't recall seeing the alert "Invoice due date is mandatory to generate a payment request" before.</p> <p>* We need to change or deactivate the alert, "Invoice lines do not match Invoice total". It is appearing when the Invoice lines seemingly match the Invoice Total. (See INV000408 in UAT.) The code needs to be examined to see what it is looking at when it displays the error to determine what to do.</p> <p>Business Impact: These alerts will confuse end users because they will fire when they should not.</p> <p>Changes to be Implemented: Deactivate the alerts requested in this ticket and make sure that they do not fire after fix is done unless they should.</p>
1781	Buyers	P2P	Link to Report 203 only showing for Admin users within PO	<p>Overview: While testing the PO Print changes implemented with Key1659, the following issue was noted: The link to report 203 is showing up for Administrator users only.</p> <p>This EBUG tracks changes to the PO Print page as requested by COVA in EVAR 3388.</p> <p>CGI Research: In researching the issue, it was determined that this access needs to be added to the Employee Profile to allow access to this report from the PO Print page.</p> <p>Business impact: The users that this link was put in place for do not have access to it.</p> <p>Changes to be implemented: Change the visibility to view link to Report 203 to Employee profile.</p>
1797	Buyers	P2P	Generate Rules Error preventing req from moving forward to 'ordered'.	<p>COVA reported because an agency is having issues processing their req to 'ordered' as the req is stuck in generate rules workflow step.</p> <p>Business Impact: The req is stuck in generate rules workflow step and cannot move forward to generate an order.</p> <p>Changes being implemented: The workflow engine being used by this req was using the older version. Underlying query needed to be updated to use query hint.</p>
1801	Buyers	P2P	QM - REQs Approval Lookahead Feature shows REQ routing to Buyer Manager regardless of dollar threshold setting	<p>Overview: QM agencies are noticing that REQs are being shown as routing into QM/Buyer Manager regardless of the QM dollar threshold. We have two examples but fear this is happening enterprise wide: REQ1741290 (NSU) – This is a \$4,068.00 requisition, but Queue Manager threshold is \$10,000.01 REQ1741393 (JMU) – This is a \$840.97 requisition, but Queue Manager threshold is \$10,000.00 (unfortunately this REQ has already been processed to ordered). This appears to be a lookahead issue only. Once the REQ begins processing the rules appear to be firing appropriately. This also does not appear to be happening in UAT (see REQ205982).</p> <p>CGI Research: There is already a threshold value but is not firing rules as expected. The workflow is correct but the Buyer Manager indicator under Workflow Preview is still showing when it should not.</p> <p>Change being Implemented: Code was changed to only fire Queue manager/Buyer manager step when the requisition amount exceeds threshold value. This was not incorporated before.</p> <p>Business Impact: Workflow should reflect the Upcoming Approvals Indicators correctly.</p>



July 2025 Release Notes (date of release July 31, 2025)

Key	Audience	Components	Summary	Description
1534	Catalog Administrators	Catalog	Administrator unable to see logs for cXML Failed order transactions	<p>Ticket reported that when cXML order transmission fails, the error log emails are not going out to the respective recipients (Ivalua OPS inbox and supplier contact). Noticed that the EAI 'cXML PO Send' is set to 'In progress' status instead of 'error' and so the NOTIFYADM and NOTIFYSUP instructions are not executing.</p> <p>With this ticket, the following issue is being resolved: We were unable to see the logs of the “*po_cxml_send*” EAI in failed cases. → *This is now resolved*.</p> <p>Ticket 1857 will track fixing the following issue: “*po_cxml_send*” EAI’s remaining instructions are not getting executed if it’s failed with an unmanaged error. Email notifications are not getting sent out.</p> <p>Business impact: Administrators need the ability to review the log information for failed transactions to determine actions needed.</p> <p>Change being implemented: Re-enable the ability for Administrators to see the logs of po_cxml_send EAI in failed cases.</p>
1789	Data Retention	Data Retention	DR: Draft status proposals are getting retained in DR application	<p>While testing DR supplier proposal functionality, the following issue was found: When Responses are in the draft status, they are getting retained in the DR application.</p> <p>Business impact: Draft status responses should not be retained.</p> <p>Change needed: Update the DR extract logic - proposals in Draft status should not be retained.</p>
1790	Data Retention	Data Retention	DR: Sealed bid proposals are getting retained prior to the sealed bids open date/time	<p>While testing DR supplier proposal functionality, the following issue was found: Submitted proposals for RFx in a Sealed Bid status, are getting retained when the proposals are submitted. Per the design, for a sealed bid RFx, proposals are not to be retained until the sealed bids are opened.</p> <p>Business impact: Sealed bid proposals are getting retained in the DR application before bids are unsealed and for a sealed bids RFx, bids are not to be made available until the bids are unsealed for the RFx.</p> <p>Change needed: Update DR logic to retain Sealed Bid RFx proposals as outlined in the design: Pull all submitted proposals when Sealed Bids are opened (Sealed Bid Date & Time).</p>



