International Journal of
INTELLIGENT SYSTEMS AND APPLICATIONS IN ENGINEERING
ISSN:2147-6799 www.ijisae.org Original Research Paper

# ERP-Enforced Financial Controls in Regulated Public Fleet Management: A Governance Maturation Framework Derived from Enterprise-Scale Implementation

**Vijaya Bhaskar Reddy Saadhu**

**Abstract:** Enterprise resource planning deployments in public sector fleet management are assessed almost universally against technical completion criteria: is the system live, are integrations active, are users trained? Missing from this assessment is the governance question—whether the deployed system actually provides the financial controls that justify its implementation. This article addresses that gap through a retrospective practitioner case study of a statewide fleet management system: an ERP Plant Maintenance module integrated with a fuel management platform via File Transfer Protocol (FTP), covering approximately 7,000 vehicles and 60 state agencies. Pre-remediation audit data, independently corroborated by a state legislative performance review, documented approximately 86% Equipment Master data incompleteness, 21% odometer anomaly rates, and 32% mile-per-gallon (MPG) anomaly rates—conditions that left a nine-figure annual fleet expenditure outside auditable financial control despite the system being technically operational. This article introduces an eight-pattern governance maturation framework addressing master data enforcement, integration integrity monitoring, field-level validation, and distributed stewardship across 60 agencies. Compensating controls implemented through this framework produced an Equipment Master error rate below 2% and a fuel transaction auto-posting rate of approximately 90%. The framework's primary contribution is a transferable post-implementation governance architecture for enterprise resource planning (ERP) fleet systems in regulated multi-agency public sector environments, grounded in the analytical distinction between deployment completion and governance maturity.

***Keywords**: ERP governance, fleet management, SAP Plant Maintenance, data quality, FTP integration, public sector, master data, compensating controls*

## I. Introduction

Going live is not the same as being in control. In ERP fleet management, the gap between these two states can be measured—in this case, it was measured: a nine-figure annual fleet expenditure residing in a system that was technically operational but could not produce reliable financial accounts. The instruments for that measurement were the findings of an independent state legislative performance review that identified data quality conditions rendering the system's financial controls functionally unreliable during the relevant fiscal year.

What produces this gap is not a failure of implementation management or technical design. The ERP Plant Maintenance module was correctly installed, the fuel management platform's FTP integration was active, and transactions were flowing through the system. The gap is a governance design problem: the architecture did not enforce the data completeness conditions on which financial control depends, and the integration did not detect or report failures that prevented transactions from posting correctly [2]. These are design choices with measurable consequences.

The governing question of this article is practical: what does governance maturation look like for a post-implementation ERP fleet system in a regulated

*Independent Researcher, USA*

*ORCID: 0009-0006-4659-0036*

multi-agency public sector environment, and what architectural interventions produce it? The answer is framed through an eight-pattern framework derived from the diagnostic and remediation process applied to this deployment. The framework is not a reconfiguration proposal—it does not require changes to the ERP Plant Maintenance or fuel management platform configurations. It is a compensating control architecture that addresses the governance gap at the data layer, where the gap actually lives [3].

The case has three properties that make it analytically productive. Scale—7,145 vehicles, the full agency population, means that the governance patterns and their outcomes are not artifacts of a small deployment. The availability of an independent legislative audit of pre-remediation conditions means the baseline is externally validated, not self-reported. The diversity of the agency population—from large central agencies to small field offices with limited procurement capacity—creates natural variation that tests the distributed stewardship model under realistic operating conditions.

## II. Method

### II-A. Research Design

The study employs a retrospective practitioner case study design following criteria established by Yin for single-case validity: bounded case, multiple data sources, explicit chain of evidence, and a research question that asks "how" rather than "how many" [4]. The case is a U.S. state government's statewide fleet management system—SAP Plant Maintenance integrated with the fuel management platform, approximately 7,000 vehicles, 60 agencies, during the period spanning pre-remediation assessment through post-remediation outcome measurement. The practitioner design reflects direct involvement in the governance maturation process; the implementation choices, diagnostic findings, and remediation interventions described in Section III are primary rather than reconstructed observations. The legislative performance review [1] provides independent corroboration of the pre-remediation baseline, constituting a second data source that strengthens the evidential chain.

