January 2026 Release Notes (date of release January 23, 2025)

Key	Audience	Components	Summary	Description
2144	AP	Invoice	Invoice: Supplier- Invoice payment term and due date missing when invoice is created from UI.	After testing Key 2041, it was found that when the Supplier creates an invoice from UI, both the payment term and due date fields are missing. CGI Research: Added the default selected value for Payment terms to 'Net 30' to show calculated due date. Business Impact: The payment term and due dates should populate and be calculated correctly for prompt pay. Changes to be implemented: Populate the payment term to net 30 by default and show the due date of net 30 of the invoice date once invoice date is selected.
2158	AP	Invoice	Invoice: PO lines not getting pulled in correctly to invoice when created through Non-OCR	During invoice testing, it was found that the PO line are not getting pulled correctly to the invoice when loaded through Optical Character Recognition. CGI Research: The logic that was set to pull PO lines based on receiving against the PO does not work when invoice is loaded through OCR. Logic * No receiving- no PO lines pull to invoice. * 1 Receipt- Pull the PO lines from the receipt. * 1+ Receipts- No PO lines pull to invoice, Business Impact: The logic does not work as expected. Changes to be implemented: Fix the invoice initialization callback (Clear Lines from invoice) of the initialization step of the invoice workflow to execute in respect of the origin of invoice (OCR/Non-PO(OCR)/Order/Receipt).
2190	AP	Invoice	Invoice: Add Receipt Delivery Date to the Invoice OK2Pay Send file	COVA requested to add Receipt Delivery Date on invoice_header node on the xml that is shared to peoplesoft. CGI Research: Need to add Receipt Delivery Date at the bottom of invoice_header node. Business Impact: Need to add Receipt Delivery Date at the bottom of invoice_header node. Changes to be implemented: Add Receipt Delivery Date at the bottom of invoice_header node.
1958	Buyers	Invoice	Inovice Data Capture - PCO based Invoices are not identifying & picking PCO Number	While testing Invoice Optical Character Recognition, CGI found that the PCO invoices are not getting identified and not picking PCO Number shown on the invoice. CGI Research found that IDC is not identifying and picking up PCO even though PCO number is mentioned in the Invoice. Business Impact: PCO invoices cannot be processed accurately if IDC is not capturing PCO invoices that are submitted. Changes to be implemented: To be added once issue is determined. CGI is working with Ivalua to determine the issue.

January 2026 Release Notes (date of release January 23, 2025)

Key	Audience	Components	Summary	Description
2065	Buyers	P2P	Not To Exceed (NTE) is not displaying in the item line grid on the PO header page	Overview: While testing the Not to Exceed changes implemented with Key 1574, it was found that the Not to Exceed column is not displaying in the item line grid on the PO header page. CGI Research: As part of the Not to Exceed changes, this field was added as a column in the requisition header - item grid, but it did not get added to the PO header - item grid. For consistency, this column should be added to the PO header - item grid. Business Impact: Buyer will be unable to see the Not to Exceed value on the PO header page making the PO grid inconsistent with the requisition grid. Changes to be implemented: Update the Item Line grid on the Purchase Order Header to add a column to display the Not to Exceed field. This column will display the Not to Exceed field value when entered on the associated contract item line and should function the same as the column added to the requisition header - item line grid.
2082	Buyers	P2P	Remove Central Receiver from 'Confirm Receipt' and 'Receipt Approved' steps on Receipt workflow	COVA reported this because when the receipt is finalized and in 'approved' status, the workflow displays additional approvers and the receipt gets stuck. CGI Research found that the receipt workflow steps, 'Confirm Receipt' and 'Receipt Approved' have Central Receiver' as the main performer. When the receipt reaches 'Receipt Approved' step and receipt is in 'In progress' status, additional approvers display within the receipt workflow. Business Impact: Receipts shouldn't need any additional approvals. The users are getting notifications and the approval requests are appearing in their pending validations list. Changes to be implemented: Remove Central Receiver as the main performer on 'Confirm Receipt' and 'Receipt Approved' steps on the receipt workflow.
2104	Buyers	P2P	Pcard Indicator firing for Non Pcard Suppliers	COVA found that the PCard message indicator was firing when suppliers do not accept charge cards. Business Impact: The message for PCard usage should only fire when a supplier accepts charge cards. Otherwise, this creates confusion which is not the goal of the commonwealth. CGI Research: We were able to recreate the issue in UAT, showing the message firing when a supplier who does not accept charge cards was added to the requisition. Changes to be implemented with this EBUG: The message will no longer fire when a supplier who does not accept charge cards is put on a requisition.

