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Objective, Scope, and Approach
Objective and Scope


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. 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
Objective and Scope (continued)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance and Campus Collaboration</strong></td>
<td>As previously reported, obtaining the unified support of the President, Provost, and Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, was a key Governance accomplishment. Keeping an ongoing line of communication with the Academic Deans is also critical to the success of the project.</td>
<td>It is our understanding that the Dean’s Council meets on a regular basis, however this is the Provost’s meeting, and attendance is by invitation only. Given that, there are not always representatives from the Program in attendance. It is recommended that a request be submitted to the Provost to have a standing agenda item where a status of the Program can be provided (similar to the practice with TxAdmin). This will also provide an opportunity for the Provost and Deans to address any concerns that they have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During this period, the Program along with the Steering Committee have moved forward with further establishment of the ERP IT Leaders Subcommittee group, to address and align with campus technical readiness initiatives. The Program has identified key technical subject matter experts that should be members of the Subcommittee.</td>
<td>This is a positive action, and as recommended previously, the Program should continue to formalize the group and associated processes, to address the pending technical issues that are concerning to the campus (such as retroactive payments, catch-up transactions, cutover Legacy periods, etc.). Constructive interaction between the Subcommittee, coupled with the Program and campus stakeholders, is essential to the overall success of the implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Program AVP continues to be very engaged, and perform very effectively in leading the Program towards success. During this period, the AVP introduced new collaboration work practices for the Program management and team. On an ongoing basis, the AVP has introduced new styles and practices as needed throughout the project’s duration, to keep the team focused and on task.</td>
<td>This was also a positive action, and timely, as the Program heads towards the November implementation date. The AVP’s engagement and understanding of key issues that may hinder the Program’s ability to move forward, will continue to add long-term value to the Program. While support has focused on the team and campus, the AVP should also receive whatever support is needed as the drive towards implementation continues.</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>It was reported by several stakeholders across campus that there has been significant communication and positive working group activity during the period. To the stakeholders, this demonstrates significant improvement from previous periods.</td>
<td>These are positive comments to hear from the campus, they are the result of significant efforts by the team, and those efforts should continue. The stakeholders should continue to be engaged and collaborated with heavily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related to the above observation, and according to plan, the Program, specifically Campus Readiness, has significantly increased activity and visibility across campus this period. Notable was their conducting demonstrations of reporting, recruiting, and employee self-service functionalities.</td>
<td>It is critical that the campus voice continue to be heard and they be part of the solution. Their requests should be recorded, prioritized, and the associated action plan and disposition be communicated regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The demonstrations and roadshows are key elements to keeping the campus user community engaged, and address some of the anxiety they have had absent that exposure to the system. It is recommended that the Program continues with its campus-related activities and proactively reach out to ensure attendance at the sessions is high. If possible, the Program should consider increasing the number of sessions to six per month. The more Workday visibility that the users have from a functionality and navigation standpoint, the more effective and efficient training will be. It will also help those users further identify what needs to change in each of their areas.</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 this period, the Architect Stage was signed off by the Steering Committee, and the proposed Sporadic Employment business rules were presented to CUBO. Sporadic Employment has been a significant change impact item that has affected certain test case scenarios that were contingent on key business rules decisions by executive leadership. It was determined that Sporadic Employment changes will be effective with the November go-live rather than at the beginning of the fiscal year.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Program continues to have constructive dialogue with the governing bodies across campus, such as the Steering Committee and CUBO, to establish cohesive deployment strategies pertaining to key Program milestones and business areas such as Sporadic Employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Steering Committee has decided to not fill the vacant Committee position. It was determined that adding a new member at this juncture of the project would cause a distraction, and would not add value, as it would take a new member several meetings to get acclimated and gain the proper knowledge needed to provide actionable input. Members of the Committee had previously been asked to submit potential candidates for the vacancy, however nothing materialized from that request.</td>