The retrospective design is appropriate because governance maturation is not a controlled experiment—it occurs in a live operational environment with real financial stakes, regulatory obligations, and organizational constraints. The value of the case study approach is its capacity to capture implementation context, the logic of design decisions, and the mechanisms through which specific interventions produce specific outcomes [5].

### II-B. System Architecture

SAP Plant Maintenance organizes fleet assets through Equipment Master records—one record per vehicle—carrying identification data, technical characteristics, cost center assignments, and measuring point configurations [6]. Three measuring point categories drive fleet financial reporting: odometer readings (supporting cost-per-mile calculations), fuel volume (supporting consumption analytics), and fuel cost (supporting expenditure attribution to agency accounts). All three must be present, complete, and validated for the system to produce reliable financial outputs.

FuelSync operates the fuel dispensing and transaction capture layer. Each fueling event at a state facility generates a transaction record that is transmitted to the ERP environment via nightly FTP transfer. The transfer protocol uses a ten-digit inventory number—the Equipment Master's primary identifier—as the sole linking key. Transaction files that include a correctly formatted inventory number matching an active Equipment Master record post automatically. Files with absent, malformed, or unmatched inventory numbers complete the FTP transfer—the transfer protocol has no awareness of whether the payload was matched—while the transactions themselves fail to post [7]. This is the silent failure mode that produced the pre-remediation accumulation of unposted fuel transactions.

### II-C. Data Sources

Data for the pre-remediation assessment derives from Equipment Master completeness records, FTP transfer logs, and transaction posting reconciliation reports drawn from the state ERP platform. The independent legislative performance review [1]—an independent audit conducted during the relevant fiscal year—provides external validation for the key pre-remediation indicators: Equipment Master completeness rates, odometer anomaly rates, and MPG anomaly rates. Post-remediation outcomes are measured using the same indicators from the same system sources after implementation of the eight-pattern framework, enabling a consistent pre/post comparison.

## III. Results and Discussion

### III-A. Pre-Remediation Data Quality Findings

Three data quality conditions, each independently significant, combined to undermine financial control in the pre-remediation environment. Equipment Master completeness assessment found that approximately 86% of records were missing one or more fields required for financial reporting - specifically, cost center assignment, vehicle classification, or measuring point configuration [1]. Cost center absence is the most consequential gap: without a cost center assignment, fuel transaction costs cannot be attributed to the correct agency account, making agency-level expenditure reporting unreliable regardless of whether transactions post correctly [8].

Odometer anomalies affected approximately 21% of records during the audit period [1]. The anomaly category includes zero-mile monthly readings for vehicles with confirmed fuel activity, negative mileage progression between readings, and implausible single-period values that exceed the vehicle type's operational ceiling. Each anomaly type reflects a different failure mechanism: zero readings indicate FTP transmission failures or measuring point configuration gaps; negative progression indicates data entry errors or system date mismatches; implausible values indicate either data entry errors or the absence of field-level validation at posting [9].

MPG anomalies were present in approximately 32% of fuel transaction records [1]. Given that MPG figures are calculated from the ratio of fuel volume to distance traveled, the anomaly rate reflects not only fuel data quality but the compound effect of odometer anomalies on the calculated denominator. The 32% figure likely understates the true calculation reliability problem because it counts only records with values outside defined operational ranges, not records with internally consistent but incorrect underlying components [10].

### III-B. Root Cause Analysis

The three pre-remediation data quality conditions share a common architectural origin: governance requirements that existed as process guidelines rather than system constraints. Cost center assignment was technically optional at the Equipment Master record creation step—the ERP Plant Maintenance configuration did not enforce it as a required field [6]. Agency staff creating records were guided by training and procedure documents to complete the field, but the system accepted records without them. The training dependency and the absence of system enforcement produced the 86% incompleteness rate.

