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Objective and Scope

This document is Deliverable #29: Monthly Risk Assessment Report (July 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 the significance of the testing activities to the project’s success, we added individual sections for all testing areas within the April, 2018 report. We are continuing to provide observations and recommendations for those areas within this report, and will do so as applicable within the subsequent reports.
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 – End-to-End, End User, Payroll Parallel, and Performance

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.

Work on Deliverable 18 (End-to-End Testing Completion Report) was also completed during the reporting period. The deliverable was submitted July 6th, and finalized July 18th.
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 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>The Program’s participation in the monthly Dean’s Council meeting continues. During the reporting period, several Colleges and Schools reported that the Deans are going back to their Leads following these meetings, with follow up activities and directives.</td>
<td>This has become a very effective means of communicating, addressing issues, and getting work accomplished within the Academic units. As the drive to go-live continues, this channel should be leveraged to its fullest to help ensure campus readiness is accomplished, especially to those areas that are experiencing the most challenges. Work on the more tactical activities and issues with the campus Leads should continue as is the practice, and critical issues and challenges should be brought to the Deans either collectively or individually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During July, the Change Management Team completed a series of rolling road shows designed to give CSUs an opportunity to experience one or more business processes of their choosing in Workday, thus providing overall exposure to the system in a customized setting. A total of 40 sessions were conducted, ranging in participation from 4 to over 100 users. All in all, almost 1,000 participated. Depending on the chosen topics, sessions averaged approximately one hour, with one Unit requesting two sessions of up to six hours. The presentations were interactive, based on pre-defined templates, but customized to fit the needs of each group. Based on the road shows, units were able to get a clearer understanding of their processes in Workday, and in some cases, were instrumental in allowing their units to reassess prior decisions, such as rethinking role assignments within the units.</td>
<td>While these road shows were very time and resource intensive, they have proved to be very effective and beneficial to the campus. During our previous campus readiness assessments, campus representatives repeatedly had stated that they needed exposure to the Workday system, and these sessions directly addressed those needs. In addition, there continues to be significant outreach to the campus, with individual meetings taking place to address their needs. The Program should continue to engage with users as they are, to empower them to make informed decisions in preparation for Workday. They should remain flexible and supportive, and be able to change direction when the maximum benefit for an activity is reached, and different means of interaction is required.</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>During a recent Steering Committee meeting, the Program requested the Committee to assist them with managing system expectations across the campus. With the increased level of system exposure, and specifically with training starting up in August, more and more users will be experiencing the system first hand, and they will see that some business processes will be changing significantly. Given that, issues and concerns will arise at the user level that will need to be addressed.</td>
<td>The Program is positioned well in addressing campus issues and concerns, and this will also be the case during the training sessions. The Deans have also been briefed on change impacts. Given that Workday is a campus-wide business initiative, it is recommended that the Steering Committee members be both proactive and reactive in realistically addressing the change impacts, and questions and concerns that their staff members raise following the training sessions. They should also work to quickly address any rumors that surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Campus Collaboration</td>
<td>The Program and campus continue to address risks that could adversely affect CSUs or workers at or after go live. For example, there is concern around timesheet management, and that some areas may be significantly behind in submitting or approving timesheets. Unless timesheet submission and approval is brought up-to-date before the implementation, there are risks that special populations may be overpaid, requiring manual intervention to recover the money, or that leave balances or fringes may not be accurate, and employees may not get all their vacation time. In addition, if timesheets are approved at the last minute, there may not be enough time to process them before go-live. With limited time and resources, as well as competing priorities on campus to support operational activities and Workday readiness, CSUs may not have sufficient time to remediate the backlog.</td>
