

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR



INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGENCY

CITY HALL EAST
200 N MAIN ST, ROOM 1400
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
213.978.3311

ita.lacity.org

TED M. ROSS
GENERAL MANAGER
CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

JOYCE J. EDSON
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

MARYAM ABBASSI
ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER

BHAVIN PATEL
ACTING ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER

TITA ZARA
ACTING ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER

October 1, 2021

Honorable Members of the City Council
City of Los Angeles
Room 395, City Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Attn: Information Technology & General Services Committee

SUBJECT: HUMAN RESOURCE & PAYROLL PROJECT - DEPLOYMENT CHANGES & UPDATE (REVISED WITH APPENDIX A BASED ON PAAW COMMITTEE QUESTIONS)

SUMMARY

This report is revised with new appendices addressing questions made in the recent Personnel, Audit, and Animal Welfare (PAAW) Committee.

The HRP project is the comprehensive replacement of the City's existing PaySR payroll system with a modern human resources and payroll system implemented by the vendor Workday, Inc. The original project timeline assumed a 21-month implementation timeline and a go-live date of January 2022. Currently, the HRP project is in the Testing Stage. We have successfully completed over 70% of original deliverables and are in the 4th of 5 stages. However, the testing phases have not completed as quickly as planned, primarily due to the impacts of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the project, as detailed in the subsequent sections of this report. To ensure the overall success of the project, the HRP Steering Committee, comprised of the Personnel Department, Office of the City Controller, Information Technology Agency (ITA), and the City Administrative Officer (CAO) recommend that the City instead implement a phased approach for system go-live. This phased approach would have the primary personnel functions that are included in the Human Capital Management (HCM) module go-live in January 2022, at the originally anticipated system go-live date. Additional modules, including Compensation, Time Keeping, and Absence Management would go-live in April 2022. Finally, the Payroll and Benefits modules are proposed to go-live in December 2022. This phased approach would increase the project cost by \$10.8 million.

The primary cause for the proposed delayed, phased implementation of the HRP project is the COVID-19 Pandemic. The project faced challenges with work conditions with the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and the Stay-At-Home order. The HRP Project formally started in March 2020 (the same month the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted our nation and City). The project team and our department partners quickly adjusted to online collaboration and were generally effective in the early stages of the project. However, system testing is most efficient and effective when testers are co-located with the project teams to review findings and resolve. While the HRP Project

completed over 7,000 test steps, this is far short of the necessary testing goals, specifically in the payroll module. As a reference, Workday has never completed a project with 100% telework. Secondly, as the pandemic raged on, the Separation Incentive Program (SIP) was implemented, resulting in substantial loss of department HR and payroll subject matter experts and project staff. The subsequent hiring freeze prevented the ability of departments to replace these key personnel. In addition, staff from the Personnel Department, Office of the Controller, and City Administrative Officer (CAO) were required to shift part-time focus to assisting the administration of SIP, vaccination policies, and other COVID-related matters.

The HRP Project began to feel the cumulative effects of these challenges during unit testing at the end of the Configuration Stage, and the impact became irreparably pronounced during End-to-End testing (July and August 2021) in the Testing Stage. COVID prevented co-location and required remote work. This led to reduced collaboration, slowed pace of multiple project activities, and impacted the ability to test at the pace needed to maintain the project timeline. Executive Sponsors, Project Management for both the City and Workday, and project team members made numerous adjustments and course corrections as described below. Nevertheless, the project is not able to meet the original go-live date for all modules and functionalities.

The goal of the HRP project has always been to replace PaySR with a sustainable, modern system and ensure an accurate payroll. Based on the factors listed above, the City of Los Angeles' best path for success is to deploy functionality in a phased approach, with HCM going live as planned on January 1, 2022, Compensation, Absence, and Time Tracking going live in April 2022, and Benefits and Payroll going live late December 2022. With this phased approach, the HRP Project team and departments can mitigate the effects of COVID-19 and SIP to focus on specific Workday functionality with each release to ensure the highest degree of accuracy, fit to City operations, and the best possible City user adoption before deploying and shifting focus to the next area. The phased-in approach will allow employees to receive more dedicated attention and targeted support from the project team when the functionality that impacts them is deployed, ensuring success of this critical project.

BACKGROUND

Project Accomplishments

The HRP project has accomplished a great deal of substantive and impressive work throughout the last seventeen months. Highlights include successfully completing three of the five project stages, Plan, Architect, and Configure & Prototype, disciplined tracking of risks, actions, issues, decisions, and questions wherein over 550 of 700+ items have been closed, configuration at 80% complete across all functional areas, developed over 100 integrations, built three Workday tenants with an average data accuracy rate of 96%, completing nearly 7,000 test steps through Unit Testing and End-to-End Testing, hosting a Citywide Townhall, administering a Citywide change readiness survey, implementing single sign-on for nearly all department testers, completing a training needs assessment, and excellent progress on developing end user training curriculum and materials.

Four accomplishments that are particularly noteworthy and support the City's readiness for the phased deployment include hosting the Department Showcase, improving the testing experience for department testers, a holistic compensation review, and launching the Change Network.

In April, the HRP Team engaged key department HR, Payroll, and IT staff for three days of “Customer Showcase” sessions, where each functional area gave a detailed overview of the configuration for the City’s Workday tenant. This represented the first time City project leads performed 100% of the presentation, which included actual use of Workday. This was a significant step toward the knowledge transfer needed for the City to support the system. The sessions were well attended and received excellent feedback from departments, who were left with a deeper understanding of their future system.

Cycle 2 of End-to-End testing was the point at which department HR and payroll staff began participating. This proceeded remotely and in virtual testing rooms with Workday and the project team supporting. However, the tester experience became problematic, due to factors such as, having only one small laptop monitor while working in several tabs at once, the inability for testing support to visually see when someone was stuck and testers not asking for help, as well as the distractions that can happen when working virtually. As a result, 38 testers completed 328 test steps over the course of seven weeks. Project Management made significant adjustments for the next cohort of testers, and pivoted to hosting small groups onsite, with dual monitors at each socially distanced and sanitized station and Workday and project management staff onsite to assist. Excitement about the new system returned and testing throughout increased significantly, wherein 49 testers completed 848 steps in 13 days.

In the spring of this year, the City Administrative Officer’s (CAO) Employee Relations Division staff, who are core team members, and the Controller’s Office Payroll Operations staff, who lent great assistance, completed the first “holistic” compensation review, which was a big litmus test for the project. This effort entailed reviewing the compensation configuration and employee compensation assignments to compare PaySR to Workday. At the beginning of the project, the Steering Committee made the decision to configure the compensation area of Workday according to the letter of memoranda of understanding (MOUs), the Administrative Code, and other authoritative documents, as opposed to looking only to PaySR. Compensation drives payroll, and by configuring Workday compensation rules to City policy, loading employee compensation assignments as they are in PaySR, and then applying Workday’s eligibility rules to see the difference between the two, the team was able to get a preview of how accurate and similar gross pay may be. After the team worked through the toughest part, correcting mapping and frequency errors in the configuration and investigating issues, the final result was very close to perfect, with only 39 employees not matching. This is a testament to the team’s configuration in Workday, as well as the City’s disciplined use of PaySR.

On the change management front, the team launched the Change Network, which is composed of employees nominated by their management to serve as Change Champions. There are 438 Change Champions representing all departments. The team holds monthly meetings with the Change Champions to demonstrate system features every employee will use and discuss key changes. Change Champions are the HRP project’s force multiplier, and through their efforts of distributing information and demonstrating actions in Workday, many more employees across the City will have increased exposure and awareness of the system and how it impacts them long before they receive training and need to enter their time.

Progress and Timeline

While years in the making, the HRP Project formally launched at the same time as the start of the COVID-19 pandemic (March 2020). COVID prevented co-location of the Workday, ITA, Controller, Personnel, and CAO Project Team, and required 100% remote work, reducing

collaboration in several respects and pace of the project. COVID and related economic impacts diverted project and department staff time from project work. For example, CAO staff were required to assist with difficult budget and labor negotiations.

Following that, about 1,300 experienced City staff retired in 2020 and 2021 as part of the Separation Incentive Program (SIP) program. Many staff assisting with the project, were no longer working for the City of Los Angeles. This required other staff to pick up the slack and assist with the project. This caused delays in timeliness of work, availability of key resources, and decision making.

Work and progress truly exceeded expectations through the first three stages of the project in the face of unprecedented circumstances. However, the extra effort and ingenuity of the team was not enough to test the large number of scenarios across all functional areas in the time allotted. Testing in the areas of Human Capital Management (HCM), Benefits, and Compensation, generally kept the planned pace. However, Absence, Time Tracking, and Payroll had an extremely large volume of tests, as well as testing teams who were either unavailable or only available on non-payroll weeks, and thus, were unable to meet daily and weekly goals.

Unit testing, which occurred at the end of the Configuration and Prototype Stage and was originally scheduled to run for one month took four months to reach a satisfactory completion rate overall. The Benefits and Compensation areas were complete after five weeks. HCM was complete after six weeks. Absence was completed in seven weeks, Time Tracking in nine, and Payroll in twelve. Also worth noting is that the Personnel team performed the overwhelming majority of tests in the HCM, Benefits, Compensation, and Absence areas, which is indicative of other team members being redirected to COVID and SIP related priorities and the remainder of the team pitching in to keep things going.

End-to-End testing, where multiple functions are tested in sequence, commenced in early May with four cycles planned, each lasting just over three weeks. Cycle 1 progressed as planned, completing 681 steps on schedule, averaging 31 steps per day. Cycle 2 began the following day. However, as Cycle 2 got underway, the need to ensure previously unavailable team members were actively involved in testing became critical, and to confirm that team leads would be in a position to say that configuration is complete and accurate after End-to-End testing, which is the purpose, the group reviewed and revised what would be tested across all four cycles. This resulted in the creation of new test scenarios with associated steps, and over the course of the next month, the number of test steps for Cycle 2 increased from 671 to over 2,000. More time was needed to complete the larger number, especially given the uneven throughput. In the first month of Cycle 2, the average steps completed per day was 28 with some days having single digit production and the highest day producing 101. Cycle 2 ran significantly longer than planned and concluded on August 8, 2021, which was the timeframe parallel testing was intended to commence.

The project made many adjustments from Unit Testing to the present. HRP's Executive Steering Committee increased their meeting cadence to every other week. Project Management shifted activities in the project plan to suit changing conditions and needs. Virtual testing rooms were created with Workday there to support testers. Daily and weekly goals were set so all testers would be informed. Project Management staff assisted with Absence and Time Tracking unit testing full-time. All project meetings were shifted to mornings only, leaving afternoons free for testing. Scheduled, real-time testing was implemented for a period. How testing stats and

progress was tracked and reported was revised several times. Daily testing stand-up meetings were revamped, twice. Testing stats and eventually daily activities were reported to the Steering Committee daily. In response to testers' frustration with the software that housed test steps and where they entered test results, the testing leads quickly shifted to the use of Google sheets, a tool more familiar to City staff. Workday brought in more resources to assist with test coordination. Hiring freeze exemptions were granted, and the Controller's Office hired two retirees on 120-day contracts. Extra time for the testing stage was built into the contract and project plan. That time was needed and used but was not enough in the light of the unforeseen challenges.

Beyond adjustments, several course corrections were made. Early in Cycle 2 of End-to-End, the team completely revamped how test steps were created. A special deep dive Steering Committee meeting was held that resulted in several interventions. Several in-person, all hands meetings were attempted in order to restore morale and shared vision, but California and the City's delayed reopening thwarted those efforts. To address resource issues, ITA provided leadership in the Personnel Department and the Controller's Office with lists of active employees who had previously worked in their departments for identification of employees who could be temporarily transferred to work on HRP for 120 days pursuant to Charter Section 233. Lists of retirees were also reviewed to identify potential 120-day hires. An onsite testing room was set up for either project team members or department testers. Workday's Organizational Change Management (OCM) team led focused deep dive interviews with each sponsor department and provided targeted support for the needs that surfaced. When the team's need to connect the minute details of testing to the big picture of what business will look like when the City is live with Workday was discovered, project leadership requested that Workday's OCM team step in again to facilitate future state process mapping sessions.

To accomplish the goal of addressing readiness and testing context concerns, OCM reviewed all existing process related information for HCM and payroll, met with functional leads from the City and Workday to define and agree upon the major value streams and processes to be mapped, and then they drafted the future state process documents to be reviewed in the days-long workshop. While the sessions were divided into the two categories of HCM and payroll, those areas also encompassed Compensation, Benefits, Absence, and Time Tracking. Together, OCM and the functional teams from the City and Workday refined the process documents, specifying steps that occur within and outside of Workday, identifying who performs the step, flagging where a step is a change from the current process, and listing outstanding decisions, questions, and actions.

Tangible outputs from the effort include 14 payroll and 9 HCM process documents, a tracking list of 155 prioritized questions, actions, and decisions with assigned owners, and training materials based on the processes. The process documents will also be included in the Change Discussion Guides, one of several change management activities already planned. The future state sessions were very successful, with the team expressing satisfaction and appreciation. Now, the project has a common understanding of what the City's administration of HR and payroll will look like in the future and a roadmap for how to get there.

The foregoing has culminated in the most substantial course correction, which is shifting to a phased deployment approach.

Phased Deployment Approach

Deploying HRP functionality in a phased approach is the best opportunity for success. The Steering Committee, Project Management, and project leads considered several options and multiple configurations for going live. After weighing many factors, such as readiness, user impacts, effort, risk, and cost, the three phases described below represent the path agreed upon by all levels of the HRP project as the best option.

Phase 1A - (January 2022 - On Time)

Phase 1A will implement Workday's Human Capital Management (HCM) functionality, which includes adding new employees, changes to employee records, job history, organizational assignments, position control, etc. This is the original go live date of January 2022, and for most employees it will consist of low impact functions to help them get used to Workday. A low effort integration to PaySR will prevent duplicate entry by HR staff.

Phase 1B - (April 2022 - 3-month delay)

Phase 1B will launch Workday's Compensation, Time Tracking, and Absence functions in April 2022. This phase will ensure that all the City's authoritative documents, such as MOUs and the Administrative Code, are translated into Workday correctly and the way employees record their time worked and hours spent away from work is accurate. (DTime is replaced in this phase.) An integration to PaySR effectively results in only payroll and benefits staff continuing to process transactions outside of Workday.

Phase 2 - (December 2022 - 11-month delay)

Phase 2, the last phase, will launch Payroll processing and Benefits in December 2022. Most employees will not notice the difference during this phase's go live. However, this is the phase when we will engage payroll and benefits staff to help us fully replace PaySR with Workday.

Crucial change management activities like stakeholder interviews and new assessments for each department to assess impacts of the new phased structure will happen prior to each phase, along with resulting recommended actions and engagements to address needs. Each phase will be preceded by high-level training on future state processes, in addition to the system specific training.

With this phased approach, the HRP Project team can focus on specific Workday functionality with each release to make sure it is right before deploying and shifting focus to the next area. This means employees will receive more dedicated attention and targeted support from the project team when the functionality that impacts them is deployed.

Risks

While the phased approach is the City's best opportunity for success and mitigates many risks, there are still other potential risks the project is tracking. The delay of payroll processing by a full year requires the City to rely on PaySR for longer than planned. PaySR is a twenty-year-old system that runs on end-of-life hardware, wherein complex changes often depend on the abilities and availability of one contractor. Additionally, one ITA team will be supporting two systems at once - PaySR and Workday. To mitigate, ITA plans to direct the PaySR contractor (Hess & Associates) to add two programmers until several months after Workday payroll launches.

The phased approach also requires building new integrations from Workday to PaySR, some of which involve complex reverse mapping and extensive testing, particularly for Phase 1B. To ensure substantive testing, the plan is to have all Phase 1B integrations built by November,

leaving several months to test. HCM training materials will need to be revised, and of course, end users need to be ready. As mentioned above, with the whole team focusing on fewer functional areas and targeted change management activities before each phase, this has the potential to be an improved process.

Not to be disregarded, the COVID-19 pandemic remains a risk to the project, as new restrictions or unforeseen impacts could arise that may impede critical project activities.

In terms of overall risk mitigation, the substantive completion of project activities and milestones translates to a significant decrease in unknown variables. Couple that with the project team's increased knowledge and use of the system and the Steering Committee's commitment to the new approach, and the project is confident about meeting the revised timeline.

Budget

At present, the HRP project is funded and expenditures have been within budgeted amounts, including some use of contingency funds. The HRP project received \$14,193,095.00 for Fiscal Year 2021-2022 and another \$1,000,000 is available from the Unappropriated Balance upon request and approval. Expenditures for the same period are projected to be approximately \$13.55M, and this is inclusive of approved and anticipated minor change orders and anticipated expenses related to improving testing capacity.

