

COUNTY OF MILWAUKEE
Inter-Office Communication

Date: October 23, 2007

To: Lee Holloway, Chairman, Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors

From: Jerome J. Heer, Director of Audits

Subject: Virchow, Krause Review of Ceridian Human Resources Information System (HRIS) Implementation

The Department of Audit engaged the firm of Virchow Krause and Company to conduct an agreed upon procedures review of the Ceridian human resources system implementation. The procedures conducted by VK addressed the current status of critical items from their March 2007 assessment of the project. A copy of their report is attached.

It is important to acknowledge that, as a result of the March 2007 report, the Ceridian project team was re-aligned and additional resources were committed to the implementation. These decisions have proven to be crucial in achieving significant progress over the last five months. Had the reconfiguration not occurred, the successes noted in the attached report would not have been achieved. Having said that, it is clear that challenges and risks are still present as the project moves into the critical phase of achieving a "go live" by the end of 2007. Several of the items identified by VK [e.g. project charter (3.1) and planning documentation (4.5)] will undoubtedly not be addressed prior to implementation. Rather, these observations can be used to inform our process for any future technology investments. Other observations by VK [e.g. contingency planning (6.8), testing (10.5, 9.4), training (4.1)] will need to be resolved to give County officials a greater level of confidence that the project will succeed by the end of 2007. The response by management clearly recognizes these priorities.

We have used the observations by VK and our own knowledge of the project to reach our own conclusions on the probability of a successful implementation by the end of 2007. Our opinion is that it is likely that the project will achieve the stated timeline of year-end. It is also our opinion that the next milestone of running a parallel test for the October 21 – November 3 pay period is less likely to yield substantial success. Indeed, later this week, the project team will make a decision about whether to handle the October 21 – November 3 pay period as a "go live" step in the implementation. This means that the next attempt at a "go live" would be the November 18 – December 1 payroll. Even this chance of success, however, is predicated on a heightened level of cooperation by all County employees and a continuation of extraordinary efforts by the Ceridian project team.

Lee Holloway, Chairman, Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors
October 23, 2007
Page Two

Please refer this report to the Committee on Finance and Audit. We apologize for the timing on this referral request but the timetable was driven by an effort to have a report that would coincide with critical decisions being made on the project.

Jerome J. Heer

JH/cah

cc: Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors
Scott Walker, Milwaukee County Executive
Rob Henken, Director, Department of Administrative Services
Scott Manske, Controller, Department of Administrative Services
Dennis John, Chief Information Officer, DAS-IMSD
Mary Reddin, Deputy Chief Information Officer, DAS-IMSD
Dave Arena, Director of Employee Benefits, DAS-Human Resources Division
Dr Karen Jackson, Director, DAS-Human Resources Division
Steve Cady, Fiscal and Budget Analyst, County Board Staff
Rick Ceschin, Research Analyst, County Board Staff
Delores Hervey, Chief Committee Clerk, County Board Staff
Jodi Mapp, Committee Clerk, County Board Staff

Milwaukee County



Ceridian Human Resources Information System (HRIS) Implementation

Agreed Upon Procedures Report

October 19, 2007

Prepared by Virchow Krause & Company, LLP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Agreed Upon Procedures Project Overview..... 1
Background..... 1
Approach..... 1

II. Evaluation of HRIS Project..... 3
1 Project Oversight and Ongoing QA..... 3
2 Work Plan Management 4
3 Functional Scope..... 5
4 User Training 7
5 Communication Management..... 8
6 Issue and Risk Management 10
7 Parallel Testing & Data Conversion 11
8 Functional and Customization Testing 13
9 Integration Testing 14
10 Performance and Stress Testing..... 16
11 Post-Implementation Operations 17
12 Post-Implementation Vendor Management 18

III. Key Finding / Conclusion 20

I. Agreed Upon Procedures Project Overview

Background

Milwaukee County's implementation of the Ceridian Human Resources Information System (HRIS) is approaching its go-live date. The County's Department of Audit requested Virchow Krause & Company, LLP's (VK) services to conduct an independent, agreed upon procedures review to assess the current status of the project against an agreed-upon set of evaluation criteria. These evaluation criteria were defined by the County so it could determine whether or not the one day project assessment report recommendations, contained in the Virchow Krause report dated March 29, 2007, have been addressed by the HRIS project team

This document represents VK's findings from the agreed upon procedures review. The areas covered within this review as well as the evaluation criteria used to review each procedure have been established by the HRIS project team and management of Milwaukee County.

This report is intended solely for the use of Milwaukee County, and should not be used by those who did not agree to the procedures and those parties that did not take responsibility for the sufficiency of the procedures for their purposes. As noted in the contract, VK's engagement cannot be relied upon to disclose errors, fraud, or illegal acts that may exist associated with HRIS project team representations.

Approach

The first phase of the HRIS Agreed Upon Procedures Project began with documenting a draft set of evaluation criteria for Milwaukee County to consider for the review. Once a final set of evaluation criteria had been documented and finalized, the evaluation criteria was incorporated as an addendum to the engagement letter and accepted by the Department of Audit on Friday, October 5, 2007. The addendum to the contract specifically defined the twelve agreed upon focus areas, evaluation criteria, and evidence and documentation collection list.

The twelve agreed upon focus areas evaluated as part of this agreed upon procedures review, included:

1. Project Oversight and Ongoing QA
2. Work Plan Management
3. Functional Scope
4. User Training
5. Communication Management
6. Issue and Risk Management
7. Parallel Testing & Data Conversion
8. Functional and Customization Testing
9. Integration Testing
10. Performance and Stress Testing
11. Post-Implementation Operations
12. Post-Implementation Vendor Management

VK's second phase of the project entailed the actual assessment of the HRIS Project against the agreed upon procedures and twelve evaluation criteria. VK conducted several interviews with IMSD and HRIS Project Team members during October 1st – October 15th to perform the agreed-upon procedures assessment. The findings and results of these interviews are contained within Section II of this report. These findings were presented to Milwaukee County on Wednesday, October 17th and Thursday, October 18th.

The following tables below represent the detailed activities, tasks, and deliverables for the HRIS Agreed Upon Procedures Project.

