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Objective, Scope, and Approach
This document is Deliverable #32: Monthly Risk Assessment Report (October 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.

During this reporting period, the Program’s major focus continued to be on the activities around the drive towards go-live. For this report, the 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.

During the reporting period, Deliverable #17 (Enterprise Readiness Verification Report) and Deliverable #22 (Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #3) were finalized on October 2nd. Both reports were presented at the CUBO Meeting, October 4th, and the HCM/Payroll Advisory Group Meeting, October 16th.
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>Governance and Campus</td>
<td>The decision to go-live was made during the reporting period. The process included significant due diligence, and the engagement of all governance groups. The Steering Committee met several times to discuss the state of readiness across campus, as well as all the remaining open issues and concerns. While issues were raised (specifically around job costing and training), the Program AVP did an excellent job of addressing all of the Committee’s concerns, including stating the actions planned and support activities for each item. As a result, the Committee voted unanimously to go forward. There was one “qualified” yes vote from a Committee member. The Program leadership, team members, and campus participants should be commended for all of the work that was accomplished throughout the project, and especially for the efforts leading up to the go-live decision. The ability to achieve this significant milestone was a direct result of the dedication, leadership, planning, and efforts of all involved. There will always be open issues with an implementation of this size, and it is key to ensure that plans and support mechanisms are in place to address them, which is the case. As previously recommended, a joint Executive Sponsor message should come out at go-live, encouraging staff to be patient, and to take advantage of the extensive support that is available to them. It is recommended that the message further state that some things may not work as well as expected at the onset, and that this is the start of an ongoing improvement process. As stated, the Program AVP did an excellent job addressing all of the Steering Committee members issues and concerns, and did so with a calm demeanor which instilled confidence in the group. While this was accomplished, it was again observed several times that there was negativity amongst several Committee members. As future processes are established, including governance, it is further recommended that Committee members fully understand their leadership role and responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>The Committee Co-Chairs then met with the Managing Executive Sponsor to present the recommendation and discuss the open issues. Following that meeting, an Executive Sponsor meeting was held including the President, Provost, and Executive Managing Sponsor. The final decision to go-live was made at that meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Campus Collaboration</td>
<td>The go-live decision showed the confidence and demonstrated the commitment of the University’s leadership to the Program and its people, as well as an endorsement of the work the Program team has achieved during this long and arduous process. They expressed great appreciation for all the work the Program, the business officers, and campus have done to promote a successful implementation. The participation of the Managing Executive Sponsor was evident throughout the month (including the attendance at a key Steering Committee meeting), lending support and encouragement to the team, recognizing their efforts, emphasizing the importance of the effort, and sending a unified message by setting realistic expectations for what is to come. The messaging was well received. It was further stated that the efforts will not end after go-live, and the coming months will be challenging as the transition continues. The stage was set to start the thought process around evolving into the next phase of Workday. The Managing Executive Sponsor stated that the Steering Committee structure will also need to be changed and evolve to meet the new environment. He solicited feedback from the members on the existing and new structure. Members were encouraged to continue to think this through and provide further input.</td>
<td>The support of the Program should continue as they overcome challenges that arise post-implementation, reminding the campus through consistent messaging including an objective outlook, and about the importance of working together to address issues in a positive, courteous manner. The Executive level involvement should continue as issues arise, reinforcing that collaboration and unity will increase the likelihood of success. As the post-implementation process progresses, the Steering Committee’s role and membership should continue to be re-evaluated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Campus Collaboration</td>
<td>During the period, the Steering Committee’s Reporting Subcommittee concluded their activities, as they felt that they had accomplished what was needed. The Subcommittee was not disbanded however, and may reconvene if the need arise in the future. A new organizational structure was implemented for reporting, including moving the function under the Technical Director. This will allow for the effective sharing of technical resources needed to complete reports and address new reporting requirements that arise post go-live. A Reporting SWAT team has also been created which will address compliance and legislative reporting needs that arise immediately after go-live. Campus engagement and collaboration continues to rise. Based on the Town Hall meeting, training sessions, User Fair, and Workday website activity during the month, the user community showed an increased level of engagement and interest in Workday leading up to go-live. The Town Hall was well received with a total number of 231 views. Training sessions have been positive, as attendees have stated their appreciation to the presenters for creating knowledgeable and interactive sessions, while learning more about Workday’s functionality. Approximately 400 users attend the Job Fair, which is a significant number. The Workday website views and clicks have also steadily increased.</td>
