UTS Disclosure Log Entry – GIPA2025/01

Provided under s.25 of the NSW Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009.

Date decided:

11/3/2025

Scope of request:

1. UTS's Service Connect Program Post Implementation Review report, 11th June, 2024
2. Monthly minutes of the Service Connect Program (formerly Enterprise Service Management) from August 2021 until December 2024.

ESM STEERING COMMITTEE. Meeting Minutes – 17th February 2022

Date: 17th February 2022
Time: 3PM – 4PM
Venue: B01.04B.12 AND ZOOM (MEETING ID: 85145951580)

GIPA s.3.2

Chair: [redacted]
Minutes by:
Attendees:

Apologies:

	ITEM	INFORMATION	RESPONSIBILITY
1	**Procedural Matters** 1. Welcome and apologies 2. Declaration/Record any relevant material interest 3. Notes & Action Items (for endorsement)		Chair
1.1	Review action items list		Chair
2	**Key Matters**		Chair
2.1	ESM success factors and SteerCo charter	Document – for decision	Chair
2.2	ESM Program background	Presentation – for information	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
2.3	Decision on preferred program scope option	Document – for decision	
2.4	Endorsement of business case structure and approach	Document – for decision	
2.5	Endorsement of governance structure	Document – for decision	
3	**Updates and Other Business (if required)**		
4	**Meeting Finalisation** Confirm action items (owner & timing)		Chair

#	Agenda Item
1	**Welcome and apologies** 1. **GIPA s.3.2 Welcomed the members to the inaugural Steering Committee for 2022 and noted GIPA s.3.2 as an apology.** GIPA s.3.2 introduced ESM program and emphasised its importance to UTS. 2. **Declaration/Record any relevant material interest** There was no conflict of interest raised. 3. **Notes & Action Items (for endorsement)** No Actions for first Steering Committee
2	**Key Matters**
2.1	**ESM success factors and Steering Committee charter** **<u>Changes to the Steering Committee Charter</u>** **Decision**: *1. The following changes to the Charter were approved:* *Modify Responsibilities section as follows:* • Champion the Program across UTS and ensure alignment with UTS 2027. • Alignment of the Program with user needs • Endorsement of Program artefacts including design, procurement, and implementation plan • Scope, budget and schedule variation oversight • Procurement approval within delegation • Risk management oversight • Benefit realisation oversight • Change and communications oversight • Program team capability oversight **<u>Reference Group Delegates</u>** **Action:** *1. Members to nominate delegates for the reference groups to bring decisions into the Steering Committee.*
2.2	**ESM Program background** • GIPA s.3 presented on the background and the current state of the ESM program

#	Agenda Item
2.3	**Decision on preferred program scope option** *(Steering Committee Pack: page 18)* • Program Manager outlined the scope and implementation options (Essential Minimum; Be Nimble, Evolve Quickly; Big Bang) **Decision:** 1. *Steering Committee has endorsed Option 2 (Be Nimble; Evolve Quickly)* 2. *ESM to re-evaluate-assess the next steps at the end of the year in terms of roadmap and approach.* 3. *HCD key feature – incorporate lessons learnt internally and finding a good mix*
2.4	**Endorsement of business case structure and approach** *(Steering Committee Pack: page 26)* **Decision:** 1. *In the business case ESM program to provide a calculation for option 1 as well (calculating and articulating the benefit impact provided by option 2 compared to option 1).* **Action:** 1. GIPA s.3.2 *to share business case template with ESM before 3rd March 2022.* 2. *Develop an Engagement and Communication Plan, in which consider the potential need for changing the program's name from "Enterprise Service Management" to an engaging name.*
2.5	**Endorsement of governance structure** **Decision:** 1. *Defer to next Steering Committee*
4	**Meeting Closed – 16:01** **Next Meetings – 24th March, 28th April**

Quick Links

- Steering Committee Documents
- Steering Committee Decisions Register
- Steering Committee Actions Register

ESM STEERING COMMITTEE. Meeting Minutes – 5th April 2022

Date: 5th April 2022
Time: 1.30pm – 2.30pm
Venue: B01.04B.12 AND ZOOM (MEETING ID: 89992748594)

GIPA s.3.2

Chair: [redacted]
Minutes by: [redacted]
Attendees: [redacted]

Apologies:

	ITEM	RESPONSIBILITY
1	**Procedural Matters** 1. Welcome and apologies 2. Declaration/Record any relevant material interest	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
1.1	Acceptance of previous Minutes	
1.2	Review of Action Items	
1.3	ESM Program Progress Report	
2	**For Endorsement/ Decision**	
2.1	Program Initiation Brief and 2022 Roadmap	
2.2	Program Governance Model v1.1	
2.3	Decision Paper on Program Name Change	
3	**For Information**	
3.1	Benchmarking Matrix Summary	
3.2	HCD Framework (SDX) Project Outcome	
3.3	Communication Approach	
4	**Other Business**	Chair

#	Agenda Item
1	**Welcome and apologies** 1. GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Welcomed the members to the second Steering Committee for 2022 2. Declaration/Record any relevant material interest There was no conflict of interest raised
1.1	**Previous Minutes** 1. Recorded as true and accurate
1.2	**Review of Action Items** 1. Action items noted as complete
1.3	**ESM Program Progress Report** ***Action***: *1. Program to include a financial forecast in future status updates.* *2. Consider resolving the scope overlap by aligning ERP and ESM Program sequence to get ESM up first; that will provide quick wins for staff experience, freeing up people's time to work on the ERP program.* *3. The Program Manager to capture risks around the end of the year go-live. Alternative delivery plan to rule out January as a potential go-live date due to the annual leaves.* *4. The Business Case decision will be a stage gate for the Program. The Program Manager will present the initial Business Case at the next Steering Committee meeting (21st April), and she will report the updates and new findings every month with further iterations and learnings.* *5. The business case will be approved by the Steering Committee and* GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]*, as the CIO, will action the release of funds into ITPMO*
2	**For Endorsement/ Decision**
2.1	**Program Initiation Brief and 2022 Roadmap** ***Decision:*** *1. The Steering Committee has provided the below suggestions on how to improve the ITCMP ESM Program Brief for circulation by 8th April for approval.* **Scope** • Highlight that the MCU structure is designed on having a hubs capability • Highlight that ServiceNow will be ultimately a Management Information System, tracking and capturing data informing policy, strategy, queries -

#	Agenda Item
	addresses the need to understand the governance inputs and how to manage the privacy related issues • Include that, these are the areas we are working on subject to the application of the prioritisation matrix **Project description:** • Include current challenges/ problems, deliverables and objectives supporting a digital transformation • Articulate the objective and framing the description what the Program will cover, including that the platform will support a digital culture and a paperless application **Solution scope:** • Provide more clarity on the deliverables i.e.: ITSM will provide a, b & c, process charts, single licenced platform which will cut down wording on development capabilities **Assumptions:** • Include assumptions regarding the integration cost (considered in the budget) • Clarify the expectation from the UPMO regarding the standardised methodology, enhancing program documents and templates. Standardise process across all programs **Benefits:** • Remove Recognition and reputation - remove Leading public university of technology • Include the staff experience and user benefits: outputs to be easier, quicker and better • Detailing the processes that will provide capacity to implement continuous improvement to deliver both financial and nonfinancial benefits • Provide clarity in the on single pain for staff experience, how we sequence and minimise overlap • The platform will provide a wide range of services for the university, expensive platform, decision/ consideration to me made if too expensive for what we need • Clarify the scope for the end of year release: implement ITSM and ESM capabilities, service catalogue for business services / core processes identified by the business units ***Action item:*** *1. Steering Committee to endorse the initiation brief out of session to release initial funding* *2. Include Prioritisation Matrix in the next Steering Committee Pack*

#	Agenda Item
2.2	**Program Governance Model v1.1** ***Decision***: 1. *The Steering Committee has provided the below suggestions in how to improve the Governance Model for circulation by the 8th April for approval.* • Adjust the Governance slide to provide clarity on the hierarchy • User Reference Group at the top, SteerCo at the bottom • Move "Decision Making, Control and Assurance Functions" to ITU PMO
2.3	**Decision Paper on Program Name Change** ***Decision:*** 1. *The Steering Committee asked the Program to decide on the name change and bring it back to the Steering Committee for endorsement. No specific option was endorsed.*
3	**For Information**
3.1	Benchmarking Matrix Summary
3.2	HCD Framework (SDX) Project Outcome
3.3	Communication Approach
4	**Meeting Closed** – 15.33 **Next Meetings** – 28th April 2022

Quick Links

- Steering Committee Documents
- Steering Committee Decisions Register
- Steering Committee Actions Register

ESM STEERING COMMITTEE. Meeting Minutes – 4th May 2022

Date:	4th May 2022
Time:	10.00am – 11.00am
Venue:	B01.04B.12 AND ZOOM (MEETING ID: 89992748594)
Chair:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
Minutes by:	
Attendees:	
Apologies:	

	ITEM	RESPONSIBILITY
1	**Procedural Matters** 1. Welcome and apologies 2. Declaration/Record any relevant material interest	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
1.1	Acceptance of previous Minutes	
1.2	Review of Action Items	
1.3	ESM Program Progress Report	
2	**For Endorsement/ Decision**	
2.1	ESM Program Business Case	
4	**Other Business**	

#	Agenda Item
1	**Welcome and apologies** 1. GIPA s.3.2 Welcomed the members to the third Steering Committee for 2022 2. Declaration/Record any relevant material interest There was no conflict of interest raised
1.1	**Previous Minutes** 1. Recorded as true and accurate
1.2	**Review of Action Items** 1. Action items noted as complete 2. ID-5 – ESM/ ERP Scope Overlap in progress ***Note:*** *Initiation brief has been approved by the Steering Committee - GIPA s.3.2 to progress*
1.3	**ESM Program Progress Report** ***Call outs:*** **Program Scope:** • GIPA s.3.2 confirmed that the Initiation Brief specifies the scope **ESM and ERP Program scope overlap:** • ESM and ERP are communicating extensively and aligning, but the lack of enterprise-level architecture remains an issue that needs to be resolved as a priority. • ITU has started an RFQ process to resolve the issue and ensure the development of an enterprise-level blueprint clarifying the role and function of the Neo replacement system, ServiceNow and Salesforce. • The SC emphasised the need for clearly communicating the benefits of the ESM and ERP Program to Faculty General Managers and the Operations Group. **Service Model:** • The Steering Committee agreed on the importance of the service model as the primary driver of the transformation. ***Decision:*** *1. At the next Steering Committee meeting, add the review of the Risk and Issues Register to the agenda.* ***Action:*** *1. Separate out the Risks and Issues in the program status update report*
2	**For Endorsement/ Decision**
2.1	**ESM Program Business Case** ***Call outs:*** **Benefits:**

#	Agenda Item
	• The SC acknowledged the clear communication on intentions and anticipated benefits. It was acknowledged that the benefits are initially non-financial but critical to enable future improvement. • UTS has very little baseline data, and it is one of the last universities to do enterprise service management. Having a proper ESM platform in place would support audit and control processes. • The $1.3M is a productivity gain that needs to be removed from financial benefits in the Business Case document **Costs:** • The (sunk) costs of not progressing with the ServiceNow platform need to be estimated • Ensuring the program is adequately resourced • The licencing costs in cost estimation are annual, as stated in the cost Assumptions section **Quality of the Business case:** • The Steering Committee appreciated the level of detail in the business case, appendix of document links and the clarity to understand the document ***Decision:*** 1. *The Program determines the SME resource requirements and develops a cost impact calculation for funding SME involvement in the ESM Program. Determine backfill requirements.* 2. *Program to remove $1.3M from the financial benefits and include it as a productivity gain* 3. *Provide more information in the business case about the platform choice and determine a stage-gate when UTS is best positioned to decide about a change in the ITSM/ESM platform and move away from ServiceNow due to its high-priced licencing costs.* 4. *Approval to commence work on the Service Model* 5. *The Steering Committee has requested the below updates to represent the Business Case by the end of May;* ***Action item:*** 1. GIPA s.3.2 *– Share the benefits canvas* 2. *ERP/ ESM Discussion offline* 3. *Program manager to distribute Lessons Learned findings and recordings to the Steering Committee*
4	**Meeting Closed** – 11.02am **Next Meetings** – 26th May 2022

Quick Links

- Steering Committee Documents
- Steering Committee Decisions Register
- Steering Committee Actions Register

ESM STEERING COMMITTEE. Meeting Minutes – 26th May 2022

Date: 26th May 2022
Time: 10.00am – 11.00am
Venue: CB01.04A.26 AND ZOOM (MEETING ID: 84945453332)

Chair: GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
Minutes by:
Attendees:

Apologies:

	ITEM	RESPONSIBILITY
1	**Procedural Matters**	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
1.1	1. Welcome and apologies 2. Declaration/Record any relevant material interest	
1.2	Acceptance of previous Minutes	
1.3	Review of Action Items	
1.4	ESM Program Progress Report	
2	**For Endorsement/ Decision**	
2.1	ESM Program Business Case	
3	**For Information**	
3.1	ESM Service Model and Solution Design	GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]
4	**Other Business**	

#	Agenda Item
1	**Procedural Matters**
1.1	**Welcome and apologies** 1. GIPA s.3.2 Welcomed the members to the third Steering Committee for 2022 2. Declaration/Record any relevant material interest There was no conflict of interest raised
1.2	**Previous Minutes** 1. Recorded as true and accurate
1.3	**Review of Action Items** 1. Action items noted as none outstanding
1.4	**ESM Program Progress Report** Program Manager provided a summary of the progress for ESM highlighting ITSM inclusion in the business case, Service Model Design stream onboarding of Deloitte kicking off Friday. ***Call outs:*** • The Domain is looking for an 80% increase in funding for the year. Portfolio manager will be conducting workshops for project managers to drill down forecasting. • Prioritisation of streams has not been made. Service Model Design engage all inscope teams to work with Deloitte understanding high level functional services. The Workflow workstream to review the legacy workflows and the 77 critical services identified by the delegate group will help in understanding the priorisiation. • Licencing costs are an operational cost. The costs are included in the program for the first year before moving to an operational cost. ServcieNow has different modules which need appropriate securities eg: HR and Finance. • UTS practice for new projects cost for software as a service is paid out of the project in order to give finance time to factor into central overheads budget.
2	**For Endorsement/ Decision**
2.1	**ESM Program Business Case** The Chair acknowledged that the business case has been presented after 6 weeks of consultation. Would like to get to a position to endorse a provisional business case which include a contingency of 20%. ***Call outs:*** • GIPA s.3.2 made slight changes, this platform is about digitisation of business in UTS. This platform has the potential to digitise all processes across the university. Should not underestimate the transformational power of this program.

