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Objective, Scope, and Approach
Objective and Scope

This document is Deliverable #33: Monthly Risk Assessment Report (November 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 also have been 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.

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.
Objective and Scope (continued)

The Workday system was implemented on November 7, with a soft launch for campus super users. This was followed on November 9, by the campus-wide launch. During this reporting period, the Program’s major focus was on the go-live, post go-live support, and executing the first Payroll runs. For this report, those areas were assessed, and the observations and recommendations continue to be provided and grouped into the following areas:

- Governance and Campus Collaboration
- Project Implementation – People, Process, and Technology
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.
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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Campus</td>
<td>The Workday system was implemented on November 7, with a soft launch for campus super users. This was followed on November 9, by the campus-wide launch. These were the major milestones that the Program had been driving towards, and both successes marked major accomplishments for the University. In general, large implementations such as these often do not go well. The UT accomplishment is a direct result of strong Executive and Program leadership, and a very strong and committed team. The Huron consultants and methodology were critical to the success, as was the Workday partnership. The campus participation and ownership of key activities was critical. It cannot be overstated how well all of the teams worked together to get to this point. The process and activities leading up to the go-live required a great amount of time, and the dedication of the overall team and their collective efforts led to the completion of all required tasks. The leadership of those activities was outstanding. The team is now working through the major business events of Payroll, which will be followed by the month-end process. The period of Hypercare is underway with ongoing campus support and outreach.</td>
<td>As issues arise, the team is addressing them very quickly. All of the associated issue resolution and support activities should continue as planned. The next several months will continue to be intense, and will be trying on the team. Leadership should continue with the same practices of focus, support, and motivation of the team, which got them to where they are today. Ongoing meetings with the Deans, TxAdmin, and VPAdmin should all continue as planned, to ensure that the campus needs are being addressed, and the Program’s messaging is successfully being heard and comprehended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Campus Collaboration</td>
<td>Through the meetings attended during the month, it was observed that campus sentiments around the system for the most part are positive. Issues are coming up, however they are being addressed. Time reporting has been a critical issue that the Program and Human Resources are addressing. The expectation setting around having issues post go-live appears to have resonated at the campus level. While this is the case, there is still a pocket of some negatively within the campus, specifically where a College leader misinterpreted an email sent from the Program, and then disseminated negatively throughout their area.</td>
<td>Messaging and restating expectations that issues will arise should continue at the Dean, TxAdmin, and VPAdmin levels. This will help continue that they then drive similar messaging across their CSU. It will also help to eliminate any misunderstandings of communications. It should be stated that if any of those participants have a question or misunderstanding about a communication, that they contact the Program directly for clarification. The Dean’s should be made aware of some of the negativity that is occurring, and how that can have an adverse impact on their staff and use of the system. Related, when the time comes for selecting members for future groups and committees, such as the Steering Committee, it is recommended that the Deans be part of the selection process, and identify participants from within their areas that will embrace change, and promote the change across the University. This may mean that the individual selected is not an Officer level. Such a selection will be critical to the future Financial system implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM/Payroll</td>
<td>HCM/Payroll is, and will be, the short-term focus for the next several months. While that is the case, strategies around the Financial system implementation are also being discussed.</td>
<td>It is recommended that leadership continue to discuss their approach regarding Financials. Building off the positive energy of the HCM/Payroll implementation, and having the appropriate change leaders and lessons learned in place, will assist in the buy-in from the Deans and other University leaders.</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 stated above, the go-live demonstrated a strong commitment of all parties involved. There were long hours, and everyone remained focused and motivated, performing exceptionally as a team in periods of high stress. Post go-live, the team has continued to demonstrate the same levels of commitment. As issues are arising, the execution of the processes by the team is proving very effective and efficient, with issues being addressed very quickly. Again the extended team should all be commended for their dedication, professionalism, and teamwork.</td>
