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Objective, Scope, and Approach
Objective and Scope

This document is Deliverable #28: Monthly Risk Assessment Report (June 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 21 (Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #2) was also completed during the reporting period. The deliverable was submitted May 18th, and finalized June 12th.
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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Campus Collaboration</td>
<td>During the period, the Program’s Executive Managing Sponsor and Associate Vice President (AVP) continued to attend the Dean’s Council Meeting. The Leadership has been presenting an agenda of current Program activities, as well engaging the Deans in discussion around any areas that are pertinent or of a concern to them. This month, system change impacts and student employment were discussed with the Deans.</td>
<td>As previously reported, attending and presenting at this meeting is a critical Program activity. Providing status, and discussing needs and concerns directly with the Dean’s enables the Program to directly address those topics in a timely manner, and helps prevent rumors from spreading, which would then take considerable time to address. As the drive towards go-live continues, these meetings should consistently be attended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Steering Committee member responsible for leading the ERPIT subcommittee, has relinquished his role on the Committee, and has accepted and started another position within the University. This individual provided a key technical perspective to the Committee, and was the champion of pending IT decisions that must be made in order for the campus to prepare for Workday. Addressing the outstanding campus technical needs remains critical, and with only four months until go-live, there is a risk of loss of continuity and disruption unless effective leadership of the group is present to drive imminent progress toward resolution of these items.</td>
<td>The Steering Committee needs to determine quickly if the Committee seat will be filled. Regarding the campus IT needs, it is critical that the Steering Committee and Program raise visibility and drive toward resolution of the outstanding decisions that will impact the campus’ ability to get their systems ready for Workday. The Program has always been very effective in proactively addressing organizational and responsibility matters, and when changes occur. To this end, they have transferred the Committee members’ campus technical responsibilities to a Program Lead. In addition, the Program is considering adding additional project management and administrative assistance. The process and meeting cadence that has been established for this area should continue, and the list of open campus items be discussed with the Steering Committee so that the status of disposition of each item is understood.</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>A new Steering Committee subcommittee is being established as a governing body to confirm that campus reports that are needed for go-live are developed and available. The subcommittee will partner with the Program to monitor and prioritize campus reporting needs. The subcommittee Charter has been created, membership will be comprised of representatives from a variety of units, and they will be meeting twice a month to address reporting concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is another positive step being taken to address a critical component of the system implementation and campus concern. Related activities, status, and open issues should be monitored closely by both the Steering Committee and Program. It is recommended that a standing agenda item should be added to the future Steering Committee meetings to discuss this area. The same is recommended for the previously discussed ERPIT items.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>During the reset, the expectation was set that Business Process Owners and Business Officers would need to confirm their readiness for Workday and participate in the decision to go live. As the go-live date approaches, there is a risk that campus units may become anxious and question their readiness based on sentiment. In order to support the campus in making a readiness determination, the Program has been developing a checklist of quantitative measurements to confirm whether their perceptions are grounded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Program should continue to encourage the campus to own their readiness self-assessments, helping them where possible to gain a better understanding of the product so they can identify areas where an effective workaround may be needed, and to ensure business continuity. Empirical data should be provided to support readiness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration between the Program and the campus has been positive as everyone comes together to resolve remaining issues. However, if decisions coming out of the effort result in changes that require additional effort, there may not be sufficient time or resources to address them, either by the Program or the campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As is the practice, the Program should continue to communicate early and often. Updates should be provided regularly, especially when changes of direction take place. When developing a solution that benefits the Program, the team should carefully consider the ripple effect on campus of the recommended actions.</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>Governance and Campus Collaboration</td>