<td>Although the timesheet risk is not the Program’s responsibility, but rather the campus’, it is being raised as it could have an adverse effect if staff lose time, or units may lose money. It has the potential to create a negative perception of Workday if such results occur. Remediation of such situations may require Steering Committee, Executive, and Dean support to ensure this gets addressed prior to go-live. Reports can be used to identify CSUs with timesheet management backlogs. Targeted communications could also be created for at-risk areas describing the impact of non-compliance in Workday. Interim and final deadlines for working the backlog could be created, with an escalation process to follow up with CSUs who fail to comply.</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</td>
<td>Reporting remains a critical area, and one on the campus’ minds. The new Steering Committee Reporting subcommittee held their first meeting during the reporting period, and is now on a regularly schedule meeting cadence.</td>
<td>This is another positive action of the Program. This subcommittee should continue to be leveraged to drive the assurance that all mission critical reports are addressed. Given the significance, interest, and visibility of Reporting, regular updates should be provided by this subcommittee to the larger Steering Committee, as well as other campus governing bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>It appears that attendance at the Steering Committee meetings has been lighter than normal. This may be a result of summer vacations and other competing priorities across campus, however it is raised as a concern given the that go-live is less than 100 days away, and issues and the need for decisions will arise at an increased rate that will need timely actions.</td>
<td>For the Steering Committee as a whole, it is recommended that following the summer vacations, in the September timeframe, that the Managing Executive Sponsor meet again with the Committee as a whole to reinforce the critical importance of the Committee prior and post go-live. The Committee’s ongoing dedication is evident, however, such a discussion may help ensure the needed participation and focus going forward. Such messaging could be coupled with, and follow, a similar joint Executive message from the President, Provost, and Chief Financial Officer. Related to the Executive messages, the Program is planning to provide a Workday demonstration to the President over the next month. This will provide the President with the context of the system as a whole, which will also assist with the effectiveness of the overall messaging. In addition, we also recommend providing a similar demonstration to the Provost. This too will familiarize the Provost with the system, and as a result, assist with the effectiveness and consistency of the joint messaging.</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>The next steps related to the Steering Committee member that was responsible for leading the ERPIT subcommittee is unclear. As previously reported, this individual was an important Committee member, and the subcommittee is critical to the success of the implementation.</td>
<td>Regarding the technical Committee member, given the short timeline between now and go-live, it is most likely not feasible that that position could be filled. The responsibilities of that member should, however, be transferred/transitioned to another individual(s), and the ongoing status be presented to the group.</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>With less than 100 days before the implementation, workloads are increasing, and it is important to take time out to relieve stress and interact in a positive manner. The Program has consistently done a very good job in addressing this, as evidenced during this reporting period when the team came together to enjoy the “Succulent Social”, a unique and creative green activity presented by Human Resources.</td>
<td>This activity was well attended, and enjoyed by all those that participated. Individuals are working very hard, and such activities should continue to relieve pressure and build morale, by coming together for short bursts of activity that reinforce collaboration and build positive relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant sustainment planning has continued during the period. A comprehensive plan has been created for the period of time leading up to go-live, and post go-live, including Organization Framework and Governance, Production Organization, and Command Center and Cutover. These areas are of specific interest to team members as they are looking to understand their roles following go-live. The Leads have been identified for the specific areas, and the related teams are being determined. The Program is being transparent with this process and the status, evidenced by the plan and structure being presented as it stands at the Program Team Meeting during the period.</td>
<td>Identifying the organization structure and the associated Leads was a positive step in defining the overall post go-live organization. The remaining components of the plan, specifically as it relates to the team members, should be fleshed out as soon as possible, as those team members continue to try to understand where they will fit in. The Program has always addressed such matters quickly and effectively, and doing so will remove the associated anxiety, and allow the team members to focus on the critical tasks at hand leading up to go-live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The team continues with its ongoing resource planning as it drives towards the go-live. Additional resources such as deployment team members and “runners” have recently joined team. Existing team members have also been applied to areas needing additional support such as assisting the campus, training, and reporting.</td>
