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Objective, Scope, and Approach
Objective and Scope

This document is Deliverable #26: Monthly Risk Assessment Report (April 2018).

On January 26, 2018, UT issued to KPMG, an Amendment to the original IV&V Statement of Work (SOW). The Amendment exercises two of the three, six month renewal periods specified in the SOW. The Amendment covers the period of January 2018 – December 2018, and identifies twelve new monthly deliverables (Deliverables 23 – 34). Deliverables 17 – 22 from the original SOW will also be created during the renewal period.

An updated, full listing of all of the deliverables is presented in the IV&V Deliverable Status section of this document.

In accordance with the original and amended SOW’s, the objective of the Monthly Risk Assessment Reports, is to monitor program activities on an ongoing basis, anticipating, identifying, reporting, and recommending actions for new risks and issues, and changes to previously identified risks and issues.

During this reporting period, the Program’s major focus continued to be on the Implementation activities. Given the phase of the project, and significance of the testing activities to the project’s success, beginning with this report we have added individual sections for all testing areas. These sections contain initial assessment observations and recommendations for those testing areas. Subsequent reports will continue to include related assessment observations and recommendations.
Objective and Scope (continued)

Therefore, for this report, observations and recommendations have been provided and grouped into the following areas:

- Governance and Campus Collaboration
- Project Implementation – People, Process, and Technology
- Project Testing – Unit, End-to-End, End User, and Payroll Parallel

Within these reporting periods, KPMG will continue to focus on assessing program activities and identifying recommendations for improvement. We will provide independent, objective guidance and experience to help assure the development of the solution is managed in accordance with practices that reduce risk and support achievement of the stated project objectives. Our IV&V methodology will be put into practice during our monitoring activities.
Our approach for the deliverable included assessing the areas under review following KPMG’s IV&V Methodology, a repeatable process for evaluating in-progress implementation activities to determine effectiveness relative to industry standards. The activities that KPMG performed during the monthly assessment included:

- **Met With UT Managing Executive Sponsor**: The objectives, content, and format of the deliverable were discussed and confirmed with the project’s Managing Executive Sponsor.

- **Applied Industry Standards**: Our team applied pertinent industry standards to the observations, which helped guide our team in developing recommendations.

- **Attended Meetings and Conducted Interviews**: During the assessment period, our team attended project meetings and conducted interviews with key project team members and stakeholders in order to understand the status of the project and associated activities. This allowed our team to identify processes that are working well for the project and those that may not be not effective.

- **Assessed Documentation**: KPMG reviewed plans, processes and other documentation. KPMG then reviewed these documents against the identified industry standards and applicable elements of the KPMG IV&V Methodology.

- **Compiled Observations**: The KPMG team compiled observations from our analyses to identify areas of project strength and weakness.
Approach (continued)

- **Developed Recommendations**: Once the strengths and weaknesses were identified and confirmed, our team developed recommended strategies to address the weaknesses and enhance the strengths, taking into account project constraints. Our recommendations were developed with the goal of being achievable and impactful for the project and UT.

- **Reviewed In-Progress Risk Mitigation Activities**: The KPMG team followed-up on the project risks that were previously identified through the IV&V process, project team, and project stakeholders.

- **Created Draft Report**: Upon completion of documenting the observations and recommendations, our team developed the draft report. The draft report went through the internal-KPMG review process, and was submitted to the Managing Executive Sponsor.