<td>The latest Town Hall event was held during the reporting period. It was a very comprehensive event, with topics covered including go-live details, timeline (including in-progress activities), vacation and time-off planning, preparing for Workday, new guidance, cutover transition schedule, training update, reporting demonstration, etc. Campus representatives presented much of the content. The event was attended in-person, and through the streaming service. It is our understanding that for some areas around campus, groups of users gathered together in conference rooms to watch the presentations.</td>
<td>The presentations and content were very good. All of the areas covered corresponded directly to the knowledge gaps that were identified by the user community when we conducted our campus readiness assessments. While these topics were covered, we did not observe many questions being raised by those that attended. In addition, at the conclusion of the event, topics for future events were solicited, and none were provided. Given that, it is recommended that the Steering Committee strongly encourage campus leaders to have their staff attend and actively participate in in all future events, as the topics they are asking for are being addressed. Similar messaging should also be provided to all governing bodies including the Deans. To further support the user community, Program leadership raised the idea of potentially having a Program representative be present with those areas remotely attending events as a group. Such an action is positive, and should be pursued to encourage user dialogue and address concerns specific to them. In addition, the Program should continue to get campus feedback, and have campus staff give presentations at all future events. This will further the campus’ system understanding, address their specific needs, and continue to further the campus areas taking ownership of the implementation.</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>With the onset of summer, Program team members and consulting resources are planning their respective time off. In order to proactively monitor and manage this, the team has created a detailed Onsite/Offsite and Out-of-Office Calendar. This lists all individual’s time-off and out-of-office time through the end of the calendar year. This topic was also discussed with the user community at the June Town Hall event.</td>
<td>This proactive planning is very important, and all team members should ensure that their time-off is accurately reflected on the calendar. Team burnout on these types of projects is always a concern, and such planning will ensure that all team members can take off their needed time, and return able to focus as the go-live approaches. This advanced notice and planning should help the leads ensure that there is coverage while various team members are out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program and campus leadership continues to meet to discuss organizational sustainment. An ongoing assessment of how resource changes affect Program operations, and what the probable implications may be as key resources change roles or reach retirement, also continues.</td>
<td>These areas will remain critical over the next several months. The Program should continue to monitor and be mindful of changes as resources shift or reach retirement status, and address those changes accordingly. Furthermore, the team will need to continue to work on messaging and effectively communicate which roles may or may not continue, and allow individuals to prepare for the change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A new team member has joined to address system usability areas. Their focus will be on notifications/alerts, help text, validation messages, etc.</td>
<td>This is a key addition to the team, and their cross-functional, holistic approach will address the user needs. The individual should attend whatever user-facing activities are possible (including outreach events, End User Testing sessions, training, etc.) to be close to the types of content the users need as they navigate through the system.</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 has documented and published workflows for the major HCM, Time, Absence, and Payroll business processes. The workflows will assist the campus with their organizational alignment by providing an understanding of common business processes in Workday. Sixteen workflows have been created and were made available to the campus via the Workday website in mid-June. The Program plans to develop and publish additional workflows for the less common business processes.</td>
<td>Workflows are another area that the campus users were requesting, and are now available. While this has been communicated out to the campus, it should be reemphasized in future communications, dialogues, and at upcoming events. The Program should continue to be responsive to campus needs and concerns by providing information needed to support organizational alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was known that the job costing area would be complex, and it has been watched closely. The difficulty was further proven during recent testing with end users. With the assistance of Business Process Owners, the Program is evaluating the issues and making recommendations for addressing them, including handling complex cases centrally or recommending that only cost center managers handle complex cases. While some of these issues may have surfaced during testing efforts in April, at which time they were deemed to be training issues, the true impact to the campus was not evident until experienced by the end users. The Program plans to revisit the design, and determine if changes are necessary and what training is needed, etc. The University of Washington was contacted to discuss their solution further.</td>