<td>Given their proven abilities and accomplishments, if possible, the core team should remain intact, and as a result, the University will benefit from the momentum and teamwork created. This is true not only for the Hypercare period and beyond for future roadmap items, but also for the Financial system implementation, which may prove to be even more challenging than the HCM/Payroll implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In November 2017, Huron resources who participated in the University of Washington's Workday implementation joined UT, lending their experience to the overall Program team. During the year leading to implementation, these resources contributed effective strategies for managing the work, providing not only assistive leadership, but also valuable tools (e.g., scorecard and readiness dashboards) and processes for the benefit of the Program team, saving both time and effort. Bringing these resources on board at a critical time continued to reflect the foresight of the management team that has contributed to the successful implementation.</td>
<td>The processes, tools, and lessons learned utilized for the HCM/Payroll implementation should be packaged and formally documented as the methodology to use for future projects.</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>
</table>
| Project Implementation – People | As a means to improve Workday knowledge for the campus user community, the Program provides numerous opportunities for continued education:  
• Open Labs  
• Virtual Open Labs  
• Topic Specific Sessions (Costing/Security)  
• Continuous Learning (Workday Training Website)  
The above items required significant efforts and resources for the team. As it was anticipated that such opportunities would be well attended by the campus users, it was reported that during the go-live month of November, there was low participation for both the open and virtual labs. | Although low participation may signal to the Program to reconsider the current utility and needs of the campus in relation to Program resourcing, it is recommended that both open and virtual labs continue.  
As campus users become familiar with basic Workday functionality, they will encounter more complex and University specific business process requirements. For these reasons, it is suggested that despite low initial turn-out, the Program continue to hold these sessions as participation is likely to increase over time. While participation in these sessions was lower than anticipated, continuing to hold them communicates both figuratively and literally that the Program is supportive and receptive to the needs of the campus.  
At times when those facilitating the labs are idle, they can work on other needed activities such as triaging and resolving issues that are being reported to the Help Desk. |
**Monthly Observations and Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The launch of the Command Center in early October has proven to be effective, and continues to progress well post go-live. Coverage remains strong and the project team continues to drive efforts to mitigate issues and risks. The Command Center is requesting that all issues be entered into the Workday Sustainment JIRA and be assigned to the Workday Command Center. This ensures that the issues are being properly tracked and resolved. As new issues arise, the project team conducts the appropriate level of investigation to understand the underlying cause, current and downstream impact, and then works to develop a mitigation strategy. The appropriate resources are assigned to monitor the issue(s)/risk(s) and provide updates as needed. The schedule is being properly communicated and includes daily calls that occur every two hours. These daily calls serve as checkpoints to provide updates to the stakeholders. Additionally, notes are taken and sent out after the call. This practice is effective and ensures there is an understanding of topics, risks, and issues amongst all individuals, even if they are unable to participate on a call. Following go-live, it was expected that the Program would experience an increase of reported issues by the user community. Acting as a programmatic foundation point, and as stated above, the Command Center holds daily focused meetings every two hours to review, prioritize, and determine a strategy to address escalated JIRA issues.</td>
<td>As previously recommended, the Command Center initiative should continue to operate to address significant issues collaboratively and effectively. Communications and resource coverage should remain strong for each time slot. As the team continues to work through the Hypercare period, we recommend the Program proactively work to define a future plan as to how and when to implement any deferred or newly created changes requests for system improvements, as they are being identified. The Command Center has demonstrated an ability to confront and grasp challenging issues quickly and efficiently. As the number of users entering Workday will increase and begin to utilize greater functionality of the platform, the number of issues escalated to the Command Center will also likely increase. (continued on next page)</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 – Process</td>
