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**BATCH TESTING:**

The following jobs test the reporting and compression portion of the TX Retroactive Processing. Basically three parallel Computes are run. The first runs the PPP930 transactions directly through a Compute, providing a basis for comparing the results of Computes affected by this release. The second Compute processes uncompressed transactions out of PPP946; the results should match the first Compute, except for default FAU replacement. The third Compute processes some compressed transaction. Differences will occur, as discussed.

1. **LOADEDB.** Load the test EDB.

2. **LOADCTL.** Load the test DB2 CTL with new messages.

3. **LOADRPG.** Load the test RPG table. This represents the PPPRPG table as it would be after the completion of the PPP930 runs for retroactive processing. The SPUFI list shows the table has dates in the RPG_RRH_DATES. It has initial values in RPG_RRA_LOAD_DATE and RPG_RRA_WRITE_DATE, which indicates that no RA transactions have been loaded into the new PPPRRA table.

4. **PPP250A.** Ran PPP250 to create a PPP2501 report. The Employee Name (EDB 0105) is obtained for the PPPRRA table. The Primary Pay Schedule (EDB 0152) is used to control to which output file PPP946 writes the RA transaction.

5. **COMPUTEA.** Run a Compute with the RA transactions as they are out of PPP930, i.e. without any intervention by the programs being issued in this release.

   The provided intermediate Compute reports, along with the PAR report PPP4401, will provide a base for comparison with subsequent Computes running with data affected by the new programs.

   The six transaction files are listed. The transaction counts including batch headers are 221, 305, 167, 147, 17 and 22, respectively.

6. **LOADEDB.** Reload the EDB.

7. **PPP945A.** Run new program PPP945 with the RA transaction files out of PPP930, starting with Process Sequence 0100. PPP945 creates rows on the new PPPRRA table. SPUFI lists display the resulting PPPRPG and PPPRRA data from each run. The PPPRPG table should show a date in the RPG_RRA_LOAD_RRA date progressively for each Process Sequence as the jobs are run. PPP945 should not be re-runnable in Add mode for any loaded Process Sequence. A rerun should use the Replace mode.

   The SPUFI list of the PPPRRA table shows the rows loaded so far. The RRA_RA_IMAGEs should match the transactions read in. The RRA_PAY_END_DATE, RRA_FAU, RRA_TITLE_CODE, RRA_DOS_CODE and RRA_RATE_CODE columns should correctly
reflect data taken from the transaction data. These separate DB2 columns are required for PPP946 processing. The RRA_EMP_NAME should be correctly taken from the EDB.

ID 000000001 has two transactions with negative values. ID 000050050 has transactions with OTP, OT2 and OT3 DOS Codes.

8. **PPP945B.** Run PPP945 for Process Sequence 0200.

9. **PPP945C.** Run PPP945 for Process Sequence 0300.

10. **PPP945D.** Run PPP945 for Process Sequence 0400.

11. **PPP945E.** Run PPP945 for Process Sequence 0500.

12. **PPP945F.** Run PPP945 for Process Sequence 0600.

An additional SPUFI list in this run shows a count of rows by Employee ID. This can be used to identify the ID’s that are of the most interest in the PPP4401 reports. The count indicates whether or not an ID’s data should be compressed in the PPP946B run below.

13. **PPP946A.** Run new program PPP946 to create both transactions and reports. This run does not have any compression. Therefore, the transaction images will be written out to the transaction files. The results should match the detail from the first Compute, with the exception of the default federal fund FAU.

The PPP9461 report is the control report. The SPEC card is displayed. Confirm that compression was not requested (blank field, see the new Run Specification Record for layout) and that a default federal fund FAU was coded (3777777FEDS55555FUNDSA1).

The number of rows read and reported should match the number of rows on the PPPRRA table. The row count will differ slightly from the original transaction counts due to the batch header records on the table from the input files, and in the output transaction files. There are 6 on the table, and four created; therefore the transaction count total should be two less than the number of rows. Note that only BW and MO files have more than one record since there are no ID’s on the test EDB with a Primary Pay Schedule of MA or SM. Confirm that transactions were written to the appropriate file based on the ID’s Primary Pay Schedule.

The PPP9462 report displays the amounts. There should be an entry for every row on the PPPRRA table that is not a batch header. The report is in Employee ID, Pay End Date, Process Sequence order. You can use the transaction image data in each case to calculate what the amount should be, and confirm that the report is correct. You can also add the
amounts up and confirm the total amounts. These individual and total amounts should be reflected the eventual PPP4401 report.

Federal fund FAU’s are flagged with an asterisk. See ID’s 000050012, 00050016 and 000050900. But note that the original PAR FAU is reported, not the default FAU.