January 2026 Release Notes (date of release January 23, 2025)

Key	Audience	Components	Summary	Description
2137	Buyers	P2P	While withdrawing a REQ, the information should also be removed from the delegation table.	CGI found while withdrawing a REQ, the information is not being removed from the delegation table. During regular EAI monitoring, it was found that sometimes the existing Delete statement was erroring out due to Foreign Key reference to the Workflow Delegation table (t_wfl_worklist_delegation). *Error Logged during EAI execution*: "The DELETE statement conflicted with the REFERENCE constraint "FK_t_wfl_worklist_delegation_t_wfl_worklist". The conflict occurred in database "ev180prod_buyer", table "dbo.t_wfl_worklist_delegation". The statement has been terminated." EAI: eva_withdraw_requisition STEP: eva_withdraw_requisition_query_dataset Business Impact: Delegations need to be accurate for requisition approval Changes to be implemented: Information should also be removed from the delegation table. * The query used in the EAI Step should be modified to first delete from the Workflow Delegation table (t_wfl_worklist_delegation) then from the Worklist table (t_wfl_worklist). This will resolve the FK reference issue observed.
2159	Buyers	P2P	Disable PO_NEGAMOUNT Alert	Overview: During daily monitoring, we found the PO_NEGAMOUNT alert query is appearing in the top resource-consuming queries, and we noticed an index scan with a high number of reads. CGI Research: As a part of ongoing monitoring, it was identified in the top resource-consuming queries. Business Impact: Timeouts are seen in requisition because of the query taking a while to load. Changes to be implemented: Disable the PO_NEGAMOUNT Alert. This alert is a warning only and not a blocking alert. In reviewing PROD data, 429 orders were found with negative total amount.
2161	Buyers	P2P	My Pending Validations - Update Forwarded On column to show Date and Time.	COVA reported that the Forwarded On column for Pending Validations is not showing correct Date and Time when downloading the table via excel. Business Impact: minor Changes to be Implemented: CGI to implement code fix to update time to UTC-5 to match Validation column EVAR Description: On the Pending Validations screen, the Forwarded column is not in the correct time zone; however, the Validated column is correct. This can be seen when you download the table via excel (see attached). Even though there is no time in the Forwarded column in the UI, this information does show when you download the table in excel. Radford has to put a formula in their Excel document before it is sent to leadership so it shows the correct date/time because it causes an issue where it looks like the item was validated before it was forward to the user to process.

January 2026 Release Notes (date of release January 23, 2025)