<td>The Program should continue to review the solution, and look for contingency processing methods to alleviate the impact of the job costing allocations solution on campus. Using issues found in testing should be considered as a stepping-stone for developing focused training for end users. As this is a highly visible area, and it will be difficult to provide a solution that will work as users are used to, the Program should continue to provide frequent progress updates and communicate outstanding items to alleviate concerns across the campus.</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 –</td>
<td>Significant change management, outreach, and support activities continue. Change impacts are being discussed, and the reality of those changes continues to take hold within the user community. As would be expected, concerns continue, and the Program is working through those with the users. The Program has been doing a very good job of managing change requests, and setting the expectation that with the new system, there will be an ongoing steady stream of change.</td>
<td>The Program should continue to keep its close touch with the user community as they work through the changes. There has been a considerable decrease in changes coming through the process, which is positive. This will need to be closely managed as End User Testing progresses, and training commences, as the hands-on activities will raise more questions and potential requests. The “ongoing change” message should continue, and also be reiterated at each training session so users know that change will be the new norm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Another area that has consistently been inquired about by the campus is system deployment. The Program has been actively planning for this, including the table top exercise, which was presented several times during this reporting period. The overall objective of the exercise is to work through all of the planning and steps needed leading up to the Workday cutover. The first exercise is planned for the week of July 9th. Specific focus and activities are planned for each day of that week. A list of participants for the exercise has been identified.</td>
<td>This is a critical activity, and it is important that the right resources be present during the sessions. There may be scheduling conflicts as multiple concurrent activities are scheduled for that week, including payroll parallel testing, and End User Testing. The table top exercise will have to be coordinated with those activities. Any related information should be provided to the participants prior to the sessions so they can prepare ahead of time. It will be important to build the appropriate contingency plans during this process and assess how many resources will be needed for future activities and the actual go-live. At the end of these exercises, it is also recommended that a formal lessons learned session be conducted by all participants, and it be documented accordingly.</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></td>
<td>As training registration is underway, several training-related concerns were raised during the reporting period by various groups. The first area surrounds the training registration being based on the February role mapping, and the feeling that that is outdated. It was expressed that they were anticipating revising the role mapping in May, however that will now occur in July. The concern is around that process will change the responsibilities, and thus who will attend which training session. There is concern that this could be a broad issue. Additional concerns surround the campus availability during the time training is planned due to work activities and vacations, and their ability to perform their day-to-day activities. The Program is working through these concerns, and seeking ways to make training options and methods available which would be as least disruptive as possible.</td>
<td>Given the go-live date, the training needs to occur according to plan. The Program should continue to work through the concerns and potential scheduling conflicts with the users, to ensure full attendance. Prior to revising the role mapping, and as there will always be changes and exceptions, the users should schedule those staff members where there is already knowledge or high likelihood that an individual will be in a specific role or roles. Users should also be taking advantage of the many other activities such as the End User Testing, Town Halls, roadshows, etc. to gain additional awareness and background prior to formal training. Those able to attend can also report back to their areas and help others get further acclimated.</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>Work on the service request and ticketing system continues. A group of CSU’s worked through the scope, and work on the related forms, security, and workflows are in-progress. The user community has acknowledged the results of the work, and expressed their appreciation of the team’s efforts.</td>
<td>This continues to be positive, especially since it was a very controversial and emotional topic earlier on in the project. The potential resource conflicts that may occur as work progresses should continue to be monitored and managed closely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An area of continued uncertainty and nervousness relates to how reports, integrations, and benefits push to payroll, and ensuring that the correct information is then sent to the State.</td>
<td>The Program continues to monitor and address this area. Ongoing dialogue and communication should continue as testing progresses, and the associated processes are further fleshed out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If a technical system documentation repository is not defined and populated, there may be little or no guiding documents to support Workday system operations and maintenance in production after go-live. System documentation typically includes requirements, architectural designs, technical documentation or algorithms, data dictionaries, enterprise relationship diagrams, end user and system administration manuals, etc. Workday system documentation may include conversion data field and data value mappings, integration requirement documentation, data dictionary and data governance plan, functional configuration, global setup configuration, scripted and unscripted end user testing and end to end testing scenarios, and any other documentation that details processes or decisions.</td>