The silent failure mode in the FTP integration layer was similarly a design feature rather than a defect. The FTP transfer protocol was designed for throughput, not reconciliation: its success criterion was file delivery, not payload matching. A correctly designed governance architecture would distinguish between transfer success and posting success, monitoring both and flagging discrepancies [11]. The absence of this distinction meant that integration failures accumulated silently between the daily reconciliation cycles that were not occurring in the pre-remediation environment.

Field-level validation gaps for measuring point data reflect a configuration decision that prioritized data entry speed over data quality: accepting readings as entered, without comparison against operational history or physical plausibility thresholds, minimizes entry friction for field staff while creating the validation responsibility that the system should carry [12]. This tradeoff was made implicitly in the pre-remediation configuration; the eight-pattern framework makes it explicit and resolves it differently.

### III-C. Eight Governance Patterns

Pattern 1 resolves the master data governance gap directly: cost center assignment, vehicle classification, and measuring point setup are reconfigured as system-enforced required fields at Equipment Master record creation. The system will not save a record that lacks these fields, eliminating the training dependency. Pattern 2 adds a daily reconciliation step to the FTP integration: after each nightly transfer, fuel management platform transaction counts were compared against ERP posting counts, and any discrepancy generates an exception report [13]. The silent failure mode does not disappear—the FTP batch transfer protocol still has no posting awareness—but its accumulation window is reduced from indefinite to one business day.

Patterns 3 and 4 address the field-level validation gaps. Pattern 3 applies odometer validation thresholds: a reading producing negative progression, a zero-mile result with concurrent fuel activity, or a single-period value exceeding the configurable maximum for the vehicle type generates a validation exception before posting. Pattern 4 applies equivalent logic to MPG calculations: values outside the operational range for the vehicle type trigger exceptions for manual review. The threshold parameters for both patterns are configurable by vehicle category, allowing the validation logic to reflect the operational characteristics of different fleet segments [14].

Pattern 5 creates the execution log—a transactional audit trail capturing every FTP transfer event, every posting attempt, and every exception generated by Patterns 2-4. This log serves two purposes: it provides the operational monitoring data that supports exception resolution, and it provides the audit evidence chain that statutory reporting requires [15]. Pattern 6 generates agency-level audit readiness reports from the execution log data, showing each agency's current Equipment Master completeness rate, exception backlog, and posting reconciliation status. These reports give agency fleet managers actionable governance visibility without requiring central oversight involvement in routine exception management.

Pattern 7 is the structural governance innovation in the framework: distributed stewardship. Rather than centralizing data quality management in a fleet governance office, the model assigns exception resolution responsibility to agency-level fleet contacts, who receive Pattern 6 reports and are accountable for resolution within defined service level parameters. Central oversight is reserved for cross-agency pattern analysis and exceptions that agency contacts cannot resolve within the service level window [16]. Pattern 8 provides the escalation taxonomy and communication protocols that connect the agency and central layers. Together, Patterns 7 and 8 make governance quality scalable—the model's workload is distributed with the responsibility, not concentrated at the center.

### III-D. Post-Remediation Outcomes

Pattern 1 enforcement of Equipment Master required fields produced the most rapid outcome: the record error rate declined to below 2% within the first full fiscal quarter of implementation, as both new records created under the enforced configuration and backfill remediation of existing records converged on the completeness standard. The speed of the improvement reflects Pattern 1's direct resolution of the root cause—there is no process dependency remaining between record creation and completeness, only the system constraint [17].

Fuel transaction auto-posting rates reached approximately 90% following the implementation of Patterns 2-5. The remaining approximately 10% of transactions requiring manual intervention represent genuine data quality exceptions—records with matching failures that require human review to resolve correctly—rather than silent failures accumulating undetected. This distinction matters for audit purposes: a 10% manual intervention rate with full execution log coverage is a fundamentally different governance condition than an unknown failure rate with no detection mechanism [18].