- **Created Final Report**: After the report was submitted to the Managing Executive Sponsor, the document was reviewed and discussed, modifications to the document were made based on the review and discussion, and the final report was submitted.
Monthly Observations and Recommendations
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Campus Collaboration</td>
<td>Significant change management outreach activities continue with the campus user community. In addition to the ongoing change management activities, the Program AVP is also meeting with each area to determine outstanding needs and understand issues that may exist. The Program is applying whatever resources are needed to assist areas with their readiness activities.</td>
<td>As these outreach activities are being reported as valuable by the users, the Program should continue with the practice, especially for those areas that are struggling. Areas should be prioritized by need. The associated outreach however can involve significant time and effort, and the Program should closely monitor the work plan so that other critical activities do not suffer or slip, due to time being applied elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Steering Committee’s newly formed ERP IT Subcommittee has created its Charter, and is now meeting as a group. The Subcommittee will ensure that campus technical readiness and downstream systems needs are addressed. To further bridge a potential technical communication gap, the Program is now also conducting a Technical Town Hall to communicate related technical topics and information.</td>
<td>As previously reported, this Subcommittee is a critical readiness element. All identified risks and issues should be promptly communicated to the Steering Committee as a whole, and addressed. A standing agenda item for these items should be considered for the Committee agenda. If nothing needs to be addressed, a brief status should be provided at the meetings. This will help ensure that Committee members are kept abreast of progress, and that they are aware of, and prepared for, potential risks and issues that may be coming to them for discussion and resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This period, further governance planning activities were drafted and confirmed pertaining to stakeholder activities for the forthcoming months. A governance planning calendar was created outlining specific initiatives by stakeholder.</td>
<td>Defining and communicating upcoming campus activities continues to be critical as the project moves towards implementation. Meetings with the various stakeholders should continue to ensure that all planned governance activities are strategically aligned with the campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance and Campus Collaboration</strong></td>
<td>The Workday decision making process is lengthy, with multiple internal and external meetings required to evaluate issues and reach a consensus, and often takes more than a month to gain Steering Committee buy-in. Where there is a policy impact, additional approvals are required by one or more advisory groups (e.g., CUBO, HR Consortium). The last of the pending business decisions are nearing resolution; however, several other open issues regarding campus IT development efforts that intersect with the Program, may also need further attention and decisions to be made. If that is the case, there is a risk of further delays that may adversely affect campus IT readiness. During the month, it was raised several times by members of the CSUs that they are still concerned that the vacated Steering Committee seat will not be filled. Their concern is that their voice needs to be continued to be heard, and they are not comfortable that this will occur with only two CSU members on the Committee, especially if either one or both members is unable to attend a meeting. They also stated that they are concerned that one of the members will be retiring at the end of the calendar year. They further stated that they did not understand the rationale behind the decision to not fill the seat.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Steering Committee expedite the resolution of any pending decisions that are needed by campus IT Leaders requiring interaction with Workday. As stated above, staying abreast of current and upcoming IT activities, as well as potential risks and issues, should help the process further. As the Steering Committee has made the decision to not fill the seat, the Co-Chairs of the Committee should ensure that all CSU needs and concerns continue to be raised and addressed. The existing CSU members should be tasked to be the “voice” of the CSU’s, or the Co-Chairs should further reach out to the CSU’s to identify their areas of concern. It is further recommended that the Co-Chairs communicate the decision rationale to the CSU’s and the approach that they will take to continue addressing CSU needs and concerns. Addressing this promptly will eliminate a distraction that is evident within the CSU community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Implementation – People</strong></td>
<td>The Program has significantly augmented the team by adding qualified resources that have Workday and higher education experience, and the plan is to continue to do so as the drive towards implementation continues.</td>
<td>As plans progress, the Program should continue to monitor the existing make-up of the team, and add appropriate resources as needed. For those existing resources, appropriate back-up should be in-place should a primary resource become unavailable due to personnel matters or shift in focus (e.g., for unanticipated campus support activities). Existing resources should also be assessed to ensure that the planned workload is not too heavy, as unplanned activities will arise and require additional time as the implementation nears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Program is quickly entering a higher-intensity mode, as go-live approaches, and the forthcoming change impacts become more of a reality. A higher level of stress and concern, specifically at the campus-level is being observed and raised by them.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Program communicate with campus community even more so now, and continue to identify potential risk areas that may impact them. Such actions should help alleviate some of the anxiety that is further surfacing. The steady stream of communication should help reduce the need for special unplanned meetings to address negative perceptions due to lack of knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Program is having conversations and strategizing on sustainment initiatives and the future roles for current members of the Program. Leadership meetings have occurred, and will continue, to address this topic. The needs beyond the hyper-care period are being defined in order to better understand the overall change impact, identify roles required, and determine where members of the team will ultimately reside.</td>
<td>These conversations are critical, and Leadership should engage HR and area management in the process, to ensure the change impacts are understood early. Once known, it is important to communicate to the impacted staff, so that they understand their role in the future; this should help reduce their unneeded stress and distractions, as well as eliminate turnover that may otherwise occur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Monthly Observations and Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation – People</td>
<td>Reporting is progressing, however there is a significant amount of work remaining. The campus user community continues to state how important reporting is to them in determining any changes to their processes and organization. Further, they are stating that this information for the most part is still an unknown to them. Currently, the Reporting Lead is managing the overall process, and is also serving in the critical subject matter expert (SME) role.</td>
<td>Moving forward, it is recommended that the Program consider having an additional resource manage the Reporting process and logistics, given the significant number of activities and responsibilities of that team, now and in the future. Adding such a resource would then enable the existing Lead to focus solely on the SME activities, and not need to spend valuable time working on plans, attending status meetings, and performing other administrative activities. This would free up the Lead’s schedule to apply time to the more needed, critical, and value-added report-definition and campus-facing activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Implementation – Process</strong></td>