<td>While the rationale for not filling the vacancy is sound, there is still a concern (as previously reported) around the absenteeism of members at Committee meetings. The Committee Co-Chairs should continue to assess member absenteeism, and address those members accordingly, as their input and participation in key decisions is critical. If the Committee is not adding new members, it should ensure that the remaining members are present and are actively involved. The importance of everyone’s presence and participation during the upcoming months as the campus prepares for go-live, should be repeatedly stressed. The Committee should also reassess the membership and determine if there is the appropriate campus representation. Without appropriate decision-making representation from a cross-section of the campus, disapproval from under-represented areas may result.</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>Action items are being recorded at Steering Committee meetings, however the status of the action items do not appear to be tracked to completion. If action items do not include owners and deadlines, and are not reviewed at the Committee meetings, there is a risk that the items requiring Committee attention will not be executed or closed.</td>
<td>It is recommended that action items be reviewed at the beginning of each Committee meeting, and a report-out on the actions taken be communicated. As an alternative, the Committee should maintain an Action Items Log to monitor, track, and historically document resolution of action items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Program has strategically identified and shifted to a tighter communication management style given that the campus is going through the budget process. Campus stakeholders, specifically business officers are showing levels of stress. The Program has asked to increase the sensitivity of critical information that might contribute further to the stress levels.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Program continue to methodically communicate specific change impacts, in order to not further alarm campus representatives. The Program should continue with the sensitivity in its communication around monies reserved for the Program, when the campus is working through budget reductions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was reported at a status meeting that consultant change orders/contracts have not yet been finalized and signed. This is a concern as finalizing roles, responsibilities, and alignment of all participants (including the ownership and accountability of specific deliverables of each party) is crucial as the drive towards implementation is underway. Absent such details can expose UT to significant risk. It is also unclear if the remaining budget is sufficient to fulfill the level of resources that are articulated in those change orders/contracts.</td>
<td>If it has not already been done, the finalization and signing of the change orders/contracts should be addressed as a very high priority. Further, another detailed review of the budget should be performed to ensure there is adequate funds to support the level-of-effort and resources needed to ensure success. The budget should be regularly reviewed in unison with each project plan update.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation – People</td>
<td>The Program continues to add resources as needed to address the tasks at hand. During this period, the Program acquired additional functional consultants that recently worked on the University of Washington Workday implementation.</td>
<td>The Program should continue to assess where subject matter expertise is needed, and augment the team with those resources. This includes both at the Program and campus levels. All avenues should be pursued including using existing resources from around campus, UT retirees, and consultants. As previously stated, the specific roles and responsibilities for each firm employed should be documented, and the budget closely monitored to ensure that the highest priority needs are addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As the drive towards implementation continues, the Program leadership is keenly aware of the need to manage and keep morale high. Various activities and events have taken place, and are planned. An award program is also going to be implemented to recognize individual and team achievements.</td>
<td>While so much emphasis is on the change management at the campus level, the Program needs to continue to monitor and manage the change and morale at the Program level. Successes should be recognized and celebrated regularly. While recognition awards are positive, as public recognition does help morale, the Program also needs to be aware that those not recognized may feel they are also working very hard and thus feel slighted. This could potentially then have a negative adverse effect. Leadership needs to be cognizant of this and continue to maintain dialogue with all team members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is our understanding that Workday no longer has a data conversion lead on the project.</td>
