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Objective, Scope, and Approach
Objective and Scope

This document is Deliverable #34: Monthly Risk Assessment Report (December 2018).

On January 26, 2018, UT issued to KPMG, an Amendment to the original IV&V Statement of Work (SOW). The Amendment exercised two of the three, six month renewal periods specified in the SOW. The Amendment covered the period of January 2018 – December 2018, and identified 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.

This document is the final deliverable for the above stated renewal period. UT Leadership and KPMG are in the process of discussing a potential third renewal period.

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 continued to focus on assessing program activities and identifying recommendations for improvement. Independent, objective guidance and experience was provided 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 was put into practice during our monitoring activities.
Objective and Scope (continued)

During this reporting period, the Program’s major focus was on post go-live support, and executing business processes. 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
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Campus</td>
<td>In early December, a Program team meeting was held to commemorate the successful first month of the Workday system. The Program AVP again recognized and thanked the Program and campus team members for all of their efforts in reaching the milestone. The meeting was also attended by the President and Managing Executive Sponsor. The President stated that the Workday transition was going well, that he had been hearing across the campus that the system is working, and thanked everyone for their dedication. The Managing Executive Sponsor also recognized and thanked everyone involved. It is again stated that given the size and complexity of such a large University implementation, the overall transition to Workday has been very smooth, a direct result of excellent leadership and a dedicated team.</td>
<td>This was another excellent demonstration of Executive level support for the team and the system. It also further points out that the system is working as well as could be expected. This public Executive support, as well as consistent messaging, should continue (including the Provost), specifically that Workday brings ongoing improvements which represents change. Now that the University is in the cloud, the end of the Workday implementation is the start of future opportunities with new endeavors. The constant state of change is the new norm for UT, and ongoing related communications will continue to help change the overall culture across campus. This will also set the stage for the future Financial system project and implementation. In addition, it is also important to continue to remind the campus that during this phase of Workday, there will be many first time issues and concerns raised within the first year. The Program should leverage their experiences and lessons learned, and continue to drive the Program in the positive direction it is currently moving.</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>Governance and Campus Collaboration</strong></td>
<td>The final Steering Committee meeting was conducted on December 19. The Managing Executive Sponsor attended the meeting, and thanked all of the Committee members for their contributions and efforts that led to a successful implementation. The Program has greatly benefitted from the Committee members as they have helped influence the direction in which the Program has taken. Moving forward, the Managing Executive Sponsor stated that he will be focusing on re-structuring the system governance. CUBO will be the overall governing body, as is the current practice for all other campus business activity. A CUBO sub-committee will be formed to address system specific topics, and provide insights to further the success of the business operations of the University.</td>
<td>Given that Workday is a business-owned system, the transition to CUBO is a sound strategy. As the Program continues to transition and re-structure their organization, it will be important to maintain communication channels with the previous Steering Committee members. The sharing of ideas and willingness to improve upon current processes should continue to be emphasized. As the sub-committee is formed, it will be critical to clearly define roles and responsibilities. As stated in a previous report, it is again also recommended that those across campus that embrace change, be involved in the process and future system implementation activities. It is also further recommended that the Program stay close to the Deans, TxAdmin, and VPAdmin. Their experiences with the system should be understood, and their input continue to be taken. As part of the ongoing transition of ownership to the business, it is recommended that Human Resources and Payroll leads also attend these meetings to receive the ongoing campus community feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As previously discussed, UT’s Human Resources Lead retired at the end of December, and the Payroll Lead is retiring in February, 2019. At this time, it is unclear to us what the specific succession plans are.  