<td>The Program continues to work diligently on operational readiness activities such as documentation, process mapping, knowledge transfer, cutover and final transition, and communication initiatives with Business Process Owners (BPOs). The Program is efficiently tracking these operational readiness activities via a master BPO checklist. The Program should continue to frequently communicate operational readiness initiatives in an effort to assist the campus to plan for organizational alignment and sustainment. The Program should communicate impacts due to various new business processes in Workday that will potentially have a financial impact or require adding new subject matter resources.</td>
<td>The Program should continue to communicate operational readiness initiatives in an effort to assist the campus to plan for organizational alignment and sustainment. The Program should communicate impacts due to various new business processes in Workday that will potentially have a financial impact or require adding new subject matter resources. The Program should continue to meet with, and maintain ongoing dialogue with, the CSUs, to discuss business requirement processes that will have a change impact in the Workday environment. The cutover checklist should continue to be used in educating the campus when certain transactions will stop in the legacy system, and how the transaction will operate in Workday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Program has been meeting with campus CSUs to ensure that the cutover transition is seamless. The deployment cutover checklist is being used with the campus to work through the process. The Program has significantly improved the campus-wide communications, and this has been recognized by the campus. However, there is still a perception from the campus that the timing of when specific activities will occur has not been clearly communicated to the proper stakeholders, and that the Program is not providing enough information to facilitate their readiness decisions. There may be a perception on the part of the Program that the campus is overwhelmed with information, and that external messages need to be simplified, consolidated, or curtailed.</td>
<td>The Program should continue with targeted communications based on stakeholders' interest and specific roles. It is also recommended that the Program conduct an analysis of the communications to understand campus informational needs. A mechanism for feedback should be created to improve the dissemination and consumption of the Program communications (e.g., a was this information useful? Y/N link) to streamline information by user group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Implementation – Process</strong></td>
<td>The Change Control Board is meeting regularly. Of the 110 change requests presented for consideration, 29% have been implemented, 28% have been approved, and 33% are open or in progress, undergoing the approval process. Only 5% of the requests that have completed the change control process have been rejected. It is unclear whether the team will be able to implement the high number of pending changes, especially with Unit Testing completed, End-to-End Testing already in progress, and a very aggressive schedule in the six months before implementation.</td>
<td>As part of the change control process, the team should assign a severity and priority to approved changes, and ensure that all tasks associated with the change are included in the work plan. Changes should be prioritized based on severity and priority, and those changes with a low impact for implementation, should be considered for deferring post-go live. Regression testing should be built into the process to ensure that additional changes do not affect the verified functionality. In addition, and at this phase of the project, denying change requests should also be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Program has initiated a process to reduce redundancy in the re-evaluation of decisions. Specifically, a RAID log dashboard in JIRA will provide an opportunity to clearly articulate action items, decisions, make appropriate assignments, and provide an anchor to memorialize the who, what, and why of a decision. In other words, tracking action items and associated decisions in this manner, creates an auditable environment that improves ownership and responsibility. The RAID log dashboard will include all known decisions, issues, risks, and action items from the Program Status Meeting, Management, Director Review, and, in time, the Steering Committee.</td>
<td>The Program and associated teams, should embrace the initiation and implementation of the proposed methodology. It will reduce the reliance on email to conduct important business and project related initiatives. A central repository for actions and decisions provides the Program the ability to audit and clarify what actions and decisions are completed, and are in progress. It is recommended for the remainder of the Workday implementation, the Program consistently utilize this repository to audit and assess progress of critical items across the functional, technical, and PM work streams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation – Process</td>
<td>The Training strategy, planning, and development activities continue. As of this period, the training strategy and inventory has been shared with the campus, however the curriculum schedule has not been provided. As a result, the campus stakeholders are stating that they cannot adequately plan for the months ahead. Additionally, the campus has stated that the overall timing of training will conflict with important operational activities throughout campus. They also stated that they need to finalize role mapping to determine who should attend the training. Unlike the current legacy system, Workday is a product that is undergoing constant change, with semi-annual releases that have the potential to change the look and feel of the product, or modify the end user's experience.</td>
<td>The Program should continue to engage users as they are doing. While the unavailability of the schedule is a timing situation, the schedule should be provided as soon as possible. The team should determine if there are conflicts, as is being reported. Additionally, prior to rolling out the schedule to the masses, the team may consider initially working with one group to confirm that it answers all of their questions. This will allow the team to adjust the schedule accordingly prior to submitting it to the campus as a whole. As part of the training effort, it is recommended that the team create the expectation that Workday has the potential to change with each release, which may modify the end user experience, emphasizing flexibility to receive the changes gracefully. As part of sustainment planning, the team should consider the need for an operations Workday administrator and test staff to support evaluating new functionality, deciding whether UT will uptake optional functionality offered in post-go live releases, perform regression and performance testing of existing configurations, and train end users on new features.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Implementation – Process</strong></td>
<td>Issues found during testing may be representative of issues that end users may encounter in their day-to-day activities after go-live. If these issues and respective workarounds are not documented in training modules, job aids, or FAQs, end users who encounter the same issues may not know how to overcome them, thus increasing the support effort, and creating end user frustration and loss of productivity after go-live.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the team document step-by-step workarounds on issues that users may encounter in their day-to-day job execution, and provide them to the training team for compilation into training materials that users can access should they encounter the same or similar situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are ongoing, outstanding business processes outside of Workday that are being addressed, however the campus users continue to raise them as a concern. These include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                             | - AL4/Summer Appointments  
- Pooled Fringe Benefits (communication of how it will be calculated is unclear)  
- Job Costing Solutions  
- Sporadic Employment  
- Overtime  
- Timesheets  
- Mass Transactions  
- I-9s  