Step 1 – Planning and Agreed-Upon Procedure Preparation	
<p>Purpose: Build the project plan and document evaluation criteria for the agreed-upon procedures review. These evaluation criteria will explore whether or not the recommendations, contained in the Virchow Krause’s report dated March 29, 2007, have been addressed by the HRIS project team.</p>	
<p>Tasks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize project work plan and meeting calendar • Establish initial set of evaluation criteria for consideration during “Management Agreed Upon Procedure” working session • Execute the "Management Agreed Upon Procedure" working session to review, add, and modify to the initial evaluation criteria • Document follow-up from Management working session and provide evaluation criteria in arrangement letter addendum • Prepare document and evidence collection list 	<p>Key Deliverables</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Deliverables • Initial List of Evaluation Criteria for Management Input • List Identifying Agreed-Upon 12 Procedure Evaluation Criteria Presented in Addendum to Engagement Letter • Document and Evidence Collection List
Step 2 – Execute Agreed-Upon Procedures	
<p>Purpose: Execute the agreed-upon procedures leveraging the evaluation criteria agreed to within step one above.</p>	
<p>Tasks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare interview questions • Conduct interviews • Document results • Management checkpoint • Prepare exceptions list and review with HRIS Team • Obtain Management's Assertion • Build the Agreed-Upon Procedures Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Write report - Internal review - Review report with client - Revise report, if necessary 	<p>Key Deliverables</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview Questions and Interview Execution • Initial Evaluation Results • Exception List • Management’s Assertion • Agreed-Upon Procedures Report.

II. Evaluation of HRIS Project

This section of the HRIS Agreed Upon Procedures Report identifies VK’s assessment findings and notes resulting from the HRIS Agreed Upon Procedures Project. The twelve key focus areas, as well as the evaluation criteria, identified below were established by the HRIS project team and management of Milwaukee County. VK scored each evaluation criteria on the following three point scale:

Score	Definition
Utilized	Best practice is recognized, is implemented, and is well understood
Recognized	Best practice is recognized and understood but is not fully implemented
Not Verified	Auditable evidence was not available to verify all aspects of test area

Project Best Practices Areas of Assessment		Document & Evidence Collection List	Assessment	Findings and Notes
1 Project Oversight and Ongoing QA				
1.1	Steering Committee is comprised of key stakeholders and they participate regularly	Steering Committee Agendas and Meeting Notes	Utilized	<p>Steering Committee (i.e. HRIS Implementation Operating Committee) meets on a bi-weekly basis, including: 6/12, 6/26, 7/10, 7/24, 8/9, 8/21, 9/11, 9/25, and 10/9.</p> <p>HRIS IOC consists of key project stakeholders, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meeting Chair: Rob Henken - Oversight Members: Jerry Heer and Wendy Kraly - Members: David Arena, Rick Ceschin, Dr. Karen Jackson, Scott Manske, Dennis John, Sushil Pillai, Mary Reddin, and Cindy Archer <p>Meeting agenda and status reports are prepared in advance and meeting minutes are well documented.</p>

Project Best Practices Areas of Assessment		Document & Evidence Collection List	Assessment	Findings and Notes
1.2	Steering Committee role is well-defined and executed (and accomplish goals and objectives for providing project direction and guidance)	Steering Committee Agendas and Meeting Notes	Utilized	Objective of IOC is to "Identify operational issues and direct performance solutions related to implementation of the Ceridian product." IOC meetings are well structured to cover project status updates, items requiring decision, and action items. Steering Committee expectations defined during 6/12 meeting.
1.3	Weekly Operating Committee exists to deal with risk and issue resolution and management	Weekly Operating Committee Agendas and Meeting Notes	Utilized	Several operating committees exist to deal with project management and issue/risk resolution, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Daily 8:30 meetings consisting of project team members and Ceridian - Leadership meetings on a weekly basis consisting of project manager and team leaders - Governance meetings on a weekly basis consisting of project manager and MKE County PMO Manager - Personnel Committee on a monthly basis with Finance and Audit members
1.4	Project success measurements are defined and tracked	Project success criteria	Recognized	No formal project success measurements are documented and tracked, but the team tracks to project plan, issues list, testing results and implementation timeline
2 Work Plan Management				
2.1	Single project plan	Project Plan	Recognized	No single project plan exists, however, project plans for CBS, CRS, and HPW-CTA-SS are managed solely by project manager
2.2	Project implementation timeline clearly defined and understood	Communications and Project Plan	Utilized	Project plans identify implementation timeframe as well as various monthly calendar snapshots maintained by team
2.3	Project plan contains phases, tasks defined at team level, expected deliverables, milestones, and dependencies		Utilized	Project plans identify implementation timeframe as well as various monthly calendar snapshots maintained by team
2.4	Estimating assumptions understood and documented		Recognized	Project plan is structured around a duration-based approach. Subsequently, estimating assumptions are

Project Best Practices Areas of Assessment		Document & Evidence Collection List	Assessment	Findings and Notes
				understood at a high-level.
2.5	Estimates and schedules prove accurate		Recognized	Project plan schedule appears to be accurate and up-to-date through early October. Difficult to assess accuracy of estimates given duration-based plan and percent complete tracking.
2.6	Project plan is regularly monitored and actuals are tracked to plan	Project Plan Updates and Versions	Recognized	Project plan is regularly monitored and updated by project manager on a weekly basis. Project plan actuals are not tracked on an hourly basis but on percent complete basis.
2.7	Process in place to diagnose and resolve work plan deviations		Recognized	Project Manager regularly updates project plan to identify and manage any deviations. Project manager communicates and escalates deviations to IOC through status reporting. Change orders are also incorporated into project plan.
2.8	Proper resources are available to support the scope		Not Verified	<p>VK is unable to verify resource availability. Project plan is duration-based and tracked at a percent complete. Project plan estimates at a resource level are neither maintained nor accurate.</p> <p>According to the HRIS Project Management Team, the team has a very good handle on resource availability and requirements given the number of operational meetings and frequency of resource discussions.</p>

3 Functional Scope

3.1	Project charter exists with clearly defined and realistic scope	Project Charter	Not Verified	No formal project charter was identified. A variety of project plans and presentations serve this purpose at a high level, including project roles and responsibilities, communication, timelines, and over project plan. Other components of a project charter such as project goals/objectives, intended project scope, and criteria for project success were not identified in the documentation.
3.2	Core requirements for HPW (HR, Payroll, Web) are identified and documented	HPW Business Requirements Document	Utilized	Requirements documents have been developed and signed by Milwaukee County representatives. However, some