As the succession plan is executed, it is recommended if feasible, that these Leads stay on as advisors. This will help the newly appointed Leads focus on the day-to-day business activities, while the previous Leads help the transition and ownership process, as well as work through business events that are executed in the new system for the first time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation – People</td>
<td>The Program team and campus representatives continue to work hard, and demonstrate their cohesiveness as a team, by addressing all issues collectively. Team members from Human Resources and Payroll are very engaged in the process of resolving issues. As things continued to progress better than expected, the team members were able to take time off for the Holidays. Appropriate coverage was determined, and all team members were still available if a critical issue arose.</td>
<td>The cohesive team approach should continue to be nurtured and promoted. Having the ability to take time off for the Holidays was an excellent means to allow team members to relax and enjoy themselves, especially given all the work they performed, and the high levels of stress that they were under. The Program has done a terrific job of addressing the “people” aspect of the initiative; this should also continue to be the norm for all future activity. The team continues to demonstrate their strong commitment, and that they will always be available to address whatever is needed. Such a commitment allows for flexibility with work activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Readiness team resources are available in the daily labs along with additional resources to assist users with their questions as needed. It was observed that users were provided one-on-one attention through specific business processes, such as time keeping, to better understand Workday functionality. While lab attendance remains sporadic, it is slowly picking up from the previous month, and there is a common trend of users coming in as a group for assistance. The Program continues to provide effective support to the users and addresses the specific questions being asked. It was also observed that the users left the labs feeling better about Workday functionality, and stated they could navigate the system more effectively after receiving the support.</td>
<td>As previously recommended, the Program should continue to monitor the lab attendance and maintain the appropriate resources as needed. It is important to maintain a positive user experience and perception of Workday by ensuring users are receiving the appropriate support to address their specific questions related to their operational business 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>Project Implementation – Process</td>
<td>The Command Center concept has continued to demonstrate that it was an effective strategy. Throughout November, status calls every two hours from the Command Center were instrumental in bringing together all relevant stakeholders to address issues promptly, as they arose. In early December, reported issues began to decline, making it possible to reduce the scheduled status calls to twice a day as the application stabilized. The calls also addressed change management topics. The Business Process Owner (BPO) calls also continue. During these meetings/calls, the future Roadmap continues to be referenced and reviewed. It identifies business events through August 2019. While there was a decline in reported issues, there is a risk that the questions and issues may increase in January, as year-end processes are executed, a new semester begins, system activity increases with new users accessing Workday, and users who may have been doing basic processing start exercising more complex use cases.</td>
<td>Given the reduction of issues and risks after go-live, the current meeting cadence appears to be working effectively. In order to ensure there is consensus in the understanding of issues across the Program and BPOs, status calls should continue in January, and the frequency increase if issues increase. Change management topics should continue to be addressed as a group regularly, using the appropriate escalation strategies to resolve issues and address new requests as they arise. Strong communications will remain extremely important to ensure all team members and users remain well informed. It is further recommended that the Program ensure that the appropriate resources attend the meeting in-person or on the phone, especially the BPOs. If day-to-day activity dictates that the primary business resource cannot attend, there should be a designated backup resource to attend, in order to disseminate information, and assist in issue resolution. Regarding the Roadmap, the Program should continue to communicate to the team and campus what is coming on the horizon, as there will be ongoing change. The Program should also use the Roadmap as a planning tool to know what focused resources will be needed when, to address the work, provide guidance, develop communications, etc.</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** | Support and outreach to campus users continues to be strong. As a follow up to our November observation, the Help Desk continues to effectively assist the user community. The production rollout has proven to be smoother than anticipated, and the lower than anticipated Help Desk call volume may be a result of this.  
In reference to the November Help Desk Survey Feedback document, users indicated that they continue to receive high quality assistance and timely responses to their issues in question. Additionally, many users continue to utilize the askUS search tool prior to reaching out for further assistance.  
The campus users that we engaged with during the month, indicated that they felt that everything was progressing well. Some indicated that they have only performed the minimum with the system, as their day-to-day focus has been on getting through the semester.  
ERP leads also stated that data being provided is good. Some small differences were identified and addressed. | As previously recommended, the Help Desk should continue to be a high priority and resourced appropriately. It is still early in the production phase and it will be important to maintain positive user perceptions as the University continues the transition.  
Given that user activity will increase after the new year, it should be anticipated that additional support needs will also increase, and thus resources should be available should that increase occur.  
Regarding the ERP leads, it is unclear how much this group is being engaged within the formal process. Given the importance of the downstream systems, if it is not already occurring, this group should be asked to report back both what is going well, and where issues exist. Some of these group members are more vocal than others, so soliciting feedback from all of them would be beneficial. This is especially true as business events are conducted for the first time. |
### Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project Implementation – Process | The number of requests for SURGE assistance were tracked and documented throughout the month.  