<td>With Reporting remaining a critical and visible concern to campus, the Program should continue to address this area with the high priority in which it is doing so, and continue with the flexible reorganizing around whatever is needed. It is recommended that the Program continue to provide opportunities to the user community to experience the various functions of the Workday system. Post go-live, in addition to the current plans, the trainings and website content should go deeper into guidance on specific processes, business transactions, and content tailored for niche groups and whatever new issues or concerns that arise. It is important that content continues to be up to date, relevant, and communicated appropriately through multiple channels, and to ensure users are aware of the various forms of help available to them. This will further assist that perceptions remain positive and the overall acceptance of the system continues throughout the University.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Governance and Campus       | The significant collaboration amongst the Program and campus continued, specifically around the resolution of the critical benefits and rescind items. Significant support and guidance also continued, including the Program developing a post go-live checklist for the campus users. The documentation provides 6 areas of focus:  
  - Time Entry 
  - Transactions Impacting Payroll 
  - Jobs with Approaching End Dates 
  - Recruitment 
  - Role Assignments 
  - Continuous Learning | The collaborative process of addressing the critical benefits and rescind items positions the Program well to address any similar issues that arise in the future. The team should remain agile to mobilize as needed to address such issues. Throughout the month, the checklist has continued to undergo revisions to provide users with a focus as they begin to utilize Workday. In the time remaining prior to go-live, it is recommended that the Program continue improving the checklist by keeping instructions straightforward and minimizing Workday jargon. As users enter Workday for the first time, many will have immediate questions or concerns regarding basic and/or advanced transactions and functionality. It is suggested to provide Help Desk Support, Operational Support, and Retroactive Transaction information earlier in the documentation. |
### 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>During the month, the team continued to be diligently focused on executing cutover activities, often under high stress. Nonetheless, the Program team took time to organize and participate in stress reducing activities, bringing the team together in a relaxed, fun environment. At a time in every project where emotions run high with potential for negativity, the opportunity to pause for respite goes a long way toward alleviating pressure, strain, and worry.</td>
<td>As responsibilities mount, especially in the first few months after go-live, the Program should continue to plan for opportunities to gather as a team to relieve the daily pressures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As the drive to go-live continues, Program resources continue to be reassigned to address remaining work and fill key operational roles in sustainment. Program management and Program resources continue to exercise flexibility and a &quot;use me where I am needed&quot; attitude, using their talents and experience for the benefit of the Program and campus.</td>
<td>The Program should continue to encourage a spirit of collaboration and flexibility to bring the Program to successful go-live, and beyond into sustainment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As the Program moves into the next phase of Workday, concerns remain in regards to some of the additional workload and potentially resources, that will be needed post go-live. Specifically raised and noted, are retroactive costing transactions, which continue to cause anxiety at the user level.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Program continue to focus on outreach and training pertaining to the key areas raised by the user community. It will be critical to give attention to individual workloads following go-live to ensure critical deadlines can be met. \nFurthermore, with the Holiday season approaching, backup resources should be identified to ensure the work continues and deadlines are met. This is true for the campus as a whole.</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>On October 3, the team started executing on the Workday Cutover Checklist. It consists of over 2,500 tasks to be executed through the hypercare period, ending in March 2019. Communications were executed well and sent to the entire Program to ensure there was a full level of awareness of upcoming cutover activities. The Program did an excellent job sending daily status emails with the cutover tasks spanning the previous, current, and next day activities. Emails included task analytics and their current status's (Not Reported, In Progress, and Complete). Reminders were sent to staff with pending items. Additionally, major announcements, updates, and changes were communicated as needed on top of the daily email. The Official Cutover Checklist was maintained on SharePoint and updated hourly. Additionally, a dedicated Slack channel was used as the official cutover channel to submit task updates/statuses. The team met its goal by completing 632 tasks (24%) through October 31. This required close coordination among the Program and the various campus units impacted. (continued on next page)</td>
<td>Excellent progress was achieved throughout the month. The Program should continue to execute on the checklist, as is 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation – Process</td>
<td>(continued from previous page)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>While maintenance of the 2500+ task checklist held some challenges to ensure all status updates were made correctly and included with the appropriate reporting status, reference ID, changes/updates, and/or comments, the Program executed the process very effectively. It is anticipated that this same level of attention and effort will be given to remaining tasks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The following chart depicts the positive progression of the tasks executed throughout the month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cutover Task Execution Tracker
### Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As planned, the Program initiated the operation of the Command Center in early October, and it will continue through March 2019. The Command Center serves as both the escalation point for deployment issues and has officially replaced the Change Review Board to review, document, and approve configuration change control issues. Coverage is expected by the Program Leadership Team, Consultant Leaders, Security Team, Communications Team, Program Managers, and Cutover staff. Later in the month, however, the Command Center calendar reflected sparse coverage. While some resources appeared to be overcommitted, others have yet to sign up for shifts. Unless the Command Center calendar is closely managed, and there is a clear understanding of the days/times that each resource is expected to be present in the Command Center, there is risk that calls may be missed, urgent situations may not be addressed timely, or that resources who are overcommitted may experience fatigue. It is anticipated this will be addressed prior to go-live.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Command Center calendar be updated to reflect availability/assignments so that the planned resources are on hand to address emergency issues. The timeframes when each resource is expected to be present should be communicated. Further, it should be ensured that there is full coverage for each time slot, as planned or as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As Help Desk calls are received, and SURGE resources assist users as they become conversant with Workday, there is an opportunity to analyze the questions being asked, along with their responses, and add these to the knowledge base repository (e.g., askUS) and other help and support information.</td>
<td>The team should index, catalogue, and analyze issues/questions that arise post go-live, to identify areas where communication or messaging could be improved, where multiple users may experience the same or similar issue, or where training materials could be enhanced to mitigate gaps, if any.</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 System Change Management Meetings began in October in replacement of the previous Change Review Board Meetings. These have progressed well during the month as the Program continues to effectively discuss issues being tracked, and provide resolution collaboratively and quickly.</td>
<td>While the new meeting is proving to be effective, it should continue to be evaluated, as there remains a significant amount of project work after go-live, and its focus may need to be revised. Change control will play a large role after the transition to Workday, and will be a key function in ensuring success long-term across the University. Furthermore, while the current focus remains on issues relevant to go-live, a strategy should be devised to transition the focus of the meetings to post go-live change management issues and include the appropriate resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Program completed a rehearsal of the Gold Tenant build between October 5 and 8. Overall, the rehearsal was successful such that the Program reached a 94% conversion and configuration validation completion rate by Saturday, October 6. A 99% completion rate was reached on Monday, October 8.</td>
<td>The result and outcome from the Gold Build rehearsal was a major success. The Program was able to set strategy into action to determine (1) if planned activities were successful, and (2) the Program allotted appropriate time and resources to successfully execute these tasks during the cut over period. For example, the Program was able to complete all planned critical transactions, a key component of the gold build conversion activities, on Saturday October 6. Knowing the effectiveness of the critical transaction strategy, the Program felt ready to socialize the process for requesting critical transactions to the Advisory Group. It is recommended that the Program utilized these lessons learned during cut over (and future project cut overs), and also be prepared to adapt to unforeseen issues that may arise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project Implementation – Process | During October, the Program completed PPT3A as well as the final cycle of Payroll Parallel Testing (PPT4). Results of PPT3A met exit criteria and are reported below:  
- PPT3A True Up Gross: 99.35%  
- PPT3A True Up Net: 97.34%  
In addition, PPT4 also met exit criteria (results reported below). PPT4 completed without newly identified bugs/issues. The Program indicated that from a payroll perspective, Payroll Parallel Testing is complete. Results of PPT4 are reported below:  
- PPT4 True Up Gross: 99.89%  
- PPT4 True Up Net: 99.05% | The Program’s completion of Payroll Parallel Testing is a major milestone for the Workday implementation. Although the non-acceptable variances in PPT4 did not present new bugs or issues, it is suggested the Program be flexible and ready to accommodate unanticipated payroll concerns.  
For any non-acceptable variances identified during cut over, it is recommended the Program, where possible, leverage existing remediation plans and/or procedures to address pre or post go-live. |
|                             | As discussed in the Business Process Owners (BPO) meeting on October 17, the first pay check from Workday will be different, and as a result, may not reflect an accurate total semi-monthly amount.  
During this meeting, both Program ad BPO members noted that inaccuracies of pay checks will be made whole by the end of the month, the second semi-monthly pay period. | The Program has stressed throughout the beginning of the cutover period that an implementation of any system, including the legacy, is never perfect. It is common that issues arise and workarounds to transactions, missing data, or imprecise values are converted. The Program has been transparent with Steering Committee, BPO, CUBO, and others, that such issues have and will likely arise.  