The SPUFI list of the PPRPG table should now show a valid date in the RPG_RRA_WRITE_DATE fields. This keeps future runs of PPP946 from rewriting these rows, unless some exceptional intervention is done to the PPRPG table.

NOTE: In the provided test JCL a final step resets these dates so that PPP946 can be rerun without editing the PPRPG table. That step can be deleted if the actual result is to be retained.

14. COMPUTEB. Run a Compute with the uncompressed transactions in the BW and MO files.

NOTE: since the SPEC card batch number in PPP946 is used in all four output files, and both the BW and MO files are used in this single test Compute run, you must edit the batch number in one file to avoid a duplicate batch number which will trigger a level 5 error in PPP360.

The same Compute reports have been provided. The final results should be the same as for the first COMPUTE A run, aside from default federal FAU, since the transaction images from the PPRRRA rows are written out in non-compress mode and should not differ from the original transactions. Confirm that the RA transactions all showed up and that the individual transaction amounts match. Confirm that the Total Gross matches, Net Pay and Deduction Sum matches, and that other Gross’s match.

There should be one difference, and that is for the federal funded FAU’s. These transactions should contain the default FAU 3777777FEDS55555FUNDSA1 from the PPP946 SPEC card. Per Report PPP9462, see ID’s 000050012, 00050016 and 000050900.

15. LOADEDB. Reload the EDB.

16. PPP946B. Run PPP946 with compression set to 19. This should trigger compression for any employee with greater than 19 rows on the PPRRRA table. This time a default federal fund FAU was not coded.

The PPP9461 report now reflects the compressed transaction counts, which of course no longer match the PPRRRA count.
17. **COMPUTEC.** Run a Compute with the compressed transactions. The same Compute reports have been provided. Due to roundoff, and a few other issues discussed below, the gross and net amounts will not always match exactly. However, in most cases they will, and where differences exist, and the differences should be small. For example, the Total Payroll Gross Pay on the PPP3902 report differs by a total of 9 cents.

For the ID’s with a 19 or less row count on the PPPRA table, nothing should change since they should not be compressed. The individual transaction images should be written out as in COMPUTEB, and should appear in the PPP4401 report. The dollar totals should be the same as in COMPUTEA and COMPUTEB. See ID’s 000050005, 000050006, 000050007, 000050010, 000050011, 000050026, 000050027, 000050052, and 000050072.

For the other ID’s compression should occur based on common ID, FAU, Title Code, DOS Code and Pay Rate Type. In most cases there should not be any difference, except maybe a penny or two. Rounding differences are most likely in hourly pay rate types.

See ID 000000001 as an example that does not differ at all. There are two RA transactions, due to two different FAU’s. The combined gross of the two transactions is $15820.97, which exactly matches the PPP9462 report. The Net Pay, Total Gross and Sum Grosses all match exactly the data on the COMPUTEA PPP4401 report. Another example, ID 000050001, only has one RA transaction because all the compression basis data is the same on all transactions. The transaction amount, $26318.04, matches the PPP9462 report. The Net Pay, Total Gross and Sum Grosses all match exactly the data on the COMPUTEA PPP4401 report.

ID 000050009 is an example of a minor variation. There are two RA transactions, and their amount total equals the PPP9462 report. The Total Gross is the same as on the COMPUTEA run. However, the Deduction Sum differs. See the DCP Bond deduction. This in turn affects the Net Pay. It also affects the FWT Gross and SWT Gross, and they in turn affect the Sum Gross which differs. ID 000050054 is another example of such a minor variation.

ID 000050012 is an example of a compressed hourly rate in which roundoff differences affects the Total Gross itself, which differs. This in turn creates minor differences in the Net Pay and other grosses.

In ID 000050071, however, the difference is more noticeable. The Total Gross only differs by a penny. However the Net Pay differs much more. The difference is triggered by the fact that this employee has PERS retirement, and its rate can be affected by history. Note DE 5524 in New Balances, the 4MO OLD RETR GRS. It is much higher in the compressed run. This is due to the fact that COMPUTEA ran with original Pay End Dates. COMPUTEC ran with a
default Pay End Date taken from the SPEC card. The date was 7/31/97, so the full impact of
the summed amount falls into that single month. The PERS deduction is prior to tax gross
calculation so the FWT and SWT grosses were affected, and therefore their deduction also.
All three affected the Deduction Sum, and it in turn the Net Pay.

ID 000050900 shows two RA transactions with the original federal funded FAU (fund
23000), showing that the default FAU was not coded on the SPEC card. See also 000050012
and 000050016).

ID’s 000050012, 000050050, 000050054, 000050071, 000050105 all had compressed totals
too large for the XC2T transaction field, and thus multiple maximum value transactions were
written along with one containing the remainder.

THIS ENDS THE BATCH TESTING