<td>Even though some of these documents may already exist or may be stored in SharePoint or JIRA during development, a formal document repository should be planned to be in place at go-live. It is recommended that plans be initiated, and owners be assigned to the associated tasks as part of sustainment planning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Testing – End-to-End Testing</td>
<td>Throughout the month of June, Wave 1 of End-to-End Testing continued and focused on the few remaining master and sub-scenario tasks among the Academic population. Weekly completion rates are presented below:</td>
<td>It is not uncommon for issues to linger beyond the close of a testing cycle. This is often due to complex, highly dependent, and/or systematic issues that require intricate resolutions and/or solutions. Through the use of JIRA, the Program has documented such issues, and in many cases, provided an in-depth analysis and discussion delineating the current status as well as planned programmatic actions. As the Program is committed to the resolution of these complex defects, continued follow up with business area owners is recommended to understand the status, changed requirements, and any impact remaining issues may pose to Workday functionality if not resolved at go-live.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | • June 1, 2018 – 99.3%  
• June 8, 2018 – 99.7%  
• June 15, 2018 – 99.7%  
• June 22, 2018 – 99.8% | |
| | In Wave 2 of End-to-End Testing, the testing daily scrum schedule was ended in late May. Following this change, two new scrum series were created: | Following the initiation of a Pod Lead structure in early May, this decision mirrors that purpose: an organizational change that realigns the manner in which the Program works together to focus on collaboration, optimization, and prioritization. As the implementation makes progress towards go-live and beyond toward future implementations, it is recommended that the Program continue to reflect and evaluate how Workday has impacted business operations and to utilize these lessons learned as a means to bolster these activities. |
| | • Monday, Wednesday, and Friday: Pod and QA Coordinators  
• Tuesday and Thursday: all End-to-End Testing Participants | |
### 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 | The Wave 2 End-to-End Testing effort has continued through May into June. With an end date of June 22, 2018, the Program has steadily progressed in the completion of both master tasks and scenario subtasks. 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:  
  - May 4, 2018 – 3.1% & Total Bugs – 70  
  - May 11, 2018 – 5.4% & Total Bugs – 58  
  - May 18, 2018 – 6.5% & Total Bugs – 45  
  - May 25, 2018 – 21.4% & Total Bugs – 33  
  - June 1, 2018 – 30.4% & Total Bugs – 63  
  - June 8, 2018 – 55% & Total Bugs – 85  
  - June 15, 2018 – 75% & Total Bugs – 112 | Despite a report of significant slow-down in early June and a report of being slightly behind in Wave 2 testing on June 14th, the Program quickly lifted the completion rate to 75% with a final week remaining. Using Wave 1 End-to-End metrics as a baseline, it is likely the final week of Wave 2 will end with approximately 88-92% of sub-scenario tasks completed.  
  It is recommended that the Program continue to effectively utilize the final End-to-End Daily scrum meetings with both Pod Leads and the testers to prioritize and allocate appropriate attention to populations struggling with bugs that may impact the completion of additional sub-scenarios.  
  During the final End-to-End Testing scrum meeting on June 21, 2018, it was announced that an “End to End Ongoing” section would focus on testing specific to the Rescind & Cancel, integrations, and reporting Workday functionality. Pod Leads clearly defined that End-to-End Ongoing is distinct from previous End-to-End Waves.  
  The addition of another distinctly separate End-to-End testing section that enables the Program to evaluate specific Workday functionality (i.e., Rescind & Cancel) will provide an opportunity for the Program to create guidance during go-live. This is especially important when users are learning the system as it will assist in situations that require correction to system or worker level data.  
  As these processes in Workday operate differently from the Legacy system, the Program’s decision to understand and document these processes in advance will be very beneficial during and after go-live. |
## 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** | On June 22, 2018 a review of the Wave 2 End-to-End Testing JIRA Dashboard indicated that 90% (1345 of 1491) of scenario subtasks had a closed or passed testing status. Additional metrics by population and bugs are reported below: A completion percentage of scenario subtask by population type is as follows:  
  • Academics – 86%  
  • Bridging – 100%  
  • Integrations – 22.6%  
  • Non-Employee – 100%  
  • Staff – 97.6%  
  • Student – 98%  
In addition, a total of 109 “bugs”, remained in the following statuses following the close of Wave 2:  
  • Blocker – 1  
  • Critical – 2  
  • Major – 93  
  • Minor – 10  
  • Trivial – 1  
  • Normal - 2 | In the final week of Wave 2 End-to-End Testing, the Program significantly increased the completion of scenario subtasks by 15% for an overall completion of 90%. Similar to Wave 1 of End-to-End Testing, it is common for more complex defects to linger past the end of a testing wave.  