As this issue directly impacts worker pay, it is recommended that the Program communicate the issue and the remediation plan as soon as possible. This will help University workers prepare of any initial discrepancy, potentially reduce help desk call volume, and empower workers to ensure pay check accuracy by the end of November. |
## 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 continues to refine training efforts and is establishing open lab opportunities for users who would like to come in and discuss specific issues and processes. The volume of users who may require additional assistance with specific business process may be high post go-live, specifically for individuals who had taken training early in August and have not completed refresher courses.</td>
<td>The open lab concept is an excellent support mechanism, and it is recommended that the Program continues to schedule resources for these. It will be critical to apply the appropriate level of staffing who can provide effective solutions to specific business process questions. Furthermore, the open labs should be offered at multiple times to accommodate various schedules and allow for flexibility for the user community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| – Process | During the week of October 15, the Program started preliminary Workday Delivery Assurance (DA) reviews of completed Gold Build configuration and data of the following modules:  
• Absence  
• Benefits  
• HCM & Compensation  
• Payroll  
• Recruiting  
• Talent  
• Time Tracking  
The Final Gold Build Workday DA reviews are planned to occur between November 3 and 4. | Initial reviews by the Workday DA consultant allow for the examination of the Program’s current tenant configuration, and more importantly, allow for recommendations and suggestions to improve, correct, and in some cases, require configuration changes prior to migration to a Production tenant. Unless initial DA reviews determined critical configuration issues, it is recommended that the Program continue to follow the cutover document, and incorporate recommended configuration changes post go-live.  
In addition, to minimize duplicative work and discussion during final DA review, it is suggested the Program further document any post go-live configuration plans and provide Workday DA consultants with detailed information for items identified within each functional area’s configuration exemption audit reports. As noted, this will expedite the final DA review process as well as detail to DA Consultants, the Program, and the University a plan and rationalization for audit exemptions. |
# Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation – Process</td>
<td>As a component of the go-live planning, a cutover contingency and back-out strategy is in place in the event a major issue arises to make deployment unfeasible so that operations must revert to the legacy system. As defined, the option to revert is possible until November 9. The steps to revert back to the legacy environment and reconcile activity in Workday back to the legacy systems, however, appear to have been loosely defined. With the significant number of cutover tasks completed or to be completed by November 8, there is a risk that the process may take longer than anticipated, creating a longer window when the campus will not have the ability to work in either system should reversion become necessary.</td>
<td>While it is anticipated that this has been considered, and will be addressed, it remains a risk. Given that, it is recommended that the specific related tasks be identified in the cutover plan in the event it becomes necessary to back-out of the implementation. It should also be ensured that the resources responsible for those tasks are available to reverse them, if needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As previously stated, the Reporting work stream has transitioned under the leadership of the Technical Director. As conversion activities complete, conversion resources, who are most familiar with the data, will assume report development roles. The reports inventory was reviewed for accuracy and completeness, identifying reports that must be delivered, and their corresponding status. Reporting consultants will be available through Spring 2019, and a SWAT team of qualified and knowledgeable resources has been assembled to assess, prioritize, and develop newly identified reporting needs.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the team continue to develop the existing reports inventory, and prioritize newly identified reporting needs. Campus representatives willing to participate and guide report prioritization and development should be identified, including representatives from downstream reporting areas (e.g., IQ and IRRIS).</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>Regarding Reporting, there has been significant campus feedback pertaining to legacy reports (e.g., AL1 and AL4), that areas feel are still necessary for them to perform specific business processes. During the reporting period, the Program stated that they will conduct meetings with units who are in need of specific information that was previously provided in the AL1 and AL4. The purpose of these meetings is to discuss the data gaps in Workday vs. the legacy system. Further related to Reporting, reports in Workday do not display if the user executing the report does not have a security role that is authorized to view the report. However, the report does not reflect the reason data is not displayed, and alerts are not displayed indicating that the user's role does not provide access to the specific report. Without easy reference from Workday to inform users on reporting options, campus users may be confused when they run a report, and it does not display the expected data. This may increase calls to the Help Desk. While the Program continues to offer users multiple forms of training, workshops, labs, etc., training remains a concern amongst several campus areas, specifically around job costing. This continues to be an issue for some users as they feel the current approach is not effective in preparing their employee’s for the transition to Workday.