#	Agenda Item

	• Benefits are not financially quantified, cost benefit analysis to justifty the considerable expense
	• Other organisations, difficulty developing business case to justify the investment
	• Its a common challenge when processes are immature, there are no baseline measures to work from
	• We are not releasing funds unchecked to the program, there are gate checks in place at milestones
	• 30 is not about technology platform, about organisational restructure in shared services
	• Capture more quantitively benefits with the HCD element
	• Evaluation strategy and how to investigate the benefits
	• Indicative savings of time from current workflow process vs new workflow in ServiceNow
	• Inclusion of Research and Academic Management
	• Communications benefits in keeping people informed, will provide an opportunity to build on this
	• Academic Programs Office to ensure they are in-scope
	• Discovery workshops with Deloitte and Prioritisation matrix will determine the groups brought into the scope of the program
	• Professional services delivery and reprioritise processes for, quick wins eg: APO
	• Acceptance of the immediate software costs
	• On completion of the model we have a milestone where we have a "go no-go" view in terms of scope for the program
	• Deloitte have 2 phases of the work
	  o Phase 1 - Service Model & Operating Model
	  o Phase 2 - Solution Design
	• Report against milestones approach to help understanding risks and issues
	• DISC - authority for reallocation of ITCMP funds
	• Resourcing a huge risk given Enterprise Architecture not in place
	
	Decision:
	1. *The Steering Committee notes that this is a provisional business case, continue to develop document in costs and benefits with a quarterly review*
	2. *The Steering Committee has expressed the lack of confidence in the phasing of the program*
	3. *The Steering Committee acknowledges there is re-phasing occurring in ITCMP as a result of market constraints and the rebalancing and therefore the phasing of the program may change and submission taken to DISC may not reflect what is indicated here*
	4. *The Steering Committee supports the provisional business case for the ICTMP 2.9m for ESM + $492,000 for ITSM spend, with the following suggested inclusions in the Benefits;*
	  o *Discovery assessment/ Prioritisation Matrix (77 critical services -1.2m annually)*
	  o *The Vendor estimation 30m slide*
	  o *A proxy of the vendor*
	  o *A proxy of productivity*

#	Agenda Item
	Action item: 1. *Program manager to submit revised business case to the Chair by COB Friday 27th May for decision* 2. *Communications to Stakeholder Management Plan* 3. *The Steering Committee has expressed severe doubts in the phasing of the program due to market constraints and competing programs – Add into Issues log*
3	**For Infomation**
3.1	ESM Service Model and Solution Design - Deloitte
4	**Any Other Business** • Approximate spend for implementing ServiceNow at Western Sydney was 12.5m over 3 years • Communications to staff - do not overpromise and under deliver, explain clearly to staff where the ESM program is **Agenda 23rd June**: 1. Communications to Stakeholder Management Plan 2. Risks and Issues review
4	**Meeting Closed** – 10.56am **Next Meetings** – 23rd June 2022

Quick Links

- Steering Committee Documents
- Steering Committee Decisions Register
- Steering Committee Actions Register

ESM STEERING COMMITTEE. Meeting Minutes – 14th July 2022

Date:	14th July 2022
Time:	3.00 – 4.00 pm
Venue:	CB01.04B.12 AND ZOOM (MEETING ID: 88105764403)
Chair:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
Minutes by:	[redacted]
Attendees:	[redacted]
Apologies:	[redacted]

Agenda

	ITEM	RESPONSIBILITY
1	**Procedural Matters**	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
1.1	1. Welcome and apologies 2. Declaration/Record any relevant material interest	[redacted]
1.2	Acceptance of previous Minutes	[redacted]
1.3	Review of Action Items	[redacted]
1.4	ESM Program Progress Report	[redacted]
2	**For Information**	[redacted]
2.1	Western Sydney Demo – Lessons Learned	[redacted]
2.2	ESM Governance Model	[redacted]
2.3	ESM Communication Approach	[redacted]
2.3	ESM Service Model and Solution Design	GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]
4	**Other Business**	

#	Agenda Item
1	**Procedural Matters**
1.1	**Welcome and apologies** 1. GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Welcomed new members to the Steering Committee and noted apologies o Introduced GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] and Interim ESM Program Director 2. Declaration/Record any relevant material interest There was no conflict of interest raised
1.2	**Previous Minutes** **Discussion:** • Endorsement of current scope for the inflight projects including delivery of Platform Reset, Service Design Lab and Service Model and Solution Design • Business case endorsed and budget approved on milestone basis • Do not have a rigourous change process within ITPMO – change scope or cost • Back filling roles – recognise both programs would finance backfilling required. • The Business case forecasted 0.5 FTE (GIPA s.3.3 [redacted] for 3 months for each in-scope business units • Steering Committees are managed in different ways – opportunity of the UPMO and ITPMO to streamline

1.3	**Review of Action Items**
	1. Scope alignment with ERP in progress
	    o ESM/ ERP weekly alignment meetings internally and with vendors
	    o Collaboration between Deloitte and KPMG – what materials they can share
	    o ERP attending ESM Deloitte workshops for People and Finance
	2. Business Case – Complete with monthly review if changes made
	
	***Action**:*
	1. Include Due Dates in the Action log
	2. Prepare paper on management of risk and scope alignment for ESM / ERP

1.4 **ESM Program Progress Report**

Program Manager provided a summary of the progress for ESM to date.

- Platform Reset – implementation of ITSM and ESM Design (technical stream)
- Service Design Lab – Non-IT workflows in legacy instance
- Service Model and Solution Design – Deloitte

Deloitte

- Phase 1 – Due for completion
- Phase 2 – Solution Design and MVP

Financial Update

- Spend for June is not reflected due to a delay in Project Connect, includes licencing and Deloitte invoicing
- Current funding authorised till mid-August, official authorisation required to move forward (Digital Initiative Steering Committee – DISC)
- GIPA s.3.2 re-negotiating Deloitte contract
- RFQ documents issued to vendors on the 11th July and evaluation is in progress for the Platform Reset project – ITSM implementation

Call outs:

- Contractual commitments till end of 2022 need to be reported at the next Steering Committee meeting. Additional ask of $5.1m (inclusive 20% contingency) – needs to be forecasted based on actual spending in 2022.
- SC Pack to include workstream-specific deliverables *(refer action: 17)*
- Ongoing support for ServiceNow and critical risk of ITSM to be completed by year end
- The Steering Committee needs to have visibility of the critical path for the program. (*refer action: 2),* clarity in the program where the float is placed, maturing the risk management *(refer action: 10)*
- Reset the program in recognition of the Service Model Design workshops findings, with clarified MVP scope, and feasible delivery timeline, continue targeting the end of 2022 delivery.
- Using the experience of other universities and their journeys

***Actions due 29th July 2022**:*

1. GIPA s.3.2 *- Redistribute core artefacts to the Steering Committee, including Feasibility Brief (Share project timelines with* GIPA s.3.2 *and* GIPA s.3.2 *by Tuesday)*
2. GIPA s.3.2 *- In a format of a quick reference site, provide access to the detailed plan that shows the dependencies and the critical path. Share on an on-going basis.*
3. *Updated Business Case to next Steering Committee – Costing section*
4. GIPA s.3.2 - Outline the current financial contractual obligations and assess committed funding – Go/No go decision driven by program reset proposal
5. GIPA s.3.2 *- Utilise the UPMO template for SteerCo Progress Report*
6. GIPA s.3.2 *- Present budget in simplified version to understand all commitments*
7. GIPA s.3.2 *- Provide proposal for the MVP scope with cost estimates*

8. GIPA s.3.2 - *Continue with Deloitte's scoped worked and bring back the updated cost plan to the next steering committee to endorse the release of required funding*
9. GIPA s.3.2 - *to take action on supporting application resourcing post MVP go-live (planning an interim structure)*
10. GIPA s.3.2 – *Review of program management, risks and program reporting*
11. GIPA s.3.2 – *Develop ERP / ESM Alignment Framework*
12. GIPA s.3.2 – *Detailed program scope walkthrough for the Steering Committee*
13. GIPA s.3.2 – *Business Case monthly review at the Steering Committee*
14. GIPA s.3.2 – *Provide report on the program change process with a view of allocated and spend to date*
15. GIPA s.3.2 – *Run program risk workshops leveraging the IT risk matrix and in co-ordination with the UPMO and ITPMO for process improvement opportunities (*GIPA s.3.2
16. GIPA s.3.2 – *Include a high risk (now an issue) around funding running out in August in the program risks and issues register*
17. GIPA s.3.2 - *Program Reset Proposal including the following subject to detailed planning and resourcing (ongoing):*
    a. *Workstream descriptions*
    b. *Deliverables by stream*
    c. *Activities to do*
    d. *Detailed Program Plan*
    e. *Dependencies*
    f. *Financial view (mapped against budget), including base financial requirements and minimum plan required to achieve*
    g. *Program Roadmap*
    h. *Critical path*
    i. *Decisions required by the Steering Committee*

#	Agenda Item
2	**For Information**
2.1	**Western Sydney Demonstration – Lessons Learned**
2.1	**ESM Governance Model**
2.2	**ESM Communication Approach**
2.3	**ESM Service Model and Solution Design - Deloitte**
4	**Any Other Business:** 1. *Present the program communications plan, including program narrative and stakeholder engagement plan summary to the Steering Committee (*GIPA s.3.2*)* 2. GIPA s.3.2 *– Create an action to invite Deloitte to present their deliverables to the PSC at the appropriate juncture* 3. GIPA s.3.2 *– Broader than just ESM, a discussion from a portfolio prioritisation view of CASS, ESM, ERP with risks, future investment and CAPEX / OPEX options* 4. GIPA s.3.2 *–Discussion around progressing a CR with the IT PMO (*GIPA s.3.2*). ITCMP and DISC* **Steering Committee, Pack and Agenda Updates (**GIPA s.3.2 **/** GIPA s.3.2 1. *Extend SteerCo to 90-120 minutes to allow sufficient time for agenda items on an as required basis.* 2. *Arrange the steering committee meetings around key decision points* 3. *Bring next SteerCo forward to get a view of where we are and frame decisions on what needs pausing or moving forward – target two weeks (subject to reset planning)* 4. *Provide list of members upfront in the pack for "roll call" purposes* 5. *Insert slide numbering into the pack* 6. *Include a future business list for the PSC in the minutes, packs and meeting invitations* 7. *Include an appendix with RAID directory* 8. *Change Steering Committee agenda to (*GIPA s.3.2 a. *Update* b. *Risks & Issues* c. *Decisions* d. *FYI*
4	**Meeting Closed** – 4.04pm **Next Meetings –** • 04/08/2022 – 3.00pm (CB01.04B.12) • 10/08/2022 - 10.00am (CB01.19.15) • 13/09/2022 - 10.00am (CB01.19.15)

Quick Links

- Steering Committee Documents
- Steering Committee Decisions Register
- Steering Committee Actions Register

ESM Program Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting – 17 Aug 2022

Date:	17 August 2022
Time:	2.00 - 3:00 pm
Location:	Zoom / CB01.04A.026_Boardroom
Chair:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
Minutes by:	
Attendees:	
Apologies:	
	[Link to the presented Steering Committee Pack]()

Actions

Action	Owner	Due date
Actions to be recorded in a consolidated actions register defining: *Details of the action / Date recorded / Forum / Due Date / Owner*	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]	Complete
IT Operating Model to be removed from the Organisational ITU Alignment issue		Complete
Cost forecast to be updated in line with the refocus plan		31 Aug
Liaise with the DW Portfolio Manager regarding the updated cost forecast (factoring in the endorsed refocus plan) **and the variance between the endorsed funding for 2022 to ensure to carry over the variance to 2023. Unused contingency to be transferred back to the pool.**		Complete
Project Briefs to be updated in line with the refocus plan		24 Oct
Forward Business list *(Upcoming decision points slide)* **needs to be updated with reflective upcoming Steering Committee meeting dates**		Complete
Update proposed roadmaps with explicit reference to the transition from a program delivery model to a product management model		24 Oct
Highlight the status of the deliverables (with traffic lights) on deliverables list, roadmaps, and timelines		24 Oct
Recut Program Plan aligning Projects and Workstreams and including a Milestone Schedule for the PSC		Complete
Include stakeholder workload expectations as part of Stakeholder Engagement Plan though a stakeholder involvement forecast		24 Oct
Review current activities, resources and resource loading to align with the new Program Refocus Roadmap		28 Nov

ESM Program Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting – 17 Aug 2022

Action	Owner	Due date
Update Business Case aligned with the endorsed refocus plan.	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]	28 Nov
Present detailed plan and activities for the Stakeholder Engagement Plan and broader Change Strategy		Complete
Provide a detailed list of activities undertaken by the ESM Senior Change Manager		19 Aug
Fortnightly meetings to be scheduled up until the end of October		26 Aug
Target uplift state for IT service delivery pack		24 Oct

Decisions

1. **ESM Program Refocus Plan**
   - The ESM Program Refocus Plan was endorsed. Further planning is required for a detailed implementation plan, cost forecast and resource estimation.
2. **ESM Pilot/MVP Program Governance Model**
   - GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] was appointed as ESM Platform Owner / Technology Owner.
   - GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] and GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] were appointed as ESM Pilot Business Owners. They will have delegated authority to make "business owner" decisions for the ESM Program in the Pilot phase.
3. **Liaison with the UPMO / ITPMO regarding dependencies with other strategic initiatives**
   - Dependencies with other strategic initiatives need to be assessed with the UPMO / ITPMO, and a shared communication strategy needs to be built for ERP/ESM. GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] is co-ordinating ERP/ESM alignment activities.
4. **Steering Committee meeting frequency and packs**
   - Fortnightly PSC meetings to be scheduled to support high-cadence decision-making.
   - Packs to be simplified for the upcoming PSC meetings. Screenshots, copies and attachments from working documents will be included (e.g., screenshots from MS Project (Milestone Plan and Critical path) or Project Connect) to reduce the time invested in creating PSC packs in the future.
5. **Operationalise the service design and build process**
   - The PSC reiterated the intention to focus on operationalising the service design and build process (Service Delivery Team) after the MVP stage to move from a delivery program to a product management model to optimise the benefits and costs for UTS.
   - The transition from program delivery and product management model needs to be emphasized on the roadmap (slides 10, 13).
6. **Messaging about the Program**
   - ESM messaging and narrative about implementation need to be aligned with the ERP Program. GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] is co-ordinating ERP/ESM communication activities.

ESM Program Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting – 17 Aug 2022

Updates not included in the Pack

1. **Jira Licences**
    - GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] provided an update regarding the resolution actions to secure Jira licences for the ESM Program. GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] confirmed that the currently available Jira licenses will sufficiently cover the Program's needs until October 2022. From October, Jira cloud will become available for UTS.
2. **Target state for IT service delivery.**
    - GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] is working on a pack outlining the "Target uplift state for IT service delivery", including IT Service Management and the Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL), which will be ready for initial review by the Program Team and other relevant stakeholders by the 26th of August.
3. **ESM Program Director appointment**
    - GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] provided an update on the recruitment of the ESM Program Director (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]), who will join UTS from the 7th of September 2022. He will take over all ESM activities that are currently assigned to GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] following a transition period.
4. **Business Case 2023**
    - Opportunity to set baseline measures as part of the Pilot to collect data to inform the next iteration of the Business Case.

