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Objective, Scope, and Approach
Objective and Scope


In accordance with the Statement of Work (SOW), the objective of Deliverables #06 – #16: Monthly Risk Assessment Report, 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.

Within the SOW, the following aspects of ASMP work have been identified for assessment throughout the periods covered by Deliverables #06 – #16 (February 2017 – December 2017):

- Program management
- Organizational change management
- Remediation of legacy cross-system integrations
- Data cleansing and conversion
- Workday test preparation
- Workday test outcomes
- Technical architecture implementation
- Workday delivery assurance checkpoints
- Training preparation and delivery
- Deployment planning and rehearsals
- Deployment execution and post-deployment support
Objective and Scope (continued)

As UT has determined that ASMP will focus solely on the Workday implementation, these reports will continue to also focus on the implementation areas. As stated in previous reports, not all of the areas specified on the previous page will be covered in each monthly report, but rather focus will be on those areas that are most active and relevant during that month, given the state and phase of the project. During this reporting period, the project’s major focus was on the Implementation activities. 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

Within these reporting periods, KPMG will continue to focus on assessing program activities and 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.

In addition to the above areas, the items raised within the previously submitted assessment deliverables (#01, #04, and #06 through #11) will also be re-visited, along with other risks identified by the project team and stakeholders. The deliverable status and project activity items that were components of the Monthly Activity Reports (Deliverables #02 and #03), will also be incorporated within the Monthly Risk Assessment Reports.
Approach