July 2025 Release Notes (date of release July 31, 2025)

Key	Audience	Components	Summary	Description
1807	Data Retention	Data Retention	DR Solicitations EAI issue when Attaching Duplicate (Existing) Documents in RFx	<p>CGI found in UAT that for a sourcing project when the same 'Existing' document is selected / added to the RFx Publicly Posted Documents section (when selecting 'Attach Existing Document'), the EAI will fail to run for the RFx.</p> <p>Business Impact: RFx(s) with duplicate documents will not be retained successfully in DR.</p> <p>Changes to be Implemented:</p> <p>Modify the eva_solicitation_data_retention sub EAI 'GET ATTACHMENTS' instruction to exclude duplicate document records.</p> <p>Note: This fix specifically deals with documents that are added multiple times from an existing document added to the sourcing projects documents. In this situation on an RFx, it is being linked multiple times to the same document and in the previous version this would cause the EAI to fail as the second time it tries to get the attachment, the document has already been grabbed, causing an error.</p> <p>This error does not happen if the user 'Creates' an attachment, even if the document is the same, only by attaching the same existing document multiple times does it cause this failure. For retention purposes, it remains in the JSON extract since this document is added multiple times, but to prevent an EAI failure, the actual document is only being copied over once.</p>
1336	Data Warehouse	Data Warehouse	DW: Invoice EAI output filename	<p>The output zip filename of the invoice EAI uses 12-hour time format. Change it to use 24-hour format. Otherwise, the ETL may miss loading some data into DW. That will then require a data fix.</p> <p>This will require an lvalua context change.</p>
1707	Data Warehouse	Data Warehouse	DW: Remove not null constraint on AUDIT_USERPROFILES_HIST.MODIFIEDBY_CONTACT_ID	<p>Remove not null constraint on AUDIT_USERPROFILES_HIST.MODIFIEDBY_CONTACT_ID. Some audit records do not have a MODIFIEDBY_CONTACT_ID populated. To load such records into DW, allow MODIFIEDBY_CONTACT_ID to be null.</p> <p>*Background info:* A NOT NULL constraint on a field in a historical audit table is preventing certain records from being loaded into the data warehouse because the field is sometimes legitimately null.</p> <p>*CGI research:* Records missing this field are being redirected to an error base table during the ETL process. These records need to be accommodated by allowing null values and then reprocessed.</p> <p>Business impact: Incomplete historical audit data is currently unavailable in the data warehouse</p> <p>*Changes to be implemented:* Remove the NOT NULL constraint on the field to allow valid null entries, and reprocess the affected records.</p>
1748	Data Warehouse	Data Warehouse	DW: Update Logi row limit transformation to handle empty Json (AUDIT_USERPROFILES_HIST)	<p>Issue being reported: ETL for Logi row limit needs update to error logging.</p> <p>Business impact: None. This is a backend ETL process improvement.</p> <p>CGI research findings: ETL for Logi row limit needs update to error logging.</p> <p>Changes to be implemented with this ticket: Update AUDIT_USER_LGROWLIM_STG1 transformation to filter out null records due to empty Json. This transformation writes Logi row limit data to DW table covabase.AUDIT_USERPROFILES_HIST.</p>