As the Program has been performing with Wave 1 defects, it is recommended to leverage Pod Leads and QA Coordinators to help ensure that lingering tasks continue to be addressed, documented, and examined in the effort to reduce any go-live readiness risks. |
## 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>On June 5, 2018, the Program began the scripted modules of End User Testing (EUT) across the Staff, Student, Academic, and Non-Employee populations. Both the reports and initial feedback from users has been positive. Further, the week of June 18, 2018 marks the half way point of scripted End User Testing. With minimal bugs and no stand out concerns reported during sessions and in questionnaires, EUT is briskly moving forward in providing end users with Workday system foundational skills.</td>
<td>Feedback and results from the first half of End User Testing is encouraging. As certain aspects of Workday system functionality may be more visible to users than in the Legacy system, scripted testing provides a foundational path for users to grasp Workday nuances. For instance, funding and costing allocation procedures are performed differently in Legacy than in Workday in that these processes in Legacy are more “backend” rather than being more visible to user. In addition, surveys, taken by users at the end of each EUT session, have yielded important details regarding Workday processes, user adoption, and, most importantly, provide information regarding training opportunities. These specific user experiences can be utilized to develop and refine Workday demos and future training sessions. As EUT so far has yielded positive and encouraging results, it is recommended that the Program continue the current EUT procedures and continue preparing for unscripted 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 first cycle of Payroll Parallel Testing (PPT) was completed in mid-June. Results were positive for a first PPT cycle. 24,980 employees were compared and demonstrated the following results after true-ups:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Parallel Testing            | • Gross within $1.00 variance – 98.7%  
• Net within $2.00 variance – 92.5%                                                                                                                  | The initial results of PPT1 are positive following a true-up of data. Issues reported were centered on configuration and conversion issues. If not already communicated, it is recommended that the Program work with the Payroll Parallel Team to understand what constitutes a true-up and how it impacts the overall gross/net percentages of PPT cycles. |
### Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Testing – Performance Testing</td>
<td>Workday performance testing continues. Due to the number of integrations and reports, it was reported that creating a process in which to properly evaluate Workday is both complex and time consuming.</td>
<td>When customers meet specific thresholds, they are subject to additional testing to ensure there are no issues with tenant performance. It is recommended that the Program understand what Workday specific performance testing procedures are necessary. After obtaining this understanding, the Program can then determine what, if any, additional testing to perform. If the Program opts to perform additional testing in both Workday and to downstream systems than what is required by Workday thresholds, it is recommended the Program echo the prioritization and optimization mindset. For example, the Program could select a representative sample of both integrations and reports and then bracket each into complexity categories: High complexity, Medium complexity, and Low complexity. This would enable the Program to extrapolate data from Workday and downstream systems to determine how integrations and reports will generally function.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Status of In-Progress Risk Mitigation Activities
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 – June 2018 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, June 1, 2018
- Weekly Lead Meeting, June 4, 2018
- Change Review Board Meeting, June 5, 2018
- Workday: End-to-End (E2E) Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, June 5, 2018
- Program Status Meeting, June 5, 2018
- KPMG Review of Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #2 Meeting, June 6, 2018
- Workday: Parallel Payroll Planning Meeting, June 6, 2018
- Workday Deployment Planning Meeting, June 6, 2018
- UT Workday Management Meeting, June 6, 2018
- HR and Payroll Technology Readiness Meeting, June 6, 2018
- Workday: End-to-End (E2E) Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, June 7, 2018
- Weekly PM Touchpoint Meeting - April-June, June 7, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

• Weekly Governance Debrief Meeting, June 8, 2018
• Weekly Lead Meeting, June 11, 2018
• June Town Hall Meeting, June 12, 2018
• Day 4 Faculty EUT Session - Round 1, June 12, 2018
• Program Status Meeting, June 12, 2018
• Workday Deployment Planning Meeting, June 13, 2018
• Campus Readiness Biweekly Meeting, June 13, 2018
• Workday HCM Payroll Business Process Owners Weekly Touch Base Meeting, June 13, 2018
• Workday Steering Committee Meeting, June 13, 2018
• UT Workday Management Meeting, June 13, 2018
• Workday: End-to-End (E2E) Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, June 14, 2018
• Weekly PM Touchpoint Meeting - April-June, June 14, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

• Weekly Governance Debrief Meeting, June 15, 2018
• Director Project Plan Review Meeting, June 15, 2018
• Day 2 Staff EUT - Round 2, June 18, 2018
• KPMG Review of May Report Meeting, April 19, 2018
• Workday Info Session - Planning Meeting, June 19, 2018
• Workday: End-to-End (E2E) Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, June 19, 2018
• Workday Deployment Planning Meeting, June 19, 2018
• Change Review Board Meeting, June 19, 2018
• Program Status Meeting, June 19, 2018
• Workday: End-to-End (E2E) Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, June 20, 2018
• Conversion Defect Validation Meeting, June 20, 2018
• KPMG Review of End-to-End Testing Deliverable Expectation Document Meeting, June 20, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- Workday: Parallel Payroll Planning Meeting, June 20, 2018
- Workday HCM Payroll Business Process Owners Weekly Touch Base Meeting, June 20, 2018
- UT Workday Management Meeting, June 20, 2018