- Recruiting (communicate changes) | The Program should provide ongoing progress of these pivotal business processes even if they are not fully finalized or fleshed out. This communication should reduce much of the associated anxiety and concern that the campus has around them. |                                                                                     |
|                             | The Program and the Payroll group continue to make significant progress by working cohesively, and Payroll owning responsibilities to ensure action items get addressed and completed. | This working and results model is one that should be used as an example of the business taking ownership of the business-related aspects of the Program. |                                                                                     |
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation – Process</td>
<td>Reporting continues to be a risk area. While the Program is developing operational reports, the functional team has not adequately tested the developed reports, therefore, the actual status is unclear and difficult to gauge from a readiness standpoint. In addition, the campus continues to state that they have not seen the reports, which continues to concern them.</td>
<td>The Program should continue to monitor the Reporting progress to ensure there are adequate controls in place to stay within the proposed timelines already announced to campus. The Program should continue to meet with campus and explain (or re-explain the remaining activities and timeline). If reports have been completed and passed testing, these should be presented to the Steering Committee and other campus groups and users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation – Technology</td>
<td>As the implementation date gets closer, there is a risk that changes on campus and to campus systems (e.g., HRMS) may adversely affect the Program’s assumptions and plans, especially for integrations that interact with Workday.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Program or Steering Committee ERP IT Committee communicate to campus IT leaders the need to keep the Program apprised of material changes within their units and systems. A mechanism to evaluate those changes for impact to the Program should be devised so that remediation can be completed timely, if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Payroll Parallel Testing (PPT) to occur multiple times, using various methods, and multiple tenants, the Tenant Management Plan is an area of concern; specifically, as the Plan relates to documentation.</td>
<td>The Program maintains multiple documents on SharePoint associated with Tenant Management. As the Program is entering a phase of the project that requires intricate planning, it is recommend that a single Tenant Management Plan is maintained. In addition, the documentation should clearly indicate the timing and activities of each tenant. This will enhance the Program’s ability to clearly communicate the current and future tenant plans as well as assist in defining opportunities to correct or realign activities impacted by tenant availability. The plan should be accurately refreshed to reflect which tenants will be leveraged for PPT. Tenants for areas such as Training should be clearly identified as Demo tenants, and refreshed on a regular basis as appropriate (weekly, bi-weekly, etc.). References to &quot;playground&quot; tenants should be removed to better identify which tenants are owned by which teams, and how they intended to be used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A review of the Tenant Management Plan showed that it is being kept up-to-date, however does not call out the move to WD31 in mid-August.</td>
<td>The team should ensure that WD31 timelines, preview tenants, and any timelines and dates are reflected in the high level plan, project plan, and impacts to parallel testing and training activities have been accounted for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The campus and HR teams are inquiring into what they can do to begin data clean up.</td>
<td>The associated clean up activities should be defined and communicated. For this technical activity, it will be difficult for the Communications team to know the details, so the team will need to work closely with Communications (or in place of) to ensure the details are communicated accurately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Program recently conducted an audit of user access across Workday implementation environments. The audit discovered several users, not a part of the Program, were provisioned access to implementation tenants. As part of a risk mitigation strategy to reduce inappropriate user access, the Program has initiated a standardized approval process in which user access is reviewed and approved by a single leader of the Program.</td>
<td>During implementation, it is essential to have governance of user access. Knowledge of who has access, and more importantly, what level of access to a Workday implementation tenant, provides multiple levels of control. It is recommended that the Program quickly and efficiently adopt this approach. If access is approved for a person outside of the Program, the recommendation is to provide an appropriate level of security for his or her role. As the implementation enters a complex timeline that includes many competing activities, it is recommended that the Program continue to monitor and audit user access. The combination of a continued audit and standard user provisioning approach equips the Program with a proper level of control, governance, and knowledge of who has access to Workday. Ultimately, this will reduce the risk of inadvertent configuration changes by users outside of the Program team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Testing – Unit Testing</td>
<td>Unit Testing still remains an open key milestone item for the Program as of this period. While the majority of Unit Testing scenarios have been tested, passed, and closed out in JIRA, there still remains several Unit Testing items that need immediate attention, from integrations to reporting.</td>
<td>The Program should assign the proper subject matter experts to those ongoing outstanding Unit Testing items and address bottlenecks to find a prompt resolution. Further delay of not addressing outstanding Unit Test scenarios could impact the project downstream.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Testing – End-to-End Testing</td>
<td>In April 2018, the Program officially kicked off End-to-End Testing. This activity is one of many that occur both concurrently and sequentially: Payroll Parallel Testing and End User Testing respectively. The plan for all aforementioned testing will require effective coordination and communication between the campus and Program teams.</td>
<td>Given the complexity of each testing activity when performed separately, it is generally not recommended to perform End-to-End and End User Testing concurrently with Payroll Parallel Testing. Performing complex concurrent testing activities have a series of risks: limited resources, multiple tasks for each resource, and fewer opportunities to correct any project delays. Although the Program understands the inherent complexity of the planned testing protocol, if and when possible, the Program should continue to closely monitor resources, progress, and coordination of impacted teams. As testing activities begin to overlap, it will become imperative to understand how and where testing resources are allocated; what role a resource may play in each testing activity; as well as provide clear expectations of each testing resource. It is recommended that the Program continue to acknowledge the complexity of performing overlapping testing activities and to acknowledge the current and future effort, coordination, and communication of impacted resource teams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Testing – End-to-End Testing</td>
<td>In the first week, End-to-End Testing identified a critical integration error. The error impacted several scenario subtasks that resulted in many testers unable to continue processing his or her cases to completion.</td>
<td>It is inevitable that critical errors occur during a project. This was no exception. However, the Program effectively managed the risk and impact of this error by quickly identifying the cause and involving the proper team for resolution. It is recommended that the Program continue to approach critical testing errors with this level of efficiency. In addition, the Program should continue to recognize issues with impacts to testing with this level of significance. With this support, End-to-End testers can feel confident that they have assistance to allocate resources and have support when requesting additional involvement of the integration team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The first two weeks of End-to-End Testing progressed smoothly and without many blocker issues. When a blocker was identified that critically impacted testing subtasks, the team collaboratively discovered the issue, communicated the need to the appropriate work stream and was able to continue making progress.</td>