<td>(continued from previous page) With an increase in reported and/or escalated issues, it is recommended that the Command Center continue to use the in-place standard issue resolution processes (i.e., JIRA documentation and communication). The use of emails, slack, or other forms of communication outside of JIRA should be minimized. This ensures that information is localized to a single environment that is auditable. Further, as a means to keep issue resolution focused, it is recommended (1) that the number of people working on a single JIRA be kept to a minimum, and (2) only if needed to involve other related work streams. This will assist in the reduction of duplicative work and concerns due to issues being miscommunicated or misunderstood across work streams.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the go-live week, the Program noted it was challenging to determine when to review and address open JIRAs escalated to the Command Center. Through a collaborative effort, the Command Center created a detailed JIRA Dashboard &quot;Workday Sustainment – All Issue Types&quot;, that improved issue type assignment, compiled issues by functional area and status, as well as issues in which the Command Center has not yet reviewed.</td>
<td>Similar to how the Program developed the End-to-End Testing JIRA Dashboard, the Command Center devised a process to address confusion regarding escalated issues as well as how and/or when to begin addressing escalated issues. As the Command Center will operate through February 2019, it is recommended that the Program continue to improve the Workday Sustainment Dashboard both to increase the visibility of all escalated issues, and to increase the communication and collaboration of personnel ultimately assigned to research, solution, and implement a resolution.</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 JIRA issues are escalated, the Command Center reviews, determines priority, as well as assigns a provisional due date. In addition, the Command Center revisits reviewed JIRAs and their provisional due date. Depending on priority and due date, the JIRA may be deferred to be completed at a later point in time. The continued programmatic review of JIRA issues by the Command Center maintains the agile approach to the solution and resolution of impacts to Workday.</td>
<td>Overall, the Command Center’s agile approach to the prioritization of JIRA issues has proven successful – as evidenced by resolution of blocker issues such as the ACA, SailPoint integration, and compensation change to terminated workers during the week of go-live. It is recommended that the Program continue to leverage an agile approach to prioritize JIRA issues that escalate to the Command Center. In the effort to expand the effectiveness of the agile mindset, it is further recommended that the Program also focus on the optimization of JIRA issues. Specifically, it is suggested that Pod leaders begin to evaluate deferred JIRA issues that fall into his or her functional area: HCM, Payroll, Benefits, etc. With their respective team, each Pod leader can collaboratively develop and define a roadmap of how to both prioritize and optimize the deferred JIRAs. This can further enhance the process by which JIRA issues are reviewed, assigned, and addressed, which ultimately can reduce the time and number of occasions the Command Center may revisit deferred JIRA issues.</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>In addition to the daily status calls, the Program is also conducting daily calls with Business Process owners, to discuss issues as they arise, including impact, results of issue analysis, and proposed resolution. The discussions are focused, clear and concise, and issues are addressed efficiently. There is usually full representation from the work streams and Business Process Owners, either in person or by phone, and a spirit of close collaboration is evident. Immediately following each call, email minutes are distributed summarizing the discussions. Similarly, daily calls are also held for System Change Management, in order to address whatever changes are needed in a prompt, transparent manner. Upcoming Roadmap items are also being discussed.</td>
<td>As previously stated, the Program should continue to address issues as they arise. As issues decrease and the system stabilizes, the number of calls can be reduced as needed, to release the participants' time. The associated user guidance regarding the resolved issues are also being created and sent out quickly; this practice should continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Help Desk continues to run effectively and provides direct and online support to facilitate the use and development of Workday. It utilizes an automated call distribution system (ACD), knowledge and ticketing system, Zoom, as well as SharePoint to effectively operate and assist users. Regarding the October survey results that were shared with the Program in November, those who requested Help Desk assistance were pleased with the level of overall support provided. It was stated that responses were given in a timely manner and the answers were specific to their questions.