Project Best Practices Areas of Assessment		Document & Evidence Collection List	Assessment	Findings and Notes
		(BRD)		were signed with hand-written comments.
3.3	Appropriate level of input and participation by DAS user community around HPW requirements	Sign off of HPW Business Requirements Document (BRD)	Recognized	All requirements and design documents were signed-off, but some had signatures from executives only.
3.4	HPW requirements are driving configuration, customizations, testing, and implementation activities	HPW Business Requirements Document (BRD)	Recognized	Requirements documentation drove the configuration, customization, and unit testing activities. There are several separate testing activities currently in progress, but no overall test plan was identified.
3.5	Core requirements for Professional Services (PS) customizations are identified and documented	PS SRS (11 customizations)	Utilized	Software Requirements Specification & Design Packages (SRS's) exist for each customization, which include detailed requirements, calculations, use cases, and other relevant information.
3.6	PS requirements are driving configuration, customizations, testing, and implementation activities	PS SRS (11 customizations)	Utilized	The SRS's are driving Ceridian's development efforts and the joint testing efforts between Ceridian and the County.
3.7	Reporting requirements have been developed and signed off by the end users	Reporting BRD and/or System Requirements Specifications (SRS)	Recognized	A Business Requirements Document (BRD) for Ceridian Payroll Reports, signed-off by the County, provides information regarding standard payroll reports. However, the team is currently conducting additional analysis on potential additional reports and/or queries. It is assumed that additional reporting requirements will be addressed post Go Live.
3.8	Scope Management process has been developed	Change Control Plan	Utilized	The project team is using the PMO's defined change control process to address changes in scope, based on the requirements documents and sign-offs.
3.9	Scope Management process is being followed	Change Control Documentation	Utilized	Project Change Control Request Forms are being used to document changes in requirements or design.
3.10	New requirements and changes are minimal	Issues List, Change Control Documentation	Utilized	Requirements and/or design changes appear to be minimal, based upon the documentation provided by the County. The Milwaukee County Open Items List highlights those items requiring design changes, as well as Critical Go Live items.
3.11	Requirements documentation of system design has been updated when testing results change the design		Utilized	Project Change Control Request Forms are being used to document changes in requirements or design, including those changes identified through testing.

Project Best Practices Areas of Assessment		Document & Evidence Collection List	Assessment	Findings and Notes
4 User Training				
4.1	Well defined training plan exists addressing requirements, training timeline, and other critical areas	Training Plan	Not Verified	No formal training plan was identified. A variety of project plans and training material serve this purpose at a high-level.
4.2	Just in Time (JIT) training has been employed on the project to-date	Training Schedule	Utilized	Multiple training sessions have occurred. Most recent HPW-CTA training sessions were in late August. Continual parallel testing efforts have also re-enforced HRIS training.
4.3	Project team has adhered to training plan and schedule		Recognized	Project team tracking training progress against project workplan. Training participant lists are being maintained. Approximately 75% of 120 HR/payroll field users have participated in training to-date. Remaining end user training will be handled via train-the-trainer approach, occasionally offered refresher training, and/or new user orientation training sessions.
4.4	Training material addresses system functionality as well as other change management components (e.g. business impacts, new process and flows, standard operating procedures (SOPs), and support)	Training Material	Recognized	<p>Training material adequately addresses system functionality. All training material and execution of training activities have been carried out by end users to influence change management and buy-in.</p> <p>Training material does not adequately address change management components. Project team expecting Central HR and Central Payroll to handle "to-be" processes documentation and standard operating procedures (SOPs). Central HR and Central Payroll have not completed this material to-date.</p>
4.5	Existence of well-defined "as-is" and "to-be" process flows for all system/business areas	Process Flows	Not Verified	"As-Is" process documentation and flows have been developed. Central HR and Central Payroll will be developing "to-be" processes documentation. Central HR and Central Payroll have not completed this material to-date.

Project Best Practices Areas of Assessment		Document & Evidence Collection List	Assessment	Findings and Notes
4.6	Effective utilization of process flows as an input to testing, training, user procedures and change management activities	Training Material and Procedures	Not Verified	<p>No evidence of “to-be” process flows being utilized for testing, training, user procedures, and change management activities.</p> <p>According to the HRIS Project Team, however, the training performed by Central HR and Payroll incorporated the differences between the current world (Genesys) and future world (HRIS) into the training curriculum. Additionally, HRIS Project Team believes the “as-is” process has been sufficiently tested through the parallel testing efforts.</p>
4.7	Process measures are in place to detect impact of implementation on process performance	Performance Metrics	Not Verified	<p>No evidence of documented metrics exists that allow management to understand the impact of training and the new system on Central HR and Payroll processes and operations.</p> <p>According to HRIS Project Team, many manual processes will be automated via HRIS and subsequently process metrics are may not be necessarily required (given there will be 100% accuracy and complete no more manual processing).</p>
5 Communication Management				
5.1	Project communication plan is well-defined	Communication Plan	Recognized	<p>An outdated 2006 HRIS communication plan exists (“HRIS Communication PlanMB.xls”). Additionally, the Communication Plan predominantly focuses on only user communication and outreach efforts. The plan does not address communication and outreach efforts to the project team and sponsors. A variety of project plans, status reports, Ceridian Communicator newsletters, and meetings (see meeting structure identified in Section 1) identify a communication process is in-place, however.</p>

Project Best Practices Areas of Assessment		Document & Evidence Collection List	Assessment	Findings and Notes
5.2	Change management plan has been defined	Change Management Plan	Not Verified	No formal change management plan was identified that defines a methodology/approach re: how the project team will successfully manage Milwaukee County from Genesys to HRIS. A variety of project plans, status reports, Ceridian Communicator newsletters, meetings, and training serve this purpose at a high-level.
5.3	High confidence level of Going Live within user community		Recognized	HRIS project team has stated that the system will go-live before January 1 st 2008. No formal announcements re: the project team's recent timeline have been communicated. According to project team, the user community can sense the reality of the upcoming "go-live" timeline given parallel testing efforts and project team requests to keep paper time reports.
5.4	High confidence level that the organization can grasp the system design and effectively utilize the new application		Recognized	Project team regularly meets with cabinet members, project sponsors, Central HR, and Central Payroll to assess confidence level re: implementation and HRIS adoption. According to project team, some end user concerns around readiness exist. No formal end user surveys have been conducted by project team to-date.
5.5	Project change management process in place (rqts, design, dev, test, deploy, prod) has been utilized		Recognized	While components of change management best practices have been followed throughout project (e.g. requirements sign-off, parallel testing involving end user community, users having ownership with execution of training activities, Ceridian Communicator, etc.), project team has not adopted, defined, and adhered to a project change management plan or process.
5.6	Project champions and sponsors within the user community exist		Utilized	According to project team, project advocates and sponsors exist across all levels. Project team has periodic meetings with project advocates and sponsors.
5.7	Regular status reports are completed	Communication	Utilized	Project manager provides regular status reports to users, project team, IOC, PMO manager, cabinet team members, personnel committee, and project leadership team.
5.8	Project information is consistently communicated at all levels		Utilized	Project manager provides timely and upfront communication to project team and stakeholders.