July 2025 Release Notes (date of release July 31, 2025)

Key	Audience	Components	Summary	Description
1750	Data Warehouse	Data Warehouse	DW: User Logi Row Limit EAI query changes (AUDIT_USERPROFILES_HIST)	<p>*Issue Being Reported: The Logi Row Limit profile information is not loaded for a new user in AUDIT_USERPROFILES_HIST table.</p> <p>*Business Impact: Affects data accuracy and auditability.</p> <p>*CGI Research Findings: Field t_usr_contact.modified is null for a new user. Due to the null value Logi Row Limit profile information is not loaded in AUDIT_USERPROFILES_HIST table. The</p>
1799	Data Warehouse	Data Warehouse	DW: Multiple records exists for same USERLOGIN in DIM_USERS Table	<p>* *Background info: Converted users are those whose records initially had {{CONTACT_ID}} and {{STATUS_CODE}} as {{NULL}}, but after conversion, have corresponding records with non-null values. Both records share the same {{USERLOGIN}}.</p> <p>For such users, there should be only one record in the {{DIM_USERS}} table with {{RECORDLATEST_TF = 1}}.</p> <p>* *CGI research: At least 48 users in the UAT Data Warehouse have more than one record with {{RECORDLATEST_TF = 1}}. This field should indicate the most recent record only. The current logic fails to update the previous "latest" record (n-1) back to 0.</p> <p>* *Business impact: These inaccuracies affect audit integrity by not reliably showing the last login or most recent update for users.</p> <p>* *Changes to be implemented: * Update ETL logic to ensure that only the most recent record per user has {{RECORDLATEST_TF = 1}}. * Ensure that any older records are updated to {{RECORDLATEST_TF = 0}}. * Include validation checks to avoid regressions post-fix.</p>
1825	Data Warehouse	Data Warehouse	DW: Extract supplier information with MOA (DW change) (DIM_VENDORS_MOA_HIST)	Modify the supplier MOA ETL to load supplier information extracted with MOA query.
1826	Data Warehouse	Data Warehouse	DW: RFx Solicitation BIDUNSEALED_DATE field update after unsealing bid (FACT_SRC_RFXHDRS)	<p>*Background info: BIDUNSEALED_DATE field on table FACT_SRC_RFXHDRS is not updated after bids are unsealed. The field remains "null". EVATM 868: When a sealed bid RFx is unsealed, the BIDUNSEALED_DATE remains "null".</p> <p>*CGI research: Confirmed with DW team cycles ran successfully and issue was replicated in ST & UAT.</p> <p>*Business impact: Data Warehouse records will be inaccurate if BIDUNSEALED_DATE reports "null" instead of the date and time which it was unsealed. - Changes to be implemented: DW update trigger needs to fire to extract date to update the BIDUNSEALED_DATE field when Competitive Sealed Bid/Proposals RFx projects are unsealed.</p>
1766	Suppliers	Invoice	Invoice - Updates to Order field	<p>As COVA reported, suppliers are creating invoices in PROD. On the top menu, under Invoicing, the "Create Invoice" option is available to Suppliers. COVA requested: Turn off the "Create Invoice" option so it is not visible to Suppliers or when the Supplier gets to the "Create Invoice" screen, change the Order selector to only show POs that are available (by organization turned on for Invoicing) to create an invoice for.</p> <p>Business/Policy impact: Suppliers are creating invoices that entities cannot work in eVA because Invoicing is not turned on for entities in PROD. This can create issues with Prompt Pay regulations because entities may not see the invoice in eVA and may not receive an invoice through their current processes.</p> <p>Changes to be implemented with this ticket: Buyer/Supplier side, change the PO dropdown selection list so users only see POs that are available for invoice according to that agency.</p>