The known change orders and expenses beyond planned implementation costs include a change order for a new Prism use case, subscription fees for a new functional area critical to go live, testing software, and a new test environment for the Financial Management System (FMS) to support HRP/FMS integration. The new Prism use case is to perform Civil Service Exam Seniority calculations, and by adding this function to the system that holds all the necessary data, Personnel can retire their Candidate Applicant Processing System. This will cost \$126K. Subscription to Workday's Time Tracking Hub (separate from Time Tracking) is necessary to replace LAPD's overtime system that was effectively part of PaySR and will cost \$26,814. Other options were explored but did not meet the department's requirements.

The other two known expenditures are for improving the City's testing capabilities. Kainos, a testing software built exclusively for use with Workday, will be essential for the remainder of implementation and especially useful when the City is live with Workday, running what-if scenarios for labor negotiations and preparing for Workday's biannual releases, as well as testing continuous enhancements made by ITA on behalf of City operations. The estimated cost is approximately \$500K and includes one-time onboarding and training, as well as the software subscription for unlimited users. Ongoing annual cost would be \$281K. Finally, the City's FMS is a system that is currently in production (i.e., live and operating), and the existing testing environments are used regularly in the normal course of business. There are 30 integrations between the payroll system and the financial system, and they are crucial. Having an environment dedicated to the Workday integrations will improve the quality and speed of testing. A final amount is yet to be determined, but HRP will contribute some portion of the \$93K cost.

The phased approach comes with a substantial cost that is not currently funded. Workday has planned deliverables and milestones for the change and estimated the cost to be \$11,279,444. The City and Workday are currently planning the timing of those deliverables,

which will clarify the funding needs by Fiscal Year. The final terms of this phased approach will require a contract amendment to our existing contract with Workday, Inc. (C-135368).

The two additional PaySR contractors mentioned above will also support the testing of Phase 1A & Phase 1B integrations and perform any coding that may be necessary. This will cost \$688K.

During the month of July 2021, the HRP project team addressed business owner concerns relative to the unknown future business processes needed to support the Workday system once it goes live. This phase of the project was not envisioned in the existing project plan but was a necessary evolution in order to fully understand the difference between the City's legacy system, PaySR, and the new functionality that will be included in Workday.

The HRP OCM Team led the effort to map the business processes for the Controller (payroll and time tracking), CAO (compensation and absence) and Personnel (HCM and benefits). The results of these meetings identified a number of high-level business processes that need to be mapped and understood in order to have a successful go live and sustainable system for the long term.

The HRP Team identified 69 detailed tasks that the Controller's team must complete in order to map to the new functionality in Workday. As an example, one of the 69 tasks is the development of the business process needed to confirm that overtime is being identified appropriately and accurately from multiple sources across the City.

While necessary, the additional workload has challenged the Controller's existing staff, as they continue to deliver the bi-weekly City payroll to City employees and contribute on a daily basis to many other aspects of the HRP implementation. Therefore, the Controller's Office proposes drawing from one of the prequalified Bench Firms, most of which have strong technology experience and skills, to assist the payroll team in the completion of the 69 detailed tasks.

The Controller's Office wishes to move forward with the issuance of a Task Order soliciting proposals from the Bench Firms with specific experience implementing the Workday payroll system in a large organization. The consultants would take ownership of specific projects and gather information, meet with stakeholders, follow up on deadlines, develop solutions, document processes, and make sure those processes are understood and feasible.

Based on initial research, this work should not exceed \$450,000, of which the majority of the costs would be incurred in the current fiscal year.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Authorize the General Manager of ITA to negotiate an amendment to the contract between the City of Los Angeles and Workday, Inc., C-135368, for a change order to implement a phased deployment approach of the Human Resources and Payroll system.

2. Transfer appropriations in the amount of \$1,000,000 from the Unappropriated Balance Fund No. 100/58, Account No. 580329, Human Resources and Payroll System Replacement, to the Information Technology Agency Fund No. 100/32, Account No. 003040, Contractual Services to fund anticipated expenditures.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The estimated General Fund impact of the proposed phased implementation is \$10.8 million. This impact includes increased costs totaling \$12.3 million (\$11.2 million for Workday, Inc., \$688,000 for the PaySR contractors including Hess & Associates, and \$450,000 for additional consulting support requested by the Controller's Office) offset by overall savings and available contingency funding in the HRP project budget of \$1.5 million. It is requested that \$1 million in available Unappropriated Balance contingency funding be transferred to the Information Technology Agency to fund a portion of 2021-22 estimated costs for the project delay. For the \$10.8 million in additional project costs, it is currently unknown at this time how much of these funds will be required in 2021-22 and which costs will be incurred in 2022-23 as the City is still in the process of negotiating a contract amendment with Workday, Inc to implement the phased go-live approach. The Information Technology Agency will submit an interim 2021-22 funding request and a 2022-23 budget request for these funds once the cost breakdown per Fiscal Year has been finalized.

FINANCIAL POLICIES STATEMENT

Approval of the recommendations of this report is in compliance with the City's Financial Policies as the underlying contracts (with Workday, Inc. and Hess & Associates) and procurement of software licenses is subject to the appropriation of funds in the City Budget.

If you have any further questions, please contact me or Joyce Edson, Executive Officer, at (213) 978-3311.

Respectfully Submitted,



Ted Ross,
General Manager

cc: Jeanne Holm, Office of the Mayor
Wendy Macy, Personnel Department
Leticia Ortiz, Personnel Department
Crista Binder, Office of the Controller
Bob Wingenroth, Office of the Controller
Matt Crawford, Office of the Controller
Matt Szabo, City Administrative Officer
Ben Ceja, City Administrative Officer
Melissa Velasco, City Administrative Officer
Karen Kalfayan, Chief Legislative Analyst
ITA Executive Team

APPENDIX A - RESPONSES TO PERSONNEL, AUDITS, AND ANIMAL WELFARE (PAAW) COMMITTEE SEPTEMBER 2021 QUESTIONS

Controller & Personnel Department:

1. Provide an objective and detailed comparative analysis of both the HR and payroll costs/benefits of:

a. The “big bang” approach vs the phased approach. This analysis should include detailing any currently unresolved issues or questions for phase 1A of the phased approach;

Phased Approach Benefits and Costs

After weighing the benefits, risks, and costs of several options, the HRP Steering Committee found the phased approach to be the best path to success for the City given the current progress of the project and context of the workforce. The following is a requested analysis of the costs and benefits of implementing a phased approach (phasing in the Workday modules) vs “big bang” (all modules at the same time) approach to the HRP Project.

First, with the phased approach, the HRP Project will benefit from focused attention with each phase. As functions are deployed, they will receive more exclusive focus from the entire project team versus all functions being deployed at once. For example, the first phase of HCM will get complete project team focus, then the second phase will receive complete focus and support, etc. During a “big bang” implementation approach (all modules in December 2022), the project team will necessarily need to split its focus across all the modules.

Secondly, a phased approach will improve user adoption and readiness (especially important as we are working through the continued effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and future re-opening). The City’s ability to manage and adapt to the change successfully is increased when the impacts are spread over time, especially given the current circumstances of competing priorities and change related to the pandemic. Three deployments of increasing difficulty allow for the project team to iterate and improve with each deployment, like learning what resonates with City learners or improving communications.

Third, the earlier timing of the phased approach allows the upcoming COVID-deferred MOU changes (effective June 2022) to be made in Workday (far easier to configure and update than the legacy PaySR system). Workday allows much simpler configuration changes in the system, as opposed to re-programming PaySR, which has taken months to update in past experiences (causing substantial frustration for City employees and unions during these delays).

Fourth, a phase approach reduces stress and burnout on the HRP Project Team. The HRP Project Staff of the Personnel Department, Controller’s Office, CAO, Information Technology Agency (ITA) have been working long and hard on the HRP Project during a global pandemic. Going live when elements are ready as opposed to waiting until the last functional area is ready (big bang) will reduce burnout among the project team members.

Fifth, the City benefits with more Workday post go live support with a phased approach. The contract provides for two months of hypercare after deployment. For a big bang approach, that means Workday is around to assist for two months, and then the in-person team rotates to other projects and the City utilizes the Workday support structure (like other customers). For a phased approach, there will be two months of hypercare after each phase, with key Workday staff remaining beyond the hypercare period until after the last hypercare period. The City realizes a savings by some Workday staff “rolling off” the project completely, while others whose functional area went live, remain but with reduced hours. Thus, the HRP team has access to their key Workday counterparts far beyond the original two-month hypercare period.

Finally, the phased approach has a cost savings compared to the big bang approach. The phased approach costs several million dollars less than delaying the entire project for one year. Commencing the phased approach with HCM going live in January 2022 increases implementation costs by \$11.2M, as it extends Workday’s engagement of staff, requires new integrations, and adds readiness assessments. The initial estimates for a December 2022 big bang approach for Workday costs is \$14.5 to \$16 million.

The primary downside to the phased approach is the need for nine new integrations between PaySR and Workday that will be used for eight to twelve months. It also requires changes to configuration and business processes for 1A and again for 1B.

Big Bang Approach Benefits and Costs

Delaying the entire project for twelve months, i.e., the big bang approach, has some unique benefits (although the HRP Steering Committee believes it ultimately has more downsides than benefits for the City of Los Angeles).

First, a big bang approach requires no new integrations between PaySR and Workday. Users would migrate exclusively from PaySR to Workday in one day. This eliminates the integration work and need to bridge two systems for a temporary time.

Secondly, the big bang approach allows a clean break in reporting between the two systems (i.e. reports are run from PaySR for one year and then from Workday for the subsequent years).

Unfortunately, there are also downsides at this time to the big bang approach. First, with the big bang delayed approach, it would require making COVID-deferred MOU changes (effective June 2022) into PaySR, which is risky and time consuming. MOU changes are more easily accomplished via compensation configuration in Workday, as opposed to re-programming PaySR. Any other changes that came along would have to be made in PaySR and the configuration updated and tested in Workday, making the replacement of PaySR a moving target. In short, a phased approach with Workday would allow MOU changes to be made in Workday as opposed to PaySR. Second, burnout among the project team becomes a real likelihood by remaining in project mode for an additional eight to twelve months due to the big bang approach. Many of these staff were working hard on the HRP Project before the formal launch in March 2020, putting them in a long duration of project-level work that would be extended a full year more. In the same vein,

the Change Network that consists of almost 500 Change Champions across the City would lose steam, as many would likely decrease engagement with a full year delay. Third, as mentioned previously, Workday’s ability to assist with post go live support would be limited to the two-month hypercare period, and the City would miss out on the fortuitous nature of extended support the phased approach provides. Fourth, it must be reminded that PaySR is at high risk of failure and must be replaced as soon as possible (as detailed in the 2017 KPMG report). PaySR has problems regularly, relies on one person for major programming changes, the hardware is end of life, and has been problematic for telework (requires agent installation onto remote computers). Deploying all but payroll and benefits as soon as possible gives the City more flexibility and options should PaySR fail. Fifth, the project cost for a big bang approach would cost \$14.5M to \$16M, rather than \$11.2M for the phased approach.

While a big bang approach was the preferred method of cutover originally on the project, the HRP Project Team now believes with the current COVID-19 pandemic recovery environment, the effects of the Separation Incentive Program, the difference in progress across the HRP modules, and the juggling of City priorities (e.g. vaccination mandates, re-hiring, etc), that a phased approach mitigates risks best in the current environment and has the best chance of success for this critical system.

TABLE 1 - SUMMARY OF COSTS/BENEFITS OF PHASED VS BIG BANG APPROACH	
Phased Approach	
<i>Benefits</i>	<i>Costs</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides dedicated attention for each phase • Improves user adoption and readiness • Eases June '22 MOU changes via Workday • Reduces burnout of HRP Project Team • Better post go live support than “big bang” • Saves millions of dollars vs “big bang” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires development of nine integrations between PaySR and Workday
“Big Bang” Approach	
<i>Benefits</i>	<i>Costs</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new, temporary integrations with PaySR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires June '22 MOU changes in PaySR (risky and time consuming)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clean break in reporting between years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Furthers burnout of HRP Project Team • Limits post go live support to two months • Extends required life of legacy PaySR systems (high risk of failure and problematic for teleworkers) • Several million dollars more expensive than phased approach
--	--

The Personnel Department also wanted to highlight the following:

The City’s HRP Workday system was initially slated to go live in January 2022 with HCM (HR), Compensation, Absence, Timekeeping, and Payroll functionality (aka “big bang”). As reported during the September 15th PAAW Committee meeting, the HRP Team determined that a phased implementation is the best approach to addressing challenges that arose during the course of the project.

The phased implementation was proposed as follows:

- Phase 1A (January 2022): Human Capital Management (*HCM, which provides functionality required to maintain employee data and assign employees to positions*)
- Phase 1B (April 2022): *Compensation (setting salary), Absence, and Timekeeping*
- Phase 2 (December 2022): *Benefits and Payroll*

The Personnel Department supports a phased approach over the original “big bang” approach as this provides an opportunity for HR to have a more focused and manageable launch. In a letter provided to Workday on September 14th, Personnel outlined the key factors to be resolved prior to going live (See “Personnel Department Items” in Appendix B). Because the phased approach is still under development, there are certain items that have not yet been completely resolved or have not yet been tested to confirm that a satisfactory solution has been found. The following are high priority matters that need to be addressed before phase 1A goes live:

An operationally feasible approach for HR staff to use Workday and PaySR concurrently:

Status: In discussions held over the past week with Bob Hess & Associates (PaySR developers), it was conveyed that it would take 4-6 weeks (late October to November) for them to evaluate and inform the HRP team and Personnel of what will be required from HR users for their daily processing.

The phased approach as proposed separates HCM and Compensation in Workday. This separation will require HR staff to perform hire/promotion processes in two systems - with appointments to positions being processed in Workday, while setting salary in PaySR. Personnel had expressed concern that having hire processes split between two systems adds complexity for HR staff and increases opportunity for errors and oversights. During the aforementioned discussions with PaySR developers, they also expressed concern about how the integration would

handle changes to hire and compensation effective dates that often occur due to corrections, management decisions, or changes in labor policy - this matter continues to be evaluated.

Confirmation from key department users that the HCM configuration meets operational needs.

Status: Testing of changes to the HR setup in Workday, as well as the integration with PaySR are expected to take place from 10/25 to 11/12. The testing strategy is being assessed with consideration to the likelihood that Workday and the PaySR team may need to complete updates to their respective systems while testing is taking place.

Citywide-user readiness and acceptance (training and change management).

Status:

Departments: There are ongoing discussions with departments such as LAPD, LAFD, LAWA, and Harbor where the HRP team is continuing to address complexities related to how adopting Workday will impact their operations. The complexities generally center around the ability to execute large reassignments on a quarterly to monthly basis, and the impact of Workday on their internal systems their operations rely on.

Department Administration (HR and Budget): In addition to ongoing development, testing, and training efforts, the HRP team is working to identify a means to incorporate “user acceptance testing.” While the current testing plan is focused on the project team and a subset of subject matter experts confirming that system changes are working as intended, user acceptance testing would involve a contingent of representative users from key departments who would test and verify that the “final” system design meets operational needs.

With consideration to these factors, Personnel remains fully supportive of a phased approach, but have proposed adjustments to how the phases are implemented with the HRP steering committee. Personnel and the HRP Team discussed concerns we have regarding operational challenges that can result from separating HCM and Compensation. We also discussed our concerns around the practicality of the HRP Team effectively completing all the activities needed prior to going live. This includes the Workday configuration, the integration with PaySR, performing testing and retesting (as necessary), clarify and establish operational standards, coordinate user acceptance testing, conduct training, and address the outstanding department concerns within the next three months in order to meet a January 2022 go-live date. With consideration to our concerns, the HRP team is now evaluating the possibility of combining HCM and Compensation for an April 2022 go-live date.

Open Issues or Questions for Phase 1A

Since the start of the HRP Project, the HRP Project Team maintains a RAIDQ log of all issues and concerns. The HRP Project Team has already worked through and resolved over 550 items on this list. The following list is a snapshot in time of open issues or questions related to Phase 1A of the phased approach at the writing of this report:

See APPENDIX B - RAIDQ LIST & PERSONNEL ADDITION OF OPEN QUESTIONS/ISSUES FOR PHASE 1A.

1b. The proposal as presented vs having phase 1A occur in April 2022 and 1B in July 2022, with Phase 2 occurring in December 2022;

As requested, below is a table comparing the impacts of the proposed phased approach beginning in January 2022 vs phase 1A occurring in April 2022, phase 1B in July 2022, and Phase 2 in December 2022.

