The University of Texas at Austin

Workday Independent Verification & Validation (IV&V) Services Project

Deliverable #10: Monthly Risk Assessment Report (June 2017)

July 5, 2017 (Final Submitted July 12, 2017)
Table of Contents

• Objective, Scope, and Approach
• Monthly Observations and Recommendations
• Status of In-Progress Risk Mitigation Activities
• Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted
• Documentation Reviewed
• IV&V Deliverable Status
Objective, Scope, and Approach
Objective and Scope

This document is Deliverable #10: Monthly Risk Assessment Report (June 2017).

In accordance with the SOW, the objective of Deliverables #06 – #16: Monthly Risk Assessment Report 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 the SOW, the following aspects of ASMP work have been identified for assessment throughout the periods covered by Deliverables #06 – #16 (February 2017 – December 2017):

- Program management
- Organizational change management
- Remediation of legacy cross-system integrations
- Data cleansing and conversion
- Workday test preparation
- Workday test outcomes
- Technical architecture implementation
- Workday delivery assurance checkpoints
- Training preparation and delivery
- Deployment planning and rehearsals
- Deployment execution and post-deployment support
Objective and Scope (continued)

As UT has determined that ASMP will focus solely on the Workday implementation, these reports will continue to also focus on the implementation areas. As stated in previous reports, not all of the areas specified on the previous page will be covered in each monthly report, but rather focus will be on those areas that are most active and relevant during that month, given the state and phase of the project. During this time period, the project’s major focus was on completing Reset activities and starting the Implementation activities. Therefore, for this report, observations and recommendations have been provided and grouped into the following areas:

• Governance and Campus Collaboration
• Project Implementation – People, Process, and Technology

Within these reporting periods, KPMG will continue to focus on assessing program activities and 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.

In addition to the above areas, the items raised within the previously submitted assessment deliverables (#01, #04, and #06 through #09) will also be re-visited, along with other risks identified by the project team and stakeholders. The deliverable status and project activity items that were components of the Monthly Activity Reports (Deliverables #02 and #03), will also be incorporated within the Monthly Risk Assessment Reports.
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 Project Sponsor:** The objectives, content, and format of the deliverable were discussed and confirmed with the project’s Managing Executive Sponsor.

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

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

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

- **Compiled Observations:** The KPMG team compiled observations from our analyses to identify areas of project strength and weakness.
• **Developed Recommendations:** Once the strengths and weaknesses were identified and confirmed, our team developed recommended strategies to address the weaknesses and enhance the strengths, taking into account project constraints. Our recommendations were developed with the goal of being achievable and impactful for the project and UT.

