



## EBS ESC/PAC Joint Meeting

**Date:** 3/12/09

**Time:** 3:00 P.M. – 4:00 P.M.

**Location:** EBS West Conference Room

---

### Introduction

The meeting objectives were to make a go live decision and review the contingency options.

### Bureau Concerns

Jennifer Sims told the group that she met with all the bureau directors, sponsors and change agents, for a direct assessment of where they are for go live. She identified what she heard:

1. System readiness
  - o Additional testing and verification. Open issues need to be resolved still from payroll parallel 2 testing.
  - o WRICEF development needs to be completed
2. Communication
  - o We need to hear the results of the testing
  - o Business documentation communicated on the differences with IBIS/SAP
3. Timekeepers training/readiness
  - o Timekeepers need additional time to practice and learn the system
4. Interim time collection process readiness
  - o Bureaus need additional time to educate employees

Jennifer noted that most of the bureaus indicated they need more time to have the confidence that the system is ready. Based on this assessment, Jennifer believed additional time is needed for go live. The ESC/PAC members confirmed to reset the HCM go live date.

### Key Factors for Success

Bruce defined key factors for the success of this Project.

- A plan that is tailored and focused on critical go-live concerns
  - o We need to drive to resolve those concerns, to stay focused
- Scope Containment
  - o This is not the time to open up our scope, very critical we move forward and focus on what needs to be done
- Sustain team morale and energy
  - o Across the City – decisions impact the Project team
- Bureau execution to the plan
  - o Make sure our bureaus can execute the plan
- Project Team execution to the plan
  - o Make sure our Project team can execute the plan

### Critical Decision Criteria

Important criteria to consider when resetting the Project's timeline.

- What bureaus need to be confident
  - o The system is ready and we have solutions that work and the bureau can do time entry and a process is in place for go live

- What project and bureaus have the capacity to do
  - Aware what the project and bureaus can do
- Conversion effort and impact
  - The contingency options introduce new conversion work and impact central bureaus

**Mid Quarter Year-to-Date Conversion**

Kelley talked about the implications of the three extensions for go live. He said ideally you want to implement a new payroll system at the beginning of the year for reporting purposes. When you implement quarterly, year to date conversions are pretty straight forward. However, if you implement the new system mid-quarter, additional development and testing is required, and reconciliation is required by Central Payroll.

He then identified the impact of each extension.

- 1 month extension
  - Requires 1st Quarter results conversion and month-to-date conversion to produce 941 and meet other reporting requirements
  - Must adjust employee conversion
- 2 month extension
  - Requires 1st Quarter results conversion and 2nd quarter month 1 and 2nd quarter month 2 results to produce 941 and meet other reporting requirements
  - Must adjust employee conversion
  - Most complex mid-year requirement
- 3 month extension
  - Requires no change to our tested mid-year year-to-date payroll conversion process (Go-live is on quarter which has completed testing)

**Project Team Activities for each Option**

Bruce provided an overview of the various activities required for each option, and the pros and cons.

**1 Month Activities - very focused on training and ensuring we resolved critical issues**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Critical Job Aids           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Guidelines for A/A &amp; Switches</li> <li>○ Payroll Business Process</li> <li>○ Key Report descriptions</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Training &amp; Communication           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Timekeeper Practice</li> <li>○ Central Bureau education</li> <li>○ IBIS vs SAP Differences</li> <li>○ Parking Lot questions</li> <li>○ FILO Structure</li> <li>○ Support Process Plan</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ System           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Disposition of current issues               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Close with bureaus, define workarounds</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Complete WRICEF               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mid-quarter conversion                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 weeks (Tech &amp; Functional)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Limited additional payroll testing</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pros           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Maintain overall City focus</li> <li>○ Minimize Cost</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Cons           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No additional configuration</li> <li>○ Additional conversion work</li> <li>○ Minimum payroll testing</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
---	--

## 2 Month Activities – the most complex effort

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <b>1 Month activities carry over, plus:</b></li><li>▪ Limited integration testing</li><li>▪ Focused payroll testing</li><li>▪ Mid-quarter conversion x 2<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ 5 weeks (Tech &amp; Functional)</li></ul></li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Pros<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ More testing</li></ul></li><li>▪ Cons<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Significant conversion work</li><li>○ High impact to people</li></ul></li></ul>
---	--

## 3 Month Activities – highest cost but no mid-quarter conversion

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <b>1 &amp; 2 Month activities carry over, plus</b></li><li>▪ Limited requirements configuration changes</li><li>▪ Dress Rehearsal: Time collection thru financial posting</li><li>▪ Focused parallel 3 testing</li><li>▪ Additional classroom Training</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Pros<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Additional configuration</li><li>○ Full dress rehearsal</li><li>○ Least risk</li><li>○ No mid-quarter conversion</li></ul></li><li>▪ Cons<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Highest cost</li><li>○ High impact to people</li><li>○ Conflicts with Year End</li><li>○ Scope containment</li><li>○ Re-training required</li><li>○ Losing project momentum</li></ul></li></ul>
--	--

BHR noted that there is the holiday conversion issue in both 2 and 3 months.

Jennifer reminded everyone that the consensus with bureaus is that we are not very far off – we are on the cusp of being ready – just need a little more time.

### Option Summary

In sum, the three different options look like this:

- 1 Month: Viable if focus is training
- 2 Months: Viable if primary focus is training, limited testing
- 3 Months: Viable if additional requirements, business process rehearsal and more parallel testing is needed.

Jennifer Sims commented that only five bureaus requested more testing, and that was due to business requirements and interfaces.

Ken Rust said that each bureau will need to determine the additional work needed in order to get us there, and then collectively, we need to agree on a new date and push ourselves to succeed.

### What's next

- March 17 at 10:30am
  - The PAC will discuss specific bureau issues and review the options
- March 19, 2009 at 3:00pm
  - The PAC and ESC will meet to recommend a new timeline