Project Best Practices Areas of Assessment		Document & Evidence Collection List	Assessment	Findings and Notes
5.9	A central project library exists and is accessible by all	Project Directory or Shared Drive	Utilized	Project team utilizes a project shared drive for knowledge management and sharing.
6 Issue and Risk Management				
6.1	Issue management process is in place and utilized	Issue Management Plan	Utilized	Project team manages a single project issues list which contains industry best practice characteristics such as description, status, priority, owner, area/module, issue type, target completion dates, comments, etc.
6.2	Escalation process to appropriate stakeholders is in place - Effective use of Operating and Steering Committee Teams	Issue List	Utilized	Project manager appropriately leverages various team (IOC, daily 8:30 operational meetings, leadership meetings, governance meetings, etc.) to review and manage project issues.
6.3	Resources are available to make critical decisions		Utilized	Project manager has project team members and sponsors available on a frequent basis (weekly or bi-weekly) for the resolution of key project issues. "Key Issues/Challenges" are frequently reviewed on status reports.
6.4	Issues are reviewed frequently and resolved in a timely fashion		Utilized	Project issues are maintained on a daily basis. Additionally, the operational committee reviews issues on a daily basis.
6.5	Risk management process is in place and utilized	Risk Management Plan	Recognized	No formal Risk Management Plan exists. However, a high-level risk management process is in-place. A variety of vehicles, including status reports, issue lists, and project team memorandums serve this purpose at a high-level.
6.6	Risk list exists and is up-to-date	Risk List	Recognized	No up-to-date Project Risk List exists. A formal, documented risk management assessment was identified ("Risk Assessment – March 2007.doc") but has not been updated or utilized since March 11, 2007. A variety of other vehicles, including status reports, issue lists, and project team memorandums serve this purpose at a high-level.
6.7	Qualitative analysis conducted to define impact, probability of risks, and mitigation activities		Recognized	No formal project risk list was identified. Extremely high level qualitative analysis of risks is done on issues lists, status reports, and memorandums.
6.8	Contingency plan developed in the event objectives not met		Not Verified	No formal Contingency Plan was identified. A variety of other vehicles, including status reports, issue lists, and

Project Best Practices Areas of Assessment		Document & Evidence Collection List	Assessment	Findings and Notes
				memos serve this purpose at a high-level. As of "Assessment of the Second Parallel Testing and Implications for "Go Live" memorandum (dated 10/9), the project team needs to complete a "Go Live" Contingency Plan.
7 Parallel Testing & Data Conversion				
7.1	Evidence of documented parallel testing plan and approach	Parallel Test Plan	Recognized	No formal overall test plan was identified, but the team has conducted a series of parallel tests, using a number of tools to compare and validate results between old versus new systems.
7.2	Confirm which functions are included in the Parallel Test: time collection & payroll only, or HR also?	Parallel Test Plan	Utilized	Parallel testing has included human resources, payroll, and time collection functions (HPW and CTA systems). The Ceridian employee master file was converted in July, 2007, and has been maintained in a parallel mode with the current Genesys system since the conversion.
7.3	Appropriate levels of testing and user sign-off	Test Results	Recognized	No formal overall test plan was identified, but several individual test plans and supporting documentation were identified for those items being tested within the parallel tests. No formal sign-offs of parallel test results were identified.
7.4	Appropriate processes and tools to compare results of Parallel Test (old vs. new)	Testing / Comparison Tools	Utilized	A variety of tools are being used to compare data between the old and new systems, including Microsoft Excel with lookup tables, Microsoft Access tables, and Microsoft SQL tables and supporting queries.
7.5	Confirm that the data conversion process is being tested via the Parallel Test	Parallel Test Plan	Utilized	Both the employee master file data conversion and the YTD/QTD balances conversion are being tested in the parallel tests. The employee master file was actually converted in July, 2007, and has been maintained in a parallel fashion along with the Genesys master file ever since.

Project Best Practices Areas of Assessment		Document & Evidence Collection List	Assessment	Findings and Notes
7.6	Confirm which specific Earnings and Deduction types are being tested in the Parallel Test	Parallel Test Plan, Test Results, List of Earnings & Deduction Types	Recognized	All Pay Codes (earnings) and Deduction Codes have been unit tested within a variety of testing activities. The most commonly used earnings and deductions are being tested in the Parallel Test. However, no evidence was provided that indicates whether ALL earnings and deduction types were triggered in the Parallel Test (i.e. there could be a specific earnings type for which no employees had any hours or earnings for the Parallel Test period).
7.7	Evidence of effective test environment maintenance and control	Test Environment / Change Control	Utilized	All parallel testing is being performed within the LIVE Ceridian environment, which is subject to formal change control processes at Ceridian's facilities. A separate test environment was also established for the testing of the PS Customizations.
7.8	Evidence that parallel testing issues are appropriately documented and managed	Testing Issues List	Recognized	Parallel test issues are being documented in a variety of formats, including Excel-based comparisons, SQL-based comparison queries, and other formats. However, no master list of parallel test issues was identified (the overall Open Items List is possibly being used for this purpose?). Latest parallel run: 5800 employees total, 4800 submitted time, 4400 submitted time correctly, 1100 had discrepancies. Issues were caused by Overtime calculation differences, incorrect benefit deductions, Injury Pay differences, and general data entry errors.
7.9	Evidence of appropriate criteria for "Go / No Go" decision	Go / No Go Decision Criteria	Recognized	Go / No Go decision criteria were verbally discussed, but no formal documentation or metrics exist. Consensus among project team was that the team should continue with Go Live assuming 1) all discrepancies are identified with causes understood, and 2) the resulting required adjustments are manageable.