TABLE 2 - COMPARISON OF REQUESTED TWO PHASED APPROACHES	
<i>Phased Approach 1 in Report (January, April, and December 2022)</i>	<i>Phased Approach 2 in PAAW Question (April, July, and December 2022)</i>
<i>Key Benefits of Phased Approach 1 in Report</i>	
<u>Better Reporting</u> - HCM start in January allows clean reporting across calendar years (PaySR reports for 2021, Workday for 2022 and beyond)	HCM reports would straddle two systems during 2022 (first three months in PaySR and 9 months in Workday)
<u>Lower Disruption</u> - Necessary freeze of HR transactions in PaySR would occur during holiday downtime with lower disruption (system activity is light)	Necessary freeze of HR transactions would happen during regular activity volume and potentially cause more disruption.
<u>Avoids Fiscal Year End Conflict</u> - Time Tracking, Compensation, and Absence (Phase 1B in April) would launch and stabilize before fiscal year end activities that would affect the time and attention of payroll staff	Controller's Office and payroll staff in City departments would need to juggle fiscal year-end duties with launch of Phase 1B in July
<u>Eases MOU Changes via Workday</u> - All MOU changes effective June 2022 and beyond can be made more quickly and easily in Workday, than in the legacy PaySR system	MOU changes effective June 2022 would need to be implemented in both PaySR and Workday, increasing risk and delays in compensation
<u>Allows 8 Months of Dedicated Payroll Focus</u> - Provides eight months between Phase 1B and Phase 2 to focus on Payroll and Benefits (largely payroll deductions) testing and go-live	Pushing Phase 1B to later in year (i.e. July) reduces the time to focus project team on payroll testing and launch

<p><u>Avoids MOU Negotiation Conflict for CAO</u> - Phase 1B would launch in April eight months before 22 MOUs are set to expire, allowing availability of CAO team for HRP Project</p>	<p>Phase 1B would launch in July when a majority of the City's MOUs will likely be under negotiation, reducing the availability of the CAO team for HRP Project</p>
<p><u>Features Delivered to City Sooner</u> - HCM configuration and features will be available for January 2022. City teams can go-live and take advantage of system features and subsequent enhancements sooner</p>	<p>HCM features would be delayed three months.</p>
<p><u>Less cost</u> - The phased approach detailed in the report requires less full-time Workday consultants on site for the year vs the phased approach mentioned in the question from PAAW Committee</p>	<p>This phased approach requires more full-time Workday consultants during the year with a total cost between \$13.5M to \$14.5M more than the original plan.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Key Benefits of Phased Approach 2 in PAAW Committee Question</i></p>	
<p>Phase 1A would occur 3 months prior, requiring system configuration and user training to be accomplished on time</p>	<p><u>Additional Time for Phase 1A Preparation</u> - The phased approach described in the PAAW Committee question would provide an additional 3 months for Phase 1A. This would provide additional time for PaySR/HRP integration development and testing and could be utilized by the Personnel Department for go-live preparation</p>
<p>Phase 1B would occur three months prior, requiring system configuration and user training to be accomplished on time</p>	<p><u>Additional Time for Phase 1B Preparation</u> - The phased approach described in the PAAW Committee question would provide an additional 3 months for Phase 1B. This would provide additional time for PaySR/HRP integration development and testing and could be utilized by the Personnel Department/Controller's Office for go-live preparation.</p>

Additionally, the Personnel Department would like to highlight that having phase 1A occur in April 2022 and 1B in July 2022 would provide for the aforementioned opportunity to have HCM and Compensation go live concurrently, which we believe would help mitigate complexity for users by reducing the need to work in both Workday and PaySr to complete hire and promotion processes. In addition, it will provide sufficient time for outstanding challenges with training, testing, and overall readiness to be effectively addressed with greater confidence.

1c. The costs and risks associated with a process that requires PaySR/Workday integration to a process that does not require such integration. Include your current confidence level in the successful Workday to PaySR integration within

the next 90 days and whether HR/Payroll staff will be doing duplicate work; state whether employee benefits has confirmed that data brought from Workday and translated to PaySR will assure zero disruptions to the various benefits Personnel administers for City employees.

Work on integrations between Workday and PaySR has already been underway. During the HRP Project, comprehensive mapping was already completed between legacy PaySR data and the new values in Workday. For the integration back to PaySR, that mapping is simply reversed. Fortunately, PaySR has an existing interface template for this type of integration. Currently DWP integrates with PaySR in a similar fashion as Workday would in the phased approach. Thus, the prototype and proof of this concept has existed for the last 15 years. The first iteration of integrations for Phase 1A are already complete. Initial unit testing has begun and full End-to-End testing will occur in the month of October. Both Workday technical teams and Bob Hess & Associates PaySR technical teams have expressed high levels of confidence in the development of these integrations in time for go-live. Full regression testing (all system functionality, including integrations) is set for early November, that will provide a final double-check of these interfaces and other Phase 1A features. These system integrations will eliminate the need for duplicate entry (entering the same information in PaySR and Workday). HR staff throughout the City will only need to enter information one time, in one place when processing HR transactions. However, some HR processes will span across both Workday and PaySR, such as basic compensation will be entered in Workday and bonuses will be entered in PaySR during the three month period between Phase 1A and 1B. Currently, the HCM team is detailing field by field and step by step what will be done in which system for development of process and training materials. Training materials for 1A and 1B are already largely complete. With the input from Workday and Personnel subject matter experts, the training materials will also include what is done in which system. HR staff throughout the City will receive instructor-led training in addition to having job aids and other resources. In exchange for a low-risk integration, City employees receive unprecedented access to their work information and many self-service features that can reduce the work of HR.

Because the Workday to PaySR integration is still in development, the Personnel Department will have a better understanding of the integration once the project is further along in testing the integration. Bob Hess & Associates have conveyed to the Personnel HRP team a high level of confidence that the integration will largely work successfully, but there's less certainty around what will be required of HR staff in order to handle processing transactions in both systems. Personnel will have a clearer understanding on this once testing is underway in November. When testing occurs, the Personnel HRP team will work to include the Employee Benefits Division in the process.

It must be noted that the Controller's Office views fiscal year end as a very difficult time to launch time tracking and absence, as payroll staff throughout the City are involved in time-consuming year-end activities.

2. Provide your input and recommendations on measures needed to mitigate risk associated with users and subject matter experts not dedicating sufficient time to the

program to refine requirements, participate in business process redesign, test, and validate the new system, and attend training.

Engaging users and utilizing the subject matter experts is a key critical success factor for the HRP Project. Leveraging lessons learned from previous large IT projects at the City of Los Angeles, the HRP Project has prioritized department engagement through a variety of means. First, the HRP Project has a dedicated Change Management Team led by Accenture. This team has embedded themselves in requirements meetings, business process redesign sessions, and testing efforts. They have performed numerous outreach events, conducted multiple citywide user readiness surveys, and continue to engage key stakeholders during the project. This includes establishing a network of Change Champions throughout City departments who have agreed to both learn about department responsibilities in the project and champion the project within their respective departments. In fact, the Change Champion monthly meeting for September 2021 had over 200 attendees from City departments. Engagement from City departments is closely monitored for each project phase and escalated to the HRP Steering Committee and department management, if necessary. Across various measurements, department users and SMEs have shown considerable engagement and participation on the HRP Project (better than most previous large IT projects). Well over 100 department users have participated in testing, and HRP recently shattered the attendance record with over 1,200 employees tuning in when they presented during ITA Office Hours, a regular event that is open to all employees.

Second, various measures have already been instituted to ensure participation from users and subject matter experts. For example, the HRP Project Plan is utilized to identify short, medium, and long term tasks coming up on the horizon. One key practice to ensuring participation by City staff is to provide as much notice as possible, which the project plan allows for. When given advance notice, departments have been very faithful to participate. Additionally, like with almost any meeting in the City, typical regular days off (RDOs) are avoided (e.g. do not schedule key meetings on Fridays). When payroll SMEs are needed, payroll week is avoided (this is a busy time for payroll staff). To date, departments have been very eager and diligent about responding to and cooperating with the HRP team. One key challenge where SME availability has been an issue is when the SMEs were lost to SIP or when they were diverted to deal with COVID issues and the resulting economic downturn. Fortunately, this situation has improved with the reduction of Disaster Service Workers and emergency COVID activities.

Additional measures that are available to further assist with department user and subject matter expert participation include:

1. Use of Mayor's Office powers to conscript key department staff that can contribute to the project, where needed
2. Further tracking of department participation in remaining project milestones (e.g. training)
3. Escalation of departments not fully participating to the Information Technology Oversight Committee (ITOC), as needed

The Personnel Department believes that the current proposed timeline for training and gathering feedback from SMEs and HR staff is constrained, particularly as we enter the

holiday season and will be contending with various City holiday and employee time off requests. An extended timeline would allow users to build a level of understanding with the system that will enable them to provide insightful feedback, and better consider any operational adaptations that may be required. The more involved departments are in testing and training prior to go-live, the fewer challenges we will see after go-live. A time extension would also provide the HRP team an opportunity to establish a well considered training plan based on a more complete iteration of the Workday system.

3. Provide your analysis regarding whether an independent Quality Assurance Consultant would or would not increase the likelihood of successful implementation as it relates to your specific areas of responsibility.

During contract development, the HRP Steering Committee was divided between those in favor of a Quality Assurance (QA) Consultant and those opposed to it. Those in favor felt comforted by the idea of an independent review of the project. Those who opposed had experiences with QA consultants on large IT projects in the past, finding them often requiring too much additional time from project staff (jeopardizing the work), incurring substantial cost that could be used towards project improvements, and adding little overall value to their projects. To promote consensus and mitigate potential risk, the members of the HRP Steering Committee agreed to initiate a QA consultant at the start of the HRP Project. Gartner Consulting was solicited through a competitive process and began work under the following scope:

Project Health Check

- Ensure quality of project governance, recommend process improvements throughout and leveraging new features of the system (business process re-design, requirements traceability, data conversion plan, testing plans)

Design Review

- Review and provide feedback on SI vendor system test effort including test results, fixes, retest results - determine if changes are ready for distribution to the UAT environment

Communications & Organizational Change management Plan

- Guidance on day-to-day change management and communication workstream, assist development of the org change management plan
- Determine appropriate initiatives to manage the impact of organizational changes resulting from
- Support Steering Committee communications to other governance orgs - ITOC, elected officials, labor

Post Go-Live operational plan

- Validate team structure, ensure procedures conform to industry standard auditing practices for modern cloud-based enterprise systems
- Review policies and guidelines

After a full year of QA consultant work, the contract was up for renewal. The HRP Steering Committee and Project Team evaluated the experience and lack of perceived value from

the previous twelve months of work and decided to not renew the contract for the QA consultant. The 2020 requirement to reduce budget across City departments, including the HRP Project, provided an additional reason. In light of the interest of the PAAW Committee in securing a QA consultant for the last portions of the HRP Project, the HRP Steering Committee members generally hold a “can’t hurt” approach to the topic and will work to solicit a QA consultant or QA engagement.

In the Personnel Department’s view, an independent Quality Assurance Consultant would increase the likelihood of a successful implementation. The HRP Team has undertaken this project in the face of unprecedented circumstances with COVID, quarantine, and the early retirements of knowledgeable staff. For the Personnel Department, this is the largest HR-focused system we have been involved in implementing. We believe that an independent QA will be able to provide insights that may help optimize our project approach with consideration to the unprecedented factors, help us build confidence in our methodology, and help the project as a whole mitigate risk factors and further delays.

ITA:

1. Provide a detailed explanation and comparative analysis of the contract cost increases associated with the “big bang” approach vs the phased approach. Please also provide a comparative analysis of the costs associated with the phased approach as presented vs. having phase 1A occur in April 2022 and 1B in July 2022, with Phase 2 in December 2022.

As stated above, the Phased Approach detailed in the report (beginning in January 2022) has a cost of \$11.2M. A phased approach beginning in April and subsequent phases of July and December (as detailed in the PAAW Committee question) would have an additional cost of \$13.5M to \$14.5M (over \$2 to \$3 Million more). A Big Bang approach in December 2022, would cost \$14.5M to \$16M more (over \$3 to \$5 Million more than the phased approach detailed in the report).

At present, the milestones for this Phased Approach are:

Milestone Event (Phased Approach)	Phase
End to End Testing Complete	Phase 1A
HCM Tenant Build	Phase 1A
End User Training Materials Complete	Phase 1A
Stakeholder Interviews - All Departments	Phase 1A
Training Delivery Complete	Phase 1A
Go Live	Phase 1A
Post Production Support Complete	Phase 1A
ABS/TT/Comp Tenant Build	Phase 1B
End User Training Materials Complete	Phase 1B
Pre Prod Tenant Build Complete	Phase 1B
Phase 1B - Go Live	Phase 1B

Training Delivery Complete	Phase 1B
Go Live	Phase 1B
Post Production Support Complete	Phase 1B
End to End Testing Complete	Phase 2
Parallel Tenant Build Complete	Phase 2
End User Training Materials Complete	Phase 2
Pre Production Tenant Build Complete	Phase 2
Go Live	Phase 2
Phase 2 - Post Production Support Complete	Phase 2

The detailed contract amendment is under development which further details costing and milestones.

2. The phased approach cost savings was said to be based on the ability to remove Workday consultants as phases begin. Please include in your analysis how this reduction in support impacts post Go Live dedicated support to City staff. Include a clear analysis of the costs and risks associated with a process that requires PaySR\Workday integration to a process that does not requires such an integration. This should include a snapshot of the status of Workday to PaySR integration efforts and readiness.

The Workday HRP Project contract includes two months of post go live support (a common approach to Workday implementations). In the “big bang” approach, all HRP modules would go live and on-site consultants would begin migrating to their next projects after about 60 days. Support would be continued remotely through the traditional Workday support model (support tickets to the Workday Help Desk). Through the phased approach, Workday consultants remain longer on the project. In other words, the Phase 1A go live would allow HCM consultants to reduce their hours or roll off of the project after 60 days. However, Phase 1B and Phase 2 consultants (with related knowledge and experience) would remain onsite and could assist with key post go live support issues if necessary. Sixty days after the completion of Phase 1B, Phase 2 consultants would still remain on site. The phased approach provides a unique opportunity for extended Workday support. While onsite Workday consultants would be reducing over time through a phased approach (reducing costs to the project vs the big bang approach), the length of onsite support is much longer than the big bang approach.

3. Provide a template of the monthly reports you plan to use to assure the City Council, via its PAAW Committee is kept apprised on a timely basis of HRP project progress, including issues that need prompt resolution, cost increases, timeline changes, and statements of readiness by user departments and labor partners.

See APPENDIX C - TEMPLATE OF POTENTIAL HRP PROJECT MONTHLY REPORT TO PAAW COMMITTEE as a template of a monthly report that the HRP Project can provide to City Council via the PAAW Committee, including accomplishments, key milestones to come, risk factors, open issues and questions, etc.

4. Provide your detailed narrative project plan for the remainder of the project that includes specific monthly milestones and which department is responsible for delivering each milestone. Plan to have each responsible department report on their milestone progress at subsequent PAAW Committee meetings.

The HRP Project maintains a detailed project plan with over 2,000 tasks divided across 5 phases of the project. The current version of the HRP Project Plan is 136 pages. Due to its size and the proprietary nature, please contact Raelynn Napper, HRP Project Manager, for a copy.

For ease of understanding, below is a summarized Critical Path for Phase 1A that highlights key project milestones with responsible parties.

No	Milestone	Description	Responsible	Due Date	Status/Trend
1	HCM Testing – 1A	Complete End to End testing for P1A.	Marvin	Updated 10/1	
2	Reports	Reports needed for this phase need to be identified by the functional leads, reviewed and signed off.	Raven	9/24	Complete 9/24
3	Integration Development	Design, Development, Unit Test, and End to End Test integrations to PaySr: Personal Information	Chad	10/8	
4	Tenant Build	Practice Tenant build for HCM and Prism, allows confirmation of steps and timing	Chris/Ray	10/8	
5	Configuration Adjustments	Update existing configuration to align with P1A scope and add additional configuration to support the integrations to PaySr.	Sonja/Marvin	10/22	
6	PRISM – Review and Signoff	Confirm the 3 use cases are complete and tested: Employee Work History, SSN Changes and Demographic Information	Marvin/Chris/Didier	10/08	Complete 9/21
7	Sustainability Model	End user support structure defined and in place. Governance committee members identified and actively meeting on a monthly basis.	Raelynn	10/17	
8	Exam Seniority Program	Functions include HCM, Integrations, PRISM	Dale/Raelynn	10/22	
9	Regression Testing	Retests to impacted areas related to the WD 21R2 and configuration adjustments	Yvonne/Anthony	11/1	
10	HCM Training	Conduct Instructor Led Training beginning 11/15	Seemab	11/15	
11	Finalize Configuration	Ensure all Configuration is in place for both online transactions and integrations.	Sonja/Marvin	11/25	
12	Gold Tenant Build	Build and migrate Production ready tenant	Chris/Ray	12/17	

CAO:

1. Provide recommendations on the most expeditious approach to establishing a contract with an experienced Quality Assurance consulting firm to provide the Council

with independent QA, in the event a decision is made to use a QA firm. The outside QA consultant would be responsible for monitoring program progress, identifying risks, and making recommendations for mitigations as well as providing regular QA reports to both the HRP leadership team and the PAAW Committee. The goal is to assure no additional late surprises for Council and to provide transparency on project progress and readiness and obstacles to all City stakeholders. This response should include an analysis on the feasibility of using the existing QA contract in use at DWP with their Workday implementation as well as existing Controller Bench Consultant

Should a Quality Assurance (QA) firm be sought, the most expeditious approach is to use an existing contract vehicle. This could include the following:

- Controller's Office Bench Contracts - The Controller's Office maintains a competitively bid bench of audit, consulting, and quality assurance vendors. With permission of the Controller's Office, the vendors could be engaged through a Task Order Solicitation (TOS) process in which they would bid and reply to the TOS. Based on pre-set criteria, the best response would be awarded the quality assurance work. Based on past CAO and ITA experiences, this process typically takes two to three months.
- Leverage Existing LADWP Contract - The LA Department of Water and Power (LADWP) is also early in the process of a Workday HRP Project. The LADWP has secured a quality assurance contract for their project with KPMG. While there can be some contractual difficulties in leveraging a contract established by the Department of Water and Power, with City Attorney assistance, the City may be able to leverage that existing contract and establish a new contract with KPMG for QA services if the services sought by the City are substantially similar to those in the LADWP contract. In past experiences, this process to "piggyback" on an existing LADWP contract can take around three months and possibly require additional Council approval (with additional time duration).
- Leverage Existing Accenture HRP Project Subcontractor - Accenture is the existing Change Management and Training subcontractor for the HRP Project. Quality assurance and audit is a service often provided by Accenture to other Workday projects. The City can potentially negotiate a change order with Accenture to provide a quality assurance engagement or service for the HRP Project. The work would be performed by a separate division in the Accenture firm, providing separation from current Accenture staff, provided that this level of independence is sufficient for the PAAW Committee.