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.
• **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>
</table>
| **Governance and Campus Collaboration** | The decision was made at the end of August to delay the Financials implementation activities in order to launch an initiative to review and re-engineer financial business processes. This decision and initiative were formally communicated by the ASMP Managing Executive Sponsor and UT President. For the immediate future, ASMP will focus solely on the HCM/Payroll implementation activities. The initial response from both the campus community and the project team has been positive, as the focus and emphasis on the HCM/Payroll activities will help ensure a successful implementation. In addition, the campus appears to support and welcome the business process analysis initiative. | It is our opinion that this is a sound option for UT, as it will allow the business to optimize and standardize its processes, and better use the Workday Financial product as a tool to support those processes. It will also provide UT as a whole an opportunity that may not be possible at a later date. The following considerations and recommendations are offered as the initiative progresses:  
• A formal work plan and team will need to be assembled to address the re-engineering initiative. While both projects may be viewed as independent of one another, there may be overlap, and decisions on one project could impact the other. An ASMP liaison should be identified and be actively involved in both projects. This will help ensure that developments on both projects are kept in sync with one another;  
• ASMP project strategies, plans, and processes will need to be reviewed and modified accordingly to address this decision point and sole focus on HCM/Payroll;  
• Resources currently working on the project will need to be realigned. They may potentially fill HCM/Payroll needs, be reassigned to the new business process re-engineering initiative, or perform other UT activities;                                                                 |
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Governance and Campus Collaboration | (Continued from previous page) | • Implementing and conducting UT business in an extended Workday/Legacy environment will need to be further reviewed, impacts and associated risks identified, and plans modified to reflect this new direction and environment;  
• “Ownership” of the Legacy Financial system will need to be identified. The plans for support and maintenance, as well as the extent of customizations made to the system, will need to be determined;  
• UT should continue to drive the enhancements to the Workday product to support its needs. Those needs will be further defined as the re-engineering activities progress. UT should maintain its leadership role in the Workday R1 User Group to accomplish this;  
• Prior to moving forward, UT should get formal commitment from Workday to assist in the process. As the Partner, Workday should be engaged and actively involved in all new strategy, planning, and resource redeployment discussions, as well as activities related to the HCM/Payroll implementation. |
# Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Campus</td>
<td>Significant efforts continue with the leadership of the project to be transparent and engage the campus community in all project activities. Such leadership has built trust and openness for participants to raise questions and address their weak areas, thus creating a positive environment for the rest of the team to support, assist and address deficiencies. The project leadership’s efforts in this regard have created an environment where issues and concerns can be raised and addressed timely.</td>
<td>The project should continue to exercise openness and transparency in order to create and maintain an environment that acknowledges and addresses deficiencies early, before they become issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>The Campus Readiness Director met with the administrative officers to discuss campus readiness and organizational alignment. The presentation and meeting was very effective, and administrative officers appear to be open and enthusiastic about receiving assistance to accomplish upcoming activities to get ready for Workday.</td>
<td>It is critical to continue the positive engagement and support to the campus to accomplish the necessary steps to get ready for the Workday implementation, and post go-live activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings to discuss the go-live date were held with various campus groups, including one-on-one conversations where needed. For the most part, the response from the campus appears to be positive, and even though one date does not fit all, there appears to be consensus and/or understanding that may lead to acceptance of the ultimate go-live date decision when made by executive sponsors.</td>
<td>While significant time has been spent doing so, the project leadership should continue to empower the stakeholders by seeking their input, and continue to provide the information available to support the options.</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>Governance and Campus Collaboration</td>
<td>There is concern within the Steering Committee regarding the lack of control UT will have over the Workday product’s future evolution, should Workday decide to introduce changes to the product that UT is not prepared to implement. Access to preview tenants and regression suites may not provide sufficient time to respond to potential risks.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the project establish a work group to monitor upcoming product changes to evaluate potential adverse effects, both pre and post go-live. Active leadership and engagement in the Workday R1 User Group should continue to gain additional insight into functionality within new releases. A post go-live testing group in sustainment should be maintained to manage testing of ongoing releases. New test cases should be built into the testing suite specifically geared to new functionality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Bridging Subcommittee was formed to review the details of pending integrations, and make recommendations to the Steering Committee. However, items brought to the Subcommittee appear to be discussed, but remain unresolved, with requests for more information, or tabled for a future meeting. Unless items brought to the Subcommittee are addressed in a timely manner, it is possible that bridging integrations will experience further delays.</td>
<td>The team should consider providing detailed information in writing prior to meetings, and request that the Subcommittee members provide potential questions/concerns to the team in writing prior to each meeting, so the team can be prepared to address them during the meetings. If feasible, the team should provide answers to questions in writing prior to the meetings, to ensure that all Subcommittee members come prepared to make decisions during each session.</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>The project sponsored two team-building events in August in an effort to integrate the consulting teams, and provide an opportunity for the team and consultants to get to know each other. Approximately 85 team members participated in both events.</td>