<td>This is a critical resource given the importance of the builds, the number of builds within scope, and the significant effort required to successfully complete the associated work activities. It is recommended that a backfill be considered.</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>As the Program enters its final stretch, there may be concern on the part of the implementation team about their future, and some team members may seek to leave the project for opportunities that may be available to them prior to the implementation. As such, there is a risk of losing valuable resources with project knowledge.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Program identify resources who are potential “flight risks”, and establish plans to retain essential resources, emphasizing as a benefit their value to the campus for their in-depth, inside knowledge of Workday policies, processes, and procedures. In addition, the Program should also anticipate that team members will leave, and have a plan to backfill for those positions. Each key resource should have a backup identified. This should not only be done to mitigate the risk of a team member leaving, but also for support purposes should a personal or medical matter make that resource unavailable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During this period, concerns were raised that the business process activities which HR is involved with during the cutover period, could impact deadline timing for the campus.</td>
<td>The Program should clearly map out how individual CSUs and resources will perform specific activities such as Recruiting efforts, during cutover periods, when no other activities are allowed in HRMS. The cutover and deployment strategies, along with the associated risks should be communicated on an ongoing basis.</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>During this period, the Program concluded the allocated planned time for Unit Testing Wave 4. This concluded Unit Testing with over 6,000 test case scenarios. During Wave 4 (which ended March 9), the Program completed 140 test case scenarios, which represents 65% of the 217 test cases in the Wave 4 inventory. 65 test case scenarios remain outstanding, which represents 30%, and 6% have defects. The Program has discontinued the Unit Testing Scrum Meetings as the timeline for Unit Testing has concluded, and the Program has shifted resources towards End-to-End Test planning activities.</td>
<td>It is recommended that while the Program has shifted towards End-to-End planning activities, the Program should still maintain high visibility on those remaining outstanding test case scenarios from all Waves, specifically those test case scenarios that were moved out of Wave 4 due to constraints. It is recommended that functional groups continue to meet on a weekly basis to ensure all outstanding test case scenarios get tested and passed. The Program should ensure JIRA test case scenario metrics are not erroneously reported or marked as complete if the proper functional team has not tested, and/or passed them. Having accurate metrics is critical as the team progresses with the future testing activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Program has identified specific End-to-End test case scenarios. End-to-End Testing will have just over 200 test case scenarios from “hire to retire”, and the execution will run from April 2 – June 22. The Program has effectively drafted a Testing Traceability Matrix (TTM) identifying detailed steps and inputs for all current scenarios.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Program continue to have dialogue with subject matter experts that will be conducting the End-to-End Testing, and identify those key resources that will be needed. The Program should continue to communicate the roles and responsibilities of all involved team members, including the Quality Assurance and Functional teams. KPMG will be conducting assessments of End-to-End Testing (Deliverable 18), and User Acceptance Testing (Deliverable 19). Associated observations and recommendations will be communicated 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 – Process</strong></td>
<td>Following the Communications Strategy, the Program continues to increase communications pertaining to the forthcoming campus-wide rollout of Workday. The strategy components, including monthly newsletters, Town Halls, etc. are all in progress and/or planned.</td>
<td>From now until after go-live, communications is a critical Program activity. If possible, and if budget is available, it is recommended that the Program invest in formal marketing materials. Prior to finalizing and distributing significant communications pieces, they should be vetted to the campus governing bodies to get valuable input and perspectives. The Program should continue to augment Town Halls based on campus feedback, and utilize Town Halls as the most effective way to communicate significant Workday change impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Program has augmented the CSU technical readiness criteria and deadlines by establishing a CSU Monthly Exit Criteria Log by CSU. This will help to further identify cutover periods and work-around plans, in order to address complications or risks that may impact CSU’s upon go-live. The Deployment team continues to work effectively with Technical Readiness and the HR Functional leads to ensure major change impacts, such as retroactive payments, are properly addressed with specific subject matter experts.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Program continue to mitigate and conduct risk assessments to ensure cutover period activities are managed accordingly during the HRMS blackout period and through Workday go-live. The Program should continue to meet with the CSUs to gather work-around plans to better coordinate the timing for HRMS/Legacy blackout period transactions, and ensure Workday catch-up transactions are timed in a manner to minimize impact across the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the previous Town Hall, several key stakeholders questioned whether the Program had finalized planning for a robust contingency plan, in the event that Workday could not meet the business requirements for the University.</td>