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Help Desk continue to be treated as a high priority and resourced appropriately, in order maintain the same high levels of support, and meet user expectations. As users become more familiar with the system, it is likely more detailed questions will be raised for specific business processes. It is important that the Program has the appropriate resources and structure in place to assist the help desk in addressing these questions as they arise.</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>The Program is conducting an open labs initiative which allows individuals to come in, discuss specific tasks and ask any questions they may have with the Workday system. The open labs are currently scheduled daily and are a strong tool being utilized for user targeted support. Virtual labs are additional opportunities the Program has initiated to assist users to become further educated on specific topics. Discussions continue around which sustainment topics will be raised during upcoming virtual lab sessions. As previously stated, currently the labs are experiencing low user attendance, which is unexpected. Lab schedules continue to be open with Program resources available to individuals who require further assistance in Workday.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Program continue to drive the open lab initiative as it serves as a great opportunity for users to become more confident with Workday. Furthermore, the Program should continue to monitor the volume of users requiring assistance as it may vary in the coming months of stabilization. Individuals may raise questions and concerns after they have had time to explore the system fully in order to better understand any new processes in place. The team should continue to talk to units to see what issues are coming up and what topics are worth sharing and discussing further during virtual labs. The Program should continue to monitor the lab attendance and maintain the appropriate resources as needed. The first several months after Workday go-live may experience both high and low volumes of lab attendance. While the current initial uptake may be slow, the Program should be ready to have resources available to assist users in event there is a spike in volume. If the current trend continues, it is recommended that the Program revisit the issue and discuss with leadership as to how the effort can be scaled back.</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>With the successful launch of Workday, the program also continues to drive communications and updates to the campus community. The project team delivers University-wide emails that cover critical issues such as timesheets and supervisor approvals, payroll transactions, Workday employee training, etc., and identifies major milestones and deadlines. Additionally, the Program has done a very good job continuing to communicate all the tools and resources available to individuals (Help Desk, askUS knowledgebase, and the Workday@UT Website, etc.) post go-live.</td>
<td>The Program should continue to maintain the strong communications channels with the user community, and share future improvement and upgrade plans, as appropriate. Allowing users to know about new functionality and enhancement made available in Workday will further assist any transition efforts in the future, and promote change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURGE resources continue to support the campus by providing face-to-face, on-site support and answers to questions to campus users in their respective units. Recurring themes and questions asked by the campus and addressed by the SURGE Team are being documented and provided to the user support teams, to be incorporated into askUS articles, training, and documentation. As of November 27, 75 recurring questions/answers were provided for incorporation into user documentation.</td>
<td>The Program should continue with this effective support strategy. They should continue to identify and document recurring support themes and make answers and workarounds available to the campus, to reduce the number of support calls to the Help Desk.</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>Project Implementation – Process</td>
<td>The number of requests for SURGE assistance were tracked and documented throughout the month. Please refer to the chart on the following page. Excluding informal, face-to-face conversations and quick questions, the Team handled a total of 380 formal requests through November 30, averaging 17 formal requests per day, with the highest activity (66 requests, 16.4%) occurring on Wednesday, November 14. The bulk of the requests (69%) were received from the College of Education (64), College of Fine Arts (59), Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost (56), HRSS (42), and Moody College of Communication (40). The remaining units (31%) submitted 1 – 21 requests. The most common topics (57% of the requests) were Timekeeping (92), Business Process (83), Payroll/Payments (40), and General (29). Security, Reports and Costing tied at 20 requests each (15%), with the remaining twelve topics (20%) reflecting 0 - 14 requests.</td>
<td>It is recommended to continue to support the campus in this manner until the application stabilizes. The SURGE activity tracker should be used to gauge the need for continued campus support by SURGE resources, gradually reducing the SURGE team as users begin to feel confident working in the system, and support calls diminish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monthly Observations and Recommendations