Key	Audience	Components	Summary	Description
2155	Catalog	Catalog	Add Market Price and Not to Exceed Columns to Export Current Catalog	Issue: Currently, the Market Price and Not to Exceed Columns are not included in the file when exporting current catalog. Business Impact: If a supplier or contract officer are using this export to update the current catalog, they will not have access to enter Market Price or Not to Exceed. Changes to be implemented: Add Market price and Not to exceed columns in the query for Export Current catalog. This ticket tracks the change for the buyer-side. Key 2208 tracks the supplier-side changes.
2064	Data Warehouse	Contracting	Modified date not updated when subcontractor is added to a contract	The DW team reported that for ctr_id=30867, subcontractor 'TSRC - State of VA' (subc_sub_id=3289) was not extracted into data warehouse. Business impact: When last modified is not set, updates to the contract subcontractor list are not extracted to the DW. This causes inconsistent data between the DW & Ivalua contract record. CGI research: It looks like the subcontractor was added at a later date, after the contract had been extracted into the Data Warehouse. When the subcontractor was added to the contract at a later date, the contract last modified date was not updated. Because the last modified date is not getting updated on the contract when this change is made, the new subcontractor was not extracted into data warehouse. Change needed: When changes are made to the Subcontractor information (tab) in a finalized contract record, update the Last Modified information on the contract record (Last Modified Date, Last Modified By). Subcontractor changes can be made by: a. Adding a new subcontractor: Clicking the Save and Close button on the Manage Subcontractor popup window saved the new subcontractor record. With this action, we need to populate the Last Modified information (Date & By) on the contract record. b. Deleting a subcontractor: Clicking OK on the delete confirmation message updated the subcontractor to deleted status (and removed them from the online grid). With this OK action, we need to populate the Last Modified information (Date & By) on the contract record. Example contract with added & removed subcontractors within Ivalua in a final contract in ST = CTR004555.
2078	Data Warehouse	Contracting	Date on contract price items not updated	Issue: Contract catalog items are not extracted into DIM_CATALOGS table in Data Warehouse. Extract misses some records. This issue was found in conjuntion with the data fix tracked as EVAR-3993. CGI Research: This issue happens when user clones an existing contract. During clone process, new Price List items are created but created and modified dates of the new Price List items remain same as original Price List items which were cloned. Hence, these newly created Price List items are missed by extract query and are not loaded in DW. Business impact: DW is out of sync with Ivalua records. And, the contract price list for the cloned contract does not accurately reflect the date/time the contract price list was created (via the clone/copy contract process). Change needed: When a contract is cloned, set the created and modified date/time information for the newly created Price List items with the date/times the new price list records are created (with the new cloned contract record).

January 2026 Release Notes (date of release January 23, 2025)

Key	Audience	Components	Summary	Description
2139	Data Warehouse	Data Retention / Data Warehouse	Data Warehouse: Add payment address key to FACT_INVHDRS table	Issue 1: The supplier's payment address on an invoice is not stored in DW with invoice data. Add the field PAYMENTADDRESS_KEY to DW table FACT_INVHDRS. This address key value will point to supplier's payment address in DIM_ADDRESSES table. Issue 2: The BILLTO_KEY and SHIPTO_KEY fields on FACT_INVHDRS are not populating with correct value. Modify the logic to populate those key fields with correct value.
2086	Data Warehouse	Data Warehouse / Vendor Portal	Update Pentaho/stageDataForPublicSearch	Issue: In PROD, the Public Search contract (incremental) load fails because there is a contract with values that exceed the limit allowed in the database. When this contract load fails, the entire job is stuck in a failed status and no contracts get loaded. To workaround this, the job now skips this one contract to allow the contract incremental load to complete successfully - updated this job for contracts to use RTRIM(XMLAGG instead of LISTAGG; however, the offending contract record then has to be manually loaded (by CGI). This ticket is being logged to change the contract load process to handle contracts with data sets that result in the longer string of values to prevent the job from failing. PROD contract ID = 'CTR042849'. Business impact: When the job fails due to this issue, contract information does not get loaded to the Transparency-Public Search page. Change to be implemented: The following rundeck job will be updated to better handle large data sets that result in a longer string of values. Rundeck Job: [VendorPortal|http://10.212.31.133:8080/rundeck/project/OPERATIONS/jobs/VendorPortal]/ [+runDataloadForPublicSearch+|http://10.212.31.133:8080/rundeck/project/OPERATIONS/job/show/45c63497-dc96-49b7-a25c-5ad5abf2c3c2] TYPE: CONTRACT Pentaho Job: VendorPortal/RUN_LOAD_CONTRACT_COLLECTION
1988	Data Warehouse	P2P	PO: Allocation percentage NULL	COVA reported Null value for Allocation percentage. EVAR-381 was logged to look at the Ivalua fix needed to prevent null / blank value for Allocation %. Per comment from EVAR 2599, this ticket is addressing the following scenario: *Scenario3:* Null Percentage values (FACT_POACCTLNS): These PO Account Lines have amount of Zero. *Findings:* IV Issue - This is happening since all_percentage field has null value in IV. Its a recurring issue. *EVAR-3817* will address this IV issue. CGI research: Testing recreated issue. On a requisition line with 2 or more allocation lines, the allocation % can be left blank on one of the allocation lines and the requisition can be processed to Ordered status. By not have this field required, the field is allowed to be blank/null which causes the downstream Data Warehouse impact. Business Impact: Affects the Data Warehouse information causing Null percentage values (FACT_POACCTLNS) because Allocation % is left blank/null. Changes to be implemented: Make Allocation % a required field. * It is noted that the initial Allocation line defaults to populated (as 100%) - this is not being changed. * Additionally, when the Allocation % does not total 100%, the 'unbalanced allocation' blocking edit fires - this is not being changed.
2126	Integration	Invoice	Invoice XML showing double lines/allocations	When the XML comes over some invoices have double lines / allocations. ie:INV000257