2. Provide the HRP labor partner meeting schedule to date, agenda topics covered, including business process changes and Workday's approach to calculating compensation as compared to PaySR, and any issues, questions, or concerns identified by labor partners. Please include ideas labor has offered to the City to adjust upcoming MOU negotiations to mitigate issues around the transition to Workday, both in terms of minimizing complex compensation changes and retroactivity, as well as your planned HRP labor partner meeting schedule from October 2021 through December 2022.

The City Administrative Officer (CAO) Employee Relations Division (ERD) has facilitated weekly meetings with representatives of all labor partners since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. During those meetings, progress and scope of the HRP Project has been a topic of discussion. While all HRP topics do not impact our labor partners, the HRP Project has conducted specific initiatives for labor in the following areas:

- The HRP Communications workstream worked closely with the manager of the ERD and City Attorney assigned from the City Attorney's Labor Relations Division to develop a strategy for project communication with labor partners. ERD is the City's lead entity when it comes to liaising with the City's labor organizations, so all HRP communications are approved and/or transmitted by ERD.

- Specialized communications to employee representatives:
 - HRP initial project awareness communication in October 2020.
 - Presentation in November 2020.
 - Written notice of the Citywide change readiness survey and an opportunity to provide feedback in April 2021.
 - Occasional mentions on the weekly labor calls.
 - The HRP team is currently planning the next presentation to our labor partners that will highlight change impacts identified to current processes and provide a timeline update.
 - The HRP Communications Plan accounts for further engagement of our labor partners in advance of each phase going live, as well as a placeholder for conversations on pay differences should any be identified.

- As labor organizations receive funding through City payroll deductions, the HRP project discussed the engagement needed for the transition of these payroll deductions to Workday during the November 2020 presentation.
 - Subsequently, the ERD Chief provided written notice of when that work would commence, and all unions were invited to orientation sessions that walked through the changes to how they would communicate a change in deductions and access reports of transactions.
 - Work then proceeded with individualized assistance from the Integrations workstream, as needed, to accomplish the technical changes to the payroll deduction file transfer process.

- To date, no pay differences have been identified for employees. Rather, the holistic compensation review mentioned in the original update report served to identify 39 employees who, at present, are potentially being paid incorrectly as a result of how their information is entered in PaySR. ERD staff are investigating those instances and working with departments to correct the errors where necessary.

- Details of changes as communicated to labor by phase:
 - With Phase 1A, Workday would only be storing the hourly base rate, which has been unit tested and tested during End-to-End testing. This presents a very low risk of impacting pay. Regression testing will validate step progression to ensure no differences, and there are also audit reports in place. All other elements that impact pay (e.g., bonuses, time, absence) will be entered in PaySR, where existing processes and validations preserve the status quo.
 - In Phase 1B, Workday will be the system of record for all compensation elements, including permanent and temporary bonuses. In Workday, Compensation is configured with plain-language logic and eligibility rules that make up plans. Every employee is assigned to a Compensation Plan and employees who receive permanent bonuses are assigned to the appropriate Allowance Plans. No special codes are needed when entering their time in order to receive the assigned compensation or allowances. There are also Allowance Plans for temporary bonuses, i.e., one that depends on the work an employee performs on a given day and is entered via their timesheet. Every temporary bonus has been configured with a Time Entry Code (TEC). The temporary bonus TEC is tied to an Allowance Plan in Compensation via a Time Tracking eligibility rule, and Allowance Plans have eligibility rules that determine which employees or positions can use them. There is a "Compensation Change" Business Process (i.e., workflow), that can be initiated by a manager, an HR Partner, or a Payroll Liaison. This Business Process is used for a number of compensation changes, including assigning and removing Allowance Plans to employees. HR approves this type of Compensation Change. Once an Allowance Plan has been assigned to an employee, they can use the TEC when entering time, the manager approves the time, and the employee receives the temporary bonus.
 - These rules and processes have been tested many times, and will continue to be tested through February 2022. They will be further tested during Phase 1B by inputting time, time off, and compensation changes in a specific pay period, using representative groups and cases. Then during testing, the integration between Workday and PaySR will run, payroll will run in PaySR (in test environment), and results reviewed including comparison to what the results would have been for the same data entered into PaySR. Should any pay difference be identified, ERD has an established process for addressing pay discrepancies.

- Upcoming MOU negotiations will be conducted in accordance with bargaining instructions provided by the Executive Employee Relations Committee (EERC). Any feedback provided by the City's labor partners in the context of those negotiations will be reviewed by the EERC as appropriate.

3. What is the detailed plan for ensuring that HR and Payroll staff from all 48 departments are trained and comfortable with Workday BEFORE Go Live? Provide recommendations

on a process that requires each GM to certify in writing that their respective Payroll and HR staff are ready to Go Live without disruption to their Core City functions. Include your means of accurately assessing readiness and recommended timeline for each GM's self-certification.

The HRP Project Plan incorporates major efforts around training, user readiness, and improving the comfort of City employees before go-live. The plan for change readiness has been developed and implemented by Accenture and is centered on several end-user centric workstreams that ensure the staff at departments are:

- Aware of Workday,
- Understand the changes (or lack of change) coming from the Workday system,
- Ready for go-live through:
 - Communications,
 - Stakeholder Enablement,
 - Change Readiness Measurement,
 - Training.

Within the Communications workstream, the HRP project team has established live events such as Town Halls and Change Readiness Roadshows as well as joined existing live events, such as ITA Office Hours and several City Department meetings where the team presents the capabilities of the system, describe the changes that are coming, and provide a demonstration of the discussed functionality. In addition, the Communications team has established a project website (hrp.insidela.org) with a chatbot, videos, FAQs, project information, and recordings of live events, including a separate page for HR and Payroll staff with curated content for them. The communications team has also engaged in target and City-wide campaigns to raise awareness with multiple communications describing Phase 1a ready to launch in the coming weeks through go-live.

Within the Stakeholder Enablement workstream the focus is on identifying changes and their impacts to stakeholders through three main activities. The first is capturing the impacts associated with the changes due to Workday, identifying the impacted stakeholder groups (including HR and Payroll staff), and determining the appropriate channels to provide that awareness and understanding. The second is the establishment of the Change Champion Network, which is a group of over 400 City employees from all the departments who will provide readiness information to their respective departments before go-live and support in the field after. To support this work, the team has provided them with detailed information about Workday and the changes that they will cascade out as well as access to their own instance of Workday that they use to both practice in Workday and lead Roadshows in their departments describing the coming changes. The final activity is the delivery of Change Discussion Guides to Change Champions and Department Liaisons. These provide the details of the changes, the transition, security roles, training, and the support model so that users and departments will be ready for the transition.

In order to properly measure readiness by departments, the team has established the Change Readiness Measurement which is a series of activities that measure over time and in multiple venues staff and department readiness for Workday. At the center of this, the team has planned City-wide readiness surveys, two of which have already been

completed and a third is planned for the month before go-live. The team has also been assessing department understanding and readiness through our monthly Change Network Meetings, and have training assessments planned for end user training. Finally, the team has instituted digital live polling for all large meetings to assess audience understanding of the content allowing the team to address questions and concerns in real time.

Despite the efforts described above to get departments and employees ready for the Workday transition, readiness will ultimately be determined by the training provided and the participation of City staff in training. Training is organized to support readiness of all city users based on how much and how often they use Workday. Training for the HRP project will be targeted based on the skills users need to use Workday or do their job. Where possible, the team will make training available on-demand and flexible to accommodate users' point of need. HR and Payroll staff will receive formal, instructor-led training using a dedicated training tenant; scenarios will be representative of the work they will do in the system. They will also have required online training as well as access to on demand training. For City staff users who will use the Employee Self-Service features rolling out with go-live, the team will provide on demand training, such as videos, online training, and job aids as well as in application help text to guide users at the point of need.

The methods described above are tried and tested ways to improve user readiness and comfort before Workday go-live. By monitoring the participation, surveys, and progress of City departments, the HRP Project gets a good measurement of readiness of each department. Departments that are not appropriately participating or engaging will be contacted by the HRP Steering Committee and escalated as needed. This method has been highly successful with IT projects over the last 10 years (FMS, Procurement, etc). Requesting General Managers to certify for their departments is not a proven method for readiness and the HRP Project Steering Committee does not recommend this process to ensure user readiness.

Combined Responses:

Provide recommendations on the effectiveness of the current HRP governance structure and whether any course adjustments are merited. If so, specify recommended changes.

The HRP Project governance structure is modeled after previous, successful large IT projects at the City of Los Angeles (e.g. the Financial Management System). In the HRP Project:

- Individual workstreams provide direct work for each Workday module
- Workstream Leads make up the HRP Project Team
- The HRP Project Team reports to the multi-department HRP Steering Committee
- The HRP Steering Committee provides reports to the IT Oversight Committee, comprised of the Mayor's Office, CAO, and CLA. Reports and contracts are also transmitted to City Council.

The HRP Project Team has accomplished many project tasks within this governance structure and has no specific recommended changes at this time.

Personnel believes that a QA would help to inform what, if any, adjustments would be needed in order to optimize the HRP governance structure for success.

APPENDIX B - RAIDQ LIST & RECENT PERSONNEL ADDITION OF OPEN QUESTIONS/ISSUES FOR PHASE 1A

RAIDQ ID	Cross App or PMO	Decision Maker	State	Item Type	Team on Task	Short Description	Start	Due Date	Description	Next Steps	Workstream	Impact
027			Work In Progress	Risk	Customer	The City of Los Angeles will be offering a Separation Incentive Program (SIP) for up-to 1300 eligible employees.	06/24/20	04/29/22	Currently there are 3000+ employees eligible so it's possible that the City will meet its quota. The SIP will solve the Furlough issue but it will present another. We have not run statistics as of yet but many of the employees who are eligible will take with them valuable intellectual capital that we require during the Architect Stage and in part during the Configuration Stage. Depending on the employees that take SIP, this could be a substantial blow to the project so this is High Risk until we know more information as to whom will be retiring.	<p>kwc: SIP program approved by the Council; furloughs will be deferred until the middle of August possibly. Need to follow up on who from the team will be signing up for program. Concerned with CAO personnels availability during the program so this is something to monitor.</p> <p>RN: 8/3/20 is the deadline to apply for SIP. 8/10/20 is the deadline to rescind an application for SIP. By 8/12/20, we should have an idea of whether the min participation was met and SIP will proceed. We may not know until later the exact impact this will have on furloughs.</p> <p>RN: SIP is approved. Department leads received the list of SIP participants on 10/2. They will review and ID people critical to the project and then assess the impact.</p>	PMO	1 HIGH (Important corrective action)

147			Work In Progress	Risk	Customer	Changes to the current AD Domains across the City landscape.	07/29/20	06/30/21	<p>The City currently has a distributed AD model. A separate initiative will be done to either combine or make each domain communicate seamless. This dueling projects can put the SSO process at risk.</p> <p>Okta only for LAWA</p>	<p>9/10: Backup plans in place should the future Google Model not work due to Googles Timelines. OKTA will be the backup plan. Only pending issue is with the writeback services to update email addresses from the AD. Time will not allow this to be done for the Phase 1a go-live and is being discussed within the City team (Woowon leading that) to discuss next steps.</p> <p>8/11: meeting next week on 8/19</p> <p>8/25: Follow up meeting tomorrow, 8/26</p> <p>10/14: desired method will not be feasible, find out status on today's call</p> <p>10/27: Still tbd, working through currently</p> <p>10/28/2020 (CKodet): In our weekly SSO/Security check-in call it has been confirmed the city will not be combining the multiple AD's into one domain, but use a federated model. Each Azure domain will remain in place and the lacity.org will communicate with the other domains for authentication. Only pending item now is for LAWA and what will be used (OKTA vs OIM) and how the federated model will work to LAWA.</p> <p>11/04: Still pending for budget reasons, looks like leaning to Okta</p>	Integrations	1 HIGH (Important corrective action)
-----	--	--	------------------	------	----------	--	----------	----------	---	--	--------------	--------------------------------------

												<p>TW: 11/10 Still TBD based off note from Doreen</p> <p>11/18: int071 one feed, process as the IDM feed, or pull data directly out of SAP.</p> <p>11/24: Still in progress, will be for at least the next few weeks.</p> <p>12/01- In progress</p> <p>12/8 - Still in progress for if there are any impacts to integrations for LAWA and the use of OIM and/or OKTA for authentication. Directive is to progress as if there will not be OKTA since and have SSO directly with OIM.</p> <p>12/22 - No updates on this item. Will continue to discuss in our standing Wednesday Security/SSO call.</p> <p>12/29: Reassigned to Kevin and Nima</p> <p>01/04: Possible internal change to IDP could cause delay in the project.</p> <p>01/05: proof of concept due in two weeks</p> <p>01/19: More information at Wed meeting 01/21/2021 - CKodet: The IdM team has finalized our decision to switch from Azure AD to Google Cloud Identity. The transition is going to be done</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

										<p>in several phases with the initial phases focused on setting up Google MFA with everyone's existing lacity.org Google accounts and migrating all of the city's 12,000 Connect2LACity (Zscaler) remote desktop users/groups from Azure AD to Google Cloud Identity. At the same time, we hope to have our directory ready for the non-production Workday tenant to switch to in early February. We can discuss details and begin testing late next week after the IdM team has laid out a bit more groundwork on the MFA and the groups. 2/02/2021: Still working on moving to google cloud. Getting ready for the testing environment</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

253			Open	Risk	Customer	Hiring freeze could result in loss of staff	08/31/20	04/22/22	The City is currently in a hiring freeze, and promotions and new hires require approval. History shows that during these times we risk losing staff to proprietary and special funded departments. This is the case for many classifications. ITA has identified their most vulnerable positions, and if lost to other departments or the expiration of their temporary training period, it will have a direct impact on the HRP Project.	ITA continues to present the case for the existing 5 positions and options for offsetting the salary increases. KWC:3.31.21 - moving the date out into E2E to see if the RISK continues to affect testing as it did with UT, especially on the PATT side.	Security	1 HIGH (Important corrective action)
260			Work in Progress	Decision	Customer	Service Dates- Confirm what LACERS and LAFPP may need from WD for them to manage continuous service dates in their systems.	09/09/20	09/24/21	SC 9/9: Daniel will follow-up with LACERS & LAFPP to determine if the service dates being used in WD will meet their needs for calculating continued service dates. SC 8/12: Adding to 8/16 Workstream Agenda Need to determine how this will be populated prior to the next build (E2E). In the meantime, within Foundation and Config tenants, any configuration and unit testing will have to either review and/or manually populate this for the employee being tested. 12/14 - Marvin still not sure if/what/how to use in a way that would make sense to the City	9/27: meeting scheduled today to discuss.	HCM Core	3 LOW (Improvement)