<td>In the effort to create a positive and collaborative work environment, it is recommended to continue communicating results in this manner. When considering the amount of time and personal resourcing allocated to, sometimes, multiple completing and complex Program initiatives, constructive and confident communication is especially effective to bolster morale and team confidence, especially during test activities. As the Program continues to make progress, whether towards specific milestones or towards resolving testing bugs, recognition from Program leadership is essential. It creates a common goal, collaborative recognition, and encourages continued individual ownership throughout the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Testing – End-to-End Testing</td>
<td>On April 24th, 2018, End-to-End Testing was declared as being officially behind schedule for Wave 1. As of April 27th, 2018, the Program had Passed or Closed 1063 out of a total 1895 scenario subtasks resulting in a completion rate of 56%. The Program is concerned that completing the remaining 832 will be both complex and challenging by a deadline of May 11, 2018.</td>
<td>The Program has continued to progress towards completing an aggressive number of scenario subtasks for Wave 1 of End-to-End Testing. However, the second half of April 2018 saw the percentage of tests completed decline. During the final weeks of Wave 1, 832 scenario subtasks remain in Open, In Progress, or Failed statuses. Through May 11, 2018, it is recommended that the Program identify what population of scenario subtasks and defect types demonstrate an influx of issues in “awaiting initiation” and or “awaiting validation”. In general, the daily End-to-End Scrum meetings have called out specific areas to address. For example, a number of configuration and integration defects remain unresolved since mid-April. These lingering defects have both delayed and impacted downstream testing subtasks. In the effort to meet the Wave 1 End-to-End Testing timeline, it is also recommended that the Program adopt an approach of “optimization” over a mentality to “fix everything”. An approach of optimization can assist in determining what remaining tasks are essential for an acceptable Workday Payroll environment as well as assist in the ramp up and push to an effective and efficiently completed Wave 1 testing cycle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project Testing \- End-to-End Testing | A review of the End-to-End Testing Jira Dashboard indicated that 1895 total scenario subtasks are planned for Wave 1 testing. At the end of April, 2018, 56% of planned tasks have either passed testing or been placed into a closed status. A completion percentage of Scenario Subtask by population type is as follows:  
- Academics – 42%  
- Non-Employee – 60%  
- Staff – 64%  
- Student – 57%  
In addition, a total of 70 “bugs” have been identified with a majority categorized as Major (60) followed by Critical (7), Minor (2), and Normal (1). | As previously stated, the Program continues to make progress toward an aggressive number of scenario subtasks targeted for completed by May 11, 2018. Although it is important that the Program address as many of the testing scenarios as possible, it is recommended that the Program place greater emphasis to ensure that testing (1) effectively touch all types of population subtasks, (2) identify issues that are impeding the Academic and Student population scenarios, and (3) determine how the 70 outstanding bugs impact testing of each population test type. With this in mind, the Program can determine the “who” and “what” required to have a successful close to Wave 1 testing.  
It is further recommended that the Program examine availability of resources and the time allotted to the remaining tests. More specifically, End-to-End Testing should determine which tester(s) are facing challenges closing out his or her subtests (i.e., those in academics and student test populations) and allocate less challenged resources to assist. At the same time, the Program should prioritize what tasks are essential in testing the Workday environment to consider Wave 1 End-to-End Testing successful. |
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Project Testing – End-to-End Testing** | In End-to-End Testing, conversion data issues were discovered that impacted both compensation and payroll. CSU testers found that position based costing allocations were not converted into the P7 Workday tenant. The specific cause was identified:  
- The conversion of business processes into P7 did not include a configuration step that applies default compensation (i.e., costing allocations) to positions.  
- As noted by the Conversion Team, the conversion file to Workday P7 contained costing allocation data. However, due to the missing business process configuration step, the default compensation was not applied.  
Of concern to the Program, was that the validation of the P7 tenant did not discover this issue until well into End-to-End Testing. | At this stage of the implementation, the discovery of a configuration issue of this magnitude is of concern. It is recommended that the Program continue to place significant emphasis on the validation of both configuration data and worker transactional data with each implementation tenant build.  
As the Program moves into Payroll Parallel and End User Testing, which involved multiple tenants, the importance of validation becomes increasingly significant. As previously stated, P8, P9, and P10 tenant builds overlap with existing testing. Having stable and comparable tenants from both a configuration and data stand point is necessary to obtain meaningful and actionable results for a successful Workday implementation.  
To effectively mitigate further risks, it is recommended that the Program incorporate this learning into future validation efforts for its Functional and Conversion teams. In a final Gold build, correcting data errors resulting from incomplete configuration is both complex and challenging. |
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Testing – End-to-End Testing</td>
<td>During this period, it was observed that the End-to-End Testing JIRA Dashboard metric components have changed. For example, the Planned Execution of Tasks by weeks previously included Open, In Progress, Closed, Passed, and Failed metrics. Throughout the month of April, the same spreadsheet was altered such that specific weeks and both the Closed and Passed metrics were no longer available.</td>
<td>On one side, metrics and associated analytics generated from End-to-End Testing, or any testing activity, provide an objective measure of the Program’s progress. And, on the other, metrics and analytic results provide a narrative of testing concerns, pain points, and strengths. If the End-to-End Testing Dashboard continues to be altered in the presentation of data, the ability to digest and synthesize objective and narrative information is a challenge. As a result, more time may be spent discussing why the presentation of the data is different than discussing the meaning of the data. Consequently, it is recommended that the Program adhere to a stable and structured method to communicate metrics and analytics. This will result in the Program’s ability to effectively communicate End-to-End Testing progress and effectively audit testing activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Project Testing – End User Testing** | CHART review meetings began to outline the plan for End User Testing (EUT). EUT is targeted to begin on June 6, 2018 and will include both scripted and unscripted testing. Although unscripted testing will occur, it was pointed out it will include a structured element. Currently, scripts are being developed, and during testing there will be a 1 proctor to 2 tester ratio. The following goals were outlined:  
- Provide end users with the opportunity to confirm critical business processes work as designed.  
- Provide end users with the opportunity to validate that data converted from HRMS and DEFINE is valid.  
- Provide end users with the opportunity to review and provide feedback on training materials.  