<td>As go-live rapidly approaches, the Program should continue to closely monitor changing needs, and display its flexibility in quickly redeploying resources to areas that need immediate attention.</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>As sustainment planning continues, the project team is also working on making role changes and shifting away from the reliance of consultants over time. Leadership has indicated that this change will occur in a gradual, rolling fashion, to allow for go-live and post go-live needs.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the team continue with this practice as the reliance on consultants will not be a sustainable model. Knowledge transfer is critical, during the change and role shifts, and such knowledge transfer should be specifically called out for each “before and after” role. It will be important to maintain ongoing communication amongst the team in order to stay abreast of any issues that may arise as these organizational changes are made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As testing activities, such as End-to-End Testing and End User Testing, move towards completion, the Program is planning and beginning to shift the allocation of available resources to go-live readiness planning and reporting initiatives.</td>
<td>As the go-live date approaches, the focus on readiness planning cannot be understated. It is a given that issues will occur; as such the Program should continue to monitor resource allocation across the project to determine what resources are best suited for current and up-coming activities. The intention is to be able to take both a flexible and tactical approach or response to critical issues that require an efficient and prompt prioritization and response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Across the campus, several key participants and stakeholders have announced their retirements. These individuals play critical roles in both the overall Program and their respective business areas. Their knowledge and experience is important and will need to be properly transferred and maintained upon their departure. If the transition and appropriate knowledge transfer is not performed in the short-term, there may be negative resulting impacts.</td>
<td>While this is also an area outside of the Program’s responsibility, the impact to the Program is significant. Plans have been made to get through the go-live period, however some departures are planned for shortly thereafter, which could impact the post go-live hypercare and stabilization period. If replacements or backups have not yet been identified, it is critical that they are as soon as possible, to enable the appropriate hand-offs, and transfer of knowledge and responsibility.</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>While the Program is working through the sustainment process, and resulting organization, the campus areas are also considering and planning for the organizational changes that will be needed for them to conduct day-to-day business activities. Staff in those areas will be trained in Workday over the next several months, so they are proficient to carry out the new business processes. As this organizational planning progresses, areas may identify gaps in their organizations, and post positions to fill those gaps. Given that staff in other areas will now be trained in Workday, and may fulfill the requirements for the posted positions, there is a risk that staff may move from one area to another, thus leaving a gap in their current area. This is similar to the situation and risks identified previously surrounding the campus technical resources.</td>
<td>This is also an area that the Program cannot control, however, it could be a risk across campus. Resources with Workday skills will be in demand, both internally and externally, and areas may find themselves competing with one another for those resources. It is recommended that Human Resources work with areas to devise potential processes and incentives to keep resources in their existing areas to help ensure a successful system implementation and stabilization.</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>Considerable deployment planning continued during the reporting period. During the week of July 16, 2018, the initial Tabletop cutover activity sessions occurred, including a detailed review of the cutover plan/checklist. The exercise met its goals of identifying missing processes, more closely defining the communication strategy, identifying gaps in the Program's planned activities, and reviewing the proposed timelines associated with cutover planning. The exercise was well planned and elicited the right level of engagement and collaboration (especially as it was the first such activity), including the identification of 28 action items, and 13 issues that must be decided to support cutover. The participants, comprised of Program team members and campus representatives, has 33 days to follow through on the issues identified before the next tabletop meeting, scheduled for August 21, 2018. This will be the final Tabletop exercise, and will be followed by dress rehearsals, the dates for which are being determined. Pilot training successfully completed during the period; it was a significant effort and positive accomplishment. The formal training commences in August. As previously reported, some members of the campus had stated that they could not finalize their staff’s registration until after role mapping was completed; that activity was completed in July.</td>