Number SURGE Requests by Date
November 1 - November 30

Total Requests 380
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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 – Process</td>
<td>In November, the team continued executing on the Workday Cutover Checklist, with daily communications to the entire Program continuing through the third week in November, to ensure there was a full level of awareness of upcoming cutover activities, and weekly communications thereafter. The Cutover Checklist was maintained on SharePoint and updated regularly. The team narrowly missed its goal of completing 2,168 tasks (83%) through November 30, despite close coordination among the Program and the various campus units impacted, and commitment to the Plan. Tasks lagged behind schedule the week of Thanksgiving, closing the month with 90 tasks behind schedule. The chart on the following page depicts the progression of the tasks executed throughout the month.</td>
<td>Excellent progress continued to be achieved throughout the month. The Program should continue to execute on the checklist through March, as planned. Close monitoring of lagging activities, and collaboration with resources responsible for the tasks should continue. Furthermore, after the transition has been made, the Program should take the opportunity to re-evaluate the tasks and issues that were of more difficulty, and discuss with team members how processes could be improved through lessons learned activities. This will prove useful for future releases and updates to Workday that may require similar efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monthly Observations and Recommendations

Cutover Task Execution Tracker
November 2018

Total Tasks: 2,609
30-Nov Target: 83%

% Complete: 27% 27% 36% 41% 48% 55% 58% 60% 66% 66% 67% 67% 70% 72% 72% 75% 75% 77% 77% 78% 85%

Tasks Complete | Tasks In Progress | Tasks Late | % Complete
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# Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project Implementation – Process | As stated above, daily change management meetings were held to review and prioritize issues as they arose, and schedule them for resolution. The issues were tracked in JIRA, and updated as they moved through the analysis, development, and implementation process.  
Issue types ranged widely, and included bugs, enhancements, operational support, data issues, testing, and others.  
Of the 2,090 JIRA issues created or closed during the month of November, 876 (42%) were still active as of November 28, and 1,214 (58%) had been resolved. This is a remarkable achievement by the Project Team, given that 809 of the 1,214 resolved issues (67%) were addressed by the team within 2 days, and 188 (15%) were resolved within 3-5 days.  
Please refer to the 2 charts on the following page.  
The first chart shows the duration of resolved issues as of November 28. For the 876 issues still active as of November 28, the number of issues per Workday Priority, along with the low, high, and average age for each category, are shown on the second chart. Issues with no assigned priority are newer, and in the process of being prioritized. | As is the practice, the Program should continue to review and prioritize issues, and resolve them as quickly as possible. |
Monthly Observations and Recommendations

Duration of Resolved Issues
as of November 28, 2018

Total Resolved Issues: 1,214

- 00 - 02 days: 188, 15%
- 03 - 05 days: 809, 67%
- 06 - 10 days: 104, 9%
- 11 - 15 days: 88, 7%
- 16 - 30 days: 13, 1%
- 31 or more days: 12, 1%