Please refer to the chart on the following page.  
As of 12/17/2018, excluding informal, face-to-face conversations and answers to quick questions, the team handled a total of 122 formal requests, averaging 10 formal requests per day, with the highest activity (18 requests, 15%) occurring on Monday, December 3.  
The bulk of the requests (67%) were received from the Moody College of Communication (21), College of Education (18), Vice President of Research (16), Office of the Executive Vice President & Provost (16), and HRSS (11). The remaining units submitted (33%) of the requests.  
The most common topics (85% of the requests) were Business Process (33), Recruiting (28), Timekeeping (16), Payroll/Payments (15), and Costing (12). The remaining five topics covered (15%) of the requests.  
Metrics from 12/17/2018 to 12/31/2018 were not available as of the publication of this report. | 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. |
Monthly Observations and Recommendations

Number SURGE Requests by Date

December 1 - December 17

Graph showing the number of SURGE requests by date from December 1 to December 17, with peaks and troughs indicating fluctuations in requests.
## 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 December, the team continued executing on the Workday Cutover Checklist. The Cutover Checklist was maintained on SharePoint and updated regularly. The team narrowly missed its goal of completing 2,414 tasks (93%) through December 31, despite close coordination among the Program and the various campus units impacted. Tasks lagged behind schedule throughout the month, but the team was able to reduce the number of late tasks, from 247 at the beginning of the month, to 67 by month end, the lowest since November 19. Nonetheless, there is a risk that as these late tasks continue to age (11 days low, 25 days average, 48 days high as of December 31), the impact of remaining incomplete for long periods may adversely affect the system. 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 of December. 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, to mitigate risks to the system due to tasks that remain incomplete for long periods of time. Furthermore, after the transition has been made, the Program should take the opportunity to re-evaluate tasks and issues that were most difficult, 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
December 2018

31-Dec Target: 93%
Total Tasks: 2,583

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project Implementation – Process | As previously stated, daily change management meetings continued through December in order 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. As of December 31, 69.6% (2,830 of 4,069) of the JIRA issues logged had been closed.

For the 30.4% (1,239 of 4,069) issues active as of December 31, 2018, more than half are transaction support (e.g., Retro, Rescinds), while 11% (137) are bugs, and 27% (335) are enhancements.

The chart on the following page depicts the issue types for the active JIRA issues, as of December 31, 2018. | As is the practice, the Program should continue to review and prioritize issues, and resolve them as quickly as possible. Where needed, CSU participation should be secured in determining business impact for the prioritization of bugs and enhancements. |
Monthly Observations and Recommendations

Open Issue Types

- **BPO Submissions**: 1, 0%
- **Bug**: 137, 11%
- **Retro**: 652, 53%
- **Enhancement**: 335, 27%
- **Mass Update**: 2, 0%
- **Queries (Tier II)**: 68, 5%
- **Rescinds**: 32, 3%
- **Cyclical Updates**: 10, 1%