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

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

• **Created Final Report:** After the report was submitted to the Managing Executive Sponsor, the document was reviewed, modifications to the document were made based on the review, 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>
</table>
| Governance and Campus Collaboration | The project leadership continues to be active and positive. The remaining Reset activities are wrapping up, and Implementation activities are in-progress; positive progress continues across the project.  
A team-wide celebration was held at the end of the month which was well received and attended by the team members. It provided an opportunity for team members to socialize and further get to know one another. | As was previously stated, the new leadership team should be commended for their efforts and positive impact that they have had on the project and user community. The team should remain flexible with assignments, and continue to move forward with their plans and activities. |
| The Steering Committee also continues to be active, meeting every two weeks to discuss/decide project matters and concerns.  
The agendas have been full, and there is some concern on our part that as the project progresses, there will be more agenda items that can be reasonably covered in a single meeting. For example, routine items such as the business case (even though necessary) are being discussed and reworked during the meeting, taking up valuable meeting time. This introduces a risk that critical business decisions that must be addressed and finalized by this group could be delayed, and thus negatively impact the project’s aggressive timeline. | While the group continues to mature, the activities of the Committee should continue to be monitored to ensure that they are engaged in the most critical activities. As the project progresses, items to consider include:  
• Prioritize business decisions pending for approval so the project team can meet its deadlines.  
• Continue to publish documentation to inform decision makers ahead of each meeting so that they come informed and prepared to discuss/decide.  
• Consider taking more administrative topics offline, or provide offline voting options to build efficiencies (e.g., emails with voting buttons for repeat topics). |
## 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>Related to the observation above, items presented to the Steering Committee that require decisions are discussed and resolved with the group. However, a review of the decisions that have been made thus far do not reveal the speed that may be required to manage the large volume of decisions that could be expected of the Committee as the project continues. It is unclear how matters to be presented to the Steering Committee are being prioritized.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the project create an inventory of the matters that need to be presented to and decided by the Steering Committee, prioritize each item, and assign a due date. If necessary, increase the number of meetings or calls to accommodate the need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the previous report, it was recommended that the team respond to the Iowa State University/University of Rochester Listserv postings pertaining to Workday experiences at those institutions. The team is addressing the matter through faculty members within the Steering Committee.</td>
<td>This is a sound approach as a faculty communication will carry more weight than a standard project communication. The matter should still be discussed with Workday as they should also have addressed the postings. Their response could be leveraged as a potential foundation for the faculty members to build upon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project leadership is working with the UT President and Provost on a campus communication to support the project.</td>
<td>As previously recommended, this will help prioritize the project across the University, and coincide with the move from the Reset to full project execution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation – People</td>
<td>The project team continues to be well led. A significant number of meetings are taking place as the project plans become more granular, the teams further establish their roles, and processes develop. Workday is also involved in these activities, and are building their team accordingly.</td>
<td>The project is in a positive position to wrap up the Reset processes and execute the plans. The cohesiveness and positive attitudes that currently exist are key to the future success of the project, as is Workday’s continued involvement with the planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At UT's request, new Workday leadership has been assigned to the project. The new managers appear to be well engaged and supportive of UT's needs, and have quickly taken charge of directing the activities of their consulting resources. The tenor of their meetings appears to be efficient and well organized, and they take time to recognize and acknowledge the contributions of the various team members, resulting in a cohesive and collaborative environment.</td>
<td>The project leadership should continue to monitor the progress, and enforce the business relationship with the new Workday leaders to ensure continued and effective support of the project, as well as the effective management of the consulting resources. The senior level relationship and ongoing dialogue between UT and Workday should also continue, including addressing any potential concerns early.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New, key resources with Workday knowledge have joined the project. These resources will cover knowledge gaps including Absence, Time Tracking, Testing, and Integration and Reporting. It is anticipated that these resources will round out the team of Workday expertise assembled under the new Workday leadership.</td>
<td>The project should contribute to the integration of the new team members, filling in any UT business practical knowledge so they can more effectively contribute to the upcoming activities. It should also be ensured that the consulting resources are available as needed over the summer months as the project begins to execute its plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation – People</td>
<td>The PMO Director will be leaving the project in September 2017. An additional resource with strong project management skills has joined the project and will be assuming the responsibilities of the Director, and also be responsible for the project standards and methods. This individual is actively engaged in the planning process.</td>
<td>The PMO remains a critical group within the project. The planned transition over the next several months should be monitored to ensure the needed knowledge transfer occurs.</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 project team continues to make strides in defining and formalizing their processes, reinforcing their activities with formal documentation that provides structure and consistency, and a direction on which to move forward (e.g., HCM/Payroll, Workday Business Process Analysis, Deployment, and Gap Management).</td>