ESM Program Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting – 7th October 2022

Date: 7th October 2022

Time: 1.00 - 2:30 pm

Location: Zoom / CB01.04A.026_Boardroom

Chair: GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]

Minutes by:

Attendees:

Apologies:

Link to the presented Steering Committee Pack

WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

1. GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Welcomed new members to the Steering Committee and noted apologies
   - GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] in attendance who will be replacing GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
   - GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] in attendance who will be replacing GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
   - Welcome to GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] as ESM Program Director
   - Welcome to GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] joining the Steering Committee

ACTIONS

Action	Owner	Due date
Cost forecast updated in line with the go-to-green plan	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]	18 Nov
Project Briefs updated in line with the go-to-green plan		27 Oct
Highlight the status of the deliverables (with traffic lights) on deliverables list, roadmaps, and timelines		18 Nov
Include business workload / effort expectations as part of Stakeholder Engagement Plan though a stakeholder involvement forecast		14 Dec
Share the ITU target state uplift for IT service delivery pack to the SC by next session.		18 Nov
Provide analysis into the impacts of the absence of an overarching ESM strategy and present a view of what options UTS has to mitigate any impacts.		18 Nov
ESM Program to adopt UPMO templates and guidance as it emerges.		Ongoing

ESM Program Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting – 7th October 2022

Action	Owner	Due date
Create and distribute a slide setting out a mapping between outcomes and investment to date	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]	Completed 7 Oct
Provide a clear view of total cost for FY23		18 Nov
Procurement - RFQ Pre-Market review session with GIPA s.3.2 [redacted].		Completed 13 Oct
Procurement – ensure that we have business representation on the RFQ evaluation panel to select a design and implementation partner.		27 Oct
Change Management - Confirm that the stakeholder management plan nominates individuals within the program as the relationship manager for every identified stakeholder. *I can confirm this is being actively managed; refer to slide 11* [here](#)		Completed 13 Oct
Change Management – Liaise with GIPA s.3 [redacted] Faculty Working Group comprising of SME's. GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] *Working Together level. WIP*		27 Oct
Establish an ESM Reference Group representing a cross section of academics and professionals that gives every decision authenticity and credibility as an academic-orientated program.		27 Oct
Start planning for an ESM presentation to ULT with mock-ups of the portal and platform. A suggestion was made to tap into what other Universities have launched.		TBC
The ESM BA to continue work on building glossary of terms including service, process, transaction and form; along with roles such as service owner, platform owner, business owner and process owner - to translate these terms into authority description, function and responsibility. It was established that the ESM & ERP Glossary of Terms is not specific-enough to ESM and unfit for this purpose.		Ongoing

ESM Program Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting – 7th October 2022

ITEMS FOR DECISION

Decision Register

1. ESM Program Funding for Next Tranche

Discussion:

GIPA s.3.2 - Not clear on what program is going to cost and at this point
GIPA s.3.2 – The program (as scoped) is currently at 20% from an earned value standpoint

GIPA s.3.2 - Business case is need of adjustment to reflect the new Release-orientated structure operationalising in 12 months from a program over 3 years.
GIPA s.3.2 - Anticipates that by this time next year, the Release #1 will be finishing, with Release #2 close behind.
GIPA s.3.2 – The vendor will need to flesh out the unknowns when they commence

GIP A – How confident are we in completing Release #1 in 12 months?
GIPA s.3.2 - Decisions and options on impacts with resourcing and stakeholder engagement are required. The program will need to forecast the expected effort required from each business unit.
GIPA s.3.2 – Ensure we have contingencies built-in, we need a better view of final costings to progress the program into BAU.
GIPA s.3.2 – Gave consideration to the impacts and consequences of not continuing with the program, with a focus on the symptoms and systemic issues that will continue to exist and in many cases worsen (refer: Deloitte Executive Summary - slide 23/3), around how we digitise the university and how it transacts. An opportunity to rethink the operating model, as many business units currently have little or no operational / performance data to rely upon.

GIPA s.3.2 – Indicated need to move forward, and invest now to get a clear view
GIPA s.3.2 – Go ahead with at least one platform such as ITSM and then we can and better understand the next horizon.
GIP A s.3.2 – Commented that we have little option than to move ahead with a fit for purpose ServiceNow platform for current and future services. There will be options throughout the rollout to refine and better navigate.
GIPA s.3.2 – agreed that the upgrade of ITSM has to happen
GIPA s.3.2 – Asked what other alternatives does UTS have than Service Now? Referenced the liaison with 5 other universities who have implemented the platform, GIPA s.3.4 advises that this is best of breed platform. Another platform will be considered sub-standard industry-wide.
It will be important to get the split between ESM/ ERP relationships and architecture right

GIP A s.3.2 – Release #1 currently looks able to make the architectural and business decisions and there is time to work on them once partner is on board. Nothing currently doing in proposed scope that precludes any business decisions, not blocking any future threats

Decision:

- *The ESM Program funding plan for next tranche (end 2022) was endorsed.*
  Subject to completion of Project Briefs and an endorsement of turn-around strategy will support additional funding as indicated on slide 8.

2. ESM Go-To-Green Plan

Discussion:

GIPA s.3.2 – Release cycle, streams – once in place and the program has delivered all Releases, must be built and flow continuous into BAU.

GIPA s.3.2 - Endorse the idea of working collaboratively to ensuring we fund and resource that collaboration.
GIPA s.3.2 - Modelled on cohesion and working with the business, including the change team

GIPA s.3.2 – Release #1 Legacy Forms, have they been underestimated? The data collected on forms does not look accurate
GIPA s.3.2 - 200 services coming onto the platform, are we business ready to do this? As we have no business process management culture in place.
GIPA s.3.2 – Without the knowledge framework and business process management we are relying on system implementation partners here to blend with our internal capabilities and engage our business units for best practice.
GIPA s.3.2 – Our capabilities will build iteratively, deliverables for Release #1 will inform Releases #2, #3, and so on.

Decision:

- *The ESM Steering Committee endorsed the Go-To-Green Plan.*

---

3. ESM Stakeholder Engagement Plan Summary

Discussion:

GIPA s.3.2 – "Academic at the Centre" - identified a need for a standing reference group to give what we are doing credibility and authenticity.
GIP A – Happy to chair Faculty Working Group of SME's
GIP A s 3 2 – We should present a mock-up or showcase of a real solution to ULT. It would be good to tap into what Universities have launched.
GIPA s.3.2 – We should be mindful of the language used when consulting with faculties eg: 'we saved you 3 people'

GIPA s.3.2 – Will there be a senior business partner for each area?
GIPA s.3.2 - Validated resourcing in Release 1

GIPA s.3.2 – Echo the idea of having orientation towards the user/ professional staff in the faculty as well as academics is critical. Ensuring HCD is incorporated.

Decision:

- *The ESM Steering Committee endorsed the Engagement Plan Summary*

  Subject to inclusion of a Reference Group for the program (60% Academic 40% Professional staff). Ensuring right reference group structure covering people in academic and professional groups, feeding into the communication piece messaging communicating benefits that is meaningful in a show and tell approach.

---

4. ESM Procurement Approach

Discussion:

GIPA s.3.2 - Pre-approved panel of vendors for delivering ESM Services (combination of big 4 and mid-tier) Vendors have worked in partnership previously with implementation previously at other universities

GIPA s.3.2 - Do we use a separate market approach for each release? Structuring the procurement appropriately

GIPA s.3.2 - Preference is to use one vendor for the program's entirety. Massive overhead and complexities to go market every time. We also have the option of setting up a 'prime' structure.

GIPA s.3.2 – Some of the big 4 are very strong in setting up frameworks and services models, then partner with other agencies who specialise in implementation and build.

Decision:

- *The ESM Steering Committee endorsed the Procurement Approach.*
  Noting preference is to use one vendor to deliver remainder of the program.
  Pre-Market approach discussion week commencing 10th October to define preferences.

OTHER BUSINESS

Next Meetings:

- 18/11/2022 | 2.00 pm
- 12/12/2022 | 11.00 am

UTS

ENTERPRISE SERVICE MANAGEMENT (ESM)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING
18/11/2022

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the ESM Program Steering Committee meeting held on Friday 18th November 2022 from 2:00pm to 3:00pm at CB01.04B.12 Boardroom and via Zoom.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	

	ACTIONS	Owner	Due	Status
1	Cost forecast updated in line with the go-to-green plan.	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]	18 Nov 22	Completed
2	Project Briefs updated in line with the go-to-green plan.	[redacted]	27 Oct 22	Completed
3	Highlight the status of the deliverables (with traffic lights) on deliverables list, roadmaps, and timelines.	[redacted]	16 Dec 22	WIP with UPMO
4	Include business workload / effort expectations as part of Stakeholder Engagement Plan though a stakeholder involvement forecast	[redacted]	10 Feb 22	Available post- vendor onboarding
5	Share the ITU target state uplift for IT service delivery pack to the SC by next session.	[redacted]	12 Dec 22	Tabled for Next SC
6	Provide analysis into the impacts of the absence of an overarching ESM strategy and present a view of what options UTS has to mitigate any impacts.	[redacted]	12 Dec 22	Tabled for Next SC
7	ESM Program to adopt UPMO templates and guidance as it emerges.	[redacted]	Ongoing	Completed
8	Create and distribute a slide setting out a mapping between outcomes and investment to date.	[redacted]	7 Oct 22	Completed
9	Provide a clear view of total cost for FY23	[redacted]	18 Nov 22	Completed
10	Procurement - RFQ Pre-Market review session with GIPA s.3.2 [redacted].	[redacted]	13 Oct 22	Completed

UTS

11	Procurement – ensure that we have business representation on the RFQ evaluation panel to select a design and implementation partner.	GIPA s.3.2	27 Oct 22	Completed
12	Change Management - Confirm that the stakeholder management plan nominates individuals within the program as the relationship manager for every identified stakeholder. *I can confirm this is being actively managed; refer to slide 11* here		Completed 13 Oct 22	Completed
13	Change Management – Liaise with GIPA s.3 Faculty Working Group comprising of SME's. GIPA s.3.2 *Working Together level. WIP*		27 Oct 22	Completed (WT)
14	Establish an ESM reference Group representing a cross section of academics and professionals that gives every decision authenticity and credibility as an academic-orientated program.		2 Feb 23	WIP (involving UPMO and build WT ToR)
15	Start planning an experiential ESM presentation to ULT with mock-ups of the portal and platform. A suggestion was made to tap into what other Universities have launched.		TBC	In Progress (reached out to SNOW)
16	The ESM BA to continue work on building glossary of terms including service, process, transaction and form; along with roles such as service owner, platform owner, business owner and process owner - to translate these terms into authority description, function and responsibility. It was established that the ESM & ERP Glossary of Terms is not specific-enough to ESM and unfit for this purpose.		24 Jan 23	In Progress
17	Work with the UPMO to build up the portfolio glossary. Eg: Service Model, Operating Model		18 Jan 23	New
18	Add a critical path to the Schedule Performance Slide.		1 Feb 23	Pending vendor onboarding / schedule convergence
19	Program to adjust schedule to install 4 weeks of float prior to September go-live.		1 Feb 23	Pending vendor onboarding / schedule convergence
20	Present the first draft of Communication Plan		14 Jan 23	Nearing readiness

UTS

DECISIONS	
1	ESM Project Briefs The Steering Committee approved the following Project Briefs; • Business Enablement • Build and Integration • Service Definition and Design On approval of these briefs, GIPA s.3.2 requested the program adjust the schedule to incorporate a 4-week float in the 9-month schedule. Proposing the go live be 1st August, with 4-week float. If the program does have concerns, to raise these at Steering Committee to approve schedule movement and risk mitigation.
2	Deloitte Deliverable Sign-off The Steering Committee approved the Deloitte Deliverables noting the Faculty engagement was light, challenges in communications and lessons learned from ERP.

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

- GIPA s.3.2 – Welcomed members to the Steering Committee and noted apologies

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items *(Slide 3)*

- Action items as For Closing or Complete, the Steering Committee note they are now closed
- Action item 4: Include business workload / effort expectations as part of Stakeholder Engagement Plan though a stakeholder involvement forecast – Open
- Action item 5: ITU Target State – Open (GIPA s.3.2 to present 1/12 steering committee)
- Action item 13: Faculty Working Group comprising of SME's – Open
- Action item 14: Establish an ESM Reference Group – Open
- Action item 15: ESM presentation to ULT – Open
- Action item 16: Building Glossary - Open

Key discussion points:

- Establishing the Reference Group for clarity what the group is trying to achieve and provide value add into the program from an academic focus.
  GIPA s.3.2 – work with the UPMO to develop the reference groups, to be used across all key programs.
- ULT presentation to be scheduled early 2023.
- Senior management forum is a high-level briefing

1.3. Program Recap *(Slide 4-5)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented an ESM Program Recap noting the following:

- High level intent and approach of ESM leveraging the Deloitte work identifying the complexities across the business units and high-level composition of Release #1 and beyond.

- UTS' scaffolded approach to ESM (in layers);
  - Foundational design
  - Platform build over 12-month horizon – Release #1
  - Business Unit Release Cycles
  - Legacy Forms Collection in Release #1
- Program achievements

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if the committee is comfortable with the recap. That we will have a platform with digitised workflows and improving staff experience. Gathering data to find out if we have enough labour to get efficiencies. How many group/ shared email boxes are being replaced? 1065 Shared Mailboxes used by over 4000 people, some of who may not be at UTS any longer.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Regarding implementation approach - if we federate the ServiceNow and the new ServiceNow and capture through the new the new one, still get the servicing metrics passing across at the same time. If things don't come across we will still get those insights.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Indicated that once we move the legal forms across this will provide an opportunity to showcase what a difference this will make in a video.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked about the September release only accessing the Legal and ITU forms and how it will be managed and communicated effectively.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the HCD for the year, a need to get the reference group in place.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Mentioned that we have the HCD playbook to utilise
- GIPA s.3.2 – Faculty forms involved in first release, what that means in terms of change management.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Advised that the ITU and Legal forms are the full suite of services.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if there is a procurement process for each release?
- GIPA s.3.2 – the intent initially was for procurement each release, however taking a smarter approach and we retain the right to do so. A new vendor will take more effort to get them up to speed. From a risk perspective to keep a small ecosystem of vendors not relying on one vendor.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Supports a smaller procurement approach of 5-6 vendors on the same system.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if there any opportunity whether to rationalise the number of forms.
- GIPA s.3.2 – There are 306 forms to analyse and expecting to half that.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suspects that across the faculties there is duplication of forms.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the forms in the faculties are the same process from a student view point. It is the servicing groups which need to change.

1.4. Program Performance *(Slide 7)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented an ESM Program Performance noting the following:

- Risk and Issue landscape noting the gap between the FY23 forecast and budget allocated by DISC and actively working to close out that gap by accessing additional funding.
- Continued substantial resourcing challenges, new project manager soon to start and solution architect just commenced.
- Budget is on track with an underspend of 2.9m for this financial year 2022.
- 2023 DISC budget allocation with gateway for additional funding.
- Schedule performance roadmap.

UTS

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked how many resources currently on the ESM team and to what extent is it slowing the schedule?
- GIPA s.3.2 – 10-11 project staff who are over utilised at present. The biggest task at present is getting a vendor on board and all are pulling together to make it happen.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned what the Service Model and Operating Model Design being review and approved by Operations Business Units meant.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Advised that it was the Deloitte workshop outputs.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that there is a lot of different language used across programs and to work with the UPMO in standardisation.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that there was an issue with the Disc consideration and the scenario chosen with 50% split of investment essential IT investment and 50% into programs. This effectively puts a stop to the program in May which is unworkable. This matter will be taken to ULT next Thursday where GIPA s.3.2 provide a briefing, confident that we will see at Q1 sufficient funds and the whole of ITCMP will have a 10%/ 5.6m contingency.
  The commitment we have given the ESM program director is that we will fund this program in FY-2023.
  Despite the 38% of the program funded, spoken with the VC, important to note that on the journey this year that we have over budgeted and under committed, and the go-green-plan we are moving in the right direction.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Queried if the schedule roadmap for project is detailed and supported in MS Project with float?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested a presenting the schedule as a rolled-up version of MS Project or a top down view.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the MS Project view can be added into the appendix.

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION

2.1. Project Briefs *(slide 27)*

GIPA s.3.2 requested approval on the following project briefs;

- Business Enablement
- Build and Integration
- Service Definition and Design

Key discussion points:

- Business Enablement
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that this piece is important on the implementation side
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Requested that the program includes due dates and status for completion on the outputs and deliverables slides
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that there are a couple of risks which are critical in the briefs, but not coming up in the RAID register at program level

- Build and Integration
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Comfortable with scope and requirements
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Raised that there was no definition on “owner”
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Noted not having access to Knowledge and the Roles are tabled for discussion

- Service Definition and Design
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Noted this brief has high rated risks

2.2. Deloitte Deliverable Sign-off *(Slide 12)*

GIPA s.3.2 provided a summary of the Deloitte deliverables where each of the business units participated in a number of workshops and interviews establishing baseline service catalogues. Each business unit now reviewing to approve the catalogues. Finance almost completing this piece of work by end of November. Requesting approval to be able to close out this piece of work and move forward.