Legend:
- BPO Submissions
- Bug
- Enhancement
- Mass Update
- Queries (Tier II)
- Cyclical Updates
- Rescinds
- Retro
- Testing
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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>As the Program continues to work through post-deployment issues, and the JIRA inventory continues to grow, there may be differences of opinion regarding the severity or priority assigned to issues by affected campus units versus the priority given to the issues by the Program. This is based on the volume of high impact issues in the Program's queue, availability of technical resources, competing priorities in the Pods, and other criteria.</td>
<td>The Program should devise a strategy for continued review and prioritization of open issues, including reviews by campus owners, Pod leaders, and technical resources. Business and technical impacts should be documented to assist with prioritization. Clear expectations should be set with the campus for issue resolution, soliciting dates by which changes must be in the system. The team should continue to review deferred JIRA issues periodically to ensure that criticality that increases over time is not missed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As the campus becomes more familiar with Workday, the volume of support requests is decreasing, while the complexity of the support needs increase. Users are getting deeper into the system and exercising more complicated scenarios, requiring a new level of guidance. It was reported that guidance provided by the Program and BPO representatives may not always be consistent. Initial guidance provided by the Program may need to be updated to fill gaps discovered based on the campus experience, and BPO representatives may need to improve documentation of decisions made to address issues that impact Workday in order to present a more unified approach to support questions.</td>
<td>Decisions should be documented as they are made, and the resolution of common issues communicated. Program guidance available to the campus should be updated to ensure consistency between the Program and BPOs. A centralized person with Workday expertise and institutional knowledge should be designated to assist BPOs in analyzing, classifying, and documenting questions and their responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      | The Program team is working with CSU’s and CPU’s to address specific business processes that require additional attention. While some issues are more critical than others, the Program continues to analyze how it will effectively approach individual cases as they are raised.  
One example is onboarding of new employees. It was observed that CSU’s are interested in a better understanding of how to approach the onboarding process, and are requesting assistance from the Program to address their questions. A bi-weekly meeting cadence with the support team is being planned with a strategy to assist users with sorting through any business process issues and concerns.  
Labs continue to be offered at various times throughout the day. The daily lab schedule is posted on the website and allows individuals to view what the particular focus of a lab is, so they may choose which lab is best suited for their specific needs. While a general open lab is offered as well, the Program has customized labs with a particular focus to ensure the appropriate resources are in place to assist users.  
The Program continues to review user feedback in order to analyze the common issues and topics that should be offered more frequently during the labs. Additionally, BPOs have been asked to provide their feedback on any “hot” topics they are observing, and should be considered for open labs. | The Program should continue to work with the units and fine tune the meeting cadences in order to improve upon business processes that require more focus and attention. The University will have to continue to re-learn certain processes that are new to them in Workday and will require additional support as these issues are uncovered.  
It is recommended that the Program continue to analyze relevant topics that will further assist users as they attend labs. Furthermore, the input from the BPOs will significantly help that the topics being covered during labs coincide with the issues being raised in the specific business units. A strong communication channel between the readiness team and business offices should be maintained. |
## 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>It was observed that the attendees of the HCM Payroll Advisory Meeting were in agreement that the Program continues to provide excellent communication in order to keep users abreast of any issues or impacts related to Workday and their specific unit. However, there was a general consensus that there are many communications being sent out, and it is difficult to understand what is particularly relevant to specific business units.</td>
<td>The Program should continue to utilize the Advisory member’s feedback, and work closely with them to ensure they remain ahead of critical communications. Additionally, a new approach should be devised to tailor communications in a fashion that allows members to easily identify general communications vs. ones that directly affect them and their respective business unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In reference to the November observation, time keeping and submission of timesheets surfaced as an issue during the payroll process when approximately 3,000 staff did not submit their timesheets on time during the first Workday payroll in November. Since then, to ensure this problem did not occur again, lessons learned were applied to subsequent payrolls. The objective was to improve upon the timesheet approval process, and in early December, a 96% timesheet approval was achieved.</td>
<td>It is recommended that this achievement be leveraged to set expectations and set the standard going forward. Appropriate communications should continue to be provided stressing the responsibility of time entry and approval, to maintain a high rate of submissions and approvals at the business unit level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As Holiday’s were approaching, the Program communicated with the user community to prepare them for time entry during the Holiday season. The Program provided information and updates as to how individuals should log their time in Workday prior to going on PTO. To supplement these communications, the readiness team put together videos that were available for viewing. Additionally, a document was provided to further highlight Holiday time guidance.</td>
<td>While this process was focused on the Holiday’s, it is pertinent to time keeping in general, as time keeping continues to be a significant topic. It is recommended that the Program remain close to the time submission process, and be prepared to address any retroactive hour changes that may be needed after the Holiday’s.</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 the Program continues to drive reporting efforts, it is possible the first six months after go-live will experience various report changes as users become more familiar with the system and make specific reporting requests. The Program has effectively addressed changes as they are raised. The team continues to place report updates in the release notes, and stating them in the University Newsletter, during trainings, and email communications. Given the reduced issue levels, the Program is considering completing the Hypercare period prior to March 1. This may also involve concluding the Command Center activity.</td>
<td>The Program should continue to monitor reporting efforts and analyze which requests are being raised continuously. Changes to one-off reports should be tracked in the event there are continuous requests which may require the Program to make changes to the structure of the report. Completing the formal Hypercare period early, if feasible and data supports it, is positive. This assumes that the Program ensures that mechanisms are still in place as business events are carried out for the first time, and if issues arise based on more users getting further involved, and exercising the system functionality. As more users get acclimated and start using the system further, it is anticipated that the issues could increase, and thus additional support be needed.</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>Following the first payroll from Workday, the Help Desk reported triaging a number of Workday users raising concerns regarding differences in pay slip appearance. The concern was addressed with the Command Center to determine both a proper response to current inquiries as well as strategy to mitigate future user pay slip difference concerns.</td>