<td>The team should continue to define and document plans and procedures, and extend this methodology project-wide to other work streams, including Change Management, Bridging, and Financials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings to kick off the initiative to analyze Financial business processes were held this month. The approach and detailed plans appear to be well thought out, and have been published to business owners. The Business owners appear to respond well to the Senior Project Manager charged with leading the effort, based on solid relationships built over the years. The extent that the Financials project team members will be involved in the business analysis process is currently unclear.</td>
<td>The active involvement and support of the Financials project team would be beneficial to the process, especially when evaluating Workday capabilities against current business processes. Given that, the project should consider engaging them as much as possible within the process. As the initiative is looking at the processes at a micro level, this is also an opportunity to look at operations from a macro level, and determine if wider spread change is needed or possible. This unique opportunity may not present itself again, so its activities and impact should be carefully planned and leveraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The participation of Workday knowledgeable consultants may be critical during the Design Confirmation Sessions to ensure that there is adequate support to the project team in managing the expectations of the participants. Workday resources may be able to address requests for reconfiguration changes that may be resolvable through best common paths in Workday.</td>
<td>As the plans for the sessions continue, the team should consider scheduling the participation of Workday resources knowledgeable in the topic under discussion to support the project team during the sessions. It will also eliminate a level of communication between the team members and consultants, that otherwise would be necessary.</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 team is documenting business processes as they prepare for the Design Confirmation Sessions in HCM/Payroll. However, the methodology for linking business processes to requirements, and requirements to configurations may not be formally defined and documented. For consistency, as business processes are defined for Financials, the same approach can be utilized.</td>
<td>The team should employ a formal, consistent process to manage requirements traceability, from business need to system requirement and configurations, to ensure that functionality needed in the system is defined, developed, tested, and ultimately implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Steering Committee subgroup has been meeting regularly to discuss outstanding bridging decisions and create recommendations to the full Steering Committee for final decision. However, the group has not yet defined the form and content to be presented to the Steering Committee, including how much detail will be needed to inform the Steering Committee’s ultimate decisions. Thus far, the meetings appear to be focused on disseminating information rather than driving recommendations that lead to an ultimate decision.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the team drive discussions to elicit and document recommendations after each discussion. A format for documenting recommendations for presentation to the Steering Committee for final decision should be established. It should include the appropriate level of detail that will be needed, and the time to be allotted for discussion in the larger group. It is further recommended to incorporate each pending bridging decision in the Decision Log (see item below), and include links to additional information, for members of the group that would prefer more detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Decision Log database is being used to track and address the HCM/Payroll pending business decisions. However, it is unclear whether the bridging decisions being presented the Steering Committee subgroup will also be tracked in the Decision Log database.</td>
<td>The team should incorporate and track pending decisions that meet the defined criteria (e.g., policy change, impact on project scope, schedule or budget, high institutional risk, business process change impacting two or more CSUs, etc.), into the Decision Log database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation – Process</td>
<td>The gap review meetings with Workday are proceeding every two weeks. However, the UT presence at the meeting is not always at the level necessary to direct and expedite UT’s needs. Without representation from someone with higher authority to drive to resolution the existing gaps, the necessary functionality to support the implementation of the Workday Financials project may not be included in Workday’s product roadmap (if such influence is possible at these meetings).</td>
<td>Ensure that a UT representative with authority to drive and direct the discussions is present at the product gap meetings. For Financial gaps it is also unclear if they are being prioritized adequately, as all requirements have not been defined. The management oversight of the process should also provide this prioritization. In addition, KPMG is requesting to have visibility into the gap report so that we can stay appraised of gap-related activity, and adequately assess it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Workday product gap that has the potential to affect the HCM/Payroll implementation date has been identified (i.e., retroactive salary adjustment with costing allocations outside of the current payroll period). Possible workarounds would have a significant impact on staffing and business processes. The team is working diligently to validate the scenarios, document the volume, and expeditiously escalate the issue to Workday.</td>
<td>The team should continue to perform due diligence to define, document, and escalate the issues for prompt resolution, as well as engaging business areas with potential impacts. Workday should be engaged to support in escalating and expediting the research and resolution of the issue. Other Universities should continue to be contacted to see how they have addressed the gaps, as it is likely that they have encountered similar scenarios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is unclear whether a change control process exists to manage requests for configuration changes.</td>