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that there was a lot of work involved with workshops, interviews and reviewing of the service catalogue and comfortable with the first cut.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that ITU did not have an Executive Debrief and we do not yet have a baseline service catalogue for ITU.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed this was a decision made in September, but represents a gap in establishing our baseline. The team are reviewing and building this out of the Enable work with Brian's team.
- GIP A s.3.2 – Comfortable with the Deloitte deliverables and Enable work.
- GIP A s.3 – Noted concern that the GIPA s.3.4 was very brief/ light with only 45m interviews. In ERP, the faculties were asked to nominate representatives across the business units but not for ESM. Should have been communicated more effectively.
  If we had the opportunity to taking the Learnings from ERP into ESM might have been more comfortable.
- GIP A s.3 – Noted that this approach was on purpose due to the high level of engagement through ERP and KPMG, very aware that there were similar learnings coming out of one program to help out the other.
  Now looking at how we can leverage the work on both programs to benefit each other.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Advised that there is a BA allocated to review the ERP finance and hr work to ensure the effectiveness with ESM.
  ESM work was to identify services not improve them, ERP is trying to understand the scope of the service in term of how to apply to the platform.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Challenge in communications, not clear in the messaging and the difference between ESM and ERP.
  The ESM Engagement Plan is not yet in place the Steering Committee would like to understand what that looks like. What does the sequencing look like with the vendor coming on board, the engagement and the change management strategy with the possibility of a launch?
- GIPA s.3.2 – The change strategy piece of work slowed down to commence work on the engagement plan and align the two. Looking to overlay the vendor activities with the activities for each project in order to get the change team get a true understanding from a granular level. Provide first draft next steering committee… slide 2?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Lessons learnt from ERP, slide pack of the structure about the university with UPMO, but did not consider the communication networks from ULT, SMF, SMF, LST forums and various committees. We should be focussing on those rather than a bottom up analysis.
- GIPA s.3.2 – ESM and ERP will merge with a similar governance structure which is aligned.

2.3. Forward Business List

These items were not discussed (time constraints) and were deferred to the next PSC meeting.

3. <u>ITEMS FOR NOTING</u>

GIPA s.3.2 presented on the following for noting:

3.1. Go-to-green Tracking *(slide 15)*
Tracking Green.

3.2. Key ESM Role Definitions *(slide 17)*
Invite feedback around these roles and next month represent with considered input.

3.3. Program Definition Update *(slide 15)*
No discussion of this item.

3.4. ESM RFQ Update *(slide 20)*
Evaluation panel established for decision on vendor by 16th December with a view to have a contract in place before end of the year.

3.5. IT Operations ESM Update Paper
Deferred until next meeting
GIPA s.3.2 to present a refreshed version of the paper next Steering Committee

3.6. ESM Strategy Update *(slide 23)*
Deferred until next meeting
This item not discussed (time constraints) and were deferred to the next PSC meeting.

4. <u>OTHER BUSINESS</u>

4.1. Wrap up/ Any other business
No discussion of this item.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 4.05pm.

<u>NEXT MEETING</u>

Thursday, 12th December 2022 11.00 - 12 .00pm

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____
CHAIR

____
DATE

UTS

ENTERPRISE SERVICE MANAGEMENT (ESM)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 12/12/2022

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the ESM Program Steering Committee meeting held on Monday, 12th December from 11:00am to 12:00pm at CB01.04A.26 Boardroom and via Zoom.

GIPA s.3.2

PRESENT:	[redacted]
APOLOGIES:	

GIPA s.3.2

	ACTIONS	Owner	Due	Status
1	Identify business resource and effort expectations as part of stakeholder engagement plan though a stakeholder involvement forecast	[redacted]	27 Mar 22	Available post-vendor onboarding
2	Share the ITU target state uplift for IT service delivery pack to the SC by next session.		24 Jan 23	Tabled for Next SC
3	Establish an ESM reference Group representing a cross section of academics and professionals that gives every decision authenticity and credibility as an academic-orientated program.		31 Mar 23	WIP (with UPMO)
4	Start planning an experiential ESM presentation to ULT with mock-ups of the portal and platform. A suggestion was made to tap into what other Universities have launched.		Proposed 3rd week March.	Planning Tri-Party Launch
5	Add a critical path to the Schedule Performance Slide.		28 Mar 23	Pending vendor onboarding / schedule convergence
6	Program to adjust schedule to install 4 weeks of float prior to September go-live.		TBD	Pending vendor onboarding / schedule convergence

UTS

ACTIONS		Owner	Due	Status
7	Present the first draft of Communication Plan	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]	7 Mar 23	On-track (pending vendor commencement and implementation approach decision)
8	Share with the Steering Committee the outcomes and decision on the vendor selection.		24 Jan 23	New
9	Liaise with Procurement on the options we have to shift the commercial construct to lower our investment commitment / risk (ie. splitting the contract into tranches, etc.) this may include but not be limited to payment milestones.		24 Jan 23	New
10	Update program forecast with confirmed vendor costs and update cost benefits within the business case to submit with circular to DISC		28 Feb 23	New
11	Requested to convene the DISC in January to address ESM funding shortfall to enable the appointment of the vendor.		<24 Jan 23	Paper in progress for submission on 8/2/23 for 15/2/23 DISC Meeting
12	Present an option for consideration which consolidates knowledge from Staff Connect into ServiceConnect for presentation to the Steering Committee		7 Mar 23	Pending consultation with the vendor
13	Update the Steering Committee membership review slides to include; • Program Governance and roles • Engagement Model, forums and groups		17 Jan 23	UPMO returned on 13/1/23 – WIP
14	The Steering Committee to approve the program organisation chart • Include in Terms of Reference		7 Mar 23	Post vendor onboarding
15	Apply the following updates to the business case and present to Steering Committee • Review costs and benefits • Quantification of benefits and investment • Non-discretionary investment in ITSM		21 Mar 23	New

UTS

DECISIONS	
1	**ESM Portal Naming** The Steering Committee agreed with the recommended option to keep the portal name as ServiceConnect. With a view that it could be rebranded once implemented.

Note: Any items reported as closed during this meeting will not be listed or tracked in future meeting presentations or minutes.

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

- GIPA s.3.2 – Welcomed members to the Steering Committee and noted apologies.

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items *(Slide 3)*

- Action 5: Share the ITU target state uplift for IT service delivery pack to the SC by next session. *Tabled for 12-Dec*
- Action 6: Provide analysis into the impacts of the absence of an overarching ESM strategy and present a view of what options UTS has to mitigate any impacts. *Tabled for 12-Dec*
- Action 14: Establish an ESM reference Group representing a cross section of academics and professionals that gives every decision authenticity and credibility as an academic orientated program. *Ongoing*

1.3. Program Performance *(Slide 7)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented an ESM Program Performance noting the following:

- Program achievements o Closing out go-to-green plan o Recruiting for program manager o Solution architect – current state assessment
  - ServiceNow video for ESM (7min) ESM being the 'platform of platforms' o Service catalogue – 4 weeks to complete artefact
  - RFQ primary focus – 3 shortlisted vendors, appoint vendor off BOFO and exploring a 4-week SOW.
- Program performance o Go-live for Legal forms in January o First draft of change strategy for review o Service Definition and Design Manager appointed o Risks and Issues; 3-4 form changes per week
- Program financials o Tracking to forecast with small underspend due to reduction in resources and in ability to recruit program manager.
  - FY23 budget will be validated once the vendor is appointed and costs have been aligned with workplan.
  - Vendor costs are approximately $2.5m, will progress with BOFO process with 3 vendors to determine the successful vendor.
  - The vendor costs to be blended with internal costs to provide a complete and accurate forecast.

- Program schedule
  - Change strategy will be available mid-January
  - Legacy engagement kicking off
  - Converging the program and vendor schedules together

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested a recap of the scope for the RFQ and what the vendor will be doing for ERP
- GIPA s.3.2 – Referred to the appendices (slide 35) Scope Definition Recap.
- The program is looking for a technical vendor to close out the design, build out the platform of core technology and Release #1 (being IT and Legal) as well as bringing over everything in the current system into the new system.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked for clarity on Legal's digitised forms and processes.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that 4 forms being digitised the request form being the biggest form which has high volume.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked why the costing issue should be red as additional funding still needs to be approved through DISC. GIPA s.3.2 confirmed this was due to the program being given assurances and a pathway to access the remaining funding.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Queried if there is a project officer being allocated to a Business Unit for upskilling and adoptions?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the key areas to lock in for resourcing in BAU using BA's at the service level and the change team. Building a model with the new vendor to map and define what we need as a business for each unit to deliver a service and during transition to BAU.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Queried the timing in signing the contract and the resolution of the budget issue given the significant shortfall with what DISC approved and what the project is requesting. What is the timing on signing a commitment to the vendor and does it align with resolving the budget issue.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Advised that there is enough funding to continue through until May without the vendor on board. Exploring fixed (design piece) and tiered pricing models.
- Socialise with the committee out of session the vendor selection on 23rd December.
- 3-4 week contract execution period, therefore in January would be in a position for a vendor to commence.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed concerns that there is currently no authorised funds to cover the engagement of the vendor which would lead GIPA s.3.2 to apply to DISC for a contingency early January. Potentially creating scheduling risks in signing a vendor contract where there are dependencies.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the sequence of activities needed for the program;
  - Either appoints a vendor or gets to a point where there is a recommended vendor and clear view of costs
  - Change request detailing the recommended vendor and associated costs
  - Dependency on DISC
- GIPA s.3.2 - Is there an option to sign something so the program can continue through January if not able to get DISC together.

UTS

- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed being nervous on committing the university without the governance in place. Preference is to convene DISC to raise the issue as a normal change request and be transparent about the actions we take.
- Other option is to 'Circular' to DISC now requesting approval to fund 2.5m to facilitate the signing of the contract for the fixed price elements of the vendor costs and recognise the issue of the initial presentation to DISC.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Offered that we could do a more risk-based approach in addressing the design component is the circular for approx. $900k.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed that if we are entering a contract we need to demonstrate the funds are allocated.
- Preference is to work with GIPA s.3.2 prior to Christmas for an amount explaining that the reasons and is problematic. If this isn't a possibility to convene a DISC in January to address the issue.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed the need for a conversation around the DISC outcomes and his understanding of the 2.9m was to complete a substantial amount of work next year. The committee will assume that the DISC budget is fully allocated and not sure where we would find the extra funding without stopping something else.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Answered that this could be a possibility, the expectation is to review the forecasts in Q1 for clarity on work volumes and resourcing needs rather than go back to DISC when outcome first seen.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Concerned that in submitting a circular now when we don't have a solution for DISC. Wait till January when we may have a few options to present to fund the shortfall
- GIPA s.3.2 – Could present to DISC a circular to options of programs lower down and as a result of this the need to stop a particular program.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if there is an option to split the contract into tranches based on the current budget? There is money to spend in the first few months. If the overall commitment could be staggered, could possibly have enough money in the current plan to go to DISC at the end of Q1.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Will talk with GIPA s.3.2 in procurement around the commercial construct and possibility of splitting the contract into tranches or payment iterations.
  Liaise with GIPA s.3.2 to determine whether this can be resolved with a circular to DISC in January.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if Has DISC has reviewed the Business Case?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the BC was endorsed by the Steering Committee in May, the Cost Benefits could be attached.
- GIPA s.3.2 – The Program can update the forecast once the total cost from the vendor is confirmed and include any other requirements DISC has to access additional funds.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Queried the Knowledge Management strategy, will it be ready for population in the go-live for Release #1?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Working this period on the tiers and types of knowledge, we have made distinctions the knowledge within the reflective areas and work with you to improve the approach to knowledge, user journey and self service. Looking forward to bringing this paper to the committee in February.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested that the paper considers the impact on Staff Connect.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Business Self-Serve as in business update knowledge articles.

UTS

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION

2.1. ESM Portal Naming *(slide 9)*

GIPA s.3.2 requested approval on the portal name presenting 2 options;

- Retain Service Connect – Recommended option
- Adopt new name of ServiceUTS

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Connect is a family origin, is connect here to stay, a broader strategy?
- Staff Connect verses Service Connect. Are we going to invest in 'connect' overall, it makes sense?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Proposed keep current name given the reference group is yet to be established. Potential to rebadge in future
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted if we are doing to look at the staff intranet and HR site, not much risk.

3. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

3.1. ESM Steering Committee Membership *(slide 11)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the potential future state Steering Committee composition.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that 10 people is a lot of members to commit and is it the best use of people's time.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that ERP has FGM representation and suggested perhaps adding GIPA s.3.2 .
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if we need a HEW GIPA s.3.3 in the faculty who will provide a real day to day view, or will representation from the reference group be more appropriate?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Proposed that GIPA s.3.2 role should remain as Staff Experience Representative and bring in others on an as need basis.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Depending on how the working and reference groups are structured with adequate academic and professional staff, GIPA s.3.2 or myself be the conduit of feedback and information/ decisions between the two.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Is referring to actually having the customer in the room. Providing an opportunity to a HEW GIPA s.3.3 (recipients) to provide input from a user perspective when the conversations are in play.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned the value in have 2 people from the same unit (GIPA s.3.2 and/ or GIPA s.3.2 Bring in GIPA s.3.2 when needed, in 3-4 months' time.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed that the nature of the Committee meetings will shift from the fundamental structure of ESM as the direction and operational changes through to nature of IT, Legal and forms and the service transformation.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked the program to bring back to the Steering Committee Composition in

UTS

January for decision to include; o Program
Governance o Program Structure o
Engagement Model, forums and groups
o Eg; When design happens, what the engagement model for the design piece and how reflected in the governance

- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned that within the LX.Lab requesting services on behalf of hew GIPA s.3.3 is that something to be raised at this level?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the reference groups are designed to do

4. ITEMS FOR NOTING

GIPA s.3.2 presented on the following for noting:

4.1. Go-to-green Tracking *(slide 12)*

Tracking Green.

4.2. Key ESM Role Definitions *(slide 15)*

Sets the scene for the context and hierarchy for the business in the program acknowledging functions and roles

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Queried who was responsible for seeing the benefits
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed there is a central benefits owner and a senior business lead owns the benefits, GIPA s.3.2 is noted as benefits owner
- GIPA s.3.2 - Needs to come back with the Governance piece and be reflected in the Steering Committee
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested a program organisation chart for 2023
- GIPA s.3.2 – Will socialise when the vendor is onboarded and have the blended resourcing model detailing program down to project level. Budget is based off the work plan not the resourcing.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that comparative to ERP there is still a lot of work to get the mix of resources right and requested that the Steering Committee sign off on the final organisation chart for the program and be part of the Terms of Reference.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted the challenge is giving the steering committee and understanding of the scope and type of work with what already has been invested, high burn rates of people, lessons learned and clarity on program team.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Hesitant to bring a firm plan as yet until we have vendor onboarded who will have their own playbooks and techniques needed to overlay.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested from a governance point of view and understanding of the basic structure of the program (why we have a program director, program manager and project managers)

4.3. ESM Strategy Components *(slide 18)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented on the key components of the ESM Strategy demonstrating our progress against the aim. Through the work with Enable and Deloitte have established and developed a number of key components with the exception of a detailed cost benefit analysis.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the gaps of the cost benefit analysis in the business case
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the cost benefit analysis was not in the business case. It is time intensive and cost prohibitive to complete this, rationale at this point in time is that the investment outweighs the outcome given the industry wide shift towards ESM. A risk-based approach already in place and are advised that we are in a good position strategy wise, alternatively we can add a summary (top-down) cost benefit analysis.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed concerns on whether there is there a basis for us in progressing this or an alternative approach in stop the program. o Unable to stop with the ITSM component o Doubts with benefits realisation
- GIPA s.3.2 - Recommends the program come back to the Steering Committee with the Business Case, review costs and benefits, what is required for quantification of benefits and investment needed.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted the issue of not having data to manage work ethic and nothing to inform load.