288			Work in Progress	Risk	Workday	LAPD unique systems	10/01/20	10/29/21	<p>LAPD has several unique systems (CHRIS, FITS, KITS, TPS) and is in the process of implementing a new CRM system, they are concerned about the ability for Workday to integrate smoothly with all of these systems</p> <p>JR 4/21: OCM team is working with Raelynn to put together a list of in scope WD functionality to help them evaluate their system landscape with WD and what WD might be able to replace, will update after discussing with LAPD in more detail</p>	<p>Integration Team confirm what integrations are in scope for LAPD and any concerns about LAPD requirements around integrations. Assuming there are no major issues OCM team can reassure LAPD that their systems are all accounted for during department check ins and eventually Change Discussions.</p> <p>KWC: Sys Admin meeting coming up to address all outstanding issues and readiness for end to end testing.</p>	Change Management	3 LOW (Improvement)
294			Open	Risk	Customer	Personnel staffing/resource concerns	10/01/20	10/29/21	<p>Personnel is worried about having enough resources to dedicate to the project and their regular day to day tasks if they lose staff.</p> <p>2.19.21-KWC: Fatima/Raelynn, I have temporarily adjusted the date to this so can you please review to see where this should be dated based on the upcoming activities on the timeline.</p> <p>JR 4/21: @Fatima, @Raelynn is this still a concern we need to be tracking?</p>	<p>PMO and Personnel should monitor the available resources for personnel on the project against the scope of work left to complete.</p>	Change Management	2 MODERATE (Preventative action)

295			Work in Progress	Risk	Customer	Personnel consolidation/centralization concerns	10/01/20	12/17/21	<p>Personnel is concerned that Workday will not satisfy the needs and complexities of each individual departments, since departments have been running their own HR for 10 years and consolidation has been a slow and limited effort. Personnel is also concerned that departments will feel like they are losing their autonomy with the increase in transparency and visibility.</p> <p>JR 4/21: OCM Team is meeting with Personnel (both internal and client services) once a month to monitor their concerns, has not been an issue yet but should keep this open through Change Discussion when departments will have a better idea of what is changing</p>	Functional team will confirm that department requirements are met by the solution during confirmation sessions and testing, OCM will leverage change discussions to manage expectations around what is changing and help prepare departments for the differences between their current state and Workday, focus on the benefits of standardization	Change Management	3 LOW (Improvement)
-----	--	--	------------------	------	----------	---	----------	----------	---	--	-------------------	---------------------

351			Open	Question	Customer	Multiple questions	08/23/21	10/10/21	<p>Additional documents that may affect NRA employees are Form 8233 and any required documents they need to submit to the employer to get their tax exemption. These documents and tax treaties require manual review and approval by the Department HR. They'll need guidance from Personnel Department.</p> <p>Question 2: What helpful information can Workday provide to employees in special circumstances (e.g. NRA, or those with lock-in letters) so they can understand the impact of their selected W4 setting? In the case of the NRA, if they filed their W4 changes or tax exemptions late, refunds for previously deducted amounts need to be refunded by the Federal or State government and not by the City -- except FICA. In the case of FICA refunds, all employees will need to fill out the consent form or FICA refunds will not be processed.</p> <p>Question 3: For those with lock-in letters, unless their W4 settings amount to more withheld taxes, lock-in letter limits apply. How can Workday help enforce this and inform employees of this if they are</p>	<p>SC 9/1: Rosemary shared the City's current process document. The doc outlines the City's recommendation for Depts however each Dept can determine their own process. City HRP team recommends adding a Review Doc step on the Onboarding BP for the employee to acknowledge receipt for NRA Checklist. Rosemary will forward docs to Marvin and Kelly.</p> <p>Add help text "The City cannot provide tax advice and that any questions on how to fill out their W4 or DE4 need to be directed to their tax advisor." WD HCM Team will update BP accordingly.</p> <p>KM, 8/30: Discuss in Cross Apps</p>	HCM Core	
-----	--	--	------	----------	----------	--------------------	----------	----------	---	--	----------	--

									affected? Question			
									4: Will it be possible to have Workday display a message informing the employees that the City cannot provide tax advice and that any questions on how to fill out their W4 or DE4 need to be directed to their tax advisor?			

370	6/9/21		Work in Progress	Action	Customer	Elicit Leave BP requirements related to adjusting workers' Step Progression Start Dates in applicable conditions	11/23/20	10/29/21	<p>There are certain types of Leave (and possibly also Time Off?) that are considered "bad time" (AKA "deductible absences") with regards to eligibility for Step Progression. For example: -John Snow is assigned to Step 1 on Compensation Grade X. Compensation Grade X is configured to advance the worker to Step 2 after they have been in Step 1 for 1 year. John Snow's Step Progression Start Date is 10/1/2019, therefore he will advance to Step 2 on 10/1/2020. -Then on 9/1/2020, John Snow goes on a certain type of Leave that is considered "bad time," i.e. it shouldn't count towards his time in Step 1. He is expected to return from Leave on 12/1/2020. -In order to ensure John Snow does not auto-advance to Step 2 on 10/1/2020, the department needs to adjust the worker's Step Progression Start Date via Request Compensation Change (I assume you can use the subprocess "Request Comp Change for Leave of Absence"). In this scenario, the department would adjust the Step Progression Start Date to be 3 months later (1/1/2021), because John is</p>	<p>LD 2021.03.30 - report is "CR INT160 Deductible Balances", configured by Chad to pull Payroll Results. Please feel free to test this report for viewing these balances @Jessie. This report may need to be revised as a result of performance considerations on Payroll Calc, since we needed to remove these items from Payroll Results @chad</p> <p>JCW 2021.04.05: Hi Lucas, could you clarify the process envisioned? I had assumed the process would be: (1) Dept initiates Return Worker from Leave (2) Subprocess: Request Comp Change for Leave of Absence (2a) embedded analytic pops up to show report of "bad time" (or help text instructs the user to run this report outside of the BP) (2b) user adjusts the Step Progression Start Date as applicable However, it looks like there isn't a step on the Return from Leave BP. So is the recommendation to schedule this report to run daily and it will be incumbent upon departments to adjust the Step Progression Start Date (either manually or via EIB), and the hope is that the departments will do so *before* the worker has been automatically progressed to the next step? (That's</p>	Compensation	2 MODERATE (Preventative action)
-----	--------	--	------------------	--------	----------	--	----------	----------	---	--	--------------	----------------------------------

								<p>going on a "bad time" Leave for 3 months. I am guessing you would want to add this as a BP step to both "Request Leave of Absence" and "Request Return from Leave of Absence" (but please confirm with the City). The City can advise on condition rules (e.g. which types of Leave or Time Off are "bad").</p> <p>LD 2020.11.24 - Paula, is this just Deductible Absences? Or is this more tied to the impact that a leave of absence needs to have on compensation changes?</p> <p>PD 2020 11 30 - Lucas, I have assigned to you but feel free to make as duplicate if the other RAIDQ items address this question. I will defer to you to alert me to any TT involvement.</p> <p>LD 2020.12.02 Reference from Ad Code: "uncompensated absence of 128 hours or less during the 2080 hour qualifying period during each subsequent 2080 hour annual period shall not extend the step advancement date.... [any hours beyond that push the step progression start date out 1 day]"</p> <p>LD 2020.12.02 - we may look to include either a To Do or Notification within the Request LOA and</p>	<p>my main concern...the workers will automatically progress before the depts review them). Thank you for the clarification!</p> <p>JCW 2021.04.05: Lucas explained: "Bad Time" as defined in their documentation is (from the ticket) "The step advancement date shall be extended one hour for each hour of aggregated uncompensated absence in excess of 128 hours." We can't have it rely on the leave business process because it is also driven by time off usage – 'uncompensated absences'.</p> <p>It is this level of complexity in calculating 'bad time' or 'deductible absences' that forced us toward the solution we have now, which involves a Time Off Plan used to track on various Accruals the hour amounts of various combinations of pay components from completed payroll results. The Custom Report Chad built initially looks at the payroll result lines, but due to performance issues in running the pay calc, we have stripped those from the payroll results and are now configuring a new Custom Report to display these Accrual tracked values (each of the 5 deductible</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

								<p>Request Return LOA BP - will look into reporting options on these buckets (deductible absences) - Jessie: Question: does the Request Comp Change BP allow us to modify just the Step Progression Start Date via web service? JCW 12/4/20: I'll test whether this is possible LD 2020.12.10 Ad Code: "(c) Uncompensated absences of 128 hours or less during the 2,080-hour qualifying period and during each subsequent 2,080-hour annual period shall not extend the step advancement date. The step advancement date shall be extended one hour for each hour of aggregated uncompensated absence in excess of 128 hours. Employees who are injured on duty and are compensated in accordance with Division IV of the Labor Code of the State of California and Article 7 of Chapter 2 of Division 4 of this Code shall not have their step advancement date changed due to their workers' compensation status." - same rounding of hours as Deductible Absence (8 hours = 1 day) - this applies a change to the Step Anniversary Date (need to</p>	<p>absence buckets, which includes one that seems to fit 'bad time'). The intended process is: - Run report (TBD scheduled or manual) biweekly upon completion of payroll each pay period - Output will yield the number of hours beyond each bucket's threshold a worker is given their service year - Upon review of the output (very brief audit period by departments), it will be manually loaded in via the Edit Service Dates BP to modify the Time Off Service Date o Here though is where the same output can be used to inform any changes to the Step Progression Start Date The new report is still in the works Jason Lopez 6.3.2021 - Jevon needs to provide the report compensation will need. The step progression change is really a process the compensation workstream should own. They are utilizing Absence data (deductible absences). Not sure that Absence would initiate or complete the task of change step progression date. JY 6.7.21 Custom report "Deductible Absences for Step Progression" created in lacity5. Report needs to be reviewed with</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

								<p>confirm how this is being tracked / which service date field in Workday) - uncompensated absences = all uncompensated time, excluding State Rate (Isophine to confirm with Workers Comp team), excluding all military leave as well - maintained by HR Records team (same as Deductible Absence)</p> <p>EJ 12/17: I was able to update the worker's step progression start date via the Request Comp Change EIB. Testing notes: Tested in Ia2 with EE 415181 Submitted request comp change effective on 12/17/2020 and changed step progression start date from 9/14/2020 to 12/14/2021. EIB only contained employee ID, comp change date, BP reason, and the new step progression start date.</p> <p>LD 2020.12.22 - this will be Bucket 05 All Uncompensated Absences (already tracking for Deductible Absences). This total can be viewed on the Payroll Results (worker level) or the Custom Reports configured by Chad used for the Deductible Absence</p>	<p>compensation team now.</p> <p>JCW 6/9/21: Jevon currently working on a report, "Deductible Absences for Step Progression," to pull in Step Progression Date and a number of days.</p> <p>JY 6/28/21: Report needs to be reviewed by the compensation workstream.</p> <p>EJ 7/7/21: City to run report and confirm the following: -Confirm results are correct -City has all data points needed in order to use it via a Req Comp Change EIB to update the applicable people's step progression date @Stephanie / Isophine: Ensure this is included as an E2E test scenario if it's not already</p> <p>EJ 8/11: Sent Anthony a note to ensure this is included in cycle 3 testing. EJ 8/31: Pushed due date to end of october when 1B UTP begins EJ 9/10/21: Pushed due date back up because step progression is in scope for 1A</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

399			Open	Risk	Customer	<p>Compensation SMEs - Resource Availability is risk for ability to meet upcoming due dates</p>	12/07/20	10/29/21	<p>CAO SMEs are balancing the full scope of their "day jobs" in addition to helping with our project, i.e. they do not have a specific percentage of allocation to the project. Due to the hiring freeze, some are also absorbing new tasks associated with attrition in the department. Resource availability will be critical in order to meet deadlines for creating unit test scenarios, validating ~2K rows of Compensation configuration, executing unit tests,, and completing the holistic review (Risk 319). If deadlines are not able to be met, the Compensation workstream status will be turned Yellow for review by the Steering Committee.</p>	<p>9/28/21 EJ: CAO SME's juggling many priorities and spread thin. Proper KT was not executed due to the lack of bandwidth creating delays in decision-making. Critical items such as the E2E Holistic Review took 3 months to complete when the C&P review took ~1 month, which will cause delays to the go-live timeline if the next review takes even longer. Critical key milestones must be met in order to go-live on time such as creating CCB unit test scenarios and having dept. SME's unit test (risk 593), updating compensation mapping, validating 100% allowance plan configuration (risk 495), completing URP testing and finalizing level/schedule bonus integration and testing. Weekly workstream status has been in yellow status to reflect the challenges in resource availability.</p> <p>3/31/21 JCW: Key dates for the activities listed in the Description were met, reliance on ERD for upcoming deadlines is not an immediate concern. Closing this item and will reopen if it becomes an active risk again.</p> <p>Prior comments: Team Workday will help with client-assigned</p>	Compe nsation	1 HIGH (Important corrective action)
-----	--	--	------	------	----------	---	----------	----------	---	---	---------------	--------------------------------------

										tasks as much as possible, and will look for opportunities to reduce administrative-type tasks.		
510			Work in Progress	Action	Work day	Create Landscape Diagram. Grouping by functional area and not by Source/Target system.	02/02/21	09/30/21	Create Landscape Diagram. Grouping by functional area and not by Source/Target system.	9/13/21 - CKodet - We will do this as one diagram for all integrations and not do this by Phase. Will continue to work on this. 8/16/21 ERG - This was discussed during PMO. ERG checked in with Chad he advised that this is not finalized and target completion date will depend on testing and other action items with higher priority. Estimated to be completed by 9/3. Chad advised HRP team members to use 2.1.3. Smartsheet to view inscope integrations. Create landscape diagram	Integrations	3 LOW (Improvement)

525			Work in Progress	Issue	Customer	Need to have IDD's approved prior to completing of Development and integrations moving to the testing phase.	11/01/20	10/15/21	Need to have IDD's approved prior to completing of Development and integrations moving to the testing phase.	<p>9/20/21 - PMO Update - still work in progress - Best case is to complete this prior to E2E</p> <p>[ERG] As of 6/2/21 The Integration's team has continued to instruct developers to push/follow up on the approval of the IDD's. Most of the IDD's are being discussed by the integration owners and the developer. FMS and JPM IDD's are currently being developed as engagement with JP Morgan Onboarding Specialist started recently and the FMS integrations (26) were awaiting mapping (Sam and Natalie were working on). Additionally, the Integration's Team reached out to the Integration Owners that have pending IDD(s) approvals. A mass email communication was sent to the integration owners.</p> <p>3/16/21 - CKodet - Game plan is for each developer to schedule a call with the business owner to get the IDD's approved.</p> <p>3/16/21 Kenneth Chambers - Estrellita this RISK will be active for several months obviously until we get the IDD's signed off so can you place the date to the end of the Development cycle, 5/15 because at that point 75% of the IDD's need to be signed off</p>	Integrations	1 HIGH (Important corrective action)
-----	--	--	------------------	-------	----------	--	----------	----------	--	---	--------------	--------------------------------------

										<p>before we can move them into Cycle 2 of Testing.</p> <p>90 out of 120 needs to be signed off.</p> <p>Have IDD's ready for approval get the business approval</p>		
526			Open	Question	<p>Is the KPMG document the authority for configuration throughout this project and for go-live? If yes, who is responsible for maintaining it? If not, what will be the authority?</p>	02/18/21	<p>We are currently looking to the KPMG document as the authority for configuration for our time tracking and payroll testing, however, we have noticed that it's not always updated or TEC don't always match what's in the document.</p> <p>Should we continue to look to the KPMG document? Who is responsible for it and ensuring it is updated as things change?</p>					

621			Open	Action	Customer	OUTSTANDING CONFIG: OTP Plans with "Need to Update" eligibility rules	05/25/21	09/30/21	<p>JCW 6/28/21: Latest comments on the Data Defect (DD-174) say "5/25 - City to determine why these profiles weren't converted"</p> <p>JCW 5/25/21: This Data Defect was reviewed with the City during today's Data Conversion call. The City is going to investigate. Pushing due date out to allow them time to do so.</p> <p>JCW 5/3/21 (later): opened DD-174 for this (Job Profiles still aren't in the tenant) and updated elig rule config as much as possible (based on Job Families). Keeping this open as a reminder to update config once the DD is reviewed.</p> <p>JCW 5/3/21: During tenant validation, I noticed there are 9 OTP plans that do not have eligibility rules configured. I don't see this listed on the "Post Build Comp Tracker" but I spotchecked a couple in the Comp Worksheet and see that eligibility requirements were provided. I spot-checked one in LA4 and see the elig rule is not there either. Comments in Comp Spreadsheet indicate the Job Profiles necessary were not available when the OTPs were originally configured, so we need to check now and see if</p>	<p>EJ 9/29/21: 4149-0 has been configured in LA7 (Silver build tenant). Chris Y's team would prefer if workers in 9245-A are corrected in Paysr (I only see one worker, 33074, in the Hire DGW)</p> <p>ICA 09/28/21: The complete comp grade information for Job Profile 4149-0 has been added to the worksheet; awaiting confirmation from HCM if "-A" should be deactivated for interim GMs.</p> <p>EJ 09/28/21: ERD/Budget/Personnel/Controller would like to deactivate 9245-A. Isophine will reach out to Marvin to have this inactivated in workday. 4149-0 is missing min, mid, max and interval steps. Once that's populated you can assign this to me to configure into Workday.</p> <p>ICA 09/14/21): Following up w/ERD/Budget/Personnel for confirmation; awaiting feedback.</p> <p>EJ 9/10/21: 2 job profiles were loaded without a comp grade. Isophine will investigate what comp grade should be attached and we'll update in the tenant manually. I'm assuming this will require configuring 2 new grades. 9245-A - Isophine believes this isn't valid. We already</p>	Completion	3 LOW (Improvement)
-----	--	--	------	--------	----------	---	----------	----------	---	---	------------	---------------------