<td>If it does not already exist, the team should create a standardized process for managing requests for configuration changes that includes documentation of the proposed change, the users impacted by the change, escalation considerations, and authorized approvers. Proposed changes should then be socialized to existing functions to ensure there are no adverse impacts to other areas, such as integrations, conversion or reporting.</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>External communication with the campus has been significantly improved; however, internal communications may still need improvement. If the internal project team learns of project activities after they have been shared with campus, they may be caught by surprise when campus approaches them to ask or discuss such project activities, of which they may not be aware. This has the potential to create morale issues within the team, and even a loss of credibility for the project outside the team.</td>
<td>To further the great strides that have been achieved including fostering a spirit of collaboration, the project should devise a method/approach for communicating project activities with the pertinent members of the internal team, either before or at the same time the information is shared with campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As stated, the teams are proceeding with positive work, however it appears that there is a tendency to each define its own methods, processes and procedures. Although these appear to make sense for each work stream, they may not be consistent across teams. Without project-wide processes that are centrally enforced and extended to each work stream (HCM/Payroll, Integrations, Conversion, Change Management, Financials, Business Process Analysis), there is a risk that the project will once again become federated or fragmented.</td>
<td>As part of the efforts underway to create common standards, methods, and processes, these should then be enforced project-wide across all work streams to promote consistency and communication. HCM/Payroll is a good model to follow as they are focused on the consistency, and they have a team member that is enforcing these logistical items, so that the project team can focus on delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A number of pending decisions that pertain to the Workday Financials project are being tracked, with plans to discuss and resolve them during business process review sessions with the campus. However, the process for documenting, tracking and managing these decisions is not clearly defined and may not be consistent with the decision making process defined during the Reset.</td>
<td>For consistency, it is recommended that the team document, track and manage the pending Workday Financials decisions into the Decision Log database, so that they can be consistently managed in line with the defined processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Project Implementation – Process | The project has decided to retain Workday as the Implementation Partner for the HCM/Payroll project, and procure a new Implementation Partner for the Financials implementation. Preliminary plans are to have the new Implementation Partner on board in November 2017. Work on the associated Implementation Partner RFP continued during the month by the PMO. A draft of the associated UT/Partner responsibilities was created, which will drive the Partner SOW. We reviewed the draft and offered related comments. The dialogue will continue as the process progresses. | The following initial comments regarding the UT/Partner responsibilities were provided to the PMO, and subsequently discussed:  
- The document does a good job of identifying the individual work streams and identifying the associated responsibilities.  
- Overall, UT should consider having the vendor perform more of the end-to-end project management responsibilities, rather than UT. For example, a number of the responsibilities ascribed to the vendor read as “recommend improvements”, “provide expertise”, “assess security”, “advise on conversion approach”. In contrast, the management and driving activities appear to the responsibility of UT. We recommend that if UT is going to procure the services of an integration vendor, the vendor should carry the weight of responsibility through implementation, including driving it to successful completion, with UT taking on project monitoring/oversight/approval responsibilities; knowledge transfer should take place throughout the process. UT should also retain responsibility for managing the campus relationships, and “soft items” including change management and training. |
## Monthly Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Reset – Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>Continued from the previous page:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• For Configuration Management, UT should consider being the lead for configuration decisions, rather than participating in configuration decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It could be helpful to the project as a whole to also include Workday’s responsibilities. That would not necessarily be included within the actual SOW between UT and the vendor, however it would provide a picture of all responsibilities. It could then also be leveraged to address Workday’s current responsibilities for the HCM/Payroll implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If it was not already the plan to do so, we recommend that the table be included within the RFP (including the Workday component), so that the responder knows specifically what is expected of them, and can focus their response on those activities.</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 project continues its efforts to divest itself of IT service offerings that fall outside of the Workday implementation. Meetings with the campus to outline each service offering have been held. Each service offering is being documented to include each area of concern previously espoused by the campus (e.g., a description of what the offering does, its benefits, value, impacts, prior approvals, recommendations, and most important to the community, projected costs). Feedback is being solicited via surveys, with follow up calls if a response is not received. The process effectively addresses previously reported concerns, and gives a voice to the campus, albeit participation may be low in some meetings and solicited feedback may not be prevalent. Team members have raised questions about when testing for bridging integrations with DEFINE will take place. It was indicated that such testing will occur in End-to-End testing.</td>
<td>As noted in previous KPMG assessments, this area has been an ongoing pain point for the campus. Therefore, the positive momentum gained in holding these sessions should be capitalized by completing the process and clearly communicating the expected outcomes of the sessions as they pertain to each IT service offering. As the initiatives move out of ASMP, ITS may need to continue to work with the campus to market the solutions, provide additional information, and/or work through identified issues where controversy still exists (e.g., software development training program). Given the significant number of bridging integrations, the project should consider creating a DEFINE environment to perform unit testing as development activities are performed for each interface. Whichever path is chosen should be clearly documented in the formal Test Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monthly Observations and Recommendations