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Program continue to work with the CSU’s and CPU’s on items such as this. In turn, the CSU’s and CPU’s need to focus on specific data that is needed, and the associated process, rather than fall back on the AL1 and AL4 due to their familiarity with them. It is recommended that the team continue to provide training on report execution and interpretation. A searchable, cross-referenced tool should be created, and be readily accessible that can be filtered either by report, report ID, or by user role to inform users to which reports their security profiles have access. It is recommended that outreach efforts continue to the users with negative training perceptions. This should be further investigated to pin point where disconnects and gaps are being perceived in this area. Training can then be modified, if needed, to address those disconnects.</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><strong>Project Implementation – Process</strong></td>
<td>During the period, the protocol for handling media inquiries was created and communicated, followed by an email communication confirming consistent messaging and contact information of the communications lead. However, unless the same or similar messaging is sent across all of campus, there is a risk of unplanned media attention at or after go-live.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Program continue to remind the internal and campus teams about the media communication protocol. This should be further reinforced to Deans, business officers, business process owners, and other UT leadership, reminding the campus at large of the correct approach should they receive media requests regarding the Workday implementation. The protocol should not differ from current UT media policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Program team continues to monitor role assignments and define role responsibilities along with their respective business processes. The BPO’s are playing an important part in this process and assisting the Program well with their knowledge of the subject matter. It is understood that there may be changes that will need to be made to specific roles due to any business processes that have to be adjusted for Workday post go-live. University policies and procedures play a large role in the campus culture and directly impact the student/staff provisioning rules. Policies and procedures are being reviewed more closely to address any changes that may need to be made and perform their work effectively post go-live.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the BPO’s continue to work closely with the Program and monitor roles responsible for addressing policy and procedural changes. Any changes to roles should be addressed in a timely manner in order to ensure operations remain fluid. The campus should continue to review and refresh their knowledge of current University policies and procedures in order for operations to perform their activities effectively and continue to move forward successfully. As the University works through the next phase of Workday, policies should be re-evaluated, and modified accordingly to the new streamlined processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Implementation</strong></td>
<td>The Program continues to work with the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement (DDCE) to ensure that the Workday application, as configured for UT, meets the Texas Administrative Code's and UT's internal policies for accessibility compliance, to ensure that users with physical limitations are able to access and use the system. MicroAssist, a third party vendor, has been engaged to assist with accessibility testing, and a Program resource has been assigned to lead the effort.</td>
<td>The Program should continue to work toward full accessibility compliance, as per Texas Administrative Code, Sections 206 and 213, Subchapter C, respectively. Workday should be held responsible for achieving full compliance with accessibility standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation – Technology</td>
<td><strong>On October 4, Workday announced the Security Lead (SL) role. A SL is expected to coordinate efforts on the customer’s end to take action regarding security notifications as well as effectively communicate and/or organize any necessary counter measures to the Program’s IT infrastructure or Workday tenant security configuration.</strong> The individual(s) who take on the SL role responsibilities are also expected to help identify who from the Program should be a point of contact for security related communications from Workday. In addition, a Security Lead may be contacted by (1) Workday Product Managers to obtain feedback and/or drive feature option, or by (2) the Workday Trust Office regarding security advisories posted to the Workday Information Security and Trust Community page.</td>
<td><strong>As Workday recommended having at least one SL, it is suggested that following go-live, and into the sustainment period, the Program evaluate the Security Lead role functionality and its place within the operational support structure. An important benefit this role offers to the Program is a direct point of contact between Workday and the University regarding security related concerns.</strong> Workday outlines SL responsibilities and suggested Workday knowledge at the following community thread: <img src="https://community.workday.com/articles/450366" alt="Link" /></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 - Technology</td>
<td>During the initial Workday Payroll Delivery Assurance (DA) review, it was noted that approximately 4,000+ calculated field exemptions existed. The reviewer noted, that while many of these could be due to Delivery Assurance Exemption Reports (DAX) that Workday has deprecated, it is important to perform an audit to determine if the noted exemptions impact reporting and/or integrations.</td>