									<p>they are available.</p>	<p>have 9245-0 in the tenant. 4149-0 - Create a new tab within the DGW Job Profile sheet with grade information</p> <p>EJ 9/8/21: Although OTP's are not part of 1A, job profiles are so this has been marked for phase 1A.</p> <p>EJ 9/7/21: Forwarded two email threads to Isophine to review.</p> <p>EJ 7/26: See email thread from Andy Lum Re: DD-174: Missing Job Profiles -Andy has asked the City to advise on what comp grades the job profiles should be mapped to.</p> <p>EJ 7/22/21: Followed-up with Chris Y - His team is investigating</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------	---	--	--

624			Work in Progress	Action	Work day	LAFD- How are positions managed when the incoming employee is in training?	04/26/21	09/03/21	<p>SC 8/30: as indicated in 6/4 comment there is no config requirements but want to follow-up on administrative decision for how the training groups will be defined. This information is needed for Phase 1A Go-Live.</p> <p>MAS 6/4: This does not appear to be a matter that has configuration change impact, it is more so an administrative decision as to how training groups will be reflected for LAFD (eg. as sub authorities or job management groups).</p> <p>SC 6/1: Reviewed on Workstream Call, no update from City</p> <p>SC 5/12:- WD Recommendations and Options reviewed again on 5/10. Will be on the 5/17 Workstream Agenda</p> <p>SC: 5/4: 1)How do we show in-lieus? As an example, Firefighter Is (Recruits) are in lieu of Firefighter IIIs. The recruits are in the Drill Tower but the positions being held are in a different division.</p> <p>2)We have some members who are in Paramedic School/Training. There is a separate division number for Paramedic Training but there</p>	<p>SC 9/17: LAFD meeting being scheduled for the week of 9/27</p> <p>KM, 8/30: Need separate meeting with LAFD and any applicable departments that have "training"</p> <p>Personnel and CAO have selected Solution</p> <p>Create Training Sup Org-Position Management EEs will be hired into the Training Sup Org</p> <p>Freeze position on the Sup Org trainee is being hired into</p> <p>When training is complete- Change Job move to position permanent position</p> <p>When a frozen position that was frozen with Sub Hold Reason is being Unfrozen route to CAO Budget Analyst & CAO Budget Chief</p> <p>Update Freeze Position BP per above</p> <p>****Add Change Job Scenario to validate workflow meets the City's needs****</p>	HCM Core	2 MODERATE (Preventative action)
-----	--	--	------------------	--------	----------	--	----------	----------	---	--	----------	----------------------------------

								<p>are no positions allocated to that division. This situation also applies to members who are on a long term military leave, and to those sworn members who have been off duty for a long time due to an injury. Sworn members who have been out for a long time are moved to Division 320 which has no positions allocated to it.</p> <p>Possible Options: Matrix (not preferred/feasible)</p> <p>Create a trainee sup org to contain all the trainee's Option-Regular authority position goes on hold Sub-Options 1.)PM staffing model means have to use Substitute Authority and this gives ability to still control number of trainees. 2.) JM staffing model means no positions needed but loose ability to control number of trainee's.</p> <p>Option - In-lieu Move regular authority positions (FF III) to trainee sup org Hire trainee's to those position in-lieu as FF1</p> <p>In either case, there is activity to manage positions and change job events to put the employee into the correct post-trainee job profile/position.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

									#2- Need clarification on whether these EEs are active			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

631			Work in Progress	Action	Customer	Update Mapping Document with new ref ID's and include column for frequency and calc method in the Var Code and Form 41 mapping tabs	05/06/21	10/15/21	<p>Creating this RAID as a reminder for Stephanie: When we get ready for the parallel build, team Workday will upload a new reference ID document on the sFTP. Stephanie will use the new reference ID's and update the existing mapping document. File path on sFTP: /outgoing/ File Name: Payroll Parallel Build Comp Load Allowance Plan Ref ID Mapping to Paysr 6_16_21 -Please also include the frequency for each plan on the Var Code tab and Form 41 mapping tabs so that the City can validate that the frequencies are aligned in the extract. -Address the rows marked as "Mapping Issues" in the Comp Worksheet -Ensure that the exceptions are also reflected in the mapping doc (see attachment in this RAID (paperclip icon) on the far left column)</p>	<p>EJ 9/28/21: Absolute deadline is Oct.15 EJ 9/10/21: Allowance file will not be extracted until end of Oct at the earliest so the conversion team has agreed to pushing back the due date to 9/28. EJ 9/7/21: Notes during workstream meeting: -Stephanie is working on the Comp Mapping tab column -Isophine will filter on the Mapping Issues and make any necessary changes and flip status to Updated Mapping</p> <p>EJ 8/31: New due date is 9/21 - Isophine to reach out to Chris's team</p> <p>EJ 8/31: Per Isophine: Hi Eunice, we have made great progress with the Comp Worksheet but still need more time. We'd like to move the deadline to Tuesday, August 31st. I will follow up with Chris and Tatiana.</p> <p>EJ 8/11: Discussed during a data meeting: City to provide MOU for rows indicated as DPO or LAAC</p> <p>EJ 7/20: Met with Chris Y, Tatiana, Stephanie, and Isophine and agreed to incorporate the mapping document in the Compensation Worksheet. Ken added additional columns to the Comp worksheet, Stephanie/Isophin</p>	Compensation	1 HIGH (Important corrective action)
-----	--	--	------------------	--------	----------	---	----------	----------	---	--	--------------	--------------------------------------

										<p>e to begin merging the document. Updated due date to after 8/6 (when Cycle 2 is slated to end)</p> <p>EJ 6/29: Discussed during workstream meeting that holistic review will be pushed back a week since the config snapshot is also pushed back a week.</p> <p>EJ 5/4: Workers were mapped to DNU'd plans in the E2E tenant because the reference ID's in the mapping document were still referencing the old plans. The comp team has also been actively creating new allowances for comp basis/calc sequencing and the newly-negotiated MOU's. So the mapping document will need to be updated to include these new allowances. Setting due date till end of May for now, this is subject to change depending on the parallel build schedule.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

645			Work in Progress	Decision	Customer			05/10/21	05/28/21	<p>5/10 Ron Corona (LAFD): Currently, the LAFD's Enterprise Records System (ERS) is highly dependent on City's Payroll System (PAYSR) for many of its modules (applications) which include, but not limited to, Recruit Tracking, Probationary Tracking, Human Capital, Program Maintenance, Incident Management and Field Incident Management Teams. The discussion to retain the same level of functionality from the Workday implementation was discussed in several meetings. To date, the LAFD ERS staff have provided the names of five (5) database tables and twenty-seven (27) views that are used on a daily basis. Please advise if the outbound service requested by the LAFD will be provided.</p> <p>Additionally, if we do agree to use Workday Worksheets functionality to replace the current PAYSR views, we need to know who in the City will own adding/removing fields.</p> <p>8/18/21 JB I have a scheduled meeting with Ron Corona this coming Thursday 8/19/21 to discuss LAFD's reporting needs</p>	<p>9/20/21 PMO update - Need to followup with Ron</p> <p>8/16/21 ERG: This was discussed during PMO. Nigel to follow up with Jonathan.</p> <p>5/12: Estrellita informed Ron that the solution is still being discussed and that the Reporting team will reach out when you have come to a conclusion. Ron responded with: Thank you and rest assured that we will be here to assist in answering all your questions.</p> <p>8/18/21 JB I have a scheduled meeting with Ron Corona this coming Thursday 8/19/21 to discuss LAFD's reporting needs</p>		
-----	--	--	------------------	----------	----------	--	--	----------	----------	--	--	--	--

LAFD Requested an Update on the 27 current PAYSR views they have. They want to know the plans for these views in Workday.

649			Open	Decision	Customer	City needs to identify cutover strategy - will departments freeze on doing certain transactions in PaySR? If so, what is the date? When will departments be notified of this?	05/13/21	07/01/21	We've discussed catchup and the conversion team is practicing that, however, it is still to be determined if the City will freeze or pause transactions in PaySR for a period of time. At a minimum this should be the week of "catch-up". So for example the pull date for Gold build is 12/1 and build is complete on 12/27. PaySR should be frozen for departments the week of 12/27 so that all catch-up transactions for month of December can be loaded into Workday. The alternative is that departments would need to know to duplicate all transactions that week in Workday and PaySR.	9/27: Ken will follow up with Cutover Process dates. While go live is far away, this strategy needs to be determined in the next 6 weeks so that departments can start to prepare and be notified.	Platform	2 MODERATE (Preventative action)
658			Open	Question	Customer	INT093B - How is job_number getting converted to Workday from PaySR? INT145 & INT086 - What job_status are configured in Workday? Could you help to list them?	05/19/21	05/28/21	SC 9/9: This appears to be a Data question. Reassigned to Chris Y & Chris P Tommy Han: Questions regarding job_number and job_status. How is job_number getting converted to Workday from PaySR? Below is a question to Lacers and their answer. Additionally, what job_status are configured in Workday? Could you help to list them? Tommy to LACERS: Could you explain to me why job_numbers are needed and	SC 9/16: CY's comment below regarding Job Number is correct. Each employee has one position assigned and the position has an ID associated. When an employee retires and is going to be paid Over the Limit they have a job assigned. Can the job ref ID provide LACERS what they need? What is meant by "Job Status" is this the employee status? Active, Retired, Terminated, On Leave? Additional information required for WD to provide an answer. 9/10/21 CY: Job numbers are not requested by HCM	HCM Core	

									<p>how it is going to be used? LACERS: Job number in PAYSR is used to distinguish the different positions held throughout the employee's City career. When the employee retires, a new job number is created to designate the employee with a job of "Retiree-over-the -limit", so the job number ties back to PAYSR to tell the system which record to update. I'm not sure how this works in HRP so we may or may not need the field so please do let us know.</p>	<p>to be converted to Workday from PaySR. So far only the prime jobs have been requested by HCM to be converted into Workday, so in that sense job number is immaterial because there is only one job per employee. HCM can provide the exhaustive list of what all job statuses there are configured in Workday. There are other ways to tie a Retiree over the limit job record (created only so they can get paid the overage amount from PaySR's payroll runs), without using the job number. I am not sure if the current interface from LACERS back to PaySR is programmed to look at the job number, but if a job number does not exist in Workday HCM module, the INT from LACERS into Workday will need to figure out a different way to associate the correct job/position between the file and what's in Workday HCM. HCM team needs to advise INT team on this.</p>		
671			Open	Issue	Workday	Security Groups migrated during the Tenant build were missing security group assignments	06/10/21	10/15/21	<p>Examples of the issue is for UBSG_Generic_f or_developers, Any of the segment security access (xxx) as well as business process access (xxx).</p>	<p>9/10/21 CY : email from Chris P. on June 16 2021 indicated that he was in contact with both Chad K. and Michael W. about this. It's for them to update this raid item with their findings. Security migration has nothing to do with my (City) DC team's work, removing myself</p>	Security	1 HIGH (Important corrective action)

										from the assignee list.		
690	7/2 6/2 1		Open	Action	Customer	Assign Platoon Shift during Hire and Change Job BPs	07/06/21	09/24/21	<p>SC 9/16: List of Job Profiles was received and are attached. The remaining open item is for the WD to PaySR Integration. Does PaySR require Platoon and Special Duty be sent? @chad do you want this to be a new RAIDQ associated to the INT?</p> <p>SC 9/10: Hess & Co advised that Platoon and Special Duty Schedules are required in PaySR. Additional discovery needed to determine if this is something PaySR can assign based on data points being sent on the file or will WD need to assign Shifts for Phase 1A go-live. Reassigning to Jason Lopez, he is working with CAO to determine mapping. Including Chad, Paula, and Kelly as contributors.</p> <p>SC 8/24- City HCM meeting with CAO Tuesday 8/31 to review. SC 7/22: Reviewed on Cross App, HCM needs a data point to identify Platoon and Special Duty Employees to use for condition rule on Hire and Change Job.</p> <p>ERD is meeting with Fire on 7/23 to review</p>	HCM Core	2 MODERATE (Preventative action)	

								<p>Determination will be made after meeting with Fire on 7/23. Jason added Fire Chief & AGM equivalents may be assigned Platoon Duty Shifts what can be used to identify this group? **Will follow-up with ERD after 7/23.</p> <p>SC 7/6: Add condition to Hire and Change Job BPs to ensure Shifts are assigned for Platoons.</p>			
691			Open	Risk		Huge section of hard coded integration mapping					
711			Work in Progress	Issue		Limitation on Data ingestion into Workday PRISM		<p>Below are the critical limitations we've discovered about ingesting large amount of data into Workday PRISM/data catalog:</p> <p>1 - Workday only allows for up to 256mb of compressed (512mb if uncompressed) data on each data file for loading into PRISM/data catalog.</p> <p>2 - The cap on the file size is an issue for migrating all PaySR data, with one of our biggest tables needing to be split into 200+ smaller files and already taking over 20 hours to finish loading</p>			

								<p>into Workday PRISM.</p> <p>3 - Even with the couple of methods available for ingesting data files into WD PRISM, the only semi-automatic way through a custom built integration event still requires someone to manually type in the names of the PRISM datasets where each and every single one of the external data file is to be loaded into. With over 3000+ tables in PaySR production, it will take months just to have someone do this full time.</p> <p>4 - There is no real file/dataset management within Workday PRISM/data catalog space. If there are 3000+ datasets ingested, every developer will need to sift through this large list to find the dataset they may need, every single time. Some clever naming conventions and ingesting files with different user accounts may be implemented to lessen the impact of this limitation, though the truth still remains that there is no real file management available in this Workday space.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

747			Open	Action	Workday	City to identify what bonuses in Paysr are folded into the base rate and how these will be converted into Workday for 1A	09/02/21	09/29/21	This is related to 699 but separate as this RAIDQ includes details for what's needed for 1A to bundle rates. Phase 1A Go-Live will include only the base rate for worker's (hourly plan and step or flat rate). City needs to identify what bonuses are bundled with the base rate (i.e. Longevity) and determine how this will be handled in conversion.		Compensation	1 HIGH (Important corrective action)
749			Open	Question		Please provide the data elements / logic used in PaySR to determine a worker being exempt from FICA & OASDI (or non-exempt if that is how			The logic and data elements that PaySR uses to determine a worker's FICA exempt status are needed in order to ensure that required data elements continue to be captured and	After data elements and logic are provided by City, Sonja and Chad will review to ensure that data is captured in Workday and is slated to be included in the PaySR integration.	Payroll	2 MODERATE (Preventative action)

						PaySR processes).			included by integration after 1a Go Live.			
751			Open	Decision	Customer	DC team needs requirements on how to convert bonus rates from biweekly to hourly	09/10/21	10/15/21	DC team has been advised to pull bonus rates from Paysr then align the rate and frequency to WD's allowance plan. In certain situations worker's in Paysr have a biweekly rate that need to be converted to hourly in order to match WD's allowance plan. Example: Row ID 1257, Hazard Pay - Bomb Detection K-9 Schedule Bonus +3 is Biweekly in Paysr but Hourly in Workday Per Tatiana, they need CAO to confirm the following: "Converting Biweekly rate to an hourly means: Hourly rate = (Biweekly amount) / 80. Is this right? I want to make sure that we are on the same page. There are Police and Fire Employees with 120 hours schedule, but we will use (Biweekly amount) / 80 to find the Hourly rate for all hourly bonuses, am I correct?"	EJ 9/28/21: Oct 15 is the absolute deadline 09/14 (ICA): Following up w/ERD/Controller/ Fire/Police for confirmation; awaiting feedback.	Compensation	2 MODERATE (Preventative action)
753			Open	Decision	Customer	All reports transitioned to ITA for Phase 1A	09/06/21	11/19/21	All reports transitioned to ITA for Phase 1A	All reports transitioned to ITA for Phase 1A	HCM Core	1 HIGH (Important corrective action)