<td>The project should continue to build cohesiveness and maintain positive morale by providing informal opportunities for interaction among project leaders, team members, and consultants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project appears to continue to struggle with the unavailability of dedicated Workday consultants to support the project’s needs. Consultants may not spend an appropriate amount of time on-site, may be required to concurrently serve multiple clients, and may be removed or have their UT hours restricted. Knowledge transfer from existing consultant to new consultant may be inadequate, creating a learning curve when new consultants must come up to speed to understand UT’s environment and configuration needs. If Workday is unable to provide qualified candidates acceptable to UT, the project may face delays, create frustration for the project team when they are compelled to train the consultants and assume their tasks, and ultimately risk additional cost to UT.</td>
<td>The project leadership should continue to work with Workday leadership to ensure that appropriate, high quality consultants are available to the project. When it becomes necessary to remove a consultant, the project should require that both the consultant and the replacement are available for a length of time acceptable to UT to ensure that knowledge transfer takes place. It should be discussed and determined if addressing this risk further at the executive level of Workday is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related to the above observation, the Data Conversion Resource is at risk of being replaced by Workday. The UT team is in active negotiations with Workday on a resolution to this.</td>
<td>The role of the Data Conversion lead is critical to making the remaining tenant builds a repeatable process. Workday needs to provide a skilled and reliable Data Conversion resource that will not be replaced prior to go-live to ensure UT’s success, given that they cannot load their own data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Design confirmation sessions continued in the month of August. These sessions were well planned and presented. The materials were relevant, and the pace of the sessions appropriate, with a good balance between presentation time, effective use of demos to illustrate concepts, and sufficient question/answer time. When controversial topics arose, the presenters and facilitators managed it well. Stakeholders were observed offering constructive suggestions as topics arose from the attendees. In addition, when sessions ended early, attendees had an opportunity for one-on-one conversation with the presenters. The audiovisual technology for livestreaming and recording playbacks of the sessions was clear and appeared to function very well, allowing remote attendees to be present and engaged. The Benefits Work stream seems to have a communication issue between the consultant and the UT Lead. There is concern that the work is not being prioritized and delegated adequately.</td>
<td>As the Design Confirmation Sessions come to a close, the project should ensure that the team follows through on the strategies and plans published (i.e., post responses to outstanding questions, identify and post FAQs, communicate outcomes, document decisions, provide proposed solutions to new requirements, secure sign off by the agreed to deadline). The availability of recorded sessions should be further communicated to the campus participants, and they should be encouraged to view those sessions as refreshers. New campus participants (as well as other team members) should also be required to view the sessions as part of their project orientation. It is critical that the team ensure that there are proper touch points and expectations on both sides regardless of whether the consultant is on-site or offsite. The recommendation from the previous report that the UT Leads/Workday Consultants have a weekly call with a set agenda would help to alleviate this issue across all 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 – People</td>
<td>Academics and specifically the Work Study group appears to have not had the right people involved to date. Decisions are being questioned, and subsequently the design is in question given the previous information provided.</td>
<td>UT has now changed the SME's assigned to this work stream, however it will be important to quickly and accurately get the necessary changes in and reviewed prior to the freeze date for the P6 build.</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>As stated above, meetings with the campus are underway to review the go-live criteria and provide an opportunity for feedback from various campus groups before a go-live date is recommended and ultimately selected. Once an achievable date is selected, it is important to drive all outstanding activities to resolution swiftly to ensure deadlines are met, since there is a risk that further delays will adversely affect the trust and credibility that has been fostered by the new project leadership.</td>
<td>The project leadership should continue to drive the team and stakeholders to reach a go-live date recommendation, and resolve all outstanding decisions so the project can stay on schedule. They should continually review the schedule and mitigate potential delays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further related to decision making, as project activities become more intense, it may become more difficult to meet deadlines, making it even more urgent to drive outstanding decisions to resolution and to give precedence to higher risk issues.</td>
<td>The team needs to continue to aggressively drive pending decisions to resolution, giving precedence to high-risk issues or those that may take longer to resolve; resources should be allocated more strategically to ensure that competing priorities are addressed and ultimately that deadlines are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is concern that resolution of business decisions may be delayed by business owners who may not readily accept the available options and may want to reopen discovery sessions to find alternate solutions.</td>
<td>The project should engage change management/organizational alignment to assist in evaluating campus concerns and reconciling expectations to available options, in order to enable the project team to solidify pending requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As the teams work closely with the campus on outstanding issues, it is important to define and emphasize terms and definitions to minimize ambiguity and ensure that the message is clear (e.g., when referring to business processes, the team should clarify whether it is a UT business process or a Workday business process).</td>
<td>The team should publish a project glossary that defines commonly used terms, and make it available to the project team and campus. As new terms are adopted (e.g., sporadic employment vs. vouchers), incorporate them into the glossary. Internal project terms (e.g., smoke testing vs. unit testing) should also be defined and included.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project Implementation – Process | - There are concerns that many changes may still be required due to changing business processes, a few as a result of the design configuration sessions, etc. In order to meet deadlines, there should be a strong commitment to manage scope creep.  
