

# OneView Pros and Cons

Functionality	Current Solution	Pros of OneView Solution	Cons	Alternatives	Pros	Cons
Single Login	Oracle SSO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NIH SSO</li> <li>Single point of entry</li> <li>consistent eRA UI (look and feel)</li> <li>Supports OPDIV integration</li> <li>Uniform Architecture for all applications</li> <li>Distributed Deployment of Shared Modules</li> <li>Better Suited for EA Web Services</li> <li>Facilitates easier and manageable deployments (e.g. easily separate IAR and Commons)</li> <li>Integrates applications based on the user permissions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to integrate all eRA apps</li> <li>User Admin need of Redesign to fully support SSO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue with customized sign on currently in use</li> <li>Use Commons approach to deploy all business functional components together</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>User Admin not on the critical path</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not scalable</li> <li>Security Issues</li> <li>can't do the NIH SSO</li> <li>25 application logins</li> <li>all sep maintained (more expensive)</li> <li>can't have true shared services, each app has to deploy their own shared services, more complex and costly to maintain</li> <li>integration until we do the eRA</li> <li>no central repository</li> <li>no seamless workflow</li> <li>higher cost to maintain sep applications</li> <li>complicated deployment view (applications have to be deploy with each other)</li> <li>loss benefit of cost already expended</li> <li>not meeting promises to users</li> <li>not providing needed services to the users</li> </ul>
Routing	Oracle Workflow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Downstream processing:</li> <li>paperless processing</li> <li>self tracking capabilities</li> <li>monitoring bottlenecks</li> <li>Support different workflows for ICs and OPDIVs</li> <li>Makes the actual applications light weight</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retirement of the Paper Based processes and ease of implementation/conversion to electronic process. Future support for eReceipt downstream processes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>maintain paper process across business areas</li> <li>build custom code and routing workflow solution</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>custom would more closely meet very specific requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>custom solution more expensive than current solution</li> <li>each development contract will be creating their own workflow solution (ex. ACR, GM, Commons, TA)</li> <li>no common infrastructure for routing across business areas</li> <li>not able to satisfy any process variations</li> </ul>

Workload	Worklist and eNotification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>triggering ability to monitor and track electronically rather than paper or other methods (consolidation of methods)</li> <li>provides user workload approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>re-factored eNote not in production yet</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>continue to print out paper and use inconsistent methods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>no culture change</li> <li>less changes to current eNote</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>electronic applications will need to be printed and processed inefficiently</li> <li>counter to the intent of eReceipt</li> <li>doesn't meet the eRA Mission "to electronically capture and manage research related data"</li> <li>requires development effort to revert Development and Test environment to pre One View state</li> </ul>
Org. Hierarchy	VOL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ability for ICs and OPDIVs to maintain their own organizational structures through the eRA systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large requirement and design effort</li> <li>User Admin and IPF Modules should be built out to manage org hierarchies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IC and OPDIV extension systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less cost</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>non consolidated solution built in each IC and OPDIV</li> <li>doesn't meet the DHHS mission to consolidation of Dept processes</li> </ul>