754			Open	Decision	Customer	Phase 1A Reports Needed for Phase 1A Go-Live	09/06/21	09/20/21	SC 9/27: Per Raven Core HCM team reviewed and the sheet was updated. Depts have been scheduled to begin their review, additional questions will be documented. Controller's Office in process of their review. City team to identify reports for phase 1A by Sept 20th in order to facilitate discussions with the departments	City team to review the updates the Workday team made in the smartsheet, specifically the reports listed as Phase 1A	HCM Core	1 HIGH (Important corrective action)
755			Open	Decision	Customer	Identify all departments, and department resources, who should be contacted as part of the reporting outreach.	09/06/21	09/20/21	City team to identify departments and department resources who should be a part of the phase 1A for the following: (1) Review the reports the department needs for phase 1A (smartsheet inventory) (2) Identify report approvers, point-of-contacts, and testers (3) Set the stage that report testing will start in the future, after development has been completed.	City team to review the list of testers Yvonne provided,	HCM Core	1 HIGH (Important corrective action)
756			Open	Decision	Customer	City team to identify all report owners and approvers for each report in Phase 1A needed for go-live.	09/06/21	10/01/21	City team to identify all report owners and approvers for each report in Phase 1A needed for go-live. Once completed update the smartsheet to capture that information.	City team to identify all report owners and approvers for each report in Phase 1A needed for go-live.	HCM Core	1 HIGH (Important corrective action)
757			Open	Decision	Customer	All reports for phase 1A signed off by City team and marked ready for production	09/06/21	11/05/21	City team to review all reports and mark them ready for production. Note: this date might change slightly as is dependent on testing schedule.	City team to review all reports and mark them ready for production.	HCM Core	1 HIGH (Important corrective action)

759			Open	Action	Customer	How will Photos work in the future Workday state. Will they come from GSD through INT181 Badging Feed. Or will photos being imported to Workday not be needed/desired ?	09/15/21	09/30/21	9/15 - CKodet - I created this and have assigned this to Raelynn for the time as we do not know who is blocking this decision and need help to get this moving. I have a note to Charles at GSD asking who in Personnel is holding up the decision and need help to get this information and a decision made.		Integrations	2 MODERATE (Preventative action)
760			Open	Action	Customer	Update Security Groups for Review, Rescind, and Cancel steps on all HCM BPs	09/17/21	10/01/21	SC 9/17: Sarah will manage the task of updating security group assignments for the Review, Rescind, and Cancel steps on all HCM BPs		HCM Core	
761			Work in Progress	Decision	Workday	Handling Step Progression Exceptions for 1A	09/13/21	10/01/21	Currently we've built in step progression exceptions to the automatic rule that's based on Y Rate, Sup Diff allowance assignments and unpaid leave status. Since these data points are out of scope for 1A we will need to create another data point for the rule to reference. City will be responsible for dual maintenance between Paysr and WD to ensure the systems are in sync.	EJ 9/20/21: Bidirectional integrations are out of scope for 1A. HCM team will recommend what data point to leverage, either custom org or job class. Timing and process of updating worker records: -Unpaid Leave Status: Need a clear definition from the City on unpaid leave status, then potentially leverage Prism to identify these workers (alert off of report) to the same HR Partner that initiated in Paysr, send an alert in WD to add the custom org/job classification to exclude them from step progression. Can we leverage the Request/Return LOA BP to update the worker's status? -Y Rate/Sup Diff Allowances: Data team will be	HCM Core	2 MODERATE (Preventative action)

											providing an allowance file (end of Oct) so HCM will identify the workers from that extract and update the worker records with custom org/job classification.		
763			Open	Action	Customer	1A Build Error - Missing Comp Grades	09/23/21	09/30/21	The following job profiles need to be attached to a comp grade but the comp grades the City provided do not exist in the tenant. Please advise on what comp grades the following job profiles need to be attached to. If the Broad Range grade doesn't apply then please populate a new tab in the DGW with the comp grade/step information. 2498-A and 2214-B	EJ 9/29/21: Chris Y's team would prefer if workers in 2498-A are corrected in Paysr. I currently see one worker, 422132, in the DGW Hire Stack) ICA 09/28/21: Confirmed that Job Profile 2498-A is no longer in use; awaiting feedback from HCM on whether this profile number should be deactivated or remain for historical purposes. Regarding Job Profile 2214-B, awaiting salary confirmation to update the comp grade.	Compensation	2 MODERATE (Preventive action)	
764			Open	Decision	Customer	City is responsible for calculating worker's level/schedule bonus rate in Paysr	09/24/21	10/15/21	Workday will only be sending a worker's base rate to Paysr. When there's a change in rate it will be updated in Workday and simultaneously the Level/Schedule bonus in Paysr will also need to be updated to accommodate the new difference in pay.	EJ 9/28/21: JB confirmed during the 9/28 weekly integration call that Paysr is expecting the base rate and step from Workday and then Paysr will calculate the level bonus. EJ 9/24/21: City to confirm that this is already an automatic process today in Paysr. Creating a RAID to ensure it's on the City's radar to calculate for phase 1A.	Compensation	2 MODERATE (Preventive action)	

765			Open	Issue	Workday	Direct deposit payment elections are part of Phase 1A. Currently, the City allows for one direct deposit account per job in PAYSR and there are a few employees that are in this situation. WD will have to be set up payment elections in WD in the same way.	09/20/21	10/01/21	JL 9/23: Janet raised this concern during the 9/27 data conversion meeting. Direct deposit payment elections are part of Phase 1A. Currently, the City allows for one direct deposit account per job in PAYSR and there are a few employees that are in this situation. WD will have to be set up payment elections in WD in the same way. If i can't b3e set up this way, existing workers and retirees with multiple direct deposit accounts will have to be notified. Kelly M said she would test the system and follow up.	JL 9/23: From 9/27 data conversion meeting, Kelly M to look into setting up WD appropriately.	Integrations	1 HIGH (Important corrective action)
766			Open	Decision	Workday	We need an understanding of how work schedules and/or shifts will be assigned and maintained in Workday. Who is responsible?	09/27/21	10/01/21	We need an understanding of how work schedules and/or shifts will be assigned and maintained in Workday. Who is responsible? How ill worker's shifts and schedules be assigned. Who is responsible for the Assign Work Shift BP? What is the FLSA impact?			
767			Open	Decision	Customer	LAWA had a question about if city departments would be able to create their own reports and is looking for more information on what the process will be for report development post Phase 1A go-live.	09/28/21	10/08/21	SD 9/28: During the LAWA Department Reporting Meeting on 9.28, Ryan Legaspi asked if departments will get access to build custom reports and is looking for a formal decision on the process and criteria for new report development.	SD 9/28: City team to make a decision on post deployment support model for department super users.	Reporting	2 MODERATE (Preventative action)

768			Open	Decision	Customer	Determine if report ID will be incorporated into report naming convention, specifically at the beginning or end of the custom report name.	09/28/21	10/08/21	SD 9/28: Determine if report ID will be incorporated into report naming convention, specifically at the beginning or end of the custom report name.	SD 9/28: Decide on naming convention updates and then add them into the reporting standardization documentation.	Reporting	2 MODERATE (Preventative action)
-----	--	--	------	----------	----------	--	----------	----------	---	--	-----------	--

Personnel Department Items

The Personnel Department recently shared the following list of priorities with Workday. Workday responded to every item, identifying which items are pre-go-live and

post-go-live, and these items continue to be worked on as we move toward going live.

PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT'S HRP PRIORITIES						
Auto-#	Section's Priority (click for legend)	Section's Deliverable	Deliverable Description/Details and Comments	Category or Area (optional)	Scope	Personnel Section
1	1 - Emergent	Mechanism for calculating Exam Seniority using both PaySR Legacy and Workday data	It is absolutely essential that the Examining section has a mechanism that aides with the calculation of Exam Seniority Credit. This is a daily operational need.	Personnel Examining	Phase 1A	<u>EXAMINING</u>
2	2 - Critical	Operational Alignment of BPs with HCM-related Security Roles	Within each BP, default roles need to be defined that align with general standards for HOW work will get done in the City.		Phase 1A	<u>DEPARTMENT HR</u>
3	2 - Critical	Core Citywide and Departmental HR Reports	Reports required for day-to-day HR administration, decision making, and reporting requirements pertaining to Positions, Employee Transactions, and Employee data, as outlined in Personnel HRP's Report List.	Reports	Phase 1A	<u>DEPARTMENT HR</u>
4	2 - Critical	Ability to generate ad-hoc reports aka "Extractor Reports"	Need to run reports for various information.	Reports	Phase 1A	<u>PERSONNEL RECORDS AND CLASSIFICATION</u>
5	2 - Critical	Ensuring Workday reflects DWP employee job history, and enables Personnel to review/approve transfers to/from DWP Systems and to/from other City Depts.	Just as regular city departments does, DWP has to approve the transfer of employees.		Phase 1A	<u>PERSONNEL RECORDS AND CLASSIFICATION</u>
6	3 - Very Important	Ability to Designate Telecommute Schedules	Workday should provide a means for Telecommute schedules to be requested, approved, and maintained.	ALL DEPARTMENTS	Phase 1A	<u>DEPARTMENT HR</u>
7	3 - Very Important	Finalize Fire's HCM Workday plan, ensuring that their HR transaction process/update method does not conflict with essential components of the Workday configuration.	The Fire Department (LAFD) has an internal system that they utilize to track deployments/assignments and execute various worker-related workflows. It is essential that 1) clear parameters are established for how LAFD's HR staff and workers will utilize Workday and 2) that LAFD's process does not disrupt or conflict with the data validations and approvals built into Workday BPs.	FIRE DEPARTMENT	Phase 1A	<u>DEPARTMENT HR</u>
8	3 - Very Important	Accommodating Quasi Private Sector departments (Mayor, Council, City Attorney) - ability to address hiring/job change/compensation rules that do not align with rest of City.	The City Clerk's HR department services Mayor and Council. The Mayor and Council office's process for appointing, structuring, and setting compensation differs from City Departments. It needs to be ensured that City Clerk is able to manage these activities within Workday	City Clerk	Phase 1A	<u>DEPARTMENT HR</u>
9	3 - Very Important	Ability to conduct Mass Reassignments: Scenarios in which several employees in various sup orgs change or exchange positions (aka "chairs").	Several departments, including Fire, LAPD, and Transportation, have frequent (monthly/quarterly) mass-reassignment scenarios in which several workers are reassigned to different orgs. A solution is needed to efficiently update and reflect these reassignments in Workday. The solution should ensure that the validations and approvals built into the Change Job BP are upheld.	ALL DEPARTMENTS	Phase 1A	<u>DEPARTMENT HR</u>
10	3 - Very Important	Finalize LAPD's HCM Workday plan, ensuring that their HR transaction process/update method does not conflict with essential components of the Workday configuration.	The Police Department (LAPD) has an internal system (CHRIS) that they utilize to track deployments/assignments and execute various worker-related workflows. It is essential that 1) clear parameters are established for how LAPD's HR staff and workers will utilize Workday and 2) that LAPD's process does not disrupt or conflict with the data validations and approvals built into Workday BPs.	POLICE	Phase 1A	<u>DEPARTMENT HR</u>

PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT'S HRP PRIORITIES						
Aut o-#	Section's Priority (click for legend)	Section's Deliverable	Deliverable Description/Details and Comments	Category or Area (optional)	Scope	Personnel Section
11	3 - Very Important	Demographic Reporting and Analytics	It is essential that the City is able to analyze workforce demographics. This includes ability to assess: - Worker Salaries by demographic values (eg. Age, Gender, Gender Identity, Ethnicity/Race) - Demographics by Organization - Demographics by Job Profile - New Hire Demographics - Job Change Demographics		Phase 1A	<u>OFFICE OF WORKFORCE EQUITY</u>
12	3 - Very Important	Naming Supervisory Organizations	Establishing descriptive Supervisory Organization Names for departments' high-level sections	ALL DEPARTMENTS	Phase 1A	<u>DEPARTMENT HR</u>
13	3 - Very Important	Ability to ensure Departments apply appropriate job profile restrictions to Job Management groups.			Phase 1A	<u>POSITIONS (CAO)</u>
14	4 - Important	Ability to log/track employees' completion of Employee Background Check	Workday should provide a means to track the type of background check employees completed: - Regular Civilian - Public Safety Civilian - Public Safety Sworn		Phase 1A	<u>DEPARTMENT HR</u>
15	4 - Important	Ability to maintain/store positions descriptions on individual positions within Workday.	Some departments will be transitioning to Workday from an existing position control system that maintains individual Job Descriptions, by position. It is essential that a means is identified to store, or link, existing job descriptions to positions in Workday.	ALL DEPARTMENTS	Phase 1A	<u>DEPARTMENT HR</u>
16	4 - Important	Random Drug testing designation	Employees in certain Safety-Sensitive positions are subject to random drug testing. Workday should provide a means that will enable the City to identify positions that have this designation.	Reports	Phase 1A	<u>DEPARTMENT HR</u>
17	2 - Critical	Ability to view all Leave of Absence events	We need to know if the leave is in accordance with CSR 7.3, 7.4 and Charter; Need to quickly see (at-a-glance)		Phase 1B	<u>PERSONNEL RECORDS AND CLASSIFICATION</u>
18	3 - Very Important	Ability to effectuate delivery of annual budgeted position additions/deletions/changes to departments			Phase 1B	<u>POSITIONS (CAO)</u>

APPENDIX C - TEMPLATE OF POTENTIAL MONTHLY REPORT TO PAAW COMMITTEE



Project: Human Resources and Payroll
 Scope: HCM/Payroll/PRISM
 LA PM: Raelynn Napper, WD PD: Brad Hoenshell, WD EM: Ken Chambers

As of Sep 24, 2021
 Next SC: Sep 29, 2021



Key Accomplishments	HRP Dashboard		
Overall, the project status is Yellow as the Test phase continues. The project plan has been aligning tasks with the new phased rollout.	Area	Status/Trend	
Functional	Overall – The phased deployment approach has been approved by the Project Sponsors but still needs an updated statement of work/Change Order to adjust the scope and go live dates. The phase deployment approach allows additional time to closeout Future State parking lot items and open RAIDQ items.	↑	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Absence</i>, GSD/DOT Confirmation Sessions, solutioning and configuration for integration requirements and testing, leave impacts to seniority calculation. <i>Benefits</i>, discuss process to track 457 Catch-Up Information in PRISM. Benefits team focus has been shifted to the HCM items needed to be completed for phase 1A. <i>Compensation</i>, closed out E2E Holistic Review, prep for 1A Go-Live, Support URP and CCB Unit test. <i>HCM</i>, onsite Department Support: DOT tester and GSD testers. Participated in CAPS Design Review, 1A Regression Test Plan design process review Highlights: Hiring Hall Hire and Termination process demonstration for various City teams. <i>Payroll</i>, will continue to work on outstanding configuration items, and open decisions. <i>Time Tracking</i>, reviewed configuration with GSD and DOT, tenant review/reference ID update completed, reviewed and updated TEC documentation as needed. Core team to review Department testing feedback and determine if any configuration/process updates are needed. <i>Seniority Program</i>, finalized Prism POC to confirm ability to add/modify/delete PaySR EWH data. Prototyped initial seniority exam calculation and adding the validation logic and data correction logic process to the integration design document. Met with the absence team to discuss unpaid leaves, need to further refine unpaid pregnancy disability and unpaid FMLA leave mapping in Workday, and work through options for time between phase 1B and phase 2 (payroll) - Clarifying the layoff (PA code 51) mapping to Workday data 	Schedule – Overall schedule has been revised allowing for a phased deployment. The plan is to go live with areas that are ready and allow additional time for areas that still have open decisions and need additional testing.	↑	
OCM and Training	Scope – Additional integrations and configuration versus the original scope plus the new scope related to the phased deployment approach. The additional configuration requires additional testing and effort from the city. The Phased deployment approach will require additional integrations, updated BP configurations, updated configuration and modified security based on the features being rolled out.	↓	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>OCM</i>, held September Change Champion Call. Scheduled third round of department/stakeholder interviews. Managed future state process parking lot items. Drafted stakeholder interview questions. Continued tier 1 check ins and follow ups. <i>Training</i>, HCM ILT Modules reviewed, on demand materials in review with WD Team (weekly cadence, Training Tenant EIBs validated) 	Resources – Resources should be aligned with the original staff plan.	↓	
Technical	Key Upcoming Project Activities		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Conversion</i>, HCM build in progress, completed pre-load and moved in config - HCM team reviewing config errors, compare report issues also being reviewed - All data files received from LA City team <i>Reporting</i>, Hiring Hall reports updated as config updates are being made to time and payroll codes. <i>Prism</i>, finalized POC to add/modify/delete PaySR EWH data for Seniority Calculations, Sign-off from HCM team for Phase 1A is complete. <i>Security</i>, reviewed HR Partner, IT Partner, and Payroll Auditor report access security and continued discussions on Department ID/Extractor Report security. <i>Integrations</i>, focused on meeting with departments and the testing team to refine each integrations testing details. We have also continued work on the Seniority reporting, migrations to fox7 for the latest build and department meetings to iron items for integrations, continued discovery/development on Bridging integrations for P1A and P1B. 	What	When	
	E2E Testing – P1A – 9/24	Sep	
	Close open P1A - Actions and Decision	Sep	
	Integrations P1A – 2 Integrations	Oct	
	Integrations P1B – 7 Integrations	Dec	
	Tenant Build – HCM P1A 10/9	Oct	
	Close out Future State Parking Lot items	Sep	

Workstream Status – Phase 1A

Activity Dashboard:

Status	Task	Responsible	Due	Complete Y/N	Actions
	HCM – Retest (1A Testing)	Marvin	9/17	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> create, hire and change job 75% complete; good place Config Changes in LA7
	INT181 – Photo Import from GSD	Marvin/Fatima	9/23		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision on how photos are going to be done? Meeting set for 9/21 with AGM, GSD and PER.
	HCM – Spot Testing (1A Testing)	Marvin	9/24		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scenarios in Sheet; most urgent items based on priorities Based on what's needed for Config; most urgent for 1A
	Building and Safety	Ken/Raelynn	9/24	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting this Week Associated with eTime; Time Tracking PCAM/PCIS; eTime integrate with 1B Absence will be associated with this process Timeline and Plan is needed; INT, ABS, TT, PMO
	Sustainability Model	Raelynn	9/24	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Model for review this week to Leads Out for Review - Dept. Leads (Workstream Leads)
	Reports Approved for 1A - PER	Marvin/Fatima	9/24		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4L. Post Go-Live Model Review in Progress with Marvin and Fatima
	Reports Approved 1A - Controller	Janet/Rosemary	10/8		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Reports 4. Ad-Hoc Extractor Reports 11. Finalize LAPD's HCM Workday Plan
	INT147- Seniority Exam Calculations - Unit Testing Completed	Chad	10/15		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Unit Test Feeling good about this one as of today
	INT5000 – HCM Demographic Data to PaySR	Chad	10/8		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1L. Mechanism to calculate Exam Seniority PaysR check-in call on Wed
	INT180 – Position Data	Chad	10/8		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delayed due to Brian on Vac Brian is back this week Key Details to follow
	Reports move into 1A Tenant	Sam Davis	10/8		
	1A - Tenant Build	Chris/Ray	10/8		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8 files ready from the City Loading will begin this week Standup calls ongoing this week Migration Recipes begins today

Workstream Status – Phase 1A

Activity Dashboard:

PMO Status Report

Status	Task	Responsible	Due	Complete Y/N	Actions
	Configuration Adjustments	Sonja	10/8	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Operational alignment for BPs 2L. User confirmation of HCM Configuration 8. Finalize Fire's HCM Workday Plan 16. Random Drug Testing 18. Annual Budget
	PRISM HCM Reporting – Review and Signoff – 1A	Marvin/Chris	10/8		5. Reflects LADWP employee job history
	PRISM Seniority Exam Reporting - Review and Signoff	Marvin	10/15		
	Integrations in Test	Anthony	10/22		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Test prep meetings with Departments on INT047(DWP), INT009(Controller), INT0126 (LAFFP), INT148 (CAO), INT117 & INT071 (LAWA)
	INT147 - Seniority Exam Calculations - Ready for Regression Testing	Marvin/Raelynn	10/22		1. Mechanism for calculating seniority
	Training Development – 1A	Seemab	10/29		
	Regression Testing	Yvonne/Anthony	10/25		3L. Operational feasibility approach 9. Mass reassignments 13. Job profile job management restrictions
	HCM Training Begins	Seemab	11/15		
	Finalize Configuration	Sonja	11/25		
	Cutover Plan Meetings (in Place)	Ken/Jon B.	11/8		All Leads Attend
	Gold Tenant Build	Chris/Ray	12/17		
	1B - Configuration Update	Jevon/Daniel			
	P2 - Configuration Update	Sam M/Rosemary			

Workstream Status – Phase 1A

Activity Dashboard:

Area	Lead	Current Status	Weekly Status	Current Week - Highlights	Configuration Update
HCM Core	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marvin Avilla Sonja Chappell 		<p>Summary:</p> <p>Onsite Department Support- 1 DOT tester and 2 GSD testers attended and participated in CAPS Design Review</p> <p>Highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1A Regression Test Plan design process review Hiring Hall Hire and Termination process demonstration for various City teams <p>Outstanding Configuration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Edit Additional Data-Position Edit Worker Additional Data Migrate Termination BP from LA9 Review all BPs and update the steps assigned to Security Admin (details on Config log) Hire BP update routing for Edit IDs step Update Additional Job Reasons Change Job Updates (pending City confirmation) Configure Active Directory Notifications- Assigned to City Configurator - Updates to Change Job Notifications- For active Directory Partner-Yvonne and Quan have been assigned this task <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision: List of Additional Job Reasons needed from City team City Team updating Master Location list. Current Location names and new locations will be loaded via EIB in LA7. Question: 624- How will LAFD positions be managed when the incoming employee is in training 260-Service Dates- Confirm what LACERS and LAFPP may need from WD for them to manage continuous service dates in their systems. <p>Decisions made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location Hierarchies are being added as a method to reduce the need for duplicate locations. The City team is continuing to update the master list of locations; the deadline is October 6th. They will be loaded via EIB in LA7 		
Testing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yvonne Hong Anthony Wang 		<p>Summary:</p> <p>Testers continue to test this week to wrap up EZE Cycle 2 scenarios. General Services and Transportation TT and Payroll groups were onsite testing this week. The Test leads continue to provide tester support for the onsite testers, reach out to certain departments to build INT scenarios, and refine the testing logistics for Phase 1A go-live. The HCM team tested 7 major HCM areas this week and provided substantial feedback as part of the defect process.</p>		
Change Mgt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raelynn/Fatima Jon Ruprecht 		<p>Summary:</p> <p>Held September Change Champion Call. Scheduled third round of department/stakeholder interviews. Managed future state process parking lot items. Drafted stakeholder interview questions. Continued tier 1 check ins and follow ups. Continued drafting end user training.</p> <p>Completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Held September Change Champion Call Began Post Go-Live Support Discussion 		

Workstream Status – Phase 1A

Activity Dashboard:

PMO Status Report

Area	Lead	Current Status	Weekly Status	Current Week - Highlights	Configuration Update
Integrations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nigel Chad Kodet 		<p>The week of 9/13 has been focused on planning E2E testing and accommodating for the split go live. Keeping the status in Yellow until we see more progress made on integration testing.</p> <p>Highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redesign needed for INT180. This is a phase 1a integration. Ryan from LAWA is OOO until Sept 20, so we can not meet to discuss changes. This is going to delay testing. INT181 photo import design up in the air. Waiting for a decision to be made before development can continue. A decision needs to be made whether eTime will be used for INT135. We are blocked on the development until this decision is made by LADBS and the City. Raelynn wants the decision to be confirmed and communicated to B&S ASAP. SSO team will not be able to write back to update a Worker's email address from AD until 6-8 months after go live The Workday Extend solution for OLOTS may be out of scope. Decision/direction needed for the replacement of OLOTS as should this need someone to do the Workday Extend, we will need to find that resource Updates to benefit mapping that will impact benefit integrations Change in layout for INTO46. This is a Phase 2 integration. Tori is working through changes now SMTP credentials were to be provided by Thursday, July 22 for INT188. They were not received due to complications. network team is working through complications. 		
Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jonathan Britton Sam Davis 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue locking down report inventory phase-wise; with emphasis on phase 1A 	
PRISM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chris Yang Didier Guzman 			<p>Highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalized POC to confirm the pattern to add/modify/delete Paysr EWH data for Seniority Calculations, and focused on finalizing the Design Doc. Sign-off from HCM team for Phase 1A is complete Testing continues for URP 	
Conversion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chris Yang Ray Baez 			<p>Highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HCM only build in progress LA CITY 7 (target tenant) completed pre-load and moved in config HCM team reviewing config errors Compare report issues also being reviewed All data files received from LA City team 	
Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doug Workman Seemab 			<p>Highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HCM Instructor Led Training is going through dev/review. Training tenant cutover is happening the week of 09/27. Training team will be participating in UAT in October (dates pending) Job aids are being reviewed by WD HCM Lead, with (Create Position and Hire on hold due to changes) *Impacts ILT as there are related demos in the course. 	

Workstream Status – Phase 1A

Activity Dashboard:

Integrations – Current Phase

INT#	Description	Status <small>(Build/Testing/Sign-Off)</small>	Due	Notes / Comments
INT011a	SSO/IDM & Inbound/Outbound API Support	Testing	N/A	
INT012c	INT012c_ct_r_Departments_Inbound - (FDM)	Testing	N/A	
INT012c	INT012c_ct_r_Units_Inbound (FDM)	Testing	N/A	
INT012d	INT012d_ct_r_Appropriation_Inbound - (FDM)	Testing	N/A	
INT016	INT016_ct_r_Locations_Inbound - (FDM)	Testing	N/A	
INT117	INT0117_Inbound_LAWA_SAP_Cost_Centers - (FDM)	Testing	N/A	
INT007a	INT007a Vendor Demographic Outbound Studio	Testing	N/A	
INT009	INT009_California_EDD_Step1 & INT009_California_EDD_Step2	Testing	N/A	
INT047	DWP Biodemographic Job Profile Inbound Studio	Testing	N/A	
INT071	LAWA Employee Master Feed	Testing	N/A	
INT126	LA FPP Roster Academy Completion 01_CCW	Testing	N/A	
INT147	CAPS: Seniority Calculations	In Dev	10/8/21	
INT148	Extract Salary Grades Outbound Studio	Testing	N/A	
INT168	PDLA_Demographics_01_CCW & QN - INT168	Testing	N/A	
INT173	Inbound_SAP_EmployeeID_And_EmailAddress - LAWA	Testing	N/A	
INT178	Report: CR INT178 - GSD Demographic Badging Feed	Testing	N/A	
INT180	Position Feed to LAWA - LAWA	Testing	N/A	
INT181	INT181_Photo_Import_Inbound_Studio - GSD	Testing	N/A	
INT5000	Bridge HCM Data	Testing	N/A	
INT093	LACERS_Excess_Bonus-DD-and_W-4_Studio_Inbound - LACERS	Testing	N/A	
INT161	JPMorgan_EWS_Inbound_Studio	In Dev	10/8/21	
INT162	JPMorgan_EWS_Outbound_Studio	In Dev	10/8/21	

Reports – Current Phase (TBD)

Key Decisions & Actions Completed – Week Ending 9/24				
RYG	ID	Detail	Due Date	Assigned To
Complete	654	Holistic Review: E2E Tenant	9/21/21	Compensation
Complete	680	Determine process/To Do description for workers whose probation period should be updated/extended when changing to a new job.	7/16/21	HCM Core
Complete	261	Seniority Calculations: what values are needed in WD, for use in CAPS system, related to doing Seniority Calculations.	7/30/21	PRISM

Key Decisions & Actions					
Decisions due, upcoming or late. Phase 1A or missing Phase					
RYG	ID	Detail	Due Date	Status	Assigned To
	643	Will PERKS require an outbound report in Workday?	05/21/21	Work in Progress	Reporting
	645	LAFD Requested an Update on the 27 current PAYSr views they have. They want to know the plans for these views in Workday.	05/28/21	Work in Progress	Reporting
	649	City needs to identify cutover strategy - will departments freeze on doing certain transactions in PaySR? If so, what is the date? When will departments be notified of this?	07/01/21	Open	HCM
	697	Review and complete mapping of EWH fields	09/02/21	Open	PRISM
	624	LAFD- How are positions managed when the incoming employee is in training?	09/03/21	Work in Progress	Compensation
	690	Assign Platoon Shift during Hire and Change Job BPs	09/17/21	Open	HCM
	754	Phase 1A Reports Needed for Phase 1A Go-Live	09/20/21	Open	HCM
	755	Identify all departments, and department resources, who should be contacted as part of the reporting outreach.	09/20/21	Open	HCM
	621	OUTSTANDING CONFIG: OTP Plans with "Need to Update" eligibility rules	09/22/21	Open	Compensation
	260	Continuous Service Date. The city will determine the rules on populating this date (for conversion as well as going forward)	09/24/21	Work in Progress	HCM
	747	City to identify what bonuses in Paysr are folded into the base rate and how these will be converted into Workday for 1A	09/24/21	Open	HCM
	752	Decision on in-person v. virtual HCM ILT	09/24/21	Work in Progress	HCM

Key Decisions & Actions					
Decisions due, upcoming or late. Phase 1A or missing Phase					
RYG	ID	Detail	Due Date	Status	Assigned To
	761	Handling Step Progression Exceptions for 1A	9/27/21	Work in Progress	Compensation
	763	1A Build Error - Missing Comp Grades	9/27/21	Open	Compensation
	631	Update Mapping Document with new ref ID's and include column for frequency and calc method in the Var Code and Form 41 mapping tabs	09/28/21	Work in Progress	Compensation
	751	DC team needs requirements on how to convert bonus rates from biweekly to hourly	09/28/21	Open	Compensation
	510	Create Landscape Diagram .Grouping by functional area and not by Source/Target system.	09/30/21	Work in Progress	Compensation
	759	How will Photos work in the future Workday state. Will they come from GSD through INT181 Badging Feed. Or will photos being imported to Workday not be needed/desired?	09/30/21	Open	Integrations
	756	City team to identify all report owners and approvers for each report in Phase 1A needed for go-live.	10/01/21	Open	HCM
	760	Update Security Groups for Review, Rescind, and Cancel steps on all HCM BPs	10/1/21	Open	HCM Core
	370	Elicit Leave BP requirements related to adjusting workers' Step Progression Start Dates in applicable conditions	10/29/21	Work in Progress	Compensation
	757	All reports for phase 1A signed off by City team and marked ready for production	11/05/21	Open	HCM Core
	753	All reports transitioned to ITA for Phase 1A	11/19/21	Open	HCM Core

Key Decisions & Actions
 Decisions due, upcoming or late. Phase 1B

RYG	ID	Detail	Due Date	Status	Assigned To
	640	Field mapping needed for Department of Building and Safety INT134 (Pay Basis and Pay Category)	05/26/21	Work in Progress	Integrations
	670	Time Tracking Location Worktag - Functionality in WD	06/23/21	Work in Progress	Time Tracking
	059	New structure of Payroll Department, and Payroll Security	07/02/21	Work in Progress	Payroll
	060	Process of creating/changing Earnings/Deductions between departments, and functional areas.	07/09/21	Pending	Payroll
	066	FLSA OT Requirements and Setup	07/09/21	Pending	Payroll
	568	Decimals in PaySR vs Workday	07/09/21	Open	Payroll
	576	Workers/Managers/Timekeepers have the ability to delete time blocks that have already been approved without the worker/manager/timekeeper receiving notification of the deletion or request to approve the new total time for a pay period.	07/09/21	Open	Time Tracking
	686	Termination Payouts	07/16/21	Work in Progress	Payroll
	672	Probationary period extension report that informs users that an employee has met 8-calendar-day or more threshold	09/03/21	Work in Progress	HCM
	344	Historical Hours Worked (biweekly total by pay period) for Eligibility Evaluation (FMLA, Qualifying Year), and Historical Deductible Absence Buckets	09/10/21	Open	HCM

Key Decisions & Actions					
Decisions due, upcoming or late. Phase 2					
RYG	ID	Detail	Due Date	Status	Assigned To
	637	SMPT set up needed for INT188. Nigel needs to create an account that can be used for the SMPT	05/14/21	Work in Progress	Integrations
	663	Identify the Integrations that include Variation Codes Information. In workday, each integration that has a Var Code will have to undergo a configuration change (If Var codes change in FMS).	06/11/21	Open	Integrations
	314	Suspended Worktags from SAP will be sent on the INT file. Suspended means they can't be used on the timesheet but are still active financial elements for Payroll Costing. Several cross functional impacts, TT, Payroll, and INT.	07/02/21	Open	Payroll
	403	WD will need to differentiate between Adjustments, Retro and Recharge. CGI stated it will be a required for WD to do this.	07/02/21	Work in Progress	Payroll
	633	Configure accrued leave contributions to Deferred Compensation Plan	07/02/21	Open	Payroll
	668	Garnishment Data Conversions issues	07/02/21	Open	Payroll
	067	Retro and MOUs	07/09/21	Work in Progress	Payroll
	472	How would Payroll Accounting reconcile multi-sup org/company data resulting from bi-weekly, retroactive, off cycle, and monthly payroll runs?	07/09/21	Open	Payroll
	660	Configuration of FDBP	07/09/21	Open	Payroll
	068	IOD (Injury on Duty pay) and negative Gross (Any Retro Leaves)	07/16/21	Pending	Absence
	350	The City's Pay Periods coincide with the fiscal year (July through June) while Workday's Period schedule goes by calendar year.	07/30/21	Open	Payroll
	446	Configurable Compensation Basis Load Options	08/06/21	Work in Progress	Compensation
	669	Select URP Owner	08/13/21	Open	PRISM
	096	Plan for Parallel Testing	08/20/21	Pending	Payroll
	647	CCB: City to review and add UNIT test scenarios as it relates to compounding bonuses	10/1/21	Open	HCM
	677	OUTSTANDING CONFIG: CCB: Review outstanding items in Daniel's Bonus Report to determine if the missing plans are due to employees being paid incorrectly in Paysr or if it was a missed requirement in the MOU	10/08/21	Open	Compensation
	702	CCB: City Unit Tests All CCB's	10/20/21	Open	Compensation

-END OF REPORT-