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Objective, Scope, and Approach
Objective and Scope

This document is Deliverable #16: Monthly Risk Assessment Report (December 2017).

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 continued to be 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.

Work on Deliverable 20 (Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #1) has also commenced during this reporting period. The deliverable is expected to be completed in February.
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>
</table>
| Governance and Campus       | Following the December 13, 2017 Steering Committee meeting, the members met with the Managing Executive Sponsor as a checkpoint. The meeting was facilitated by the Committee Co-Leads, and was emotionally charged. A number of issues and concerns from the members perspective were expressed. In summary, these included:  
  • Members are not steering, and member input is not being heard nor considered.  
  • Issues and concerns are not being addressed.  
  • All members are not being communicated to in a consistent manner.  
  • A campus needs assessment was never conducted.  
  • There is not adequate time to review project items.  
  • A recommended staffing plan has not been provided.  

Following the meeting, the Co-Leads were going to document the discussion points, identify associated action items, and then send those to the Managing Executive Sponsor.  

While the meeting was intense, the Co-Leads effectively ran the meeting, and demonstrated positive leadership by discussing the members’ issues and concerns in a professional, non-emotional nor confrontational manner. | Once the Co-Leads provide the meeting documentation to the Managing Executive Sponsor, the content should quickly be discussed with the Co-Leads, and then the Committee as a whole.  

The overall charter and guiding principles of the Committee and members should be reviewed again in the short-term with the group as a whole. This project governing body (and their positive leadership) is critical to the overall project’s success, and any outstanding issues need to be addressed quickly. Further changes to the Committee membership should be considered if necessary.  

Thus far it has been observed that the Program team has brought project status, decision points, and issues to the Committee in a timely manner, and solicits their input. If Committee members feel that they are not getting adequate information nor feel that their voices or opinions are not being heard or considered, they must raise that and ensure it is addressed. If members are aware of issues or need to have something addressed at a meeting, they should submit those to the Co-Leads.  