Project Best Practices Areas of Assessment		Document & Evidence Collection List	Assessment	Findings and Notes
8 Functional and Customization Testing				
8.1	Evidence of documented functional and customization testing plan and approach	Test Plan	Recognized	No formal overall test plan exists, but several individual test plans and supporting documentation were identified. Test plans for each customization are driven by the respective SRS document.
8.2	Existence of test scripts to facilitate functional and customization testing activities	Test Scripts	Recognized	Test plans and scripts were identified for the customizations, but additional plans or scripts were not identified for overall testing and general test conditions.
8.3	<p>Test scripts include all day to day processing, special process, and ad hoc situations. Testing takes into account the most complicated situations that the County encounters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All Earnings & Deduction types - All logic "branches" for Earnings & Deduction calculations - Monthly, Quarterly, Annual Processing; e.g. tax reporting, W-2's, etc. - Are tax calculations being validated (Federal, State, FICA, etc.)? - Are taxable grosses being validated, based on pre-tax deductions? - Imputed Income (tax on employer-provided excess life insurance coverage) - FLSA Overtime - all possible combinations tested? 	Test Scripts and Scenarios, Test Plan, Test Results	Recognized	The County is relying upon the Parallel Test for the majority of its testing. Detailed specifications, test conditions, test data, expected results, and automated comparison tools are being used to test the PS Customizations (custom programming changes by Ceridian). The most common test conditions and scenarios are being tested in the Parallel Test and other supporting test activities. The team is using all electronically available data to validate testing results. Some data validation is also being performed manually by Central Payroll and HR staff. However, no overall test plan and global test conditions were identified. Also, the team has deferred the testing of some components until after Go Live, including year-end processing and imputed income calculations. The risk exists that a specific condition or calculation is not being tested by the Parallel Test or other spot testing activities.
8.4	Customization Testing - evidence of test scripts that are based upon the agreed upon specifications (SRS)	Test Plan, Test Scripts	Utilized	Individual test plans, scripts, and tools have been developed for the testing of each customization, based on the specifications.
8.5	Evidence of testing of all required Reports: standard batch reports and ad hoc queries	Test Plan, Test Scripts	Recognized	Standard reports are being tested within the Parallel Test process, and are being used to validate results. However, analysis is currently in progress regarding potential additional reports.

Project Best Practices Areas of Assessment		Document & Evidence Collection List	Assessment	Findings and Notes
8.6	Evidence of testing of Application Security - all levels	Test Plan, Test Scripts	Recognized	System security continues to be tested by virtue of the ongoing Parallel testing. However, no formal documentation or test plans were identified.
8.7	Appropriate levels of testing and user sign-off	Test Results	Recognized	Formal testing sign off was identified for specific HR-based testing (Self-Service and Workflow). However, no formal sign-offs of the parallel testing or other tests were identified.
8.8	Evidence of effective test environment maintenance and control	Test Environment / Change Control	Recognized	Two primary Ceridian environments were identified: LIVE for the live employee master file data and ongoing parallel testing, and PSTEST for the testing of customizations. Ceridian uses standard environment maintenance and change control processes within their data centers.
8.9	Evidence that functional and customization testing issues are appropriately documented and managed	Testing Issues List	Recognized	Testing issues are being documented within separate testing documents and within the overall Open Items List, but no overall log of testing issues was identified.
8.10	Evidence of appropriate criteria for "Go / No Go" decision	Go / No Go Decision Criteria	Recognized	Same as Section 7 above: Go / No Go decision criteria were verbally discussed, but no formal documentation or metrics exist. Consensus among project team was that the team should continue with Go Live assuming 1) all discrepancies are identified with causes understood, and 2) the resulting required adjustments are manageable.
9 Integration Testing				
9.1	Evidence of documented integration testing plan and approach	Test Plan	Recognized	Three of the PS Customizations are system interfaces: HPW to CRS, HPW to DefBen, and CBS to DefBen. As such, they have been designed, developed, and tested as part of the overall Customization development process. However, no formal Integration Test plan was identified.
9.2	Existence of test scripts to facilitate integration testing activities	Test Scripts	Recognized	Test scripts and documentation were identified for the interfaces that were developed as part of the PS Customizations, but other test scripts for additional interfaces were not identified.

Project Best Practices Areas of Assessment		Document & Evidence Collection List	Assessment	Findings and Notes
9.3	Adequate documentation regarding all system interfaces: internal vs. external, data elements / layouts, triggers, batch vs. real-time, frequency, etc.	Interface Documentation	Utilized	Detailed design and specification information is provided within the SRS documents for the three interfaces developed as part of the PS Customizations. In addition, several interface data mapping documents were identified. The HPW Interface Business Requirements Document also includes information regarding system interfaces.
9.4	Evidence that all interfaces have been tested (either in Parallel Test or in separate Integration Test)	Test Plan, Test Results	Not Verified	Unable to confirm if all system interfaces have been fully tested. No overall integration test plan was identified.
9.5	Evidence of coordination with third parties for testing of external interfaces	Test Plan, Test Results	Unknown	TO BE DETERMINED
9.6	Appropriate levels of testing and user sign-off	Test Results	Recognized	Same as Section 8 above: Formal testing sign off was identified for specific HR-based testing (Self-Service and Workflow). However, no formal sign-offs of integration testing were identified.
9.7	Evidence of effective test environment maintenance and control	Test Environment / Change Control	Recognized	Same as Section 8 above: Two primary Ceridian environments were identified: LIVE for the live employee master file data and ongoing parallel testing, and PSTEST for the testing of customizations. Ceridian uses standard environment maintenance and change control processes within their data centers.
9.8	Evidence that integration testing issues are appropriately documented and managed	Testing Issues List	Recognized	Same as Section 8 above: Testing issues are being documented within separate testing documents and within the overall Open Items List, but no overall log of testing issues was identified.
9.9	Evidence of appropriate criteria for "Go / No Go" decision	Go / No Go Decision Criteria	Recognized	Same as Section 8 above: Go / No Go decision criteria were verbally discussed, but no formal documentation or metrics exist. Consensus among project team was that the team should continue with Go Live assuming 1) all discrepancies are identified with causes understood, and 2) the resulting required adjustments are manageable.