4.4. ESM RFQ Update *(slide 20)*
Deferred until next meeting

4.5. IT Operations ESM Update Paper *(slide 21)*
Deferred until next meeting

4.6. Forward Business List *(slide 30) No Discussion of this item*

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business

- GIPA s.3.2 – Thanked GIPA s.3.2 for work undertaken in the last 4 months and clarity in the packs.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 12.00pm.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 24th January 2023 | 2:00 – 3:00pm

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

CHAIR

UTS

DATE

CLOSED ACTIONS

	ACTIONS	Owner	Due	Status
1	Cost forecast updated in line with the go-togreen plan.	GIPA s.3.2	18 Nov 22	Completed
2	Project Briefs updated in line with the go-togreen plan.		27 Oct 22	Completed
3	Highlight the status of the deliverables (with traffic lights) on deliverables list, roadmaps, and timelines.		16 Dec 22	Completed
7	ESM Program to adopt UPMO templates and guidance as it emerges.		Ongoing	Completed
8	Create and distribute a slide setting out a mapping between outcomes and investment to date.		7 Oct 22	Completed
9	Provide a clear view of total cost for FY23		18 Nov 22	Completed
10	Procurement - RFQ Pre-Market review session with GIPA s.3.2		13 Oct 22	Completed
11	Procurement – ensure that we have business representation on the RFQ evaluation panel to select a design and implementation partner.		27 Oct 22	Completed
12	Change Management - Confirm that the stakeholder management plan nominates individuals within the program as the relationship manager for every identified stakeholder. *I can confirm this is being actively managed; refer to slide 11* here		Completed 13 Oct 22	Completed
13	Change Management – Liaise with GIPA s.3 Faculty Working Group comprising of SME's. GIPA s.3.2 *Working Together level. WIP*		27 Oct 22	Completed (WT)
3	Update the ESM strategy analysis to include the impacts of the absence of an overarching ESM strategy and present a view of what options UTS has to mitigate any impacts.		12 Dec 23	Completed

5	Continue work on building glossary of terms including service, process, transaction and form; along with roles such as service owner, platform owner, business owner and process owner - to translate these terms into authority description, function and responsibility. It was established that the ESM & ERP Glossary of Terms is not specific-enough to ESM and unfit for this purpose. • The program will work with UPMO and the new vendor on terms before commencing business engagement.	GIPA s.3.2	7 Mar 23	Closed

UTS

ENTERPRISE SERVICE MANAGEMENT (ESM)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 24/01/2023

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the ESM Program Steering Committee meeting held on Tuesday, 24th January from 2:00pm to 3:00pm at CB01.04b.12 Boardroom and via Teams.

GIPA s.3.2

PRESENT:	[redacted]
APOLOGIES:	[redacted]

	ACTIONS	Owner	Due	Status
1	Identify business resource and effort expectations as part of stakeholder engagement plan though a stakeholder involvement forecast	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]	27 Mar '22	Available post-vendor work planning
2	Share the ITU target state uplift for IT service delivery pack to the SC by next session	[redacted]	24 Jan '23	Closed
3	Establish an ESM reference Group representing a cross section of academics and professionals that gives every decision authenticity and credibility as an academic-orientated program	[redacted]	31 Mar '23	WIP with FGM
4	Start planning an experiential ESM presentation to ULT with mock-ups of the portal and platform. A suggestion was made to tap into what other Universities have launched	[redacted]	31 Mar '23	Planning Tri-Party Launch
5	Add a critical path to the Schedule Performance Slide	[redacted]	28 Mar '23	Pending vendor schedule convergence
6	Program to adjust schedule to install 4 weeks of float prior to September go-live	[redacted]	TBD	Pending vendor onboarding / schedule convergence

UTS

	ACTIONS	Owner	Due	Status
7	Present the first draft of Communication Plan	GIPA s.3.2	07 Mar '23	On-track (pending vendor commencement and implementation approach decision)
10	Update program forecast with confirmed vendor costs and update cost benefits within the business case to submit with circular to DISC		31 Mar '23	New
11	Requested to convene the DISC in January to address ESM funding shortfall to enable the appointment of the vendor		15 Feb '23	Scheduled 15/2/23 DISC Meeting
12	Present an option for consideration which consolidates knowledge from Staff Connect into ServiceConnect for presentation to the Steering Committee		04 Feb '23	Pending consultation with the vendor
13	Update the Steering Committee membership review slides to include; • Program Governance and roles • Engagement Model, forums and groups		17 Jan '23	UPMO returned on 13/1/23 – WIP
14	The Steering Committee to approve the program organisation chart • Include in Terms of Reference		17 Mar '23	Post vendor onboarding
15	Apply the following updates to the business case and present to Steering Committee • Review costs and benefits • Quantification of benefits and investment Non-discretionary investment in ITSM		21 Mar '23	New
	Finance - Present a budget breakdown on costs for 2023 • Resourcing • Vendor costs		07 Mar '23	New
	Finance - Confirm that there is float built into the program schedule		07 Mar '23	Pending vendor onboarding / schedule convergence

UTS

	ACTIONS	Owner	Due	Status
	Finance - DISC Paper • Case for change slide, move to appendix item • Case for change – headline uplift • Create 4-5 dot point slide • Slide numbers for the pack • Move budget slide up front • Avg spend to other universities $19m	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]	06 Feb '23	**Closed**
	Vendor - Request the winning vendor (AC3) showcase their higher education experience	[redacted]	04 Feb '23	**New**
	Vendor - AC3 to provide a referee from the higher education industry	[redacted]	04 Feb '23	**New**
	Change and Communications Present the Change Strategy including • name and key messaging • reference groups #academics at the centre	[redacted]	07 Mar '23	**New**
	Change and Communications • Schedule meeting with Change Manager with GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]	[redacted]	04 Feb '23	**Closed**
	Change and Communications • Meet with School Mangers, FGMs – consultation on our mission on how their lives will change., #academics at the centre • Locate a heavy user who would benefit from ESM/ present how would be beneficial	[redacted]	04 April '23	WIP Met with FGMs
	Change and Communications Develop and release general communications to the university for all key transformation initiatives. I.e., ESM, CASS, Curriculum Management Program	[redacted]	07 Mar '23	**New**

	DECISIONS
1	**Release #1 RFQ: Evaluation Committee Recommendation** The Steering Committee agreed to engage AC3 as Release #1 vendor. With the expectation that one of the referees is a higher education provider. If not possible, for the program to advise the Steering Committee of the institutions that AC3 has worked with.

<u>Note</u>: Any items reported as closed during this meeting will not be listed or tracked in future meeting presentations or minutes.

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

- GIPA s.3.2 – Welcomed members to the Steering Committee and noted apologies.

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

- Actions and minutes noted as read.

1.3. Program Performance *(Slide 4)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented an ESM Program Performance noting the following:

- **Program achievements**
  - Onboarded a new Program Manager and made changes in the change management space.
  - Closing out the go-to-green plan
  - Evaluation Committee has recommended a vendor
  - Go-live on track with Legal for 20th February considering some further enhancements and allowing for testing and CAB
  - Baseline Service catalogues on track with the exception of UPMO
- **Program performance**
  - Principal systems integrator joining the program and together with their playbook and the convergence of schedules will help with direction of approach and implementation strategy.
  - CFO approval and Steering Committee endorsement, the program will inform the vendor is successful and propose a pre-commencement phase.
  - The programs key focus;
    - Building vendor mobilisation pack
    - Endorsed Implementation approach endorsement by the vendor
    - Building the Service Design Experience
  - A successful meeting with ServiceNow resulted in clearer view of commitment and expectations in going forward.
  - Commenced a licencing review in terms of spend moving forward, which modules we currently have and what remix maybe needed.
  - Defining the Target ESM Operating Model.
- **Finance**
  - The program came within 1% of forecast and approved budget for 2022
  - DiSC did not sufficiently provide the funds forecasted to complete Release #1, due to an unintended error and a result a new submission in February to account for shortfall.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – What confidence do we have in being able to deliver the program within parameters in 2022.
- GIPA s.3.2 – The program has completed a resourcing review including the need for an HCD FTE going forward. The compliance, oversight, active monitoring is required to ensure the outcomes are aligned with the scope of the program.

UTS

- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested visibility of cost breakdown so the Steering Committee can better understand where the funds are being spent and resources managed.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Queried what other funding for groups contributing to the budgeting costs, including backfilling.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Once the vendor comes on board, will be able to provide an accurate view of effort and resources required from the business. The vendor mobilisation pack will include previous work and goals.
  Expressed a need to get the foundations right first, then can start investigating the Chatbots and other opportunities down the line.

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION

2.1. Release #1 RFQ: Evaluation Committee Recommendation *(slide 7)*

GIPA s.3.2 requested endorsement to engage the recommended vendor noting that the evaluation panel support AC3 for Release #1.

- The program has commercially structured the engagement in three performance sequenced SOWs (non-committal) to align outcomes with each tranche.
- The evaluation committee comprised of GIPA s.3.2 .

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Raised the point of where the program would be if AC3 were determined not suitable after the first tranche.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Advised our Plan B would be to approach the next best vendor for a 6-week due diligence. ESM skills are generally transferrable and portable.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked how we are managing the communications around the top 3 vendors
- GIPA s.3.2 – Mentioned that in the final stages of the valuation the program held sessions whereby the vendors were asked specific questions on service design, play book, what services will be most beneficial for improvement.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested that the program builds in float into the schedule.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed there is 2 weeks float however this is at risk as a result in delays onboarding the vendor.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked whether other universities have used AC3.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Recalls that RMIT used AC3, one in New Zealand and will come back to the Committee their submission of previous engagements.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated that the Steering Committee should take confidence in the rigor of the procurement process.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Agreed the committee should be confident in particular Release #1 being standard IT services, work previously done with other organisations, all very similar.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if GIPA s.3.2 and s.3.4 came second in the evaluation process.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed GIPA s.3.2 and s.3.4 the preferred second candidate due to GIPA s.3.2 and s.3.4 .

UTS

- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Commented that GIPA s.3.2 and s.3.4 [redacted] which led AC3 to be the preferred vendor?
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Explained that the evaluation was an iterative process over a number of consultations and viewed through various lenses.
    - o The rankings initially are around a non-priced score evaluation
    - o Followed by direct consultation period for the vendors and their intentions and how-to bring value to UTS and to address questions and concerns from the panel
    - o GIPA s.3.2 and s.3.4 [redacted] provided vague ambiguous answers with no relevance or commitment to working with the program
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Commented that the same was with the IT Op Model that the difference between the non-price and the final scoring is enormous. It is difficult for the panel to go with the numbers.
- GIPA s.3 [redacted] – Noted that the Payroll vendor engagement, GIPA s.3.2 and s.3.4 [redacted] Learning from this, need a vendor with experience with higher education, does AC3 provide examples of services in a higher education context so the Steering Committee has visibility that they can cater to UTS effectively.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Proposed the AC3 provide a higher education referee

2.2. DISC Submission Paper *(slide 9)*

The chair explained to the committee that when the DISC convened last year to prioritise the budget there was an error in the presentation for ESM. The difference between the budget proposed by the program and what was given is a difference of $4.5m.

The purpose of this paper is to return to DISC to bid for funding for AC3 and demonstrate success with tranche 1, secondly to get an agreement in principal subject to the availability of contingency for further funding for the remainder of the program.

Should DISC not approve further funding, the university will need to decide what it will do about the platform.

- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Expressed at the program is seeking $454,000 to fund delivery of the first SOW of tranche 1, contract tranche 2 and internal teams till the end of May.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Requested the need on the executive summary to be explicit on what the recommendations are (refer slide 12).
  Issue on approval of specific amounts and approval in principal.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] - Deloitte slide to representing an organisational challenge
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – We do not have capacity outside of ServiceNow platform to manage the large number of transactions across the university. Having invested over $1.5m supporting the platform up to current version.
  Already aligned our ITSM, deciding on another platform and having to refit an entire IT unit in terms of operations. This is trying to build on a platform we already have a host of transactions in IT and expand across all other functions.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Confirms this is an urgent need to move to a newer platform as there will be a risk to IT systems integrity.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – States that this risk has never been called out to himself, we are losing all the benefits out of the platform we are paying for as we aren't moving.

- GIPA s.3.2 – If this is a case for change, the headline is uncompelling, we have an opportunity to improve. Ie: HR systems
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the key thing here is this is the means of digitising the way we work.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that the consequence of not doing this, there really is not a choice.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Raised that the program has three change and communications resources, they need to be involved in the messaging
- GIPA s.3.2 – Case for change slide is too detailed and recommends a slide with 4-5 dot points.
  - Primary means of digitising internal business
  - We do not become a digital business
- GIPA s.3.2 – Engine room for digitising the university a platform for automating things
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested that the language is difficult to understand and needs to be simplified.
  - "Uplift end to end experience/ What's in it for me?"
  - Provide examples of what would be different
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that the Faculties just want "it" to work
- GIPA s.3.2 – ESM in 2023 indicates over 200 processes to be digitised this year and can we really achieve this.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if these processes have been reviewed to see if processes are still relevant?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that is coming and Deloitte analysed the relevance across the units in terms of complexities and readiness. Taking to the next level to prioritise when the vendor is onboard.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested that for the next Steering Committee for the Change and Communications present Change Strategy.
  Not compelling enough, the language and connection with the pain points to make this relevant for people.
  - Change plan
  - Elevator pitch
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented on the ESM needing a name other than ESM.
- *Please take reference to previous Steering Committee minutes decision on the portal name. Retaining ServiceConnect was the agreed option. It is noted that* GIPA s.3.2 *was an apology last meeting.*
- GIPA s.3.2 – Referred to the Change and Communication team who should be advising the Steering Committee on the name
- GIPA s.3.2 – Have the change team met with the FGMs?
- GIPA s.3.2 – found that with the LX transformation program, they needed to do a translation piece for the change managers as consulting (service) terms are not used in practice. E.g. use accounts payable
- GIPA s.3.2 – #making ServiceConnect better
  A key role will be translating terms in the business engagement piece
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested in the DISC paper to explain what the funds are going to be spent on. $2.5 is allocated to what? Noting that the below would also be useful to include in the paper as it is not compelling enough to match the level of investment.
  - Slide illustrating burn rate, what is costed and why and expiry
  - Budget slide move the last slide up front
  - Average cost other universities have spent on ESM; $19m
  - Universities are making major investments, can see the productivity benefits are there

UTS

- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that Western University have engaged EY to reviewing the platform to expand on it.

3. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

3.1. Proposed Launch Event *(slide 10)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented launch event and what it could look like, in recognition of key roles of our principle systems integrator and ServiceNow. The concept of a tri-party launch has resonated will with the team and stakeholders. Also noting that this approach has work well for government a year ago.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed concerns on being in a good position to launch ESM given the current discussion (name, taglines, language consistency); 14th February seems premature. Noted that also not available that day to support the launch.
  Onboard the vendor, after a month revisit the launch with one name, one vision.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed a need to get focussed on the work and the program started
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested a presentation on Change Strategy which includes the name, key messages
- GIPA s 3 – Requested communications on the difference of ESM and ERP the impacts, bringing people into the conversation explaining what and why the university has invested into these programs.
- GIPA s.3.2 – General communications to the whole of IT bringing awareness to other initiatives such as CASS and Curriculum management program
- GIPA s.3.2 - The Steering Committee does not believe the program is ready to launch. A requirement for the Change and Communications plan to be endorsed first
- GIPA s 3 2 – Suggested getting feedback from a heavy user for their opinion as to why it's a good idea, to act as a speaker to the Steering Committee to explain how their life would be different.
- GIPA s.3.2 – In progress of gathering analysis on the top 10 service requesters

4. ITEMS FOR NOTING

4.1. Go-to-green Tracking *(slide 12)*

No discussion of this item

4.2. Legal Services Digitisation *(slide 14)*

No discussion of this item

4.3. Departmental Showcase *(slide 16)*

No discussion of this item

4.5. IT Operations ESM Update Paper *(slide 19)*

Noted as read

4.6. Forward Business List *(slide 29)*

- Implementation Strategy is the detailed sequence of activities to cut over into the new system
- Design & Architecture Authority is how ESM would run in the future world. One step below the governance.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed concerns on the program governance and the need for reference groups. #academics at the centre - How are we going to ensure that our academic users are at the centre of the design.
  We have representation at a Steering Committee level
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the bulk of the Change Strategy and Communications Plan has been built which includes the stakeholder engagement. Need
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested an option that ESM could launch on the same day as legal goes live. Happy to have an out of session meeting to ensure the change and communications plan is right.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business

- No other business was raised

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 3.05pm.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 7th March 2023 | 11:00 – 12:00pm

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____

CHAIR

____

DATE

UTS

CLOSED ACTIONS

	ACTIONS	Owner	Due	Status
1	Cost forecast updated in line with the go-to-green plan.	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]	18 Nov 22	Closed
2	Project Briefs updated in line with the go-to-green plan.	[redacted]	27 Oct 22	Closed
3	Highlight the status of the deliverables (with traffic lights) on deliverables list, roadmaps, and timelines.	[redacted]	16 Dec 22	Closed
7	ESM Program to adopt UPMO templates and guidance as it emerges.	[redacted]	Ongoing	Closed
8	Create and distribute a slide setting out a mapping between outcomes and investment to date.	[redacted]	7 Oct 22	Closed
9	Provide a clear view of total cost for FY23	[redacted]	18 Nov 22	Closed
10	Procurement - RFQ Pre-Market review session with GIPA s.3.2 [redacted].	[redacted]	13 Oct 22	Closed
11	Procurement – ensure that we have business representation on the RFQ evaluation panel to select a design and implementation partner.	[redacted]	27 Oct 22	Closed
12	Change Management - Confirm that the stakeholder management plan nominates individuals within the program as the relationship manager for every identified stakeholder. *I can confirm this is being actively managed; refer to slide 11* here	[redacted]	Completed 13 Oct 22	Closed
13	Change Management – Liaise with GIPA s.3 [redacted] Faculty Working Group comprising of SME's. GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] *Working Together level. WIP*	[redacted]	27 Oct 22	Closed (WT)
3	Update the ESM strategy analysis to include the impacts of the absence of an overarching ESM strategy and present a view of what options UTS has to mitigate any impacts.	[redacted]	12 Dec 23	Closed
5	Continue work on building glossary of terms including service, process, transaction and form; along with roles such as service owner, platform owner, business owner and process owner - to translate these terms into authority description, function and responsibility. It was established	[redacted]	7 Mar 23	Closed

UTS

	that the <u>ESM & ERP Glossary of Terms</u> is not specific-enough to ESM and unfit for this purpose. • The program will work with UPMO and the new vendor on terms before commencing business engagement.			
8	Share with the Steering Committee the outcomes and decision on the vendor selection.	GIPA s.3.2	24 Jan 23	Closed
9	Liaise with Procurement on the options we have to shift the commercial construct to lower our investment commitment / risk (ie. splitting the contract into tranches, etc.) this may include but not be limited to payment milestones.		24 Jan 23	Closed
9	Liaise with Procurement on the options we have to shift the commercial construct to lower our investment commitment / risk (ie. splitting the contract into tranches, etc.) this may include but not be limited to payment milestones.		24 Jan 23	Closed

ENTERPRISE SERVICE MANAGEMENT (ESM)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 07/03/2023

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the ESM Program Steering Committee meeting held on Tuesday, 7th March 2023 from 11:00am to 12:00pm at CB01.19.15 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	[redacted]

	ACTIONS	**Owner**	**Due**	**Status**
1	Identify business resource and effort expectations as part of stakeholder engagement plan through a stakeholder involvement forecast	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]	27 Mar '22	PWG (ref group) in draft. Core R#1 departmental effort requirements available post-vendor onboarding
2	Establish an ESM Reference Group representing a cross section of academics and professionals that gives every decision authenticity and credibility as an academic-orientated program	[redacted]	31 Mar '23	WIP with FGMs.
3	Start planning an experiential ESM presentation to ULT with mock-ups of the portal and platform. A suggestion was made to tap into what other Universities have launched	[redacted]	31 Mar '23	Planning Tri-Party Launch
4	Add a critical path to the Schedule Performance Slide	[redacted]	28 Mar '23	Pending vendor schedule convergence
4	Program to adjust schedule to install 4 weeks of float prior to September go-live	[redacted]	TBD	Pending vendor onboarding /

UTS

	ACTIONS	Owner	Due	Status
		GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]		schedule convergence
5	Present the first draft of Communication Plan		07 Mar '23	Complete
6	Update program forecast with confirmed vendor costs and update cost benefits within the business case to submit with circular to DISC		31 Mar '23	Open
7	Present an option for consideration which consolidates knowledge from Staff Connect into ServiceConnect for presentation to the Steering Committee		04 Feb '23	Pending consultation with the vendor
8	Update the Steering Committee membership review slides to include; • Program Governance and roles • Engagement Model, forums and groups		17 Mar '23	UPMO returned on 13/1/23 – WIP
9	The Steering Committee to approve the program organisation chart. • Include in Terms of Reference		17 Mar '23	Post vendor onboarding
10	Apply the following updates to the business case and present to Steering Committee • Review costs and benefits • Quantification of benefits and investment • Non-discretionary investment in ITSM		21 Mar '23	Open, WIP
11	**Finance** - Confirm that there is float built into the program schedule.		07 Mar '23	Pending vendor onboarding / schedule convergence
12	**Change and Communications** • Meet with School Mangers, FGMs – consultation on our mission on how their lives will change. • Locate a heavy user who would benefit from ESM/ present how would be beneficial		04 April '23	WIP Met with FGMs
13	**Change and Communications** Develop and release general communications to the university for all key transformation initiatives. I.e., ESM, CASS, Curriculum Management Program	UPMO	Ongoing	ESM & UPMO to build Transformation Portfolio Communications Plan
14	**Program Milestone** Include milestones in the schedule to track and provide early call outs for delays in the IT	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]	04 April '23	New

UTS

ACTIONS		Owner	Due	Status
	transformation, as AC3 will need to execute rapidly to make September.			

DECISIONS	
1	**Launch Event** The Steering Committee endorsed the Launch Event.

<u>Note</u>: Any items reported as closed during this meeting will not be listed or tracked in future meeting presentations or minutes.

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

- GIPA s.3.2 – Welcomed members to the Steering Committee and noted apologies.

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

- Actions and minutes noted as read and accepted.

1.3. Program Performance *(Slide 4)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented theESM Program Performance, noting the following:

- **Program achievements**
  - DiSC submission successful for tranche #1 funding
  - Contract negotiations in progress with preferred vendor AC3
  - Baseline service catalogue complete across all departments which will be used to inform the IT op model and service design process.
  - Project Management Plan slightly behind schedule to due to focus on the AC3 contract, no direct implications.
  - Legal Services successful in their go-live, taking the key learnings from this release to apply in our approach moving forward.
  - Communications Plan is ahead of schedule.
- **Program performance**
  - A new issue raised with the delay in onboarding AC3 and a subsequent risk for not having an implementation approach.
  - Closed out resourcing risk within the Business Enablement project and the funding on DiSC and ability to accurately forecast now that we have vendor process complete.
- **Finance**
  - Clarity on total costs for the total program forecast at $7.3m.
  - Tracking and underspend due to Target Operating Model and AC3 costs not being realised as early as anticipated.
  - DiSC additional funding approved and Finance advised we are able to roll over $600k from 2022 budget.#1
  - Anticipate next DiSC submissions to be in June and October

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that we are taking the opportunity at end of Q1 to review the ICCV and GIPA s.3.2 has flagged concerns around capabilities.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed next DiSC will be in May.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted the need to understand the sequencing and scope of services coming onto the platform. Currently IT Service Management implemented by September, is there any flexibility where we can bring forward a pain point such as People?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested that the program will bring this to the Committee as a variation request as an option.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Is seeking clarity on "What is the Staff Experience" we are seeking to provide what will that do in terms of specifying requirements?
  When the Staff Connect and Service Connect platforms come together
- GIPA s 3 – Commented that as FGM representative will work with colleagues to establish reference and working groups to collaborate with HR and capturing their processes.

UTS

Membership of these groups will have a good representation across faculty academic and professional staff.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Ensure that the composition of these groups is appropriate.
- GIPA s.3 – Commented that once the groups are established, they will be able to present to all the Faculty Execs so they know who is representing their voice to the ESM program. Looping in Teaching and Learning and Research as well.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Agreed that this is a good approach and suggested keeping it simple in highlighting "what is being replaced" as ESM won't mean anything to anyone.
- Coming up with real examples that will resonate with the faculties such as Onboarding, what is the current process and what it could be in ESM. Can we produce a video, so know what ESM project is about?
- GIPA s.3.2 – questioned the timing of the HR Services and if it could be an opportunity to be brought forward.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested moving with Recruitment first
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that faculties want to hear how we will improve the onboarding experience and somehow between ESM and ERP need to come to together to say this is how collectively how we will improve the experience.
- GIPA s.3 – Stated that there is an opportunity to educate the faculties that other half of the process is in HR and the process doesn't stop in the faculties.

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION

2.1. N/A

3. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

3.1. Proposed Launch Event *(slide 10)*

GIPA s.3.2 noted that the launch event is taking more shape now and scheduled now for the 30th March when AC3 will be onboard, active and up to speed. In recognition, key roles that AC3 play, along with ServiceNow, the concept of a tri-party launch resonated well with our stakeholder group.

A key development from the last Steering Committee was to use this event to announce the new name in being the ServiceConnect Program and attaching ourselves to that product.

Note: GIPA s.3.2 changed the Launch Event to a decision item (from a discussion item) and was endorsed by the Steering Committee.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Reminded the committee that the ServiceConnect name was a most popular result from surveys and testing conducted by the program at end of 2022 around different names which was approved by the committee.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if there was a logo for the program.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that what the portal will look like is a key element.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that there is a ServiceNow video demonstration which can be made available showing lots of different options in widgets and banners etc. so it will take some time to design the portal.
  The team has been engaging with stakeholders and end customers in the solution to build a tailored view that benefits them and unique to each department.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented on “What are we using this for and how it will be better”.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that visual recognition with a logo is important referencing a smurf in a document management system which successfully carried the program.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned that when we are talking about staff experience, what we are expecting and hoping for academics in the use of the system? Have we explored our principles in how academics will use the system, will we be transferring workload to the academics?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that WesternNow use separate portal for staff and students as do UTS.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Emphasised the need for personalisation of the portal.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked who the audience will be for the launch?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that everyone who has been engaged thus far in the program.
  - Workshop participants
  - Reference groups
  - Service people
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that it will be a kick off for the communications plan activity as well.
  The room booking has been paused until the contract is finalised as we need to give people a 3-week notice period.
- GIPA s.3 – Commented we need to be clear on timing for the reference groups on the codesign, UAT and how much time will be needed.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that there is a feedback link in the SharePoint page.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented on how we address the issue on work being transferred and being up front on the SharePoint site.

4. ITEMS FOR NOTING

4.1. Change Strategy *(slide 9)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented on the program Change Strategy noting the following:

- The change approach is based on 3 themes to make things easier across the board for UTS staff looking at accessibility, digital function and portal design.
  - One Front Door
  - Powerful Platform
  - Service Improvement
- The analysis carried out on the current state of UTS, the approach will be an iterative approach looking at the needs of faculties and build out a firm design change plan addressing those needs. Taking into account the learnings from the Legal launch.
- The Change Plan will include a detailed impact assessment.
- Change intervention – applying an intervention tool to support change in the processes for faculties and business units.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the disjointedness of this program and have seen other adoption tools as being an option? Possibly using WalkMe in the student space
- Transferring from the old to the new
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the WalkMe system needs an administrator and it's a separate project.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented we have not defined our Staff Experience
- GIPA s.3.2 – Addressed a process risk for the program in how we are going to do this. A need to understand that faculties all have different way of doing things and educating them on this is the way things are going to be streamlined and this is the standard process.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that there is a whole periphery around process management with people and governance policy changes.
- GIP A s.3 – Noted that this includes delegations and will have direct impact on work arounds.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Who owns the process redesign, who owns the resolution.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Understands this is the functional owners as these are workflows reflecting the process.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated there is potential of overlap and duplication of work with ERP.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that ESM is the experience layer being the portal and the ServiceNow Platform.
  The process maybe ESM or ERP or both triggered by ESM into ERP
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested we need to be careful on how much service/ process change would fall under that.
- GIP A s 3 – Commented that a recent briefing with ERP, the FGM were advised that nothing has been documented on current state processes as they are obsolete or they won't support it so the need for ERP and very little customisation needed. To design the processes, need to understand what the processes are.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Attended a briefing last week around these systems coming in with what is called "best practice". We don't customise but configure.
- GIP A s 3 – There are certain processes in the university in place for reasons such as the Enterprise Agreement
- GIPA s.3.2 – The due diligence being conducted will determine those requirements and ensure we have the capability in place. GIPA s.3.2 has been brought on full time as HR Lead to understand these issues and will mean that there won't be 7 different ways to do HR management.

4.2. High Level Communications Plan *(slide 17)*

Noted as read.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that the channels are clear and systematic.
  Asked the program to look at the key messages and changing the wording of the elevator pitch.
  - ESM is about making things easy.
  - Make it clear and crisp.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the program has updated the vision.

UTS

4.3. AC3 Mobilisation Update *(slide 18)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented on the AC3 Mobilisation noting the following:

- RFQ process where AC3 is the preferred vendor, the contract negotiations in progress.
- Should be in a position for GIPA s.3.2 to sign this afternoon, after a number of amendments have been addressed by both parties.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented on the tightness of the schedule and must deliver release 1 at the end of September. If we start changing scope, we really need to understand why.
  Asking for consideration in Release 1 SoW for an opportunity to mix things up a bit and bring HR forward on items not dependant on ERP.

4.3. Departmental Benefit Showcase *(slide 20)*

GIPA s.3.2 explained how the Departmental Showcase will shape the program's success criteria.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Raised the cross functional work and not being able to see the effect in the matrix.
- GIPA s.3.2 – the goal here was to gather unique items for each area, there is a lot of interconnected workflows.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Showcasing processes shows that they are multi-functional processes e.g.: onboarding is not just a people process.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Explained he was not sure how these benefits will be achieved.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Shared that where this has value is a voice of the customer for what they are looking for, to get understanding and trigger thinking. Not necessarily to align with benefits tracking.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed what was helpful in the key messages in the communications plan, the perspective of the user, provider and manager.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the program is designing target specific training to the users around roles.

4.5. Baseline Service Catalogue Update *(slide 23)*

GIPA s.3.2 shared with the committee that the baseline service catalogue is complete.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if there is a view of which services will be provided ERP?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that falls under service architecture which we have established a first draft of, along with guiding principles, and the next step is to socialise those with ERP. The program is designing a dashboard which is meaningful.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked whether we have looked at these which are truly discreet?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that these are purely a collection of current state.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Summarising a service catalogue, as a list of unique activities, and a separate list from that main list, of those services which are user-requestable.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the cost to the program and rate of change, and a concern around IT and Ops where work which hasn't commenced yet and where ITU has the potential to slow

things down. We need to rationalise that and include this as a milestone on the schedule. The risk is whether ITU can keep up with the pace that AC3 must execute at, in order to meet September.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested if we want it to be bespoke, we won't keep up.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed not bespoke, GIPA s.3.2 replied we can make the deadline if not bespoke.

4.6. Forward Business List *(slide 26)*

No discussion of this item

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business.