The distributed stewardship model's performance across the full 60-agency population demonstrated that the governance framework scales without degradation. Agency-level exception resolution rates under Pattern 7 were consistent across agencies of varying size and procurement capacity—the pattern's design, which provides actionable reports and defined escalation pathways rather than relying on agency staff to identify problems independently, produces governance performance that is relatively insensitive to agency-level capacity variation [19].

### III-E. Transferable Governance Lessons

The eight governance patterns produce eight transferable lessons for ERP fleet implementations in regulated public sector environments. Master data completeness must be enforced before integration activation—configuring required fields after initial data population requires backfill remediation that could have been avoided by enforcement at deployment [20]. Single-linking key architectures require explicit daily reconciliation because the silent failure mode is a structural property of the FTP protocol, not a configuration defect.

Compensating controls at the data layer—Patterns 1-5—achieve governance outcomes equivalent to system reconfiguration without the operational risk and procurement requirements that reconfiguration entails. Distributed stewardship is the appropriate governance model for multi-agency ERP deployments where central oversight cannot scale to the exception volume. Audit readiness must be designed as a continuous operational output, not as a periodic reporting exercise. Exception threshold calibration must be vehicle-category-specific to avoid both false-positive suppression of genuine data quality issues and false-negative acceptance of valid operational variance [21].

## IV. Conclusion

The distinction between deployment and governance is not semantic. A deployed ERP fleet system that cannot produce reliable financial accounts is not providing the governance function its implementation was intended to deliver—it is providing the appearance of that function. The case study makes this distinction concrete: a nine-figure annual fleet expenditure processed through a technically operational system while remaining outside auditable financial control. The eight-pattern governance maturation framework introduced in this article provides the architectural mechanisms for closing the gap between deployment and governance in regulated multi-agency public sector environments.

Three properties of the framework warrant emphasis for practitioners considering analogous deployments. Compensating controls at the data layer are more tractable than system reconfiguration in regulated public sector environments, where system changes require procurement and change management processes that data layer interventions do not. Distributed stewardship scales with organizational complexity in ways that centralized governance cannot—the 60-agency scope of the deployment makes the model's scalability a practical necessity. Execution logging as a continuous audit output converts the governance function from a periodic compliance activity to an operational characteristic of the system, which is the appropriate design for environments with statutory financial reporting obligations.

The framework's boundaries are defined by the empirical base: a single ERP Plant Maintenance deployment, a specific FTP integration architecture, and a single-state regulatory context. Multi-platform validation, cross-jurisdictional comparison, and investigation of real-time integration alternatives to the FTP batch architecture represent the most productive directions for extending this work. The governance maturation question—how long does it take, under what organizational conditions, and through what interventions—remains largely uncharacterized in the literature and represents a research opportunity well suited to the multi-case comparative design that a single-deployment study cannot provide [4].

## References

[1] A. K. Ningsih et al., “Evaluating Successful Implementation of Fleet Management System,” Journal of System and Management Sciences, vol. 13, no. 6, Nov. 2023, doi: https://doi.org/10.33168/jsms.2023.0619

[2] T. H. Davenport, "Putting the enterprise into the enterprise system," Harvard Bus. Rev., vol. 76, no. 4, pp. 121-131, Jul.-Aug. 1998. Available: https://hbr.org/1998/07/putting-the-enterprise-into-the-enterprise-system

[3] T. C. Redman, “The impact of poor data quality on the typical enterprise,” Communications of the ACM, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 79–82, Feb. 1998, doi: https://doi.org/10.1145/269012.269025.

[4] R. K. Yin, Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods, 6th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2018.