For EUT, the Program has asked several HR staff members to participate in the testing, acting as proctors to oversee testing activities, and address questions that may arise. While this idea in theory seems feasible, if proctors are not well versed in Workday and the testing process, having them involved may actually be counterproductive. | Documentation on SharePoint is already available for scripted testing across Staff, Student, and Faculty. It is recommended that the “structured” unscripted tests begin development and are placed on SharePoint for review and finalization. Further, the EUT goals are well stated and clearly defined.  

With the overlap of Payroll Parallel Testing, End-to-End, and EUT, it is important that EUT continue to stay ahead of planning. This will mitigate risks concerning resource availability, improve clarity of tasks required of process/test owners, as well as allow for proper scheduling alignment.  

It is recommended that the proctor candidates be assessed to determine if they can effectively carry out their responsibilities. Based on that assessment, action plans, if necessary, should be created and executed, to ensure all proctors are ready once the EUT commences. |
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From May through October, 2018, the Program will perform Payroll Parallel Testing (PPT). During this time frame, PPT cycles will overlap with three Workday tenant builds. The specific instances of overlap are listed below:</td>
<td>Throughout PPT cycles, it is common to discover variances between the Legacy and Workday payroll systems. For successful PPT cycles, it is critical that transformational, conversion, configuration, and practice/policy variances are not only documented, but more importantly, that the source of the variance is understood, corrected, and tested.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Project Testing – Payroll Parallel Testing | · PPT1 and P8 Build Overlap  
· PPT2 and P9 Build Overlap  
· PPT3 and P10 Build Overlap | During PPT1, PPT2, and PPT3, the Program will build a new Workday tenant that will overlap with ongoing PPT activities. The overlap of Workday tenant builds during PPT cycles poses a challenge for effective variance resolution and configuration control. For example, if PPT1 determines that a change is required for Workday Payroll configuration, how will the Program ensure that this change is reflected in the ongoing P8 Tenant Build? | 
|      | This strategy has been reviewed by Business Process Owners, the Parallel team, and the Workday Steering Committee. | Given the complexity of a PPT cycle and Workday tenant build overlap, it is recommended that the Program develop a method to prioritize the testing, documentation, and correction of PPT cycle variances that may impact the next tenant build. Prioritizing these PPT activities will assist the conversion team in making extraction, transformation, and mapping logic prior to a build. Addressing these variances while building a tenant are complex and pose a risk to PP2, PPT3, and PPT4 cycles, project timeline, and configuration control between PPT Workday tenants. |
### Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Testing – Payroll Parallel Testing</td>
<td>The Parallel team reviewed the strategy for PPT cycles. As of now, the plan is to extract a snapshot of Legacy Payroll into the PRQUAL environment and to utilize this snapshot for PPT against a Workday Payroll tenant. Members of the team identified a concern regarding keeping PRQUAL in synchronization with Workday tenants. Specifically, the concern centered on what payroll data items were required in both Workday and PRQUAL to effectively perform PPT.</td>
<td>The team continues to take advantage of a weekly Parallel Payroll Planning meeting. As the PPT approach includes Base/Full compares as well as Consecutive/Subset compares, it is recommended the team continue to document and outline what payroll data elements will be under scrutiny for each PPT cycle so that (1) each environment (PRQUAL and Workday) contain comparable data, (2) there is alignment regarding what data elements are being examined in each cycle, and (3) when it is necessary to seed PRQUAL with additional payroll data to examine consecutive/subset PPT populations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Status of In-Progress Risk Mitigation Activities
Monthly Observations and Recommendations