As previously reported, a process is being finalized and will be implemented 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 will be presented in this section.

The tracking spreadsheet created by the PMO to manage these risks and the associated activities is currently being finalized, and will be shared with KPMG after it is reviewed with the Managing Executive Sponsor.

A summary of the April – June risk activity is presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>April 2017</th>
<th>May 2017</th>
<th>June 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Process</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or Unassigned</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

- Workday@UT Training Class 4, Day 3, June 1, 2017
- ASMP Bridging Meeting, June 1, 2017
- UT-Austin Financials Gap/Case Review Meeting, June 2, 2017
- Weekly Governance Debrief Call, June 2, 2017
- Weekly Engagement Leads Meeting, June 6, 2017
- Workday@UT Training Class 6, Day 2, June 6, 2017
- ASMP Leadership Team Meeting, June 6, 2017
- Pooled Rates and Fringe Compensation Plan Discussion Meeting, June 6, 2017
- Identify Potential "Blocker Gaps" for HCMP Go-Live Meeting, June 7, 2017
- ASMP Bridging Meeting, June 8, 2017
- Program Wide Approach to Product Gaps Management Meeting, June 8, 2017
- Lock Time Entry Discussion Meeting, June 12, 2017
- Workday Program Team Meeting, June 12, 2017
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended (continued)

- Weekly Engagement Leads Meeting, June 13, 2017
- ASMP Payroll Team Sync Up Meeting, June 13, 2017
- UT Austin Financials Gap/Case Review Meeting, June 14, 2017
- HCM/Payroll Bi-Weekly Team Meeting, June 14, 2017
- Leads' TMP Review Meeting, June 16, 2017
- Business Process Analysis Approach Meeting - Session #1, June 16, 2017
- Weekly Engagement Leads Meeting, June 20, 2017
- Finance Weekly Team Meeting, June 20, 2017
- TAI "In Process" Service Offerings IT Leaders Meeting, June 20, 2017
- ASMP-Workday Bridging Discussion Subcommittee Meeting, June 21, 2017
- UT Team Workday Consulting Meeting, June 21, 2017
- ASMP Payroll Team Sync Up Meeting, June 22, 2017
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended (continued)

- Finance Weekly Team Meeting, June 26, 2017
- Weekly Engagement Leads Meeting, June 27, 2017
- IV&V - RFP Discussion Meeting, June 27, 2017
- PMO Staff Meeting, June 27, 2017
- ASMP Payroll Team Sync Up Meeting, June 27, 2017
- TAI "Not Started" Service Offerings IT Leaders Meeting, June 27, 2017
- Testing Leads Planning Meeting, June 28, 2017
- ASMP-Workday Steering Committee Meeting, June 28, 2017
- UT Team Workday Consulting Meeting, June 28, 2017
- ASMP Summer Kick-Off Celebration, June 29, 2017
- UT-Austin Financials Gap/Case Review Meeting, June 30, 2017
- Weekly Governance Debrief Meeting, June 30, 2017
- Business Process Matrix Prioritization Meeting, June 30, 2017
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Interviews Conducted

- Senior Project Manager (Business Process Analysis), June 14, 2017
- Workday Engagement Manager, June 20, 2017
- Development and Campus Technical Lead, June 23, 2017
Documentation Reviewed
Documentation Reviewed