One Committee member suggested they revisit their list of open items. This should take place, and be augmented with other issues, such as those identified in the meeting. A disposition for all should be identified and action plans performed. Identifying specific, rather than anecdotal, items is key. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Campus Collaboration</td>
<td>The Project Work Plan was presented and approved by the Steering Committee and CUBO. With an aggressive timeline and pivotal decisions still to be made, it is critical that the Steering Committee stay abreast of the plan and status, to help guard against schedule slippage, and mitigate the risks of falling behind on upcoming milestones.</td>
<td>The Steering Committee should ensure that the Program adheres to the published schedule. Regular checkpoints should be conducted to assess overall progress, and eliminate potential “road blocks”. The project should continue to communicate the deadlines and milestones both externally and internally to the team at the task level to ensure that everyone is aware of his or her part in meeting the objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Program continues to lack support from the Provost Office and Academic Deans. Given that the project is only ten months from go-live, this lack of support is now considered to be a high risk to the project’s success. Campus confusion over prioritization and focus, can quickly become detrimental to them carrying out required tasks, as well as negatively impact their readiness.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the President influence the Provost and Academic Deans to perpetuate throughout campus, unconditional support to the Program as it continues to reach milestones and nears the go-live date. This should be addressed during the month of January as the campus leadership and support will directly correlate to the success of the Program, and successful carrying out their business post go-live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Following the holiday break, the Program will need to have all stakeholders and participants engaged in the project’s day-to-day activities, to ensure that they are positioned to drive towards the November implementation date. At the end of the reporting period, Academic Personnel Services was the only group that did not have a participant(s) embedded in the Program. This absence of critical faculty-related business expertise poses a significant risk to achieving a successful implementation.</td>
<td>The Program has been reaching out to Academic Personnel Services repeatedly to gain this participation, however have been told that resources are not available due to the volume of day-to-day business activities. Both the Program and Academic Personnel Services collectively need to determine how to fill this gap, as this critical business expertise is needed for decision making and project activities. Note: Following the holiday break, the group has begun to contribute resources, although they are not embedded like other areas. As a result, this must still be monitored and addressed as a significant risk.</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>Prior to the Managing Executive Sponsor meeting with the Steering Committee members, a Committee member aired strong concerns regarding the service request/ticketing solution. While this topic has been discussed and documented, there remains a “disconnect” between some Committee members and the project leadership. The members strongly feel that the campus has not had visibility into the proposed solution. As a result, this remains a high risk area.</td>
<td>This area should continue to be driven to conclusion as a high priority; it should be included as one of the action items the Committee is creating. The write-up that was included in the last Committee meeting packet should be reviewed as the starting point. A diagram depicting how the process would work should be discussed with all Committee members. If possible, a product demonstration should also be conducted. As a result, it should be able to be determined if the solution is viable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation – People</td>
<td>The new Deputy Director of the Workday Program became fully engaged during this reporting period. He is effectively providing the needed added value of his experience with Workday implementations, specifically within the Higher Education environments. He is contributing the tools, processes, and best practices that have proven effective on other implementations. His participation appears to be valuable in driving the day-to-day project activities, which allows the Director to focus on the strategic aspects of the Program.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Program continue to engage the Deputy Director with all project planning and day-to-day activities, in order to keep the Leads focused on their areas, as well as continue to allow the Director to focus on the critical strategic activities. Continuing to bring the benefit of his experience in identifying and resolving Program issues is necessary as a contributing factor to a successful implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Following the holiday break, the team is well positioned for the drive to the November implementation, and is showing strong flexibility. As an example, the Program Enablement team has been reforming in order to better serve the entire Program team. Roles and responsibilities of team members have been redefined to best utilize their skills and experience.</td>
<td>The Program should continue to be active in realigning team members as the project needs change, to best utilize the skills, experience, and talent of project resources. Leadership should encourage team members to remain nimble and be open to new responsibilities as the needs of the project change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the reporting period, a risk related to knowledge of the background check logic was identified. There appears to be only one team member with knowledge of this area, and they are out on leave, thus postponing it until some time in January.</td>
<td>The background check logic was reported to be very complex. When the individual with this knowledge returns, they may be inundated with other work responsibilities, thus postponing this further. Key, complex areas such as these should be identified, and knowledge transfer/coverage plans be created accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A new project manager has been assigned to the Change Management area. He will be responsible for coordinating and managing area activities.</td>
<td>This is a positive and key addition to the team. With the project manager focusing on day-to-day activities, the Lead will be able to address the strategic needs.</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 make positive progress towards the November go-live date, by finalizing the “living” project plan with definitive milestones. As stated above, the plan was approved by the Steering Committee this period. Another critical planning tool developed was the resource plan. The team continues to establish deployment training sessions, working demo labs, and readiness documentation to ensure campus work streams are ready for the proposed November go-live date.</td>
<td>The tools needed to manage the activities through implementation are now all in place. Specifically, the resource plan is very effective and addresses the critical aspect of campus resources and the timing of their involvement. These tools now only need to be maintained and communicated to all stakeholders. While the Program continues to establish readiness initiatives as it pertains to deployment, documentation, and end-to-end user training, it is essential that the Program make the campus aware of these initiatives. There is a notion with some across campus that visibility has not been provided for these initiatives by the Program. As a result, it is causing a “disconnect” when in reality there are such initiatives in place to ensure success of the Program and campus. The ongoing communications will help counter these sentiments. The upcoming Town Hall event is a very good venue to provide further visibility into these activities, and boost campus confidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Program has made significant improvements addressing the Job Costing allocations issue by creating the strategic job costing allocation working group. This is a risk area that has been raised in previous monthly reports.</td>
<td>The Program should continue to work internally with the workgroup to resolve associated issues, and externally with peer Universities to determine courses of action taken when the Workday product does not provide the needed functionality. The progress and results should regularly be communicated to the Steering Committee to reassure confidence that requirements will be met.</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 – Process</strong></td>