<td>As recommended in previous reports, it is suggested that the Program, following go-live and within the period of stabilization, develop governance of Workday Global and Report-based calculated fields. The management and governance of calculated fields will require the Program to establish strong guardrails to minimize duplication, time to regression test reports and/or integrations utilizing calculated fields, as well as the management clean-up activities. It is recommended that the Program review Workday community to gain an understanding and find customer contacts in the Workday ecosystem that provide insight into the management of these processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation - Technology</td>
<td>The Program’s Gold Build tenant management plan incorporates the use of two additional configuration controlled tenants. The first, UT3, a tenant holding static configuration, will be used to migrate and validate configuration between the start and completion of the Gold Tenant build on November 2. During this time, the Program will migrate configuration, reports, integrations, and security from UT3 into Gold. The second, UT6, will hold all configuration changes approved by the Command Center. Between November 2 and 4, the Program will migrate configuration approved/required for go-live.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Program continue to operate both the System Change Management process as well as the migration of approved configuration into UT6 and ultimately Gold/Production. Once Workday is live and in a Production status, it is suggested that the Program continue to utilize a similar migration strategy with an additional step: migrating the configuration to the Sandbox environment prior to the migration to Production. This will provide the Program with an additional layer to test the configuration change in an environment closely aligned with Production.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(continued from previous page)</td>
<td>Often customer implementation tenants, DEV and QUAL for the University, are refreshed less frequently than Sandbox, which is refreshed weekly, and contain out of sync Production data and configuration. A final evaluation of all configuration changes within Sandbox will provide a more improved guardrail than testing solely in Implementation tenants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workday provides regular communication via email with customers. Provided information details customer alerts to Workday tenant functionality. For example, with each alert, Workday provides a Status, Alert Type, Impacted Workday Release, Product, JIRA, Affected Data Centers, and further information detailing the alert and its impact.</td>
<td>When Workday provides Customer Alerts that may impact functionality, it is recommended that the Program implement a standard communication protocol across the University. This process, if possible, should incorporate automated messaging to reduce delays of information distribution to campus users. For example, units could update web pages directly to the Program’s reference material, which could include Workday status information. This could ultimately reduce end user call and email volume to the Help Desk. If the University utilizes a current standard process to detail IT status functionality (i.e., AskUs), it is recommended that the Program continue to utilize the in-place and University recognized process.</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 – October 2018 project risk activity is presented in the graph below:
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- Workday Readiness Activity - Employee Self Service (ESS) Meeting, October 1, 2018
- Financials Pod Business Owner Meeting – Accounting, October 1, 2018
- Financials Pod Business Owner Meeting – Budget, October 1, 2018
- Financials Pod Business Owner Meeting – OSP, October 1, 2018
- KPMG Review of Enterprise Readiness Verification Report (Deliverable 17) and Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #3 (Deliverable 22) Meeting, October 2, 2018
- Workday Reporting Demo Meeting, October 2, 2018
- Enterprise and Campus Readiness Reports Meeting, October 2, 2018
- Change Review Board Meeting, October 2, 2018
- Workday Training for FAS Meeting, October 2, 2018
- Weekly PM Touchpoint Meeting, October 2, 2018
- Program Status Meeting, October 2, 2018
- Workday: Parallel Payroll Planning Meeting, October 3, 2018
- Workday HCM Payroll Business Process Owners Weekly Touch Base Meeting, October 3, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- Workday Steering Committee Meeting, October 3, 2018
- UT Workday Management Meeting, October 3, 2018
- Council of University Business Officers (CUBO) Meeting, October 4, 2018
- Workday Readiness Activity - Managers Self Service (MSS) Meeting, October 4, 2018
- Workday Bridging Meeting, October 4, 2018
- TMP Review Meeting, October 4, 2018
- ERPITL Meeting, October 5, 2018
- System Change Management Meeting, October 8, 2018
- Financials Pod Business Owner Meeting – Accounting, October 8, 2018
- Financials Pod Business Owner Meeting – Budget, October 8, 2018
- Workday Readiness Activity - Employee Self Service (ESS) Meeting, October 9, 2018
- System Change Management Meeting, October 9, 2018
- Payroll Advisory Group Meeting, October 9, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- Program Status Meeting, October 9, 2018
- Workday Critical Transaction Debrief Meeting, October 10, 2018
- Program Team Meeting, October 10, 2018
- Workday HCM Payroll Business Process Owners Weekly Touch Base Meeting, October 10, 2018
- System Change Management Meeting, October 10, 2018
- Workday Steering Committee Meeting, October 10, 2018
- UT Workday Management Meeting, October 10, 2018
- Workday Readiness Activity – Managers Self Service (MSS) Meeting, October 11, 2018
- System Change Management Meeting, October 11, 2018
- Campus Reporting Advisory Group Meeting, October 11, 2018
- Workday Bridging Meeting, October 11, 2018
- System Change Management Meeting, October 12, 2018
- System Change Management Meeting, October 15, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- Workday Readiness Activity – Employee Self Service (ESS) Meeting, October 15, 2018