- No other business was raised

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 12.00pm.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 4th April 2023 | 1:00 – 2:00pm

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____

CHAIR

____

DATE

UTS

CLOSED ACTIONS

ACTIONS		Owner	Due	Status
1	Cost forecast updated in line with the go-to-green plan.	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]	18 Nov 22	Closed
2	Project Briefs updated in line with the go-to-green plan.	[redacted]	27 Oct 22	Closed
3	Highlight the status of the deliverables (with traffic lights) on deliverables list, roadmaps, and timelines.	[redacted]	16 Dec 22	Closed
7	ESM Program to adopt UPMO templates and guidance as it emerges.	[redacted]	Ongoing	Closed
8	Create and distribute a slide setting out a mapping between outcomes and investment to date.	[redacted]	7 Oct 22	Closed
9	Provide a clear view of total cost for FY23	[redacted]	18 Nov 22	Closed
10	Procurement - RFQ Pre-Market review session with GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]	[redacted]	13 Oct 22	Closed
11	Procurement – ensure that we have business representation on the RFQ evaluation panel to select a design and implementation partner.	[redacted]	27 Oct 22	Closed
12	Change Management - Confirm that the stakeholder management plan nominates individuals within the program as the relationship manager for every identified stakeholder. *I can confirm this is being actively managed; refer to slide 11* here	[redacted]	Completed 13 Oct 22	Closed
13	Change Management – Liaise with GIPA s.3 [redacted] Faculty Working Group comprising of SME's. GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] *Working Together level. WIP*	[redacted]	27 Oct 22	Closed (WT)
3	Update the ESM strategy analysis to include the impacts of the absence of an overarching ESM strategy and present a view of what options UTS has to mitigate any impacts.	[redacted]	12 Dec 23	Closed
5	Continue work on building glossary of terms including service, process, transaction and form; along with roles such as service owner, platform owner, business owner and process owner - to translate these terms into authority description, function and responsibility. It was established	[redacted]	7 Mar 23	Closed

UTS

	that the <u>ESM & ERP Glossary of Terms</u> is not specific-enough to ESM and unfit for this purpose. • The program will work with UPMO and the new vendor on terms before commencing business engagement.			
8	Share with the Steering Committee the outcomes and decision on the vendor selection.	GIPA s.3.2	24 Jan 23	Closed
9	Liaise with Procurement on the options we have to shift the commercial construct to lower our investment commitment / risk (ie. splitting the contract into tranches, etc.) this may include but not be limited to payment milestones.		24 Jan 23	Closed
9	Liaise with Procurement on the options we have to shift the commercial construct to lower our investment commitment / risk (ie. splitting the contract into tranches, etc.) this may include but not be limited to payment milestones.		24 Jan 23	Closed
2	Share the ITU target state uplift for IT service delivery pack to the SC by next session		24 Jan '23	Closed
11	Requested to convene the DISC in January to address ESM funding shortfall to enable the appointment of the vendor		15 Feb '23	Closed
18	**Finance -** DISC Paper • Case for change slide, move to appendix item • Case for change – headline uplift • Create 4-5 dot point slide • Slide numbers for the pack • Move budget slide up front Avg spend to other universities $19m		06 Feb '23	**Closed**
22	**Change and Communications** Schedule meeting with Change Manager with GIPA s.3.2		04 Feb '23	**Closed**
12	**Finance** - Present a budget breakdown on costs for 2023. • Resourcing • Vendor costs		07 Mar '23	Undertaken on 7/3/23; Closed

14	**Vendor** - Request the winning vendor (AC3) showcase their higher education experience	GIPA s.3.2	04 Feb '23	Closed
15	**Vendor** - AC3 to provide a referee from the higher education industry		04 Feb '23	Closed
16	**Change and Communications** Present the Change Strategy including name and key messaging reference groups		07 Mar '23	Closed

UTS

ENTERPRISE SERVICE MANAGEMENT (ESM)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 04/04/2023

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the ESM Program Steering Committee meeting held on Tuesday, 4th April 2023 from 1:00pm to 2:00pm at CB01.04a.026 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	

ACTIONS REGISTER

DECISIONS	
1	**Implementation Approach** The Steering Committee endorsed Option 2 – Transition and Transform together in one event for both the portal and the platform (in September).
2	**Option Evaluation for the Acceleration of the People Unit** The Steering Committee endorsed Option 2 – Continuing with current scope for Release #1 focusing on the full transformation of People Unit as a revised Release #2 (with current Business Units in Release #2 pushed back). With a view to explore a value orientated approach and what options evolve.
3	**Reference Group** The Steering Committee confirmed to move this item for noting, not a decision.

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

- GIPA s.3.2 – Welcomed members to the Steering Committee and noted apologies.

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

- Actions and minutes noted as read and accepted.
- GIPA s.3.2 Suggested to move the Actions above into a separate register with a link to refer to.
- **Action** 2: ESM Reference Group.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Queried that the Steering Committee still has not received a membership list for review.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the program has been working with GIPA on the reference group. GIPA is the convenor of the reference group who will endorse the membership and TOR has been drafted for approval.

1.3. Program Performance *(Slide 3)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the ESM Program Performance, noting the following:

- **Program achievements**
  - Program Launch event is scheduled for the 26th April.
  - AC3 in week 3 of mobilisation, have joined in our ways of working and reporting.
  - Senior Manager, Service Management office commencing Tuesday next week.
  - Plans for the portal design approach.
  - Convergence of schedules of AC3 and the program.
  - Milestone mentions of portal/ platform design and build.
  - Reference Group recruitment has commenced.

- **Program performance**
  - The program continues to track green..
  - Amber representing the criticality of locking down the implementation approach

- **Finance**
  - The program is continuing to track against the forecast.
  - Expect the underspend to level out in the next few months, GIPA s.3.4 .
  - Acceleration options of bringing forward the People Unit, potential impact by way of a variation.
  - Returning to DiSC in May.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested to include in the Launch agenda the Reference Group membership.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested to include a quote from GIPA – "I have to open 7 programs to get anything done!"
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked whether we need to identify a risk between the IT Operating Model and ESM?

UTS

- GIPA s.3.2 – Answered with equally with ERP and the necessity to be sharp on the language for these risks, not leaving gaps and duplicating.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that UPMO will help facilitating this and providing visibility.

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION

2.1. Implementation Approach *(Slide 7)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the ESM Implementation approach in collaboration with AC3 and ServiceNow, noting the following four options:

1. New Platform (Hybrid) **Recommended** – Comprises a blend of option 2 and 4 delivered in July. Upgrade the portal to a new future ready experience using current outputs of the portal design approach. Potential to incur more cost.
2. New Platform (Big Bang) – Build a new platform in the background and transition business units onto it with a clean switch in September.
3. New Platform (Phased) – Designing a new platform and a progressive transition leading to a confusing user experience.
4. Fix and move forward – Unpick constraining customisations to existing ServiceConnect platform. Reset what we already have, the effort and finding where to put knowledge management prove to be overwhelming.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed the Steering Committee will not consider high risk options.
- GIP A – Expressed that option 2 would be more efficient than option 1 given not managing things at the same time. How possible without additional cost.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated that the cost of option 1, the effort is the same as the portal needs to be designed and built however the sequencing will be different.
  Bringing the portal forward earlier and working on the departments in the background
  Additional effort is negligible.
- GIP A – Mentioned that end of June is the end of autumn session where a lot of people on leave and activities being finalised up for the end of semester.
  Advised checking with FGM's if the June timeline is a good idea.
  End of September is good timing as teaching is in session.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked what no impact means for customer experience in options 1 and 2.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Advised the customer experience for option 1 is brought up to the portal level in July and the transition of being shifted across. Option 2 customer experience needs to be unpacked a bit further.
- GIP A – Mentioned that customer experience is through the uplift in the portal, the transition method where everything working and cutting over to new one, can't guarantee that it will work if on a separate system in the first step.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that option 1 will bring forward the portal design creating user experience whilst in the background tweak forms and get new one ready in parallel. However still faced with a cutover to new platform. Why is the risk mitigated? The Steering Committee has previously agreed that September is the preferred timeline. Can we deliver a portal in 10 weeks? Change period is not ideal given the holidays. Preference is to have a consultation period.
- GIP A – Shared his preference is for option 2.

UTS

- GIPA s.3.2 – Also shared concerns for option 1, using the expression where they might "see the pig, rather than the lipstick".
- GIPA s.3.2 – Agreed after discussion to choose option 2, based on the current delivery approach. Notwithstanding people unit acceleration option.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Acknowledged the intent of the program trying to bring the value forward. The value will be in the content rather than the appearance. Option 2 is the preferred option given the change risk which GIPA s.3.2 called out, schedule cost and design risk in trying to fast track the portal.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the definition of Portal is important, from service portal to total staff experience portal.

2.2. Option Evaluation for the Acceleration of the People Unit's ESM Transformation *(Slide 10)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the People Unit Options Paper, noting that currently they are scheduled for release 3 and 4. Given the large volume of service requests and disuse of the HR Module the program has explored four high level options to bring People into release 1.

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed a need to understand why the approach continues to be functionally siloed. The schedule of services across all functions has a view of taking highest transaction services within the enterprise catalogue and address those first.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Explained the early-stage analysis by Deloitte characterises the people unit, their services and complexities.
  Each option was assessed against a specific set of measures to ensure consistency.
  Regardless of which unit we are sequencing/ prioritising, the fundamental dependency exists we need to have the portal and platform completed for any business unit to transition.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked where is the additional cost and risk when moving People into release 1 across all options and raised in previous sessions the dangers of siloed approach and not realising the change impact on staff, is there a reason why we need to keep a functional approach?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated that this agenda item is to explore the options of accelerating People at the Steering Committees request, the program has not investigated breaking up the services beyond the department layer. There is a need to preserve division, unit, team, section.
  The way we conduct this work is by engaging with the departments.
  The program is on target and commitment to scope and approach needs to remain.
  We need to paint the user experience department by department or against the programs recommendation of section by section.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that the outcome here is to remove GIPA s.3.2's pain points, not transform the whole of HR but give them quick fixes and provide maximum value early, with no impact to current release scheduled.
- GIPA – Asked if the cost and effort, is that bring forward of spend already committed to or additional?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that we have a clear scope with AC3 till September and tracking towards that budget. Options presented are extra costs incurred brought forward from 2024, post September.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Mentioned another option noting that University of Sydney took a user centric perspective, looked at end to end processes and bundle services into their portal. I.e.: a

number of processes don't sit within People Unit but across a number of functions such as onboarding.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the program discussed this with Deloitte and this is the interdepartmental workflows, we transform these on a case by case basis with the originating department.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the huge quick win and improving the staff experience by removing shared mailboxes removing the manual tasks.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that this is one of the biggest pain points for People and also Knowledge Management needs to be in place for it to be effective. Deloitte scheduled People at the end as they are complex and all over the place.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the Steering Committee will not consider high risk options.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Explained Option 1 essentially solved Legals biggest pain points in the digitising of their forms. Using the HR module in a targeted benefit driven approach, circle round and complete Legal in release 3 and 4.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Legacy forms are in excess of 300, 80 unique forms.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested that we do not currently have the budget for option 1 and will need to apply to DiSC.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Option 2 is the more conservative approach concentrating on People and deferring the other departments to 2024, representing the lowest cost.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Shared preference for option 2.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the commencement of the review and redesign of the operating model for People Unit, may cause us to defer or integrate with option 2.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Acknowledged the committee is comfortable with option 2, focusing purely on the full transformation of People Unit.
  Release 2 scheduled for September 2024, will need more analysis due to system integrators arriving on ERP, currently People Unit is front loaded into ERP, will be in design mode and potentially organisational change impacts.
  Taking on GIPA s.3.2's point, not convinced that everything needs to be unit by unit as opposed to cross enterprise workflows, example faculty fee waivers. Explore more mix of benefits, take a view of staff centric and pain points staff have.
  Explore a value orientated approach and what options evolve.

2.3. Program Reference Group Overview *(Slide 15)*

GIPA s.3.2 shared the program reference group overview, for noting and taken as read.

- This group is being established, with GIPA s.3.2 at the helm to ensure that ESM is people led, the PMG will help the program co-design.
- GIPA will provide membership and terms of reference and ensure that every area is represented, with the support of the OCM team.

3. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

3.1. N/A

UTS

4. ITEMS FOR NOTING

4.1. Portal Design Approach *(slide 20)*

- No discussion of this item

4.2. Legal Service Digitisation Case Study *(slide 28)*

- No discussion of this item

5. APPENDICES

5.1. Forward Business List *(slide 31)*

- No discussion of this item

6. OTHER BUSINESS

6.1. Wrap up/ Any other business

- GIPA s.3.2 thanked the program team, noting that the pack now has a level of maturity and looking forward to the kick-off on the 26th April.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 2.00pm.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 9th May 2023 | 10:00 – 11:00am

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____

CHAIR

____

DATE

UTS

CLOSED ACTIONS

ACTIONS		Owner	Due	Status
1	Cost forecast updated in line with the go-to-green plan.	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]	18 Nov 22	Closed
2	Project Briefs updated in line with the go-to-green plan.		27 Oct 22	Closed
3	Highlight the status of the deliverables (with traffic lights) on deliverables list, roadmaps, and timelines.		16 Dec 22	Closed
7	ESM Program to adopt UPMO templates and guidance as it emerges.		Ongoing	Closed
8	Create and distribute a slide setting out a mapping between outcomes and investment to date.		7 Oct 22	Closed
9	Provide a clear view of total cost for FY23		18 Nov 22	Closed
10	Procurement - RFQ Pre-Market review session with GIPA s.3.2 [redacted].		13 Oct 22	Closed
11	Procurement – ensure that we have business representation on the RFQ evaluation panel to select a design and implementation partner.		27 Oct 22	Closed
12	Change Management - Confirm that the stakeholder management plan nominates individuals within the program as the relationship manager for every identified stakeholder. *I can confirm this is being actively managed; refer to slide 11* here		Completed 13 Oct 22	Closed
13	Change Management – Liaise with GIPA [redacted] Faculty Working Group comprising of SME's. GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] *Working Together level. WIP*		27 Oct 22	Closed (WT)
3	Update the ESM strategy analysis to include the impacts of the absence of an overarching ESM strategy and present a view of what options UTS has to mitigate any impacts.		12 Dec 23	Closed
5	Continue work on building glossary of terms including service, process, transaction and form; along with roles such as service owner, platform owner, business owner and process owner - to translate these terms into authority description, function and responsibility. It was established		7 Mar 23	Closed

UTS

	that the <u>ESM & ERP Glossary of Terms</u> is not specific-enough to ESM and unfit for this purpose. • The program will work with UPMO and the new vendor on terms before commencing business engagement.	GIPA s.3.2		
8	Share with the Steering Committee the outcomes and decision on the vendor selection.		24 Jan 23	Closed
9	Liaise with Procurement on the options we have to shift the commercial construct to lower our investment commitment / risk (ie. splitting the contract into tranches, etc.) this may include but not be limited to payment milestones.		24 Jan 23	Closed
9	Liaise with Procurement on the options we have to shift the commercial construct to lower our investment commitment / risk (ie. splitting the contract into tranches, etc.) this may include but not be limited to payment milestones.		24 Jan 23	Closed
2	Share the ITU target state uplift for IT service delivery pack to the SC by next session		24 Jan ‘23	Closed
11	Requested to convene the DISC in January to address ESM funding shortfall to enable the appointment of the vendor		15 Feb ‘23	Closed
18	**Finance -** DISC Paper • Case for change slide, move to appendix item • Case for change – headline uplift • Create 4-5 dot point slide • Slide numbers for the pack • Move budget slide up front Avg spend to other universities $19m		06 Feb ‘23	**Closed**
22	**Change and Communications** Schedule meeting with Change Manager with GIPA s.3.2		04 Feb ‘23	**Closed**
12	**Finance** - Present a budget breakdown on costs for 2023. • Resourcing • Vendor costs		07 Mar ‘23	Undertaken on 7/3/23; Closed

GIPA s.3.2

14	**Vendor** - Request the winning vendor (AC3) showcase their higher education experience		04 Feb ‘23	Closed
15	**Vendor** - AC3 to provide a referee from the higher education industry		04 Feb ‘23	Closed
16	**Change and Communications** Present the Change Strategy including name and key messaging reference groups		07 Mar ‘23	Closed

SERVICECONNECT PROGRAM (SCP)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 09/05/2023

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the SCP Program Steering Committee meeting held on Tuesday, 9th May 2023 from 10:00am to 11.00am at CB01.04b.12 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.2 [redacted], GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]

ACTIONS REGISTER

New Actions added to the register:

- **Program Achievements** – GIPA [redacted] to remove completed milestones and build out more detail in portal and platform milestones.
- **Risk reporting** - GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] and UPMO to build a risk report including a pie graph.
- **Inbound channel review** – GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] (Program's Change Manager) to investigate the journeys from the outside website and also from StaffConnect into the existing ServiceConnect portal and identify issues and opportunities to improve those journeys.
- **Licencing** – Work with ServiceNow on an escalation and potential claw-back of some sunk costs related to the HR module.
- **Appendices** – GIPA [redacted] to remove the reference slides and build into the Key Documents slide.