January 2026 Release Notes (date of release January 23, 2025)

Key	Audience	Components	Summary	Description
2127	Integration	Invoice	Optical Character Reconition (OCR) Invoice: Integration step did not move to the next step after the handshake	COVA reported that Integration for 4 invoices are stuck at the Integration Send step even though the handshake has occurred and the file has been sent to the external ERP. See INV000257. PeopleSoft has manually deleted the extra lines in the invoice record and plans on sending the voucher to Cardinal for payment. The workflow needs to be at the next step to receive the response from ERP after Cardinal decision CGI Research: The workflow got stuck at integration send step. Upon analysis, OCR invoices goes through the standard data capture workflow and then followed by invoice approval workflow. When doing validation, it looks for the current activity and looks in the standard data capture workflow instead invoice approval workflow causing the workflow validation step to fail. Business Impact: Workflow to be able to receive response. Changes to be implemented: Updated the underlying query to pick the latest workflow (Invoice approval workflow).
2192	Integration	Invoice	Invoice: Invoice Integration Response step is failing when invoices are created from OCR	COVA reported that when invoices are created which were submitted from Optical Character Recognition, when it reaches the 'Integration Response' step, it throws an error and invoice is stuck at the 'Integration Response' step. CGI Research: When invoices are loaded through OCR, when the invoice reaches 'Integration Send' step, the validation looks at the OCR workflow rather than the normal invoice approval workflow. With that, since it is unable to find the step in the OCR workflow, the invoice gets stuck and cannot be moved forward to 'Paid' step. Business Impact: Invoices are getting stuck at 'Integration Response' step for invoices created from OCR. Changes to be Implemented: Update the step eva_inv_response_latest_wfl of the EAI (eva_inv_response - Inv Integration Response) to pick the correct workflow object (eva_inv_app_copy). This is a sql query change on the step.
2212	User Managers	User Management	Restrict access to eVA Global Security profile	Description The system allowed the eVA Global Security Internal Profile to be granted to a user by another user who did did not have the correct permission. The way this profile works is that you must have it listed in your account in order to grant it. The eVA Global Security Internal Profile is a powerful restricted Internal Profile that is only granted to the eVA Global Security Team. CGI Research: CGI found that a user with the eVA Administrator profile could assign the eVA Global Security Team profile when creating a new user. Business Impact: People without authorization for the Global Security Internal Profile could end up making unexpected changes to users' access. Changes to be implemented: The user should not have been able to view the profile in the list of Internal Profiles. ONLY Users with "eVA Global Security officer" profile, should be able to see the following internal profiles when assigning profiles to new/existing users. The below 3 are the ones identified with incorrect settings and getting fixed in this ticket. - eVA Global Security officer - Entity Eva Lead - Site Configurator Set the "View Authorization" correctly by assigning the auth "auth_security_admin" to these 3 profiles so they are visible to user that has profile attached to "auth_security_admin" authorization. Only "Administrator" and "Global Security Officer" profile has this authorization associated.