<td>It is important that the Program has begun the process of defining the necessary steps across the project, and for CSUs to maintain a stable and successful go-live. Initial sessions provided a barometer of readiness of CSUs and programmatic readiness to move to Workday. As it was noted during Workday Deployment Planning meetings, core activities require further refinement and evaluation, and it is critical that the team ensure that discussions/meetings take place to address all of the identified action items and issues prior to the second Tabletop exercise on August 21, 2018. Holding these meetings in smaller, focused groups may more efficiently assist in determining the necessary steps and granularity of events for each CSU. The larger monthly meetings can then be used to collaborate as an overall team to find commonality, dependencies, or additional steps required across teams for a successful transfer to Workday. Now that role mapping is completed, those campus areas that felt it was a block to registration, should be able to move forward. At this point it is too early to understand that impact on the training schedule, and capacity of the sessions. While registration is the responsibility of the campus, the team should continue to work closely with the campus to ensure those requiring training are registered.</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 a result of cutover and production operational planning, the Program has determined that they will operate a Command Center for the lead up to Workday go-live and post go-live support. This is planned to be operational on October 1, 2018. It was also reported that the Change Management function will be incorporated within the Command Center at that time.</td>
<td>The Program’s plan to implement a Command Center whose primary role is to act as the central hub for Workday related information and decision making of high priority items will serve the Program well. Implementing it a month prior to the go-live will also have it established, and enable the user community to become acclimated to it, prior to the actual go-live. Across Workday go-lives, it is common, and effective practice that a Command Center is created and staffed with decision makers who contain appropriate programmatic Workday knowledge. It is recommended that the Program allocate resources who possess this knowledge, who can quickly prioritize issues, and adapt to the need of end users who are experiencing Workday for the first time. This will enhance the end user experience by having their questions answered or issues solved with minimal hand-offs between help desk personnel. It is also recommended that the Program consider using implementation partners during go-live and during post go-live hypercare periods. This is also a common practice. as well as an experience that customers report as being an essential opportunity for final system handoff.</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 Program plans to provide a full year of support in sustainment to the campus after go-live, or until all business processes are completed in Workday (e.g., deferred reporting, summer assignments, and budgeting). Dedicating resources to maintenance and management of deferred process may effectively mitigate the risks and alleviate campus concerns. During the reporting period, the Program modified the JIRA Testing Tracking Dashboard. After the modification, the Dashboard displays information and data for each testing initiative independently.</td>
<td>The Program should continue to identify sustainment challenges, evaluate risks of first-time processes, and address campus' concerns after deployment. The metrics and analytics generated from the Dashboard provide both an objective measure of the Program’s progress as well as a narrative of pain points, strengths, and concerns. As many aspects of the Program rely on this information, it is recommended to continue organizing testing initiatives separately and independently. This will result in the Program’s ability to (1) effectively communicate progress of each initiative (i.e., End-to-End, End User, Payroll Parallel Testing), and (2) effectively perform an audit of each testing initiative.</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 – Technology</strong></td>
<td>Sustainment planning should include how semiannual Workday releases will be evaluated and tested, or whether/how already released functionality not up-taken by the University (to reduce risk just prior to go-live) will be incorporated, how the new functionality will be communicated to the campus, and how training will be provided where required. UT has planned to implement DUO Two-Factor Authentication (2FA) at the same time as Workday. This is a concern as following go-live, there will be a steady stream of help desk requests that will need to be quickly triaged and addressed. The introduction of 2FA on top of Workday will add another layer of complicated triaging and resolution, as it may not be initially evident if an issue is related to Workday or 2FA. This extra component could therefore add significant workload to a support team that is already expected to have a significant workload with the go-live and the period of hypercare.</td>
<td>It is recommended that sustainment planning include the evaluation, acceptance, testing, and training for additional functionality delivered by Workday in regular releases. While 2FA is a very positive and effective security service to implement, the timing of implementing it with the initial release of Workday carries with it significant risk. The Program should continue to work with ITS to reschedule the 2FA to a more suitable point in time, after Workday hypercare and following a period of system stabilization.</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 | Throughout the month of July, End-to-End Wave 1 Testing continued and completed the few remaining Master and Sub-Scenario tasks among the Academic population. Weekly completion rates are presented below:  
• July 6, 2018 – 99.89  
• July 13, 2018 – 99.89%  
• July 20, 2018 – 100%  