Project Best Practices Areas of Assessment		Document & Evidence Collection List	Assessment	Findings and Notes
10 Performance and Stress Testing				
10.1	Evidence of documented performance, stress, and load testing plan and approach	Test Plan	Utilized	System performance testing was conducted as documented within the "Ceridian for Milwaukee County, Application Profile, Infrastructure" document (8/22/07). A number of issues were identified, but their status and resolution are unclear. The maintenance of employee data continues to be stress tested as the Ceridian database continues to be maintained in parallel with the Genesys system.
10.2	Test environments and architecture mimic production	Test Environment	Utilized	The current Parallel tests are being performed in the LIVE environment, in which the County will continue to process following the actual Go Live.
10.3	Existence of test scripts to facilitate testing activities	Test Scripts	Utilized	The document discussed above (Ceridian for Milwaukee County, Application Profile, Infrastructure), includes documented test scripts that were used in the tests.
10.4	Test scripts cover likely system stress and load demands	Test Scripts and Scenarios	Recognized	The testing discussed above was focused on individual transaction performance and response times. Formal stress testing with multiple concurrent users was not documented. However, the ongoing parallel test activities have simulated a production environment, as all user departments, HR, and Central Payroll have maintained the employee database in the Ceridian LIVE environment, in conjunction with the current Genesys database.
10.5	Evidence that system performance testing conforms to agreed upon Service Levels (based on SLAs)	Test Results	Not Verified	No evidence of formal Service Level Agreements was identified, other than the required 99.5% system uptime discussed in the Ceridian Hosted Services agreement. No transaction performance requirements were identified.
10.6	Appropriate levels of testing and user sign-off	Test Results	Recognized	Same as Section 9 above: Formal testing sign off was identified for specific HR-based testing (Self-Service and Workflow). However, no formal sign-offs of performance testing were identified.
10.7	Evidence of effective test environment maintenance and control	Test Environment / Change Control	Recognized	Same as Section 9 above: Two primary Ceridian environments were identified: LIVE for the live employee master file data and ongoing parallel

Project Best Practices Areas of Assessment		Document & Evidence Collection List	Assessment	Findings and Notes
				testing, and PSTEST for the testing of customizations. Ceridian uses standard environment maintenance and change control processes within their data centers.
10.8	Evidence that performance and stress issues are appropriately documented and managed	Testing Issues List	Recognized	Same as Section 9 above: Testing issues are being documented within separate testing documents and within the overall Open Items List, but no overall log of testing issues was identified. A number of issues were documented within the document "Ceridian for Milwaukee County, Application Profile, Infrastructure" (8/22/07), but their status and resolution are unclear.
10.9	Evidence of appropriate criteria for "Go / No Go" decision	Go / No Go Decision Criteria	Recognized	Same as Section 9 above: Go / No Go decision criteria were verbally discussed, but no formal documentation or metrics exist. Consensus among project team was that the team should continue with Go Live assuming 1) all discrepancies are identified with causes understood, and 2) the resulting required adjustments are manageable.
11 Post-Implementation Operations				
11.1	Program Operations & Help Desk Support structure have been established	Organization Chart	Recognized	Post-implementation operations and help desk support structure is defined at an organizational chart level (see Ceridian HRIS Support.doc – Dated October 2, 2007). The "Ceridian HRSI Support.doc" is drafted but not complete. Document still requires roles and responsibilities matrix.
11.2	Production Operations & Help Desk Processes have been defined	Post-Implementation Support Plan	Recognized	Project manager has stated that all areas have a shared vision and understanding of roles and responsibilities. Help Desk processes are more thoroughly defined identifying 4 help desk support tier levels, help desk ticket tracking reports, and individual support contacts. Help Desk processes and functions are defined in "IMSD Service Desk Process Manual – 10/11/2007". The "Ceridian HRSI Support.doc" is drafted but not complete. Document still requires further definition on processes and procedures.

Project Best Practices Areas of Assessment		Document & Evidence Collection List	Assessment	Findings and Notes
11.3	Evidence of process to open, manage, track, and close issues reported to help desk	Help Desk Tracking System	Utilized	Milwaukee County will utilize internal Help Desk support tools and functions.
11.4	A readiness assessment of the Operations & Help Desk has occurred	Cutover Checklist	Recognized	An early, incomplete draft of cutover checklist, "Proj Checklist – Go Live.xls" is defined. According to HRIS Project Team, Help Desk has been operational since CTA went live in 2006. All "Go-Live" requirements – support, help desk, Ceridian support, field and Central responsibilities, express checks, treasurer processes, have been documented.
11.5	End user request management process has been defined	System Enhancement Management Plan	Recognized	Enhancements will be communicated to Central HR and Central Payroll who will relay them to HRIS project team. No formal documentation exists on process, however. Project manager has stated that all areas have a shared vision and understanding of roles and responsibilities.
11.6	Establishment of User Administration procedures and processes	Security Plan	Recognized	No formal documentation exists on process. Project manager has stated that all areas have a shared vision and understanding of roles and responsibilities.
11.7	Project methodology for transition exists	Cutover Checklist	Recognized	An early, incomplete draft of a cutover checklist, "Proj Checklist – Go Live.xls" is defined. Project team does not have a current inventory of deferred items requiring attention post-implementation, however, HRIS Project Team has stated that the change control process and issues list identify some of the deferred items. Note that project team also does has a testing checklist or milestone timeline outlined in "October 2007 – November 2007 POA.doc" and "Parallel Processing Plan for Central HR.doc".
12 Post-Implementation Vendor Management				
12.1	Milwaukee County has appropriate level of visibility	Contract and RFP	Utilized	Ceridian representatives participate in daily 8:30 am

Project Best Practices Areas of Assessment		Document & Evidence Collection List	Assessment	Findings and Notes
	and communication with Ceridian			operating committee calls. According to project team, attention to Ceridian's ongoing support obligations will need to be visited within upcoming weeks but Ceridian is obligated to provide 30 days of post-implementation support.
12.2	SLAs and maintenance agreements are communicated and understood between County and Ceridian		Recognized	SLAs and responsibilities defined in RFP/contract. Ceridian's Tier 4 Help Desk support structure and contacts are not defined in current draft of "Ceridian HR Support.doc" (October 7, 2007). According to project team, attention to the SLAs and Ceridian's ongoing support obligations will need to be looked into further within upcoming weeks.
12.3	Disaster Recovery Plan has been developed and is understood	Disaster Recovery Plan	Recognized	Ceridian's Disaster Recovery responsibilities are defined in RFP/contract and "Ceridian Disaster Recovery/Business Continuity Program" (dated 04/26/2004). According to project team, attention to the Ceridian's Disaster Recovery Plan and services will need to be looked into further within upcoming weeks.

III. Key Finding / Conclusion

Management requested and executed this agreed upon procedures review to help provide insight and input into the County's Go / No Go decision process as the County is nearing a decision to go live with HRIS. The detailed findings and how the findings will be used in a Go / No Go decision making process is the responsibility of County Management and the Governance Structures that guide such decision making within your environment.