As previously reported, a process has been created by the project team to address risks identified in KPMG’s previous Deliverables #01 and #04 (and subsequent Monthly Reports), as well as risks identified by the project team and project stakeholders. Each month, the metrics related to that process are presented in this section.

A summary of the April 2017 – April 2018 project risk activity is presented in the graph below:
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

• Workday: End-To-End (E2E) Testing Kickoff Meeting, April 2, 2018
• UT Austin - Performance Testing Touchpoint, April 2, 2018
• Weekly Lead Meeting, April 2, 2018
• Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 2, 2018
• Project Status Meeting, April 3, 2018
• Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 3, 2018
• HR and Payroll Technology Readiness Meeting, April 4, 2018
• Workday: Parallel Payroll Planning Meeting, April 4, 2018
• UT Workday Management Meeting, April 4, 2018
• Workday Deployment Planning Meeting, April 4, 2018
• WIP Leads Bi-Monthly Lunch Meeting, April 4, 2018
• Workday Immersion Lab: Basic Navigation 2 - Academic Personnel Services Meeting, April 4, 2018
• Campus Readiness Biweekly Meeting, April 4, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

• Training Work Sessions Meeting, April 4, 2018
• Workday Steering Committee Meeting, April 4, 2018
• Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 4, 2018
• ASMP Payroll Team Sync Up Meeting, April 5, 2018
• Request Form System Upgrade Subgroup Meeting, April 5, 2018
• Items For BPO Milestone Checklists Meeting, April 5, 2018
• Workday Op. Readiness Check-In Meeting, April 5, 2018
• Weekly PM Touchpoint - April-June Meeting, April 5, 2018
• RFS Work Group Meeting, April 5, 2018
• Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 5, 2018
• Pay History Validations Meeting, April 6, 2018
• Weekly Governance Debrief Meeting, April 6, 2018
• Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 6, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- April Town Hall Meeting, April 9, 2018
- Training Status Updates Meeting, April 9, 2018
- Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 9, 2018
- Project Status Meeting, April 10, 2018
- OFA Operational Readiness Meeting, April 10, 2018
- Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 10, 2018
- Workday: Parallel Payroll Planning Meeting, April 11, 2018
- UT Workday Management Meeting, April 11, 2018
- Workday Deployment Planning Meeting, April 11, 2018
- Weekly Lead Meeting, April 11, 2018
- Reporting Kick-Off Invitation Meeting, April 11, 2018
- Directors' Project Plan Review Meeting, April 11, 2018
- HR and Payroll Technology Readiness Meeting, April 11, 2018
Meetings Attended

Meetings Attended

- Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 11, 2018
- Weekly PM Touchpoint - April-June Meeting, April 12, 2018
- RFS Work Group Meeting, April 12, 2018
- Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 12, 2018
- TMP Review Meeting, April 13, 2018
- Weekly Functional/Readiness Check-In Meeting, April 13, 2018
- Weekly Governance Debrief Meeting, April 13, 2018
- Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 13, 2018
- Weekly Lead Meeting, April 16, 2018
- Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 16, 2018
- Project Status Meeting, April 17, 2018
- KPMG Review of March Report Meeting, April 17, 2018
- Workday Program Meeting, April 17, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 17, 2018
- CHART Meeting, April 18, 2018
- Training Work Sessions Meeting, April 18, 2018
- HR and Payroll Technology Readiness Meeting, April 18, 2018
- Workday: Parallel Payroll Planning Meeting, April 18, 2018
- UT Workday Management Meeting, April 18, 2018
- Workday Deployment Planning Meeting, April 18, 2018
- Workday Demo - Employee Self Service Meeting, April 18, 2018
- Workday Steering Committee Meeting , April 18, 2018
- Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 18, 2018
- Weekly PM Touchpoint - April-June Meeting, April 19, 2018
- Campus Readiness Biweekly Meeting, April 19, 2018
- Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 19, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

• Weekly Governance Debrief Meeting, April 20, 2018
• Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 20, 2018
• Weekly Lead Meeting, April 23, 2018
• Training Status Updates Meeting, April 23, 2018
• Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 23, 2018
• Project Status Meeting, April 24, 2018
• Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 24, 2018
• Workday: Parallel Payroll Planning Meeting, April 25, 2018
• UT Workday Management Meeting, April 25, 2018
• Workday Deployment Planning, April 25, 2018
• Weekly Functional/Readiness Check-In Meeting, April 25, 2018
• Human Resources Campus Readiness Debrief with Program AVP Meeting, April 25, 2018
• HR and Payroll Technology Readiness Meeting, April 25, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 25, 2018
- Senior Project Manager Org. Alignment Lead Meeting, April 26, 2018
- Cutover Checklist Meeting, April 26, 2018
- Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 26, 2018
- Governance Planning Meeting, April 27, 2018
- Weekly Governance Debrief Meeting, April 27, 2018
- Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 27, 2018
- Weekly Lead Meeting, April 30, 2018
- Technical Town Hall Meeting, April 30, 2018
- Workday: End-to-End Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, April 30, 2018
- Workday Program Team Meeting, April 30, 2018
- Training Status Updates Meeting, April 30, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Interviews Conducted

• Training Lead, April 24, 2018
• Reporting Lead, April 25, 2018
• Organizational Alignment Lead, April 26, 2018
• Interviews Related to Deliverable 21:
  o CSU – College of Liberal Arts, April 3, 2018
  o CSU – Dell Medical School, April 3, 2018
  o CSU – School of Law (Group 1), April 3, 2018
  o Deployment and Campus Technical Coordination Lead, April 3, 2018
  o Campus Readiness Program Director, April 4, 2018
  o CSU – College of Natural Sciences, April 4, 2018
  o CSU – Moody College of Communications, April 4, 2018
  o ERP IT Leaders (Meeting 1), April 18, 2018
  o AVP, Workday Implementation Program, April 24, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Interviews Conducted

- Interviews Related to Deliverable 21 (continued):
  - Technical and Reporting Program Director, April 24, 2018
  - CPU – Human Resources, April 24, 2018
  - CSU – College of Pharmacy, April 24, 2018
  - CSU – School of Law (Group 2), April 24, 2018
  - CPU – Budget, April 25, 2018
  - Managing Executive Sponsor, April 25, 2018
  - College and Schools Chief Business Officers (TxAdmin), April 26, 2018
  - Vice Presidential Chief Business Officers (VPADMIN), April 26, 2018
Documentation Reviewed
Documentation Reviewed

- Workday Steering Committee Packet, April 4, 2018
- Workday at UT Project Timeline, April 4, 2018
- Workday at UT Implementation Program Status Report 100k Foot View, April 13, 2018
- Overview of Faculty-Specific Changes due to Workday, April 17, 2018
- Workday Steering Committee Packet, April 18, 2018
- Change Default Compensation Guide, April 18, 2018
- Governance Planning Calendar, April 18, 2018
- Outstanding Unit Testing, April 18, 2018
- Workday at UT Project Critical Path Timeline, April 19, 2018
- E2E Testing Traceability Matrix, April 20, 2018
- Tenant Management Plan, April 23, 2018
- Reporting Update Summary, April 30, 2018
- High-Level Cutover Planning, April 30, 2018
- BPO Master Checklist, April 30, 2018
IV&V Deliverable Status
## Project Deliverable Status