Age of Active Issues by Workday Priority (in Days)
as of November 28, 2018

Total Active Issues: 876

Legend: Low, Average, High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Legend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blocker</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td>Now that the University has gone live with Workday HCM/Payroll, in addition to the ongoing support of users and their day-to-day transactions, the University will now start to run their scheduled business events. For November this included running the first Payrolls. While they were a success overall, several issues arose that were addressed quickly that enabled employees to get paid. One issue that arose, and which is a concern, relates to an ACH file issue with a partnering bank. While approximately 40 files had been provided to this bank during the testing period, the file did not process when in production. During the testing, the bank had stated that the files “looked good” and requested UT to no longer send them files. Given that hidden characters in the file were the cause of the problem, it was evident that the bank could never have tested the file, as the problem would have surfaced with the first run. It is assumed that the bank only performed an “eye check” during their review. Time keeping and submission of timesheets surfaced as an issue during the Payroll process. Approximately 3,000 staff did not submit their timesheets on time, and thus did not get paid. Appropriate guidance is being created and distributed quickly. Lessons learned from this process will be applied to future executions.</td>
<td>While there is nothing the University can do if a third party comes back to them and states that files are acceptable, the bank file issue should further raise concerns around other third parties. The Program should continue to refine its contingency plans around the third parties to help reduce any downstream impacts that may be experienced in the event similar circumstances occur. In addition, it should be anticipated that this will happen again, and therefore proactive measures should be made to further validate file testing with those third parties that are involved in upcoming critical business transactions. This will not eliminate the risk, however it will help minimize the likelihood of a significant issue arising. As Payrolls are complete, the month-end close is the next major event, and the team is preparing for this. As part of this preparation, if there is third party involvement, they should also be considered within the planning. The Program continues to take on a lot of responsibilities of addressing issues campus-wide that the business should own. This is expected following a go-live, however as the Hypercare period and stabilization progresses, activities that the Program now performs should be transitioned to the business units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      | As a component of the go-live process, Final Workday Delivery Assurance (DA) Reviews were completed on November 4, of the following modules:  
• Absence  
• Benefits  
• HCM & Compensation  
• Payroll  
• Recruiting  
• Talent  
• Time Tracking  
Overall, the DA reports revealed a positive and successful assessment of configuration across each functional area. | The completion of Workday Final DA reviews is a significant accomplishment in and of itself. Not only was it a critical milestone of the Program’s preparation for the move to Production, it also represented the momentous collaboration, dedication, and willpower of each individual involved.  
Overwhelmingly, the DA reviews indicated that each module passed. However, it is recommended that the Program review the final review summary section of the Benefit and Compensation reports and determine a strategy and roadmap to address areas labeled as “Areas of Concern”. It will be important to determine if the “Areas of Concern” have immediate, long-term, and/or downstream impacts when developing a plan.  
It is further suggested that the Program review the “Recommendation” areas within the Recruiting and Time Tracking reports. Here, the Program can evaluate the proposed recommended changes to determine how and if they align with the current and long-term vision of the University’s Workday processes. |
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      | As the University continues to adopt the Workday platform, campus users will shift jobs and/or responsibilities. As a result, the Role Based Security of a worker may require changes in the form of additional or removal of security roles. The dynamic nature of worker changes will require a standardized and robust process that contains targeted and precise communication to the users. HCM Advisory Group meetings delineated initial plans to provide a report of security roles weekly and monthly to assist CSU's in the audit of appropriate user security. | Currently, the Program provides security-related training, help and support, as well as resource information on Workday@UT. Workday security is complex and often poses a challenge for users. In addition, Workday security impacts all users (CSU through BPOs and Policy/Procedure Oversight Units), and consequently, requires clear, jargon-free language that University personnel can easily understand, assimilate, and comprehend. As the Program has made strides to provide detailed information to the University on Workday@UT, it is recommended to continue to refine messaging and available resources. It is suggested the Program research and/or consult with other Universities and Institutions in how they have provided security related information and training to users. Due to the inherent complexity of Workday security, it is recommended that the Program add information to Workday@UT regarding the following, to further assist users to comprehend security details:  
• How do I know what roles I need?  
• How to see your own security roles  
• How to see the security roles of another worker  
Further, as additional processes are created that assist users audit security assignments in the determination of appropriate security, it is suggested that these procedures also be made available to the appropriate domain within Workday@UT. |
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 – November 2018 project risk activity is presented in the graph below:
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- Daily Workday Meeting (7am, 9am, 11am, 1pm, 3pm, 5pm, 7pm), November 1 – 30, 2018
- Daily Business Process Owner Meeting, November 1 – 30, 2018
- Daily System Change Management Meeting, November 1 – 30, 2018
- Intro to Sustainment Jira Meeting, November 1, 2018
- Workday Bridging Meeting, November 1, 2018
- Cutover Weekend Meeting (10am, 11am, 1pm), November 3, 2018
- UT Austin – HCM & Comp Final DA Review Meeting, November 4, 2018
- UT Austin – Recruiting Final DA Review Meeting, November 4, 2018
- UT Austin – Talent Final DA Review Meeting, November 4, 2018
- UT Austin – Absence Final DA Review Meeting, November 4, 2018
- UT Austin – Time Tracking Final DA Review Meeting, November 4, 2018
- UT Austin – Benefits Final DA Review Meeting, November 4, 2018
- UT Austin – Payroll Final DA Review Meeting, November 4, 2018
- Open Labs and Sessions Kick Off Meeting, November 5, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- MicroAssist Accommodations Meeting, November 5, 2018
- UT Austin Performance Checkpoint (1st day in Production) Meeting, November 6, 2018
- HCM Advisory Group Meeting, November 6, 2018
- UT Austin Performance Checkpoint Meeting, November 8, 2018
- Workday Bridging Meeting, November 8, 2018
- ERPITL Meeting, November 9, 2018
- Daily Release Notes Preparation Meeting, November 9 – 30, 2018
- UT Austin Performance Checkpoint Meeting, November 12, 2018
- KPMG Review of October Report, November 13, 2018
- Workday Steering Committee Meeting, November 14, 2018
- Workday Bridging Meeting, November 15, 2018
- ERPITL Meeting, November 23, 2018
- KPMG Touch Base Meeting, November 27, 2018
- KPMG Future Planning Meeting, November 28, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Interviews Conducted