July 2025 Release Notes (date of release July 31, 2025)

Key	Audience	Components	Summary	Description
1755	Suppliers	P2P	Remove 'reject' functionality from supplier side invoice header for PCO invoices.	<p>Upon testing, it was found that the 'reject' functionality added on invoice header page on the Supplier Side when the invoice is in 'Charge Pcard on PO' step should not be visible.</p> <p>Business Impact: Supplier Side: The 'reject' functionality added on invoice header page on the Supplier Side when the invoice is in 'Charge Pcard on PO' step allows the supplier to take action on something they should not have access to.</p> <p>Changes being implemented: Remove the reject button from the invoice header page on the Supplier side when the invoice is in 'Charge Pcard on PO' step as that button was not there before this change.</p>
1803	Suppliers	Supplier	Make "include in eVA Public Supplier Directory" box default to Yes on Supplier Registration	<p>COVA reported that the "include in eVA Public Supplier Directory" checkbox is not checked by default resulting in users missing the checkbox and not all suppliers being available publicly. The Supplier Support team currently manually checks off the box before approving supplier registrations. Any supplier doing business registering with the Commonwealth should be shown publicly to meet transparency requirements. Suppliers should only be hidden from the Public Supplier Directory if an administrative decision is made to do so.</p> <p>CGI found during supplier registration the "include in eVA Public Supplier Directory" field the internal user has to check the box manually during supplier on-boarding.</p> <p>Business Impact: Suppliers not being listed publicly does not meet transparency requirements</p> <p>Change to be Implemented: Make the "include in eVA Public Supplier Directory" box default to Yes on Supplier Registration.</p> <p>On State-Entered registration make the "include in eVA Public Supplier Directory" box default to Yes and disabled. The user must perform an Information Change Request to change the value. This will provide tracking for updates to the checkbox (performed by which user and when). Only users with internal change request access will be able to update the field.</p> <p>This field should be defaulted and disabled for all suppliers during on-boarding, including self-registered suppliers.</p> <p>Note: box is not available on Supplier Self-Registrations and only available during the on-boarding of the self-registered suppliers by internal users.</p>
1810	Suppliers	Supplier	Add "Military Family-Owned Business" to SWAM categories in lvalua	<p>COVA reported that a new SWAM category needs to be added. Per Code of Virginia 2.2-4310, a new SWAM category "Military Family-Owned Business" will be created as a new business designation. eVA needs to collect this new designation from SBSD and display it wherever SWAM designations are displayed in eVA, the Vendor Portal, reports, etc. This needs to be active by 07/01/2025.</p> <p>This must be implemented in eVA for the 3 web service calls that are made to SBSD; VendorBySSN and VendorByTIN, which are called ad-hoc during Supplier creation (on-boarding); and VendorByDateRange, which is called by a daily batch job.</p> <p>Changes to be implemented: The following lvalua tables will be updated to add the new SWAM category: t_sup_mwbe_category; t_sup_document_type; t_sup_document_type_scope. Refer to the Development tab for column detail.</p>



July 2025 Release Notes (date of release July 31, 2025)

Key	Audience	Components	Summary	Description
1793	System	P2P	Query Optimization: Multiple Draft Receipts Alert	<p>Overview: While creating a receipt, the following alert is appearing: "Multiple draft receipts exist for this order. Please review the draft receipts." We found that the query responsible for this alert can be written more efficiently, as the current version is consuming significant system resources. The query has been rewritten for better performance. We assume that this alert is triggered at this point in the process. Alert Code: DL_DUPLICATE_RECEIPTS Alert Label : Multiple draft receipts exists for this order, please review the draft receipts.</p> <p>CGI Research: The functionality needs to be analyzed further and tested thoroughly. Should be consistent with old functionality with improved performance.</p> <p>Change being Implemented: Query is being rewritten for performance enhancement.</p> <p>Business Impact: We found that the query responsible for this alert can be written more efficiently, as the current version is consuming significant system resources.</p>