- Usability Working Group Meeting, June 20, 2018
- Workday: End-to-End (E2E) Testing Daily Scrum Meeting, June 21, 2018
- Council of University Business Officers (CUBO) Meeting, June 21, 2018
- Day 2 Student - Round 3, June 21, 2018
- Weekly Governance Debrief Meeting, June 22, 2018
- UT Austin Performance Test Touchpoint Meeting, June 25, 2018
- KPMG Touch Base Meeting, June 26, 2018
- Change Review Board Meeting, June 26, 2018
- Workday HCM - Functional Pilot Training Review - Student, June 26, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

• Day 2 Faculty EUT Session - Round 3, June 26, 2018
• Program Status Meeting, June 26, 2018
• Workday HCM Payroll Business Process Owners Weekly Touch Base Meeting, June 27, 2018
• Workday Steering Committee Meeting, June 27, 2018
• UT Workday Management Meeting, June 27, 2018
• TMP Review Meeting, June 28, 2018
• Weekly Governance Debrief Call Meeting, June 29, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Interviews Conducted

- HCM Implementation QA Analyst, June 18, 2018
- Readiness Lead, June 19, 2018
- Workday Project Director, June 19, 2018
- Security & Testing Lead, June 21, 2018
Documentation Reviewed
Documentation Reviewed

- E2E JIRA Dashboard – June 1, 8, 15, 22, 27, 2018
- EUT Scripted Testing Documentation – June 1, 8, 2018
- E2E TTM – June 4, 8, 22, 25, 2018
- Workday Workflows (16), June 6, 2018
- Master Checklist as of 6/4/2018, June 6, 2018
- Human Resources Workday Operational Readiness Checklist, June 6, 2018
- Operational RACI Matrix as of 6/6/2018, June 6, 2018
- Workday Methodology: Scope of Performance Testing, June 13, 2018
- Workday Steering Committee 6/13 Review Packet, June 13, 2018
- EUT Proctor Training Documentation – June 15, 22, 27, 2018
- Workday Steering Committee 6/27 Review Packet, June 25, 2018
IV&V Deliverable Status
## Project Deliverable Status

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number/Name</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 14 (December 2017)      | 1/05/2018   | Complete        | • Submitted draft report, January 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, January 26, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, February 12, 2018 |
| 17 – Enterprise Readiness Verification Report                      | 9/28/2018   | Scheduled       |                                                                                                                                          |
| 18 – End to End Testing Completion Report                          | 7/06/2018   | Pending Approval| • Submitted draft report, July 6, 2018  
• Submitted final report, July 18, 2018  
• Pending approval                                                                                     |
| 19 – User Acceptance Testing Completion Report                     | 8/10/2018   | In-Progress     | • Deliverable activities are in-progress                                                                                                 |
| 20 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #1            | 2/15/2018   | Complete        | • Submitted draft report, February 10, 2018  
• Submitted final report, February 13, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, February 28, 2018  
• Presented report to CUBO, March 8, 2018 |
| 21 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #2            | 5/18/2018   | 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   | Scheduled       |                                                                                                                                          |
| 23 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 15 (January 2018)       | 2/05/2018   | Complete        | • Submitted draft report, February 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, February 13, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, February 28, 2018 |
| 24 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 16 (February 2018)      | 3/05/2018   | Complete        | • Submitted draft report, March 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, March 19, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, March 26, 2018 |
## 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>
| 25 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 17 (March 2018)   | 4/05/2018 | Complete        | • Submitted draft report, April 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, April 17, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, April 26, 2018 |
| 26 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 18 (April 2018)   | 5/05/2018 | Complete        | • Submitted draft report, May 4, 2018  
• Submitted final report, May 8, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, May 10, 2018 |
| 27 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 19 (May 2018)     | 6/05/2018 | Complete        | • Submitted draft report, June 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, June 19, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, July 2, 2018 |
| 28 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 20 (June 2018)    | 7/05/2018 | Pending Approval| • Submitted draft report, July 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, July 18, 2018  
• Pending approval                               |
| 29 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 21 (July 2018)    | 8/05/2018 | In-Progress     | • Deliverable activities are in-progress                                                     |
| 30 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 22 (August 2018)   | 9/05/2018 | Scheduled       |                                                                                              |
| 31 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 23 (September 2018)| 10/05/2018| Scheduled       |                                                                                               |
| 32 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 24 (October 2018)  | 11/05/2018| Scheduled       |                                                                                               |
| 33 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 25 (November 2018) | 12/05/2018| Scheduled       |                                                                                               |
| 34 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 26 (December 2018) | 12/31/2018| Scheduled       |                                                                                               |
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