- Workday Business Case Draft as of May 23, 2017, June 2, 2017
- Sample Template of the Gap Definition Document, June 8, 2017
- Financials Gap Process Flow, June 8, 2017
- Workday HCM/Payroll Design Confirmation Summary presented to CUBO, June 9, 2017
- Brainstorming Business Process Analysis Approach, June 15, 2017
- Proposed Workday Process Analysis Approach, June 15, 2017
- Proposed Project Timeline for Workday Process Analysis, June 15, 2017
- Impact Analysis Process Characteristics, June 15, 2017
- Workday Project – Finance Taxonomy, June 15, 2017
- Vendor-UT responsibilities for WD Financials implementation, June 19, 2017
- Workday Program Design Confirmation Strategy, June 20, 2017
- ITS Service Offering Briefing Page: Continuous Integration (Jenkins), June 20, 2017
- ITS Service Offering Briefing Page: Development Environment Management (Amazon Web Services (AWS)), June 20, 2017
Documentation Reviewed

- ITS Service Offering Briefing Page: Enterprise Project and Issue Tracking (JIRA), June 20, 2017
- Cost Centers, Funded by and Costing Allocation/Funding Levels, June 21, 2017
- UT Data Validation Reports, June 22, 2017
- HCM Payroll Design Confirmation Session Schedule – Workday UTA, June 22, 2017
- ITS Service Offering Briefing Page: Version Control (GitHub), June 23, 2017
- ITS Service Offering Briefing Page: Workload Automation (Stonebranch), June 23, 2017
- ITS Service Offering Briefing Page: Enterprise Binary Repository (Artifactory), June 23, 2017
- ITS Service Offering Briefing Page: Electronic Doc Signature (DocuSign), June 23, 2017
- ITS Service Offering Briefing Page: Integration Services - (MuleSoft – ESB, API Registry), (RabbitMQ – Message Broker), June 23, 2017
- ITS Service Offering Briefing Page: Electronic Content Management (Documentum - D2), June 23, 2017
- ITS Service Offering Briefing Page: Image Capture - (Kofax), June 23, 2017
- ASMP Steering Committee Packet for 6/28/2017 Meeting, June 23, 2017
IV&V Deliverable Status
# Project Deliverable Status

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number/Name</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 07 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 5 (March 2017)    | 4/05/2017  | Complete          | • Submitted draft report, April 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, April 21, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, April 26, 2017 |
| 08 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 6 (April 2017)   | 5/05/2017  | Complete          | • Submitted draft report, May 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, May 15, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, May 18, 2017 |
| 09 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 7 (May 2017)     | 6/05/2017  | Complete          | • Submitted draft report, June 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, June 13, 2017  
• Received deliverable approval, June 30, 2017 |
| 10 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 8 (June 2017)    | 7/05/2017  | Pending Approval  | • Submitted draft report, July 5, 2017  
• Submitted final report, July 12, 2017  
• Pending approval                                     |
| 11 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 9 (July 2017)    | 8/05/2017  | In-Progress       | • Monthly activities are in progress.                                                      |
| 12 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 10 (August 2017) | 9/05/2017  | Scheduled         |                                                                                           |
| 13 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 11 (September 2017)| 10/05/2017 | Scheduled         |                                                                                           |
| 14 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 12 (October 2017) | 11/05/2017 | Scheduled         |                                                                                           |
| 15 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 13 (November 2017)| 12/05/2017 | Scheduled         |                                                                                           |
| 16 – Monthly Risk Assessment Report, Month 14 (December 2017)| 12/31/2017 | Scheduled         |                                                                                           |
### 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>17 – Enterprise Readiness Verification Report</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>• Pending revised implementation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – End to End Testing Completion Report</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>• Pending revised implementation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 – User Acceptance Testing Completion Report</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>• Pending revised implementation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #1</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>• Pending revised implementation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #2</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>• Pending revised implementation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 – Workday Deployment Readiness Verification Report #3</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>• Pending revised implementation plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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