<td>Unit Testing continued to be a major project activity and focus during the reporting period. While significant progress has been made, Wave 2 Unit testing is behind schedule, with two work streams (Work Study and Student Enrollment) in a Red status, and the remainder in a Yellow status. A number of test scripts were moved from Wave 1 to Wave 2, and the timeframe dedicated to Wave 2 testing is very aggressive. If Unit Testing is not completed within the schedule, execution of End-to-End testing may be delayed.</td>
<td>The program should continue to make Unit Testing the critical project priority. To help keep team members focused, meeting attendance should be minimized to essential meetings only. Non-essential staff should be released from attending meetings, and include only those whose participation is required to meet the meeting’s objectives. The Lessons Learned process should continue, and subsequent testing activities be honed based on results of that process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A risk area has been identified pertaining to the feasibility of meeting the Wave 2 deadline given the volume of open test scenarios versus the number of resources assigned, and thus having to push test scenarios not completed to Wave 3. The Program has been allocating more subject matter resources as team moves into Wave 2 of Unit Testing to help mitigate this risk.</td>
<td>The addition of resources is a positive strategy to meet the defined milestones, and should continue based on the ongoing test results monitoring. The Program should strive to complete Unit Testing strong to ensure End-to-End testing is ready. End-to-End Testing preparation sessions should be conducted to avoid running into the same constraints that were found in Unit Testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Program has asked for consultants to be responsible for defects found during Unit Testing. The team is looking for a more efficient way to manage changes and the impacts throughout the system and functional areas. This strategy will help the Program identify those defects that need to be addressed from a configuration standpoint or defects that need to go through the change control process.</td>
<td>The Program should clarify this process early in January, and provide insight to team members. Also, there should be conversations to address past defects and the process of managing all the changes within the Master tenant.</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>During this period of Wave 2 Unit Testing, there are changes coming out of the defect resolution process that have been identified as risk areas. There is potential that these changes to cause impacts to other work-streams.</td>
<td>The Program should identify all defects found during Unit Testing, and assign them to the respective functional consultant for prompt resolution. It is further recommended that consultants start attending the standing Unit Testing scrum meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting continues to be an area of angst within the Steering Committee and user community. Their overall perspective is that they do not know what they will or will not get within the system, nor what is available to them.</td>
<td>The Program should regularly present the reports inventory, associated metrics, priority, and overall status to the Steering Committee, and campus stakeholders. The Program should identify reports within the inventory that have been configured and are ready for testing during the Unit Testing waves. The Program should also present Workday report examples, and identify pros and cons to prepare the campus for any related nuances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>While the Reporting team has discussed multiple times the Operational, Institutional, and Campus Readiness reporting strategy, reports continue to be one of those areas that creates emotion and distraction. As the campus feels the reports are key to their day-to-day activities, their anxiety will continue to grow until they gain a full understanding of this area.</td>
<td>The Reporting Team should be monitored to determine other resources that are needed to ensure the success of this work stream. While the Reporting Team has a strong command of the UT reports, the Program should consider adding additional resources with Workday report expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many decisions are being made on the Project, but these decisions may not be formally memorialized in the Decision Log. It appears that the Decision Log was last updated on August 30, 2017. Also, 14 historical records with a status of “Decided” do not reflect the outcome of the decision; and decision makers for several In Process decisions have not been identified.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Program decisions be well documented in the Decision Log. All fields should be populated to maintain a full record of the decisions, including the outcome of the decision, the decision makers, and the stakeholders affected by the decision.</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</strong>&lt;br&gt; <strong>– Process</strong></td>
<td>As the Workday implementation draws nearer, there is some apprehension and concern on campus surrounding their readiness to carry out day-to-day business functions effectively and efficiently in the new system.</td>
<td>To address current campus concerns and anxiety, the following recommendations are offered for consideration:&lt;br&gt;- The program should continue to provide positive and informative communication. Areas with less Program involvement should be targeted to provide opportunities for them to become familiar with the system.&lt;br&gt;- The positive changes the system will bring should be further marketed (but not over-marketed), and campus concerns addressed as clearly and directly as possible.&lt;br&gt;- Expectations should be managed by creating transparency that all will not be perfect at the outset.&lt;br&gt;- Consistent communications should be promoted by educating internal team members about campus concerns, and ensure that they understand the unified message approved by the Program leadership.&lt;br&gt;The additional KPMG Readiness Assessment (Deliverable 20) is underway, and is focusing on these campus readiness areas. A separate assessment report is scheduled for submission in February.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation</td>
<td>The UT Data Conversion team continues to make positive progress in conjunction with the Workday Data Conversion team regarding P6b &amp; P6c iterative builds.</td>
<td>The Program should continue work through and hone the conversion process with the Workday team to ensure all files reload successfully, and timelines continue to be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Technology</td>
<td>A potential parallel payroll testing risk was identified regarding the timing of WD31 and new rates effective as of September 1, 2018.</td>
<td>This risk should continue to be monitored. As time progresses, the tenant build will be faster. Parallel runs should continue, and be run as frequent as possible, as the team will learn more with each run. The project plan should be assessed to determine any potential impacts.</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 – December project risk activity is presented in the graph below:
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- Weekly Governance Debrief Meeting, December 1, 2017
- Unit Test Meeting, December 1, 2017
- Unit Testing Wave 1 - Lessons Learned Meeting, December 4, 2017
- CHART Team Meeting, December 6, 2017
- Workday HCM Payroll Business Process Owners Weekly Meeting, December 6, 2017
- Unit Test Meeting, December 6, 2017
- Team Workday Consulting Meeting, December 6, 2017
- Workday Bridging Meeting, December 7, 2017
- Payroll Application Disposition (Part 2) Meeting, December 7, 2017
- Weekly Governance Debrief Meeting, December 8, 2017
- Unit Test Meeting, December 8, 2017
- Unit Test Meeting, December 11, 2017
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- Workday Program Team Monthly Meeting, December 12, 2017
- ASMP-Workday Bridging Discussion Subcommittee Meeting, December 13, 2017
- Workday Steering Committee Meeting, December 13, 2017
- Unit Test Meeting, December 13, 2017
- Team Workday Consulting Meeting, December 13, 2017
- ASMP Payroll Team Sync Up Meeting, December 14, 2017
- TMP Review Meeting, December 14, 2017
- Weekly Governance Debrief Meeting, December 15, 2017
- Unit Test Meeting, December 15, 2017
- Unit Test Meeting, December 18, 2017
- Functional Lead Check-In Meeting, December 18, 2017
- Job Costing Solutions Working Group Meeting, December 18, 2017
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- Continue EICCC Discussion Meeting, December 18, 2017
- Unit Test Meeting, December 20, 2017
- UT: Team Workday Consulting Meeting, December 20, 2017
- ASMP Payroll Team Sync Up Meeting, December 21, 2017
- Workday Bridging Meeting, December 21, 2017
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Interviews Conducted