<td>Although not necessarily a critical issue, it is recommended that the Program provide a general communication to the University detailing the changes to worker pay slips. For example, the Program could provide screen captures on Workday@UT that compare and indicate the nuances between Legacy and Workday pay slips. Worker pay is often a delicate subject. As such, if the Program took action on the above recommendation, it would likely reduce further user calls to the Help Desk, and more importantly, provide clear and transparent information to users regarding his or her earnings, deductions, and tax related information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On December 4, 2018, The Command Center reviewed JIRA item WDS-2860 (“How should we handle names with special characters?”) that revealed ambiguity regarding the Workday Business Process Legal Name Change approval process. Specifically, although Payroll is the approver for a legal name change, Human Resources Records was involved to confirm the authenticity of the particular transaction referenced in JIRA WDS-2860.</td>
<td>The Legal Name Change Business Process has undergone appropriate scrutiny through requirement gathering, development, testing, and approvals by the Program, BPOs, and other associated personnel. As a questionable worker’s name was approved via the business process, this particular issue discovered in Production raises caution. Specifically, a Legal Name Change requires approval through validation of the proposed legal name in Workday and appropriate legal documentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on the next page)
## 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>(continued from the previous page)</td>
<td>Among Workday customers, it is common to keep the Legal Name Change Business Process to a minimal number of steps. A typical process begins with (1) Employee Self Service (ESS) to modify a legal name as well as attached one or more required documents (i.e., social security card). This is followed by (2) a review step, typically performed by the Payroll team, to validate that the provided documents match the modified worker name in Workday. Finally, (3) if the modified name in Workday corresponds to the provided documentation, the Payroll team can approve the change in Workday. Although Payroll personnel are typically utilized for both the review and approval step due to W2 requirements, a Human Resource and/or shared services department is commonly used as well. Although limited to this particular issue, it is recommended that a reviewer and/or approver of sensitive information use care and discretion. As (1) a Legal Name impacts various functional areas and downstream systems, and (2) the validation occurs outside of Workday and prone to human error, it is additionally recommended to have regular communications/reminders regarding the need and intricacy required of all transactions.</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>Related to the previous observation in this report, JIRA item WDS-2860 (“How should we handle names with special characters?”) caused multiple integrations, such as SailPoint and other HRIS integrations, to fail due to quotation marks in a worker’s Legal Name. Since the initial JIRA creation, the Command Center has reviewed and provided feedback to resolve the offending Legal Name. However, a strategic process has yet to be implemented regarding allowable special characters or diacritical marks as well as how to audit Workday as a means to prevent future integration failures.</td>
<td>Although Workday accommodates the use of special characters and diacritical marks, downstream systems are often critically impacted. In an effort to reduce impact to downstream systems, it is recommended that the Program utilize preventive validations in Workday. For example, to limit special characters and/or diacritical marks from being entered into Workday fields such as Legal or Preferred Name, a True/False Calculated Field can house all University defined unwanted or illegal characters. This True/False calculated field could then be referenced in validation rules across business processes in which Workday allows a user to enter information into a free text field. Essentially, having this rule in place forces Workday to check the entered user text for any defined unwanted or illegal characters and prevents the user from being able to submit that information into Workday.</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>In the attempt to understand escalated JIRA issues, Command Center personnel often review attempted mitigation strategies across the QUAL, Sandbox, and Production tenants. Recent analyses indicated a gap of data, configuration, and transaction between QUAL and Production. At times, this amplifies the challenge for the Command Center to solution Production issues. The Program recently discussed planned tenant management including refreshes through 2019.</td>
<td>The length of time between tenant refreshes often poses a challenge for operational support teams to successfully manage and problem solve issues from Production. Although the current refresh frequency of QUAL aligns with the mainframe environment to provide symmetry between those systems, it is recommended to (1) consider increasing the frequency of QUAL refreshes through Hypercare, or (2) for Production related solutions utilize another tenant that is refreshed at a greater frequency. As the time between a QUAL/Production refresh increases, the QUAL environment no longer is an accurate representation of Production. And, as a result, utilizing the QUAL as a means for troubleshooting and testing Production level solutions, may not ultimately represent a source of data, configuration, and transaction necessary to properly address Production issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During Command Center JIRA issues reviews, the Program discovered that the Benefits VRSCO outbound interface had not run since November 11, 2018. Requirements indicate that the VRSCO interface should run daily. Investigation revealed that the interface schedule had been suspended and not been re-activated. The Command Center discussed a long term plan and monitoring for all integrations.</td>
<td>As the Legacy Benefit VRSCO interface ran monthly, the suspension did not cause significant impact. Although the Command Center and Integrations team have begun developing a strategy to address the cause and prevention of future issues, it is recommended that the Program take the initial step (1) to align all integration schedule to begin and end on the same date, and (2) appoint an individual responsible for all integration schedule changes. Responsibilities include schedule monitoring and adjustment, as well as performing, scheduling, and ensuring that ad hoc integration runs do not impact or alter the master integration schedule.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Implementation – Technology</strong></td>
<td>The Command Center continues to address user issues, questions, and or requests for Workday security changes. As the University continues to embrace Workday, it is expected that users will become more familiar with its functionality, including who and what has access to worker information, web services, and the ability to modify data and functional areas of Workday. 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 users.</td>
<td>As discussed in the November 2018 report, the Program provides security-related training, help and support, as well as resource information on the Workday@UT web space. Although the Program has continued to improve security training and content, it is recommended to continue revisiting, improving, and problem solving potential security gaps. It is further suggested that the Program continue developing the compliance and security knowledge and functionality of Workday. This will result in the Program taking preventative action and steps against users who may expose security loopholes to his or her benefit. Workday customers, both new and experienced, have reported that users have exposed security gaps through the application of EIBs or UI updates to Worker profiles that alter compensation, payroll payment elections, as well as other worker benefits. These situations are often due to (1) misunderstanding of Workday security, (2) unapplied and updated configuration requirements, and/or (3) a programmatic failure to provide development opportunities for employees as well as Human Resources Security and Compliance leaders not aligning an organization’s security landscape with Workday’s ability to configure and apply that security vision. For these reasons, it is recommended that the Program revisit the security landscape and perform a thorough audit of who should have the ability to launch in or outbound EIBs.</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 – December 2018 project risk activity is presented in the graph below:

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

Meetings Attended

- Daily Workday Meeting (9am, 11am, 1pm, 3pm, 5pm), December 3 – 5, 2018
- Daily Business Process Owner Meeting, December 3 – 5, 2018
- Daily System Change Management Meeting, December 3 – 5, 2018
- HCM Payroll Advisory Group Meeting, December 4, 2018
- Business Process Owner Meeting (Tuesday/Thursday), December 6 – 21, 2018
- Daily Workday Meeting (11am, 3pm), December 6 – 21, 2018
- Daily System Change Management Meeting (11am, 3pm), December 6 – 21, 2018
- Mandatory All-Workday Team Meeting, December 6, 2018
- Workday Bridging Meeting, December 6, 2018
- ERPITL Meeting, December 7, 2018
- Workday Bridging Meeting, December 13, 2018
- PM Touchpoint Meeting, December 13, 2018
- Tenant Management Plan Review Meeting, December 14, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

• KPMG Review of November Report, December 18, 2018
• HCM Payroll Advisory Group Meeting, December 18, 2018
• Workday Steering Committee Meeting, December 19, 2018
• Release Notes Meeting, December 19, 2018
• Workday Bridging Meeting, December 20, 2018
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Interviews Conducted

• Technical Director, December 5, 2018
• SURGE Lead, December 19, 2018
Documentation Reviewed
Documentation Reviewed

- UT Workday Cutover Daily Activities Tracker, December 3 – 21, 2018
- Workday Sustainment – All Issue Types Tracker, December 3 – 21, 2018
- Workday Help Desk Overview, December 18, 2018
- Workday Steering Committee Packet for 12/19/2018 Meeting, December 19, 2108
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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05 – Comprehensive IV&amp;V Plan</td>
<td>1/31/2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Submitted draft report, January 31, 2017, Submitted final report, February 8, 2017, Received deliverable approval, February 14, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable Number/Name</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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 |
### 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>
| 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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