- Financials Pod Business Owner Meeting – Accounting, October 15, 2018
- Financials Pod Business Owner Meeting – OSP, October 15, 2018
- Workday Town Hall Meeting, October 16, 2018
- System Change Management Meeting, October 16, 2018
- HCM – Payroll Advisory Group Meeting, October 16, 2018
- KPMG Review of September Report, October 16, 2018
- Program Status Meeting, October 16, 2018
- Workday Readiness Activity – Employee Self Service (ESS) Meeting, October 17, 2018
- Parallel Payroll Planning Meeting, October 17, 2018
- Workday Steering Committee Meeting, October 17, 2018
- System Change Management Meeting, October 17, 2018
- Workday HCM Payroll Business Process Owners Weekly Touch Base Meeting, October 17, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

• UT Workday Management Meeting, October 17, 2018
• Workday Readiness Activity – Employee Self Service (ESS) Meeting, October 18, 2018
• System Change Management Meeting, October 18, 2018
• Workday Bridging Meeting, October 18, 2018
• System Change Management Meeting, October 19, 2018
• TMP Review Meeting, October 19, 2018
• UT - Benefits - Configuration Only Checkpoint Meeting, October 19, 2018
• Business Process Owner Meeting, October 22, 2018
• System Change Management Meeting, October 22, 2018
• UT - Payroll Configuration Only DA Review Meeting, October 22, 2018
• KPMG Touch Base Meeting, October 23, 2018
• Employee Self Service (ESS) Meeting, October 23, 2018
• Business Process Owner Meeting, October 23, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- System Change Management Meeting, October 23, 2018
- UT - Absence - Configuration Only Review Meeting, October 23, 2018
- Workday HCM - HR Analyst Training Meeting, October 24, 2018
- Parallel Payroll Planning Meeting, October 24, 2018
- Business Process Owner Meeting, October 24, 2018
- System Change Management Meeting, October 24, 2018
- Workday Readiness Activity – Employee Self Service (ESS) Meeting, October 25, 2018
- Business Process Owner Meeting, October 25, 2018
- System Change Management Meeting, October 25, 2018
- HCM - Payroll Advisory Group Meeting, October 25, 2018
- Workday Bridging Meeting, October 25, 2018
- Prepare for the Command Center's Every 2 Hour Calls Meeting, October 26, 2018
- Business Process Owner Meeting, October 26, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

• System Change Management Meeting, October 26, 2018
• TMP Review Meeting, October 26, 2018
• Business Process Owner Meeting, October 29, 2018
• System Change Management Meeting, October 29, 2018
• Reporting Review Meeting, October 29, 2018
• UT Austin Performance Testing Check-In Meeting, October 29, 2018
• Intro to Sustainment JIRA Meeting, October 30, 2018
• Business Process Owner Meeting, October 30, 2018
• System Change Management Meeting, October 30, 2018
• HCM - Payroll Advisory Group Meeting, October 30, 2018
• Business Process Owner Meeting, October 31, 2018
• System Change Management Meeting, October 31, 2018
• Workday Steering Committee Meeting, October 31, 2018
• Intro to Sustainment JIRA Meeting, October 31, 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, October 2 – October 31, 2018
- Workday Cutover Contingency & Back Out Strategy, October 8, 2018
- Workday Steering Committee Packet for 10/10/2018 Meeting, October 9, 2108
- Command Center Communication Plan, October 12, 2018
- Workday Steering Committee Packet for 10/17/2018 Meeting, October 16, 2108
- Recruiting Configuration Only DA Review File, October 20, 2018
- Time Tracking Configuration Only DA Review File, October 23, 2018
- Absence Configuration Only DA Review File, October 23, 2018
- Benefits Configuration Only DA Review File, October 23, 2018
- September 2018 Workday Culture Survey Results Summary, October 25, 2018
- Governance, Prioritization, Process and Release Schedule during Hypercare, October 25, 2018
- Change Communication During Hypercare, October 25, 2018
- Workday Steering Committee Packet for 10/31/2018 Meeting, October 29, 2018
# 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 – Feasibility Assessment Report</td>
<td>11/21/2016</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted initial report, November 21, 2016&lt;br&gt;• Reviewed report with Leadership Team, November 28, 2016&lt;br&gt;• Revised report, submitted final report, November 30, 2016&lt;br&gt;• Presented report to CUBO, December 1, 2016&lt;br&gt;• Received deliverable approval, January 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 – Initial Monthly Planning Activity Report (November – December 2016)</td>
<td>1/05/2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, January 4, 2017&lt;br&gt;• Submitted final report, January 25, 2017&lt;br&gt;• Received deliverable approval, January 26, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 – Monthly Planning Activity Report (January 2017)</td>
<td>2/05/2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, February 2, 2017&lt;br&gt;• Submitted final report, February 8, 2017&lt;br&gt;• Received deliverable approval, February 14, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 – Comprehensive IV&amp;V Assessment Report and Recommendations</td>
<td>1/05/2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, January 4, 2017&lt;br&gt;• Reviewed report with Leadership Team, January 10, 11, 2017&lt;br&gt;• Revised report, submitted revised draft report, January 19, 2017&lt;br&gt;• Reviewed report with Leadership Team, January 24, 2017&lt;br&gt;• Revised report, submitted revised draft report, January 24, 2017&lt;br&gt;• Submitted final report, January 25, 2017&lt;br&gt;• Received deliverable approval, January 26, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 – Comprehensive IV&amp;V Plan</td>
<td>1/31/2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, January 31, 2017&lt;br&gt;• Submitted final report, February 8, 2017&lt;br&gt;• Received deliverable approval, February 14, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 4 (February 2017)</td>