• Reporting Lead, December 5, 2017
• Interviews related to Deliverable 20:
  o College and Schools Chief Business Officers (TxAdmin) – Group, December 7, 2017
  o College and Schools Chief Business Officers (TxAdmin) – Steering Committee Members, December 7, 2017
  o AVP, Workday Implementation Program, December 12, 2017
  o Managing Executive Sponsor, December 12, 2017
  o Campus Readiness Program Director, December 13, 2017
  o CSU – College of Liberal Arts, December 14, 2017
  o Technical and Reporting Program Director, December 14, 2017
  o CSU – Housing and Food Services, December 20, 2017
Documentation Reviewed
Documentation Reviewed

- Change Impact List, December 5, 2017
- Converting Non-Exempt Employees to Hourly, December 5, 2017
- Design Confirmation RACI, December 6, 2017
- RACI Security Acceptance Model, December 6, 2017
- “Plan for When Heather is Out: January – March”, December 6, 2017
- Workday Steering Committee Packet for 12/13/2017 Meeting, December 12, 2017
- Employee/Independent Contractor Classification Checklist (EICCC), December 19, 2017
- Deliverable – AL1 Solution Recommendation draft 3.0.docx, December 21, 2017
- Steering Committee Charter, December 21, 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 | 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 |
<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  | Pending Approval  | • Submitted draft report, January 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, January 26, 2017  
• Pending approval                                                                     |
| 17 – Enterprise Readiness Verification Report                                         | TBD        | Pending           | • Pending revised implementation plan                                                              |
| 18 – End to End Testing Completion Report                                             | TBD        | Pending           | • Pending revised implementation plan                                                              |
| 19 – User Acceptance Testing Completion Report                                        | TBD        | Pending           | • Pending revised implementation plan                                                              |
| 20 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #1                                | 2/28/2018  | In-Progress       | • Deliverable activities are in progress                                                            |
| 21 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #2                                | TBD        | Pending           | • Pending revised implementation plan                                                              |
| 22 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #3                                | TBD        | Pending           | • Pending revised implementation plan                                                              |
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