• July 27, 2018 – 100% | The Program has officially closed out a significant portion of End-to-End Testing. Although Wave 1 may have taken longer than expected to complete, the Program remained focused on prioritizing and addressing the complex defects or failures that occurred in testing. |
|                           | The End-to-End Wave 2 Testing effort has also continued through July. At the end of each week, a review of the End-to-End Testing JIRA Dashboard indicated the following percentages of scenario subtasks with either a closed or passed testing status:  
• July 6, 2018 – 93.57% & Total Bugs - 61  
• July 13, 2018 – 95.56% & Total Bugs - 65  
• July 20, 2018 – 95.82% & Total Bugs - 58  
• July 27, 2018 – 98.84% & Total Bugs – 47 | Since the close of End-to-End Wave 2 Testing, the Program has increased the percentage of completed or closed sub tasks from 90% to 98.84%. In addition, the number of defects has dropped from 109 to 47. Overall, the Program continues to process and address the lingering sub tasks and defects from End-to-End Wave 2 Testing. |
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Testing  – End User Testing</td>
<td>Throughout July, the unscripted portion of End User Testing continued across the Staff, Student, Academic, and Non-Employee populations. Final End User Testing sessions occurred on July 31, 2018. Minimal defects and/or concerns have been reported throughout End User Testing.</td>
<td>Overall, End User Testing resulted in minimal defects and user concerns. More importantly, throughout the unscripted module, feedback has continued to yield positive and encouraging results. Testers have reported that after playing a role in End User Testing they are excited for additional Workday training and have a better understanding of Workday functionality. This is especially true of processes and procedures in Workday that are more visible than in the Legacy system. With both the scripted and unscripted modules of End User Testing finalizing, the Program provided users with foundational Workday system skills. This should help those that participated with further understanding as they head into formal training sessions.</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 – Payroll</td>
<td>The second cycle of Payroll Parallel Testing was completed in mid-July. Results were positive for the cycle. For the cycle, 25,507 employees were compared, and demonstrated the following results after true-ups:</td>
<td>The results of the cycle are positive following a true-up of data. Results indicate improvements in data conversion accuracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Testing</td>
<td>• Gross within $1.00 variance – 99.02%</td>
<td>As previously stated, it is recommended that the Program continue to work with the Payroll Parallel Team to understand the impacts of a true-up of payroll data to both the overall gross and net percentages of PPT cycles. This is important to gain a clear understanding of why Legacy and Workday payroll data differ, and how a true-up means to match, reconcile, or tie-tie out balances with the assistance of an adjustment. Mismatches can be due to various factors, such as timing, budgeting, or other errors (i.e., Workday configuration/conversion issues).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Net within $2.00 variance – 94.19%</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 Testing – Performance Testing</strong></td>
<td>Workday performance testing kicked-off at the end of July. A number of integrations, reports, and data staging is required, creating a process that is complex and time consuming.</td>
<td>Over the course of two weeks, the Program plans to complete Workday Performance Testing. Many reports and integrations are dependent on data staging across functional areas. As previously stated, it is recommended the Program echo the prioritization and optimization mindset taken throughout both End-to-End Testing and End User Testing. For example, the Program could take a “bracketing” approach in which a representative sample of reports and integrations fall into complexity categories: high, medium, and low complexity. Here, the Program could extrapolate how data from Workday, upstream, and downstream systems will generally function given this representative sample.</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 – July 2018 project risk activity is presented in the graph below:

![Risk Mitigation Activities Graph](image-url)
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- Weekly Lead Meeting, July 2, 2018
- Workday Deployment Planning Meeting, July 3, 2018
- Change Review Board Meeting, July 3, 2018
- Usability Working Group Meeting, July 3, 2018
- Workday Deployment Planning Meeting, July 5, 2018
- Weekly Lead Meeting, July 9, 2018
- Workday Table Top Dry Run Meeting, July 10, 2018
- Change Review Board Meeting, July 10, 2018
- Program Status Meeting, July 10, 2018
- Workday HCM Unscripted Testing - Staff Meeting, July 11, 2018
- Workday HCM Payroll Business Process Owners Weekly Touch Base Meeting, July 11, 2018
- Workday Steering Committee Meeting, July 11, 2018
Meetings Attended

- UT Workday Management Meeting, July 11, 2018
- Weekly PM Touchpoint Meeting, July 12, 2018
- Weekly Governance Debrief Meeting, July 13, 2018
- Workday Deployment Planning Meeting, July 17, 2018
- Workday HCM Unscripted Testing - Academics, July 17, 2018
- Change Review Board Meeting, July 17, 2018
- EUT - Unscripted Testing, July 17, 2018
- Program Status Meeting, July 17, 2018
- Workday HCM Unscripted Testing, July 18, 2018
- Workday Parallel Payroll Planning Meeting, July 18, 2018
- Workday HCM Payroll Business Process Owners Weekly Touch Base Meeting, July 18, 2018
- UT Workday Management Meeting, July 18, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- KPMG Review of June Report, and End-to-End Testing Completion Report Meeting, July 18, 2018