<td>It is unclear if the Program is creating such a plan, however it is assumed that it will. Once created, it will also need to be vetted with the CSUs, and all governing bodies.</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 previously raised, Reporting continues to be an area of concern, and is identified as a risk to the campus stakeholders. During this period, many reports have been identified as not needed due to Workday’s Reporting User-Interface and Cube functionalities. Further, a significant number of operational reports have been developed, however a majority of those designed and developed reports were not tested nor passed successfully during Unit Testing. Several reports that were tested during the final Wave were found to have defects.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Program place emphasis on reports that have been tested and passed successfully to truly gage how the Reporting area is progressing. The Program should address the backlog of reports designed and developed, to identify priority operational reports that must be tested in order to identify any gaps. The Program should continue ongoing communication to the campus stakeholders regarding the progression of reports marked as complete (tested and passed successfully). This will help instill confidence with the stakeholders that they will be able to conduct business as usual, and see value in the Workday’s reporting functionality. The Program should conduct reporting demonstrations by CSU to ensure all of their needs are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Program has drafted a Training Curriculum, however it has not yet been fleshed out or finalized. A draft has been presented at previous Steering Committee meetings at a high-level. This also continues to be a risk area as key stakeholders feel they have not received any related communication nor been advised of the plan or content.</td>
<td>As previously stated, it is recommended that the Program and Training leads align strategically with the campus in finalizing the Training Curriculum. The stakeholders need to be aware of the training plan and initiatives so they can adequately plan to attend training sessions. Their involvement will help alleviate the associated anxiety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This period, the on-demand check payment ability has been identified as a specific business area of concern. The Program has not yet fleshed-out a final strategy to address this.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Program reach out to other Higher Education institutions that have previously faced the same business requirements, and gain an understanding of the resulting solution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Implementation – Process</strong></td>
<td>During this period, the Program has successfully completed the parallel payroll testing strategy and approach. They key objective of this testing will be to ensure and validate the same period processing in Workday, and allow the Program to compare against a calculated payroll in the Legacy system. Regarding the parallel payroll testing, the plan is to conduct 4 parallel tests. Typically, within Workday implementations, we would see up to 3 parallel tests. The team is also planning to do a completely new tenant build for each of these parallels, which also is not typical.</td>
<td>The Program should continue to share its testing strategy and approach with key stakeholders across campus, and with the governing bodies, to get their input. This will also provide the opportunity to confirm required test scenarios are accounted for. While this process can work, there is concern as it will be labor intensive and time consuming for UT. It will be necessary for team members to be available to validate the data and results, consulting resources cannot perform those activities. The necessary consulting resources required for the tasks should also be confirmed within the previously discussed change orders/contracts. It is recommended that the team revisit this strategy and ensure that the required resources are understood and will be available, as well as ensure that appropriate budget will be available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation – Technology</td>
<td>The Program continues to enhance the Workday tenant build process. This period, the Program has successfully completed the P7 build schedule, and has detailed a P7 plan addressing the Functional team’s P7 responsibilities. The Functional team conducted P7 build configuration validation March 15 and 16. For the payroll parallel comparisons, the UT team will be using a payroll comparison tool that the Collaborative team built, rather than the Workday PACT tools.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Program ensures that the Functional team participates effectively in all assigned validation activities. To mitigate risks, the Program should continue to encourage validation participants to promptly reach out to the consultants or leads if questions arise. The Program needs to ensure that there is clear direction on the part of the entire payroll team including UT, Workday, Huron and all subcontractor resources.</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 – March 2018 project risk activity is presented in the graph below:

Risk Mitigation Activities

[Graph showing risk mitigation activities from April 2017 to March 2018 with categories such as On Hold, New/Unassigned, In Process, Future, Completed, Closed, and Total.]