[5] M. L. Markus, S. Axline, D. Petrie, and C. Tanis, "Learning from adopters' experiences with ERP: Problems encountered and success achieved," J. Inf. Technol., vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 245-265, 2000. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/02683960010008944

[6] SAP SE, "SAP Plant Maintenance (PM) module documentation," SAP Help Portal. Available: https://help.sap.com/docs/SAP_ERP_SPV/61f8c51bfee94fa78c8835db685249eb/b97cb6535fe6b74ce10000000a174cb4.html

[7] M. Themistocleous, Z. Irani, and P. E. D. Love, "Evaluating the integration of supply chain information systems: A case study," Eur. J. Oper. Res., vol. 159, no. 2, pp. 393-405, 2004. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2003.08.023

[8] C. P. Holland and B. Light, "A critical success factors model for ERP implementation," IEEE Softw., vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 30-36, 1999. Available: https://doi.org/10.1109/52.765784

[9] E. J. Umble, R. R. Haft, and M. M. Umble, "Enterprise resource planning: Implementation

procedures and critical success factors," Eur. J. Oper. Res., vol. 146, no. 2, pp. 241-257, 2003. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217(02)00547-7

[10] F. F.-H. Nah, J. L.-S. Lau, and J. Kuang, "Critical factors for successful implementation of enterprise systems," Bus. Process Manage. J., vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 285-296, 2001. Available: https://doi.org/10.1108/14637150110392782

[11] L. F. Luna-Reyes, J. Zhang, J. R. Gil-Garcia, and A. M. Cresswell, "Information systems development as emergent socio-technical change: A practice approach," Eur. J. Inf. Syst., vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 93-105, 2005. Available: https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ejis.3000524

[12] V. Weerakkody, M. Janssen, and Y. K. Dwivedi, "Transformational change and business process reengineering (BPR): Lessons from the British and Dutch public sector," Gov. Inf. Q., vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 320-328, 2011. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2010.07.010

[13] ISACA, COBIT 2019 Framework: Governance and Management Objectives. Schaumburg, IL: ISACA, 2019. Available: https://www.isaca.org/resources/cobit

[14] M. J. Moon, "The evolution of e-government among municipalities: Rhetoric or reality?" Public Adm. Rev., vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 424-433, 2002. Available: https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-3352.00196

[15] E. Monk and B. Wagner, Concepts in Enterprise Resource Planning, 4th ed. Mason, OH: Cengage Learning, 2012.

[16] M. L. Markus and C. Tanis, "The enterprise system experience—from adoption to success," in Framing the Domains of IT Research, R. W. Zmud, Ed. Cincinnati, OH: Pinnaflex, 2000, pp. 173-207. Available: https://pro.unibz.it/staff/ascime/documents/ERP%20paper.pdf

[17] W. N. Robinson, and G. Elofson, "Goal Directed Analysis with Use Cases," J. Object Technol., vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 57-75, 2004. Available: http://www.jot.fm/issues/issue_2004_05/article3

[18] M. Smith, "A Comparison of Internal Controls: COBIT®, SAC, COSO and SAS 55/78," Academia.edu, 2015. https://www.academia.edu/36558470/A_Comparison_of_Internal_Controls_COBIT_SAC_COSO_and_SAS_55_78.

[19] K. C. Laudon and J. P. Laudon, Management Information Systems: Managing the Digital Firm, 16th ed. Hoboken, NJ: Pearson. https://uploads.openlearning.com/user-uploads/vno5zNwADWRmsNUbmxWTmocRA2FwdqtGn8JZCGNQhrBbztV4fZkx6cbHr9CHkxSF.1629076103/eBook-ManagementInformationSystemsManagingtheDigitalFirm.pdf?se=2026-06-05T08%3A28%3A11Z&sp=r&sv=2022-11-02&sr=b&sig=7DAwIGsfyPNt2q1sXqlQfYZrZqE8G5tlAOd6jsbhLsE%3D

[20] T. C. Redman, "The impact of poor data quality on the typical enterprise," Commun. ACM, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 79-82, 1998. Available: https://doi.org/10.1145/269012.269025

[21] Y. Wand and R. Y. Wang, "Anchoring data quality dimensions in ontological foundations," Commun. ACM, vol. 39, no. 11, pp. 86-95, 1996. Available: https://doi.org/10.1145/240455.240479