• No formal interviews were conducted during the period
Documentation Reviewed
Documentation Reviewed

- UT Workday Cutover Daily Activities Tracker, November 1 – 30, 2018
- Workday Sustainment – All Issue Types Tracker, November 1 – 30, 2018
- Workday Steering Committee Packet for 10/10/2018 Meeting, October 9, 2018
- Absence Configuration Review Template Final, November 12 – 16, 2018
- Benefits Configuration Review Template Final, November 12 – 16, 2018
- Compensation Configuration Review Template Final, November 12 – 16, 2018
- HCM Configuration Review Template Final, November 12 – 16, 2018
- Payroll Configuration Review Template Final, November 12 – 16, 2018
- Recruiting Configuration Review Template Final, November 12 – 16, 2018
- Talent Configuration Review Template Final, November 12 – 16, 2018
- Time Tracking Configuration Review Template Final, November 12 – 16, 2018
- Workday Help Desk Overview, November 28, 2018
- Workday Helpdesk – askUS Survey Feedback – November 28, 2018
- Hourly Timekeeping Communications in Advance of Next Semi Monthly Deadline, November 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 5 (March 2017)</td>
<td>4/05/2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, April 5, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, April 21, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, April 26, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 6 (April 2017)</td>
<td>5/05/2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, May 5, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, May 15, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, May 18, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 7 (May 2017)</td>
<td>6/05/2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, June 5, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, June 13, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, June 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 8 (June 2017)</td>
<td>7/05/2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, July 5, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, July 12, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, July 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 9 (July 2017)</td>
<td>8/05/2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, August 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, August 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, August 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 10 (August 2017)</td>
<td>9/05/2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, September 5, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, September 21, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, September 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 11 (September 2017)</td>
<td>10/05/2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, October 5, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, October 13, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, October 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 12 (October 2017)</td>
<td>11/05/2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, November 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, November 14, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, November 16, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 13 (November 2017)</td>
<td>12/05/2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, December 5, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, December 18, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, January 3, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 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, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, February 12, 2018 |
| 17 – Enterprise Readiness Verification Report                  | 9/28/2018 | Complete | • Submitted draft report, September 28, 2018  
• Submitted final report, October 2, 2018  
• Presented report to CUBO, October 4, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, October 8, 2018  
• Presented report to HCM/Payroll Advisory Group, October 16, 2018 |
| 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 | Complete | • Submitted draft report, August 10, 2018  
• Submitted final report, August 28, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, August 30, 2018 |
| 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 | Complete | • Submitted draft report, September 28, 2018  
• Submitted final report, October 2, 2018  
• Presented report to CUBO, October 4, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, October 8, 2018  
• Presented report to HCM/Payroll Advisory Group, October 16, 2018 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number/Name</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 |
| 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 | Complete | • Submitted draft report, July 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, July 18, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, July 27, 2018 |
| 29 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 21 (July 2018)    | 8/05/2018 | Complete | • Submitted draft report, August 3, 2018  
• Submitted final report, August 28, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, August 30, 2018 |
| 30 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 22 (August 2018)   | 9/05/2018 | Complete | • Submitted draft report, September 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, September 11, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, September 12, 2018 |
| 31 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 23 (September 2018)| 10/05/2018| Complete | • Submitted draft report, October 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, October 16, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, October 22, 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>
| 32 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 24 (October 2018) | 11/05/2018  | Complete        | • Submitted draft report, November 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, November 13, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, November 30, 2018 |
| 33 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 25 (November 2018)| 12/05/2018  | Pending Approval| • Submitted draft report, December 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, January 11, 2019  
• Pending approval                                      |
| 34 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 26 (December 2018)| 1/05/2019   | Pending Approval| • Submitted draft report, January 4, 2019  
• Submitted final report, January 11, 2019  
• Pending approval                                      |
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