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

• Workday Deployment Planning Meeting, March 1, 2018
• TMP Review Meeting, March 1, 2018
• Workday: Operational Readiness Discussion Meeting, March 1, 2018
• Proposed BP Updates: Benefits INT / To Do's Meeting, March 2, 2018
• EID Block Demo Meeting, March 2, 2018
• UT Austin - Performance Testing Touchpoint Meeting, March 2, 2018
• Weekly Governance Debrief Meeting, March 2, 2018
• Request Form System Work Group Meeting, March 6, 2018
• Workday Demo: Recruiting - Job Requisition Meeting, March 6, 2018
• CHART Meeting, March 7, 2018
• Workday Steering Committee Meeting, March 7, 2018
• UT Austin - Delivery Assurance - Compensation Prototype Configuration Review Meeting, March 7, 2018
• Workday HCM Payroll Business Process Owners Weekly Meeting, March 7, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- Workday: Parallel Payroll Planning Meeting, March 7, 2018
- UT Workday Management Meeting, March 7, 2018
- CUBO Meeting (Presented Deliverable 20), March 8, 2018
- TMP Review Meeting, March 9, 2018
- CSU Review of E2E Scenarios Meeting, March 9, 2018
- Weekly Governance Debrief Meeting, March 9, 2018
- Project Status Meeting, March 13, 2018
- Unit Testing Meeting, March 14, 2018
- HR and Payroll Technology Readiness Meeting, March 14, 2018
- UT Workday Management Meeting, March 14, 2018
- Workday HCM Payroll Business Process Owners Weekly Meeting, March 14, 2018
- ASMP Payroll Team Sync Up Meeting, March 15, 2018
- KPMG Review of February Report Meeting, March 19, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- Workday Program Meeting, March 19, 2018
- Project Status Meeting, March 20, 2018
- HR and Payroll Technology Readiness Meeting, March 21, 2018
- Workday Steering Committee Meeting, March 21, 2018
- Workday HCM Payroll Business Process Owners Weekly Meeting, March 21, 2018
- Workday: Parallel Payroll Planning Meeting, March 21, 2018
- CLF Standing Meeting, March 21, 2018
- UT Workday Management Meeting, March 21, 2018
- ASMP Payroll Team Sync Up Meeting, March 22, 2018
- Workday Deployment Planning Meeting, March 22, 2018
- TMP Review Meeting, March 23, 2018
- Weekly Governance Debrief Meeting, March 23, 2018
- Legacy Systems Matrix Discussion Meeting, March 26, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

• Project Status Meeting, March 27, 2018
• KPMG Touch Base Meeting, March 27, 2018
• UT Workday Management Meeting, March 28, 2018
• Workday Program Test Phase Kickoff Meeting, March 28, 2018
• Workday HCM Payroll Business Process Owners Weekly Meeting, March 28, 2018
• Workday Deployment Planning Meeting, March 29, 2018
• RFS Work Group Meeting, March 29, 2018
• TMP Review Meeting, March 30, 2018
• Weekly Governance Debrief Meeting, March 30, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Interviews Conducted

• ERP IT Leader/Associate Director, March 28, 2018
Documentation Reviewed
Documentation Reviewed

- Workday Job Requisition Demo Head Start, March 6, 2018
- UT Direct Request Forms System, March 6, 2018
- Workday UT Implementation Program Readiness Summary Status Report, March 7, 2018
- Workday Steering Committee Packet, March 7, 2018
- Additional Employment Guidance, March 8, 2018
- Parallel Payroll Testing Strategy Approach, March 20, 2018
- Workday Steering Committee Packet, March 21, 2018
- E2E Overall Timeline, March 26, 2018
- Testing Traceability Matrix, March 26, 2018
- Operational Reports Inventory, March 27, 2018
- Unit Test Updates, March 27, 2018
- Training Curriculum Draft, March 28, 2018
- TRECS Open Issues Feb-Mar 2018, March 28, 2018
- Legacy Cutover Matrix, March 28, 2018
- The University of Texas at Austin – Workday Steering Committee ERP IT Leaders (ERPITL) Subgroup Charter, March 28, 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 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number/Name</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 14 (December 2017) | 1/05/2018   | Complete       | • Submitted draft report, January 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, January 26, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, February 12, 2018 |
| 17 – Enterprise Readiness Verification Report | 9/28/2018 | Scheduled      |                                                                            |
| 18 – End to End Testing Completion Report | 6/15/2018 | In-Progress    | • Planning activities are in progress                                      |
| 19 – User Acceptance Testing Completion Report | 7/20/2018 | In-Progress    | • Planning 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 | In-Progress    | • Deliverable activities are in progress                                     |
| 22 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #3 | 8/17/2018 | Scheduled      |                                                                            |
| 23 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 15 (January 2018) | 2/05/2018 | Complete       | • Submitted draft report, February 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, February 13, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, February 28, 2018 |
| 24 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 16 (February 2018) | 3/05/2018 | Complete       | • Submitted draft report, March 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, March 19, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, March 26, 2018 |
| 25 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 17 (March 2018) | 4/05/2018 | Pending Approval | • Submitted draft report, April 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, April 17, 2018  
• Pending approval |
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### Project Deliverable Status (continued)

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