The following table provides the list of project deliverables and their respective status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number/Name</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
• Reviewed report with Leadership Team, November 28, 2016  
• Revised report, submitted final report, November 30, 2016  
• Presented report to CUBO, December 1, 2016  
• Received deliverable approval, January 4, 2017 |
| 02 – Initial Monthly Planning Activity Report (November – December 2016)               | 1/05/2017  | Complete | • Submitted draft report, January 4, 2017  
• Submitted final report, January 25, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, January 26, 2017 |
| 03 – Monthly Planning Activity Report (January 2017)                                    | 2/05/2017  | Complete | • Submitted draft report, February 2, 2017  
• Submitted final report, February 8, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, February 14, 2017 |
| 04 – Comprehensive IV&V Assessment Report and Recommendations                          | 1/05/2017  | Complete | • Submitted draft report, January 4, 2017  
• Reviewed report with Leadership Team, January 10, 11, 2017  
• Revised report, submitted revised draft report, January 19, 2017  
• Reviewed report with Leadership Team, January 24, 2017  
• Revised report, submitted revised draft report, January 24, 2017  
• Submitted final report, January 25, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, January 26, 2017 |
| 05 – Comprehensive IV&V Plan                                                           | 1/31/2017  | Complete | • Submitted draft report, January 31, 2017  
• Submitted final report, February 8, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, February 14, 2017 |
| 06 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 4 (February 2017)                           | 3/06/2017  | Complete | • Submitted draft report, March 6, 2017  
• Submitted final report, March 25, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, March 30, 2017 |
### Project Deliverable Status (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number/Name</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 07 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 5 (March 2017)  | 4/05/2017  | Complete | • Submitted draft report, April 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, April 21, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, April 26, 2017 |
| 08 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 6 (April 2017) | 5/05/2017  | Complete | • Submitted draft report, May 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, May 15, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, May 18, 2017 |
| 09 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 7 (May 2017)  | 6/05/2017  | Complete | • Submitted draft report, June 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, June 13, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, June 30, 2017 |
| 10 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 8 (June 2017) | 7/05/2017  | Complete | • Submitted draft report, July 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, July 12, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, July 25, 2017 |
| 11 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 9 (July 2017) | 8/05/2017  | Complete | • Submitted draft report, August 4, 2017  
• Submitted final report, August 10, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, August 17, 2017 |
| 12 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 10 (August 2017)| 9/05/2017  | Complete | • Submitted draft report, September 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, September 21, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, September 25, 2017 |
| 13 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 11 (September 2017)| 10/05/2017 | Complete | • Submitted draft report, October 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, October 13, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, October 25, 2017 |
| 14 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 12 (October 2017)| 11/05/2017 | Complete | • Submitted draft report, November 3, 2017  
• Submitted final report, November 14, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, November 16, 2017 |
| 15 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 13 (November 2017)| 12/05/2017 | Complete | • Submitted draft report, December 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, December 18, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, January 3, 2018 |
### Project Deliverable Status (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number/Name</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 14 (December 2017) | 1/05/2018  | Complete  | • Submitted draft report, January 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, January 26, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, February 12, 2018 |
| 17 – Enterprise Readiness Verification Report                 | 9/28/2018  | Scheduled |                                                                                                                                           |
| 18 – End to End Testing Completion Report                    | 6/15/2018  | In-Progress | • Deliverable activities are in progress                                                                                               |
| 19 – User Acceptance Testing Completion Report               | 7/20/2018  | Scheduled | • Planning in-progress                                                                                                                  |
| 20 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #1      | 2/15/2018  | Complete  | • Submitted draft report, February 10, 2018  
• Submitted final report, February 13, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, February 28, 2018  
• Presented report to CUBO, March 8, 2018 |
| 21 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #2      | 5/18/2018  | In-Progress | • Deliverable activities are in progress                                                                                               |
| 22 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #3      | 8/17/2018  | Scheduled |                                                                                                                                           |
| 23 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 15 (January 2018) | 2/05/2018  | Complete  | • Submitted draft report, February 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, February 13, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, February 28, 2018 |
| 24 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 16 (February 2018) | 3/05/2018  | Complete  | • Submitted draft report, March 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, March 19, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, March 26, 2018 |
| 25 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 17 (March 2018)   | 4/05/2018  | Complete  | • Submitted draft report, April 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, April 17, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, April 26, 2018 |

*Note: The above table represents a continuation of the project deliverable status, detailing the due dates, statuses, and comments for various project deliverables.*
## Project Deliverable Status (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number/Name</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 18 (April 2018)</td>
<td>5/05/2018</td>
<td>Pending Approval</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, May 4, 2018&lt;br&gt;• Submitted final report, May 8, 2018&lt;br&gt;• Pending approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 19 (May 2018)</td>
<td>6/05/2018</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
<td>• Deliverable activities are in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 20 (June 2018)</td>
<td>7/05/2018</td>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 21 (July 2018)</td>
<td>8/05/2018</td>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 22 (August 2018)</td>
<td>9/05/2018</td>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 23 (September 2018)</td>
<td>10/05/2018</td>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 24 (October 2018)</td>
<td>11/05/2018</td>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 25 (November 2018)</td>
<td>12/05/2018</td>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 26 (December 2018)</td>
<td>12/31/2018</td>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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