- Workday Tabletop - Initial Cutover Activities Run Through, Part 2 Meeting, July 19, 2018
- Weekly Governance Debrief Call Meeting, July 20, 2018
- Workday Deployment Planning Meeting, July 24, 2018
- KPMG Touch Base Meeting, July 24, 2018
- Change Review Board Meeting, July 24, 2018
- Program Status Meeting, July 24, 2018
- Director Project Plan Review Meeting, July 24, 2018
- UT Workday Management Meeting, July 25, 2018
- Workday Parallel Payroll Planning Meeting, July 25, 2018
- Workday HCM Payroll Business Process Owners Weekly Touch Base Meeting, July 25, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- Workday Steering Committee Meeting, July 25, 2018
- Workday HCM Unscripted Testing - Staff Meeting, July 26, 2018
- Weekly PM Touchpoint Meeting, July 26, 2018
- Workday Performance Testing Planning Meeting, July 26, 2018
- Workday HCM Unscripted Testing – Open Lab, July 31, 2018
- Workday Management Meeting, July 31, 2018
- Program Team Meeting, July 31, 2018
- Change Review Board Meeting, July 31, 2018
- Weekly PM Touchpoint Meeting, July 31, 2018
- Program Status Meeting, July 31, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Interviews Conducted

- End User Testing Proctor, July 17, 2018
- End User Testing Proctor, July 18, 2018
- Change Management Rolling Roadshows Coordinator, July 25, 2018
- Senior Training Coordinator, July 26, 2018
Documentation Reviewed
Documentation Reviewed

- Workday Steering Committee Packet, July 11 & July 25, 2018
- Steering Committee Testing Report, July 11 & July 25, 2018
- End User Testing Surveys, July 13 & July 27, 2018
- End User Testing Test Scripts, July 13 & July 27, 2018
- Workday Table Top Scope and Expectations, July 13, 2018
- Workday Cutover Table Top Day #1 Presentation, July 16, 2018
- Workday Cutover Table Top Day #2 Presentation, July 19, 2018
- 20180716 Cutover Table Top Meeting Minutes, July 23, 2018
- 20180719 Day 2 Cutover Table Top Meeting Minutes, July 23, 2018
- End User Support at Go-Live and through February, July 25, 2018
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 |
<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, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, February 12, 2018 |
| 17 – Enterprise Readiness Verification Report                    | 9/28/2018 | In-Progress     | • Deliverable activities are in-progress                                                                       |
| 18 – End to End Testing Completion Report                        | 7/06/2018 | Complete        | • Submitted draft report, July 6, 2018  
• Submitted final report, July 18, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, July 27, 2018 |
| 19 – User Acceptance Testing Completion Report                  | 8/10/2018 | Pending Approval| • Submitted draft report, August 10, 2018  
• Submitted final report, August 28, 2018  
• Pending approval                                                  |
| 20 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #1         | 2/15/2018 | Complete        | • Submitted draft report, February 10, 2018  
• Submitted final report, February 13, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, February 28, 2018  
• Presented report to CUBO, March 8, 2018 |
| 21 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #2         | 5/18/2018 | Complete        | • Submitted draft report, May 18, 2018  
• Submitted final report, June 12, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, June 14, 2018  
• Presented report to CUBO, June 21, 2018 |
| 22 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #3         | 9/28/2018 | In-Progress     | • Deliverable activities are in-progress                                                                       |
| 23 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 15 (January 2018)     | 2/05/2018 | Complete        | • Submitted draft report, February 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, February 13, 2018  
• 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 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number/Name</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 17 (March 2018)</td>
<td>4/05/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, April 5, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, April 17, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, April 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 18 (April 2018)</td>
<td>5/05/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, May 4, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, May 8, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, May 10, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 19 (May 2018)</td>
<td>6/05/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, June 5, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, June 19, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, July 2, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 20 (June 2018)</td>
<td>7/05/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, July 5, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, July 18, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, July 27, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 21 (July 2018)</td>
<td>8/05/2018</td>
<td>Pending Approval</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, August 3, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, August 28, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pending approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 22 (August 2018)</td>
<td>9/05/2018</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
<td>• Deliverable activities are in-progress</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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