Best Practice area 7.9 should be contemplated in a strategic fashion by Milwaukee County.

7.9	Evidence of appropriate criteria for "Go / No Go" decision	Go / No Go Decision Criteria	Recognized	Go / No Go decision criteria were verbally discussed, but no formal documentation or metrics exist. Consensus among the HRIS project team was that the team should continue with Go Live assuming 1) all discrepancies are identified with causes understood, and 2) the resulting required adjustments are manageable.
-----	--	------------------------------	-------------------	---

Although the County currently recognizes aspects of the Go / No Go best practice, the necessary level of detail and documentation was not evident during our review. We would expect a formal and documented Go / No Go set of criteria to establish the framework with which the County would make the Go / No Go decision.

Management at the County responsible for making the Go / No Go decision and the various Governance Structures involved with oversight for the project should agree and document the Go / No Go criteria associated with the specific risk profile that meets the County operating style. For example, the Go / No Go criteria should be documented and Management's position clearly defined around such best practices as:

- **Finding: 6.8** - Contingency plan developed in the event objectives not met.

Consideration: The Management in Milwaukee County should have a formal position surrounding the lack of formal and documented contingency plans prior to the Go / No Go decision process. The formal position should take into account the County's tolerance for risk. If relatively conservative relative to risk, the County may adopt a position that a formal and documented contingency plan is a "must have" prior to go live. If the County is more open to risk, they may choose to adopt a formal position that HRIS can Go Live without a documented contingency plan.

- **Finding: 8.3** – Test scripts include all day to day processing, special process, and ad hoc situations. Testing takes into account the most complicated situations that the County encounters.

Consideration: The Management in Milwaukee County should have a formal position surrounding whether each and every complicated test situation must be tested prior to Go Live. The formal position should take into account the County's tolerance for risk. If relatively conservative relative to risk, the County may adopt a position that each complicated scenario is inventoried, documented and tested with evidence of a successful test. If the County is more open to risk, they may choose to adopt a formal position that HRIS can Go Live without testing each complicated scenario relying on the HRIS project team and Ceridian's packaged product to deliver successful results.

These two example findings and considerations serve only as an example of the structured process we would expect to see for significant Go / No Go decisions involving critical software applications.

We would expect the County to have many other considerations including discussions surrounding the risks of not going live when evaluating the various Go / No Go criteria. Finally, it is important to note that when evaluating and testing the project best practices that were audited as part of this project, many of the audited items may have significantly less impact on the Go / No Go decision. For example, a documented project charter would not be an example of an audited item that would be considered a "high impact" item relative to deciding Go / No Go. The County Management team and HRIS project team's are likely the right team to identify and prioritize the "high impact" items.

**COUNTY OF MILWAUKEE
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION**

DATE: October 23, 2007

TO: Jerome J. Heer, Director of Audits

FROM: Rob Henken, Director, Department of Administrative Services *RH*
Dennis John, Chief Information Officer, DAS - IMSD *DJ*

**SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO VIRCHOW KRAUSE AGREED UPON PROCEDURES
AUDIT OF CERIDIAN HRIS IMPLEMENTATION**

Background

In March 2007, the Department of Audit and Department of Administrative Services (DAS) retained Virchow Krause & Company (VK) to conduct a one-day project assessment of the implementation of the Ceridian Human Resource Information System (HRIS). The March Assessment Report addressed the likelihood of meeting the July 1 implementation date, the sufficiency of resources and the quality of the project management tools and techniques. The assessment concluded that successful implementation was improbable in July and that several project management tools and techniques warranted better focus.

After digesting the results of that assessment, the HRIS management and project team developed recommendations to re-plan the project, enhance the open communication plan and contract for additional high-level management and implementation resources. The project team believes that these strategies have helped to place the project back on track for a successful implementation in 2007. These efforts have been made possible only with strong contributions from the entire project team of County, contractor and Ceridian resources, including high level program management and implementation resources and IMSD's project management officer.

On October 19, the Ceridian management team received a follow-up report by VK assessing the current status of the project against an agreed-upon set of evaluation criteria. The VK auditors reported significant progress since their initial report in late March and verified the successful re-engineering of the overall project. As expected, the auditors also pointed out some areas of concern, which are addressed in this memorandum.

The HRIS management and project team want to express appreciation for the opportunity to work with the Department of Audit and the VK audit team to conduct this latest review. We credit the auditors for working with as little intrusion as possible on the time of busy project resources and for welcoming and incorporating feedback.

Agreed Upon Procedures Report - Response

VK utilized the recommendations of the March Audit to determine best practices against which to benchmark project implementation for the October Audit. Thus, the Agreed Upon Procedures Audit is a way to determine whether the recommendations of the March Assessment Report have been addressed. The premise is that the project management best practices are critical to successful implementation of large projects. We strongly support that premise. The agreed upon evaluation criteria represent important tools in project management practices.

We are pleased to note that Virchow Krause's October Agreed Upon Procedures Report finds significant evidence of project management best practices in several key areas, including areas that were found lacking in March. The report notes that key stakeholders actively participate in the Implementation Oversight Committee with well-structured meetings, decisions and action items. It states further that the project plan contains phases, deliverables, milestones, dependencies and tasks defined at the team level, and that requirements are driving configuration, customization, testing and implementation activities. The report also cites the multiple training sessions that have occurred and the variety of tools used to compare data between the old and new systems.

While we are proud to recognize accomplishments in those areas, we also wish to address areas where Virchow Krause reports that auditable evidence was not available to verify that project management best practices are being utilized.

As general background for our responses, we point out that when we re-started the project, we made conscious decisions on how to execute the project for completion in 2007. Based on those decisions, we decided to be extremely detailed on items on the critical path, and we believe that for virtually all such items, best practices were recognized, implemented and documented. In certain other areas outside of the critical path, while best practices were recognized and in most instances followed, they were done so in the absence of formal documentation.

The following offers a management response to areas of concern identified in the VK assessment that we consider to be critical areas, including our assessment of the concerns and how we plan to address them.

2.8 Proper resources available to support the scope.

The VK assessment indicates an inability to verify resource availability to support the project. We would respond that while the resource level estimates on the project plan are not currently updated, the project plan itself is current and updated and we use it to drive the timely completion of project tasks. At the daily meeting, the project team reviews current assignments, available resources and workload, and directs priorities. This is our method of ensuring that sufficient resources are available to support the tasks to completion.