- There is some concern on the part of business process owners that the capacity to address manual business processes in their units may not be there in view of budget reductions.  
- Project leadership had spent significant time with the business process owners on this topic during the re-set, and there was limited concerns raised by the owners. As the project implementation activities have picked up, and implementation has become more “real”, these issues are becoming more prevalent and significant.  
- Many areas where the system may not have audits or safeguards in place (to prevent errors from moving through the system) are being mitigated with the recommendation that custom reports be created to find the errors quickly. However, it is unclear whether these custom reports are being duly inventoried and the conditions and timing upon which they must be run clearly identified. With over 500 reports already in the inventory, the number of reports that must be created, tested, and deployed may become burdensome. | - It is recommended that the project strive to limit change to must-have functionality at go-live, and create a plan to track and manage additional scope that may be created by requested changes for functionality. The team should identify those that can be delivered post go-live, if possible.  
- The project should ensure that all areas where additional manual processing will be required after go-live are identified early. This will help alleviate business process owners from being surprised, and enable them to devise plans to manage additional workloads where needed.  
- The teams should add reports recommended to mitigate system weaknesses to the reports inventory so that they are not overlooked. They should fully document their description, purpose, and specifications. It should be defined precisely when and under what conditions they must be executed. The reports should be prioritized so that they are developed, tested, and available to campus at go-live. |
### 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>Also related to the absence of existing edits and audits in the legacy system that will not be available in Workday, there is still concern on campus about how to get staff trained with true knowledge and understanding of HR laws, policies, practices and processes that UT staff will need in order to process Workday transactions after go-live.</td>
<td>As part of campus readiness for Workday, the team should work with the central processing units to ensure that the appropriate HR training is provided to campus before (and after) implementation of the Workday product. This activity is incorporated into the project work plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The number of Jira issues related to the P6 build are increasing more than they are currently decreasing – especially in the area of Payroll. This is of concern given the upcoming configuration freeze.</td>
<td>The team should be focused on closing out these issues, and only opening new P6 Jira’s if absolutely necessary to meet the P6 build deadlines (other non-P6 issues should continue to be added to Jira), and thus remain on schedule. Objective guidelines should be put in place for all work streams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It has been noted that many of the outstanding Jira’s are not due to activities being completed, but rather are due to outstanding decisions which need to be made.</td>
<td>The team should ensure that these are being packaged and reviewed with stakeholders in a consistent and efficient manner to expedite any decisions. Sufficient information should be provided in advance to approve these. These should be managed very closely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrations appear to be behind schedule, and it appears that the team may not be able to meet the December deadlines, with an estimate of two additional months needed to complete them. In view of the project’s aggressive timeline, immediate remediation may be needed to prevent an adverse impact to follow-on activities, including unit testing and subsequent testing phases.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the team perform a review of the integration activities as soon as possible to determine if in fact, they are behind schedule. If that is the case, the impact of the overall schedule and dependent activities (e.g., unit testing and all subsequent testing activities, training design and development, etc.) will have to be understood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Project Implementation – Process** | As previously reported, the Decision Log is a key project document and tool. While there has been ongoing dialogue around the decisions and process, the Decision Log continues to be incomplete.  
- Items that have been decided appear to have no outcomes or the outcomes are ambiguous (e.g., the statement “see recommendation” appears in the Outcomes field, but multiple options are presented in the recommendation.  
- The log does not appear to document the date the decision was made and all persons involved in making the decision.  
- The status may not be accurate for all items (e.g., items in progress appear as not started).  
As the number of items logged increases, there is a risk that the metadata surrounding decisions will be lost. | The project should ensure that all information related to project decisions are accurately captured. Decision owners should assume responsibility for the accuracy and of the content. Fields should be added to capture the date the decision was made, and capture everyone involved in making the decision, if not fully defined in the Decision Makers field. |
| | Another key project document is the Business Case. It too has been discussed and drafted, however has not been finalized and approved. | The project should complete the document, submit it for appropriate review, receive approval, and include it with other project documentation. |
# 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>Review of the Integrations tracker indicates there are approximately 257 integrations in scope for UT for the HCM/Payroll roll-out. The tracker still does not indicate priority of these integrations (i.e., High, Medium, Low) or include the first run dates.</td>
<td>As the team finalizes the go-live date over the next month, it will be critical to have these milestones indicated on the overall tracker. This will provide an explicit plan based upon priority of time/date of the first run, impact of not running, etc. It will provide the UT team with an objective methodology for prioritizing these integrations, given the finite set of UT and Workday resources. Since 257+ integrations is such a high number, the team will have to establish a “sliding scale” of priority and dates of first run. If this is not established, the team may not be able to sustain these at go-live.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Status of In-Progress Risk Mitigation Activities
Monthly Observations and Recommendations