<td>3/06/2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, March 6, 2017&lt;br&gt;• Submitted final report, March 25, 2017&lt;br&gt;• Received deliverable approval, March 30, 2017</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>
| 07 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 5 (March 2017)    | 4/05/2017  | Complete | • Submitted draft report, April 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, April 21, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, April 26, 2017 |
| 08 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 6 (April 2017)    | 5/05/2017  | Complete | • Submitted draft report, May 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, May 15, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, May 18, 2017 |
| 09 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 7 (May 2017)      | 6/05/2017  | Complete | • Submitted draft report, June 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, June 13, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, June 30, 2017 |
| 10 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 8 (June 2017)     | 7/05/2017  | Complete | • Submitted draft report, July 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, July 12, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, July 25, 2017 |
| 11 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 9 (July 2017)     | 8/05/2017  | Complete | • Submitted draft report, August 4, 2017  
• Submitted final report, August 10, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, August 17, 2017 |
| 12 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 10 (August 2017)  | 9/05/2017  | Complete | • Submitted draft report, September 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, September 21, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, September 25, 2017 |
| 13 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 11 (September 2017)| 10/05/2017 | Complete | • Submitted draft report, October 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, October 13, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, October 25, 2017 |
| 14 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 12 (October 2017) | 11/05/2017 | Complete | • Submitted draft report, November 3, 2017  
• Submitted final report, November 14, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, November 16, 2017 |
| 15 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 13 (November 2017) | 12/05/2017 | Complete | • Submitted draft report, December 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, December 18, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, January 3, 2018 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number/Name</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 14 (December 2017)| 1/05/2018 | Complete | • Submitted draft report, January 5, 2018  
• Submitted final report, January 26, 2018  
• Received deliverable approval, February 12, 2018 |
| 17 – Enterprise Readiness Verification Report                | 9/28/2018 | 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 15 (January 2018)</td>
<td>2/05/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, February 5, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, February 13, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, February 28, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 16 (February 2018)</td>
<td>3/05/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, March 5, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, March 19, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, March 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 17 (March 2018)</td>
<td>4/05/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, April 5, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, April 17, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, April 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 18 (April 2018)</td>
<td>5/05/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, May 4, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, May 8, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, May 10, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 19 (May 2018)</td>
<td>6/05/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, June 5, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, June 19, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, July 2, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 20 (June 2018)</td>
<td>7/05/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, July 5, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, July 18, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, July 27, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 21 (July 2018)</td>
<td>8/05/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, August 3, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, August 28, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, August 30, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 22 (August 2018)</td>
<td>9/05/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, September 5, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, September 11, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, September 12, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 23 (September 2018)</td>
<td>10/05/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, October 5, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, October 16, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received deliverable approval, October 22, 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 24 (October 2018)</td>
<td>11/05/2018</td>
<td>Pending Approval</td>
<td>• Submitted draft report, November 5, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submitted final report, November 13, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pending approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 25 (November 2018)</td>
<td>12/05/2018</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
<td>• Deliverable activities are in-progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 26 (December 2018)</td>
<td>1/05/2019</td>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>