3.1 Project charter with clearly defined and realistic scope.

The VK assessment states that no formal project charter was identified, though it also notes that a variety of project plans and presentations serve this purpose at a high level. We strongly support the position that a Project Charter is critical to *initiate* a large project, but also concur with the VK statement in the “Key Finding /Conclusion” section that at this point in time, a documented project charter would not be considered a high impact item relative to deciding Go/No Go.

The project does have documented elements of a Project Charter in the “Transition / Implementation Statement of Work” section of the Ceridian contract. This document includes project objectives, scope of work, risk management approach, roles and responsibilities, high level timeline and change control procedure. During the project restart, we decided that the completion of a formal updated project charter document was not necessary nor appropriate given the advanced stage of the project.

4.1 Well-defined training plan addressing requirements, training timeline and other critical areas.

4.5 Well-defined “as-is” and “to-be” process flows for all system/business areas.

4.6 Effective utilization of process flows as an input to testing, training, user procedures and change management activities.

The VK assessment is correct in noting the lack of a formal master training plan and formal documentation of “as is” and “to be” process flows. However, we would respond that the project team built the “as-is” and “to-be” processes into training materials. It was believed that this would provide the best value for employees. With “as-is” and “to-be” documentation right in the training materials, employees have the best opportunity to understand how to succeed at their work in the new environment, as well as materials to retrain backups or train new staff.

We would also note that while a separate, formal training plan is not in place, project leadership put significant emphasis on communicating all the components of a training plan with field and central payroll clerks and HR managers both in writing and in meetings. The project team consistently communicated the components of a training plan, including what the training would cover, when it would occur, how the training would be conducted and the level of participation required for their departments. This was communicated to field payroll clerks before training was conducted and assessed with them after training. In spite of the level of communication, there were departments that did not immediately take full advantage of training. For these departments, the project team conducted follow-up personalized training sessions to bridge the knowledge and capability gap.

4.7 Process measures to detect impact of implementation on process performance.

VK auditors stated that they found no evidence of documented metrics that would allow management to understand the impact of training and the new system on Central HR and Payroll processes and operations. We would point out that training was conducted by County employees to take advantage of their knowledge of departments and procedures. The added expertise they developed will remain as a resource in the County when the contractors depart. Our metric to assess this training was solicitation of feedback from field payroll clerks and HR managers.

Because there has been significant communication at the department head level about both automated and manual processes, we have confidence that department managers recognize and are planning for the impact of HRIS implementation. In addition to frequent field visits by the project team, stakeholders on the Implementation Oversight Committee (IOC) have met with managers of major departments within recent weeks to assess their readiness and identify any needs for further assistance. This has not been a documentation process so much as an iterative communication process building toward overall readiness. Our metric for assessing whether departments are ready to address systems impacts has been their feedback to the project team.

5.2 Change Management Plan

VK auditors noted the lack of a formal change management plan. The Change Control procedure is documented in Exhibit 1 of the Transition/Implementation Statement of Work, which is part of the Ceridian contract. We chose to continue to use Ceridian's change control process based on our experience with it. The purpose of this process is to manage changes to project scope that could materially affect the success of the project. All change requests are tracked from start to finish on the Project Change Request Log.

At a higher level, change management is a structured approach to change that enables the transition from current state to future state. The management of change during a system implementation includes: communicate vision and roll-out; manage the human landscape plus maintain momentum; and solidify ground made. We accomplish these objectives via the Ceridian Communicator and the reports, meetings and messages from project sponsors on the IOC. The process changes are included in training documentation and the cultural changes are brought into acceptance in departmental management meetings. Evaluation and recognition reinforce the changes. Our processes reflect focused attention to each of these areas, without a separate document.

6.8 Contingency Plan

The VK assessment correctly noted the lack of a formal Contingency Plan. To date we have verbally communicated preliminary contingency plans to the IOC and department heads. Contingency plans were not formally documented when the project was in an earlier phase, in order to prevent those contingencies from becoming reality. However, as we now approach a stage closer to Go Live, we will be documenting a formal Readiness Assessment (which includes Technical and Organizational Assessment and Contingency Plans) with the IOC. This is anticipated to occur within the next week. The documented Readiness Assessment will be shared with officials and department heads for their information and support.

9.4 Test all interfaces

The only interfaces that have not been tested to-date are the ones related to Ceridian Recruiting System and DefBen (a Genesys module for Retirement) since these are neither live nor a priority at this point. They are unit tested but not parallel tested. All other interfaces are tested.

Testing was an extremely high priority after project restart. We converted from sample testing to

testing 100%. This required the use of automated tools to identify discrepancies, which could be audited and verified. Central HR and Payroll validated the manual verification process. The rationale for this approach was to gain their insight on system performance and to give them a better understanding of the system and the audit process that they can follow for auditing day-to-day operations in the future.

10.5 System performance testing conforms to agreed upon Service Levels

System performance testing was conducted and documented in the "Ceridian for Milwaukee County: Application Profile: Infrastructure 08/27/07." It included individual test scripts and focused on transaction performance and response time. In addition, IMSD is testing kiosks and timeclocks.

Key Finding / Conclusion

We appreciate and take very seriously the identification of the need to formally document and assess the criteria for the Go/No Go decision. We are now developing a Readiness Assessment Document for consideration by the IOC. The Readiness Assessment will include Technical Readiness (Ceridian customizations and configuration), Organizational Readiness (employee participation, and central and field HR and payroll processing) and Contingency Plans. The project team and IOC will evaluate readiness by evaluating the completeness of and risk associated with high impact areas identified in the VK Audit Report, i.e., post implementation process documentation, training, testing (including audit and verification) and participation.

Summary

The Audit Department and Virchow Krause outside "snapshot" is much appreciated and has already been invaluable in preparing for full Ceridian implementation.



Rob Henken, Director
Department of Administrative Services



Dennis John
Chief Information Officer, DAS-IMSD

cc: County Executive Scott Walker
Karen R. Jackson, Ph.D., Director of Human Resources
Dennis John, Director, IMSD
Mary Reddin, Deputy Director, IMSD
Sushil Pillai, Ceridian Implementation Project Manager
Scott Manske, Controller
David Arena, Director, Employee Benefits
Ed Eberle, County Executive's Office
Wendy Kraly, IMSD Project Management Officer
Rick Ceschin, County Board Research Analyst
Steve Cady, County Board Fiscal and Budget Analyst
Dee Hervey, County Board Chief Committee Clerk
Jodi Mapp, County Board Committee Clerk