As previously reported, a process is being finalized and will be implemented 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 will be presented in this section.

The tracking spreadsheet created by the PMO to manage these risks and the associated activities is currently being finalized, and will be shared with KPMG after it is reviewed with the Managing Executive Sponsor.

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

Meetings Attended

• Project Status Meeting, August 1, 2017
• ASMP-Workday Steering Committee Meeting, August 2, 2017
• Team Workday Consulting Call, August 2, 2017
• Weekly Governance Debrief Call, August 4, 2017
• Design Confirmation Session - Funds Checking Encumbrances, Fringe Costing, and DEFINE Codes, August 7, 2017
• Design Confirmation Session - Decoupled FDM and Costing Allocation, August 7, 2017
• PMO Staff Meeting, August 8, 2017
• Project Status Meeting, August 8, 2017
• Design Confirmation Session - Student Session #1, August 8, 2017
• ASMP-Workday Bridging Discussion Subcommittee Meeting, August 9, 2017
• Payroll Benefits Check-in Meeting, August 9, 2017
• Workday HCM/Payroll Business Process Owners Weekly Touch Base Meeting, August 9, 2017
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

• ASMP-Workday Steering Committee Meeting, August 9, 2017
• ASMP Payroll Team Sync Up Meeting, August 9, 2017
• Engagement Leads Meeting, August 9, 2017
• KPMG Review of July Report Meeting, August 10, 2017
• Benefits Reports Review Meeting, August 10, 2017
• Monthly TXAdmin Lunch Meeting, August 10, 2017
• Near-Term Detailed Work Plan - Payroll/Time/Absence Meeting, August 10, 2017
• Design Confirmation Session - Student Session #2, August 10, 2017
• Weekly Governance Debrief Call, August 11, 2017
• PMO Staff Meeting, August 15, 2017
• Project Status Meeting, August 15, 2017
• Team Workday Consulting Call, August 16, 2017
• Design Confirmation Session - Academic Session #4, August 17, 2017
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

• Engagement Leads Meeting, August 18, 2017
• Project Manager Knowledge Transfer Meeting (Communication Plans), August 18, 2017
• Weekly Governance Debrief Call, August 18, 2017
• Project Status Meeting, August 22, 2017
• KPMG Touch Base Meeting, August 22, 2017
• ASMP-Workday Bridging Discussion Subcommittee Meeting, August 23, 2017
• Workday HCM/Payroll Business Process Owners Weekly Touch Base Meeting, August 23, 2017
• ASMP-Workday Steering Committee Meeting, August 23, 2017
• Team Workday Consulting Call, August 23, 2017
• TXAdmin Go Live Discussion Meeting, August 24, 2017
• UT-Austin Financials Gap/Case Review Meeting, August 25, 2017
• Weekly Governance Debrief Call, August 25, 2017
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

• ASMP Payroll Team Sync Up Meeting, August 25, 2017
• Workday-UT Only Team Meeting, August 29, 2017
• Project Status Meeting, August 29, 2017
• Project Planning Session (Roles, Deadlines, etc.), August 29, 2017
• ASMP Bridging Meeting, August 31, 2017
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Interviews Conducted

- Workday Product Architect, August 16, 2017
Documentation Reviewed
Documentation Reviewed

- ASMP Workday Dashboard Week Ending 20170728, August 1, 2017
- ASMP Steering Committee Packet 8/2/2017, August 1, 2017
- P6 Conversion Status Update 7/28/2017, August 8, 2017
- ASMP Steering Committee Packet 8/9/2017, August 8, 2017
- Workday Go Live Drivers, August 9, 2017
- Deployment Cutover Window v1, August 10, 2017
- Go Live Month by Month v5, August 10, 2017
- P6 Conversion Status Updated 8/11/2017, August 14, 2017
- Minutes of Bridging Subcommittee Meeting, August 17, 2017
- Routing of Stand-Alone Costing Allocation Changes, August 17, 2017
- Proposed Details for Posting Payroll Actuals, August 17, 2017
- HCM/Payroll Staff Life-Cycle Design Confirmation Session #1 Synopsis held 7/25/2017, August 18, 2017
Documentation Reviewed

- HCM/Payroll Staff Life-Cycle Design Confirmation Session #2 Synopsis held 7/26/ 2017, August 18, 2017
- Go Live Decision-Making Process as of 8/9/2017, August 22, 2017
- ASMP-Workday Steering Committee Packet for 8/23/17, August 22, 2017
- Deployment Cutover Window v1, August 24, 2017
- Workday Go Live Date Highlights v2, August 24, 2017
- Bridging Meeting Minutes from 8/24/2107, August 28, 2017
- P6 Conversion Status Report Update of 8/25/2017, August 28, 2017
- Workday Implementation Program Internal Communications Standards and Best Practices, August 28, 2017
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 |
<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 | Pending Approval | • Submitted draft report, September 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, September 21, 2017  
• Pending approval |
<p>| 13 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 11 (September 2017) | 10/05/2017 | In-Progress   | • Monthly activities are in progress. |
| 14 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 12 (October 2017) | 11/05/2017 | Scheduled     |                                                                          |
| 15 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 13 (November 2017) | 12/05/2017 | Scheduled     |                                                                          |
| 16 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 14 (December 2017) | 12/31/2017 | Scheduled     |                                                                          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number/Name</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 – Enterprise Readiness Verification Report</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>• Pending revised implementation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – End to End Testing Completion Report</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>• Pending revised implementation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 – User Acceptance Testing Completion Report</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>• Pending revised implementation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #1</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>• Pending revised implementation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #2</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>• Pending revised implementation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #3</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>• Pending revised implementation plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or entity. Although we endeavor to provide accurate and timely information, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. No one should act on such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation.
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