DECISIONS	
1	**Licence Review** The Steering Committee is comfortable with the licencing approach presented. GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] noting that if we treat this as an ITOM module or CMBD implementation, we will be in trouble, this needs to be a capability development.
2	**Option Evaluation for the expansion of scope for Legal Unit (now OGC)** The Steering Committee confirmed that the Legal team (under OGC) remains in scope for Release #1 and the newly added Risk & Compliance teams (under OGC) are to be deferred to Release #2 in 2024.

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

- GIPA s.3.2 – Welcomed GIPA s.3.2 to the Steering Committee and noted apologies.
- Expressed positive feedback on the launch event and provided good awareness and clarity. GIPA s.3.2's realism on the difficulties encountered and the time it took was also a great addition, along with her description of the exciting outcomes.
- It was also valuable in setting out the design and reference group approach.

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

- **Decision item 1** - Implementation Approach
  Endorsement of option 2 – Transition and Transform together in one event for both the portal and the platform ("big-bang").
- **Action item AS1078** – Installing 4 weeks of float remains outstanding due to the tight critical path, and may not be feasible without a re-baseline.
- **Action item AS1089** – Business case update with vendor costs, cost benefits underway
- Remaining actions and minutes noted as read and accepted.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Recalls the committee agreeing not to take high risk approach however the decision was to endorse Option 2 ("big-bang") that potentially has a high risk whereby the cutover would entail a complex deployment plan, the inherent risk is low.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Recollection is that GIPA s.3.2 & GIPA required minimum disruption to the business as a priority driving the implementation approach decision.
- GIPA s.3.2 – The implementation approach endorsed represents the best and cleanest user experience in terms of coexistence (running 2 systems for most user groups). Slightly higher transitional or cutover risk here due to technical complexity of portal and platform going live. A well-rehearsed back up plan will mitigate this risk.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed preference for release 2 due to the need for a basic level of Knowledge Management to be established.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the committee is comfortable with Option 2 as discussed in April meeting.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the program is continuing to try and inject 4 weeks of float into the schedule, but due to the tight deadlines and many interconnected activities on the critical path that it may not be achievable without a re-baseline.
- GIPA s.3.2 – The revised business case takes a wider investment view, compared to the first edition which solely focussed on Release #1.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested that it would be good finalise given the context of DiSC.

1.3. Program Performance *(Slide 3)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the SCP Performance, noting the following:

- **Program achievements**
  - Successful launch event, in terms of providing awareness and understanding of the Program's mission. Engagement substantially increased following the event with

enquiries coming through from areas such as UTS International, Respect-now-always and the Library.
  - The program's SLG update in the context of the UPMO Portfolio update further built on that awareness.
  - Program Reference Groups have mobilised commencing this week.
  - Interviews being held this week for the Senior Manager SMO
  - Joint AC3/UTS team have almost completed the Service Transformation Framework
  - Business engagement workshops due to commence next week, with the help of GIPA s.3.2 coming on board into the Head GIPA s.3.2 role.
  - Continued inter-program alignment work with UPMO.
  - ERP/ SCP piece is in focus for 2024, IT Op Model alignment is up front. GIPA s.3.2 mentioned that ERP is a significant and crucial investment and that work should be planned in 2023; GIPA s.3.2 acknowledged.
  - Portal and platform build to commence next week.
  - Solution architecture and Knowledge Management approach near completion.
  - Development of a business unit reporting dashboard is about to commence.

- **Program performance**
  - The program continues to track amber for resource and schedule, reflecting a few GIPA s.3.4, September schedule risk and some scope boundary clarifications we are working through with AC3.
  - There is a risk of rework and additional effort to align with organisation and the responsibility changes implemented by the IT Operating Model, need to be aligned with this work and reflect this in our work.
  - Risk and dependency analysis work with AC3 this week resulting in findings that OOTB, ITOM and ITSM approach along with our approach to process and workflow improvement are all compliant thus far with product and platform models.

- **Finance**
  - The program is continuing to track against the expected spend forecast.
  - Continued underspend GIPA s.3.4 (which is almost resolved), resources moving off the program (our Communications Manager) and delays in SMO role being hired and onboarded which continues to impact us.

- **Timeline**
  - A High-level timeline of key activities showing a project-by-project view.
  - Detailed business unit timelines in development.

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if there is a danger on impacts for requirements definition for ERP if we don't get clarity on expectations of each platform?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that yes, SCP need to work on the service architecture with ERP and a draft has been released with ERP to socialise.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that for UTS will see this as a high priority and the investment for ERP is substantial and will be led by ERP investment requirements.
- GIPA s.3.2 – At this stage we expect ESM would orchestrate the components in the absence of ERP selecting a platform.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that the design of portal and platform have very few milestones over a 3-month period, which doesn't provide much visibility of progress. Build out detail and forward view. Action registered.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked whether whilst there won't be significant re-work, will there be further enhancements post IT Op Model and order of magnitude might be.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Discussions are underway with GIPA s.3.2 on the approach – this may include a feature release drop from Sep-Oct timeframe to be more appropriate and in line with IT Op Model to be more impactful delivery. Reviewing all options
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked when the program is due to run out of funding.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that current allocations will run out in June.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated that we are doing the "classic lift and shift", are we ignoring opportunity other functions.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Minimal improvements in the Legacy forms space (to get off the old platform), where possible we will apply minor <2 day effort improvements, but not the full service transformation..
- GIPA s.3.4 Mentioned a previous project AC3 completed was rationalising 285 forms to 50 improving user experience as it was less complex and the key is to engage the right stakeholders so they understand the change.
- GIPA – Asked who the program is engaging with.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that we have stakeholder maps identifying the appropriate engagement, and that engagement is active.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if, at this point in the schedule development, if the program was at the stage to determine the critical path.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the gold milestones provide the overall picture of the critical path.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if the Knowledge Management (KM) approach and strategy has kicked off and who the program was collaborating with.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated that a function of the PRG will be to review the KM approach and strategy, along with all key knowledge stakeholders.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked that when portal released in September, will KM be in place?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the program will build that framework with knowledge-based articles by type. Certain elements of the IT KM articles will be transferred across.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that the UTS website is very out of date, and the onboarding portal has old information and broken links. Queried if that angle is being looked at, in coming into the Portal from the website?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Clarified that the DPP program is looking at our external website, and requested for the Change Management of the program team investigate the journey from the outside website and also ServiceConnect into the existing ServiceConnect portal and identify issues and opportunities to improve those journeys.
- GIPA s.3.2 - Asked for an overarching plan as to 'what goes where', as faculties often build SharePoint sites which have forms within. LX.labs has a public facing site and they are trying to work out what should be on the website from a teaching point of view vs what should be in SharePoint.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that ITU are looking at that big picture and the provision of tactical direction/ recommendation in how we use those platforms which may address that.

2. ITEMS FOR NOTING

2.1. Program Reference Group Update *(Slide 8)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the SCP Reference Group Update noting the following:

- The launch event built successfully created more awareness and the membership is increasing.
- PRGs have mobilised with the first session on Friday focussing on portal design. Portal development group will meet regularly over the next 4 weeks to test and review and provide input of the prototype. Plans will then be consolidated with service and workflows group and the change and communications group.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if the make-up of these groups are the same people.
- GIP A – Confirmed that there are a few overlaps in some areas.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented on the large investment in HCD made in 2022 and looks to need further funding this year.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the HCD Playbook developed in 2022 is largely the SCP bible and that AC3 is following that playbook. The HCD resourcing gap has recently been filled and is reviewing the status quo.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked whether before the ITSM implementation, do we need to apply same logic of reference groups, given our specialist customer facing processes? Preference is to have a separate ITSM reference group.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that we are all customers, and that we should extend and repurpose groups. Discussions with IT Ops ongoing in this space as we identify a distinctive group purpose separate from the workshops underway.
- GIP A – Observed that we probably didn't invite enough people to the launch and would welcome service centre and IT Ops representation.

3. ITEMS FOR DECISION

3.1. Licence Review *(slide 10)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented on the Licence renewals seeking endorsement on the purchase of ITOM in Release #1 and HAM & SAM in Release #2.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Mentioned that we are behind in these capabilities, we are not ready to move to HAM & SAM. We need to get our best practices in place.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that in setting an expectation in creating a burning platform around the program is addressing asset management in our cyber GIPA s.3.2 .
- GIP A – Commented that the faculties struggle with requests from academics wanting software and applications which are probably duplicated in another faculty therefore not cost effective.
  FEIT now records in an excel spreadsheet as part of business continuity planning all their software and applications.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded with that being on the radar in getting a better handle on what is out there.

UTS

- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that as part of the LX Transformation the Program should consolidate that information and is uncertain if that is technology based.
- GIPA – Noted that if we are going to improve our cyber GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
- GIPA s.3.2 - Rigour around business case and course liability and true costs.
- GIPA - What is missing now is the people costs associated with delivering a course, not looking at the NSI required.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the HR Module was a waste of time and money.

3.2 Option Evaluation for the expansion of scope for Legal Unit (now OGC) *(slide 16)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented on the Legal scope expansion to include Risk and Compliance sections to better align with the organisational changes, noting the following 3 options:

1. Deliver the transformation of the Risk and Compliance teams in Release #2 – **Recommended.**
2. Add the Risk and Compliance teams to the current scope of Release #1
3. Do nothing

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned the impacts Option 1 would have on the People Unit's release.
- GIPA s.3.2 – We have sufficient time to plan and go to market with Release #2
- GIPA s.3.2 – Understands that the difference between the options 1 and 2, the spend will be $95k, just a phasing question to decide whether this year or next.
- GIPA s.3.2 – From a business focus, the Office of General Council (OGC) will be fully transformed as a business unit under Option 2 above. The legal team risk will be deferred.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the difference between options 1 and 3, that this is about risk management for the program and risk to the schedule of delivering ITSM. Conveyed nervousness around people working on Legal, are not working on ITSM.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that in option 1, we keep the current scope with Legal and that there is no risk to the program by including the Risk and Compliance teams in Release #2, but there will be large impacts if adding into current scope of Release #1.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated that we agreed to do Legal as a test case digitising their forms and we need to be clear that the wider General Counsel function is Release #2. The priority for now needs to be ITSM.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented on having not seen the internal workings of how AC3 functions, can only assume that the Legal piece is running parallel to ITSM.

4. <u>APPENDICES</u>

4.1. Forward Business List *(slide 31)*

- Noted as read and accepted.
- Noting that review of the revised Business case was missing as this has been scheduled to be presented at next SteerCo

UTS

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business

- With GIPA s.3.3 leaving and GIPA s.3.3 on maternity leave, the program is working with UPMO on a backfill strategy in a Change Manager with communications skills.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Flagged a risk that the work done to-date on ITSM requirements definition may not be reflective of the broader IT requirements and may create rework, impacting schedules.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded with meetings scheduled this week;
  - Overview of the SCP approach
  - ITSM works completed to-date.

- GIPA s.3.2 thanked the program team for the continued good work.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 11.00am.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 6th June 2023 | 1:00 – 2:00pm

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____

CHAIR

____

DATE

UTS

SERVICECONNECT PROGRAM (SCP)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 06/06/2023

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the SCP Steering Committee meeting, held on Tuesday, 6th June 2023 from 1:00pm to 2.00am at CB01.04b.12 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]

ACTIONS REGISTER

New Actions added to the register:

- **Financials** – Program to provide a more detailed financial update to PM.
- **Financials** – UPMO to uplift the program financials slide for all programs (transferred to the UPMO)
- **Release #1 Schedule Impacts:** Problem #1 - AC3 to complete the full discovery and analysis and present findings back to the next Committee with a recommendation from the program.
- **Release #1 Schedule Impacts:** Problem #1 – AC3 to provide a pie chart breakdown to show form level.
- **Release #1 Schedule Impacts:** Problem #1 - AC3 to provide a second PVR that covers an alternative "no transformation" approach specifically, and outlines any associate impacts.
- **Release #1 Schedule Impacts Problem #2 -** AC3 to present a PCR to address the scope gap to the next Committee with a recommendation from the program.
- **Definitions** – GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to develop a slide for the next Committee to define and clarify key terms. E.g. Service Catalogue, process, taxonomy, architecture and workflows.
- **Knowledge Management** – GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to send GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] a list of contributors to the Knowledge Management strategy and approach.
- **Business Case** – GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to clarify implementation approach commentary (why we chose and be consistent on lower risk) as noted in the business case.
- **Business Case** – GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to add amortised and scaled cost benefits into the business case – consult GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] slide.
- **Change Management**: GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to present stakeholder engagement plan, setting out the end-to-end service user experience over the various stages of implementation.
- **Reference Groups**: Bring a Reference Group update for the July Steering Committee

UTS

DECISIONS

1 **Knowledge Strategy**

The Committee acknowledges the work being done and has raised several points to be investigated and addressed and updates to be made. In particular;

- Explain the current environment up front and what is the problem statement.
- Contextualise more - this is within what frame and will be applied how?
- Be clear - not replacing StaffConnect for all features and functions.
- Integrate with digital experience work.
- Say that we are only scoping user and requestor consumable knowledge ("how do I ...?", "or I want to know...")
- Articulate what knowledge is and what it isn't.
- How will we publish in a user context?
- Be clear about the objectives, and then explain, in the strategy, how these will be achieved and when.
- Reduce the amount of guiding principles
- Provide a list of stakeholders for engagement to validate the approach.
- What is not in scope e.g.: confluence, replace as a knowledge source.
- The user focus needs to be paramount.
- A UTS reference group needs to be consulted, provide input, perspective and authenticity to this artefact.
- Missing a regulatory and legislative compliance (i.e. privacy) lens
- Key stakeholders (by role)
- What's not in scope? - Clarify: slide 7 zooms in on the ServiceConnect components. Is the previous slide a continuation or does this replace it?
- Be clear on the relationship with confluence - does ServiceConnect replace that?

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

The Chair welcomed the Steering Committee, GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] representing UPMO and noted apologies.

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

Minutes taken as accurate and read.

- **Action item AS1087 –** Revised Business Case will be presented to the July Steering Committee
- **Action item AS1101 –** Change Management journey analysis has commenced, which is aimed at identifying all inbound user journeys to ServiceConnect. One particular finding was that not one pathway directly links users to ServiceConnect, they all must be manually entered in the URL bar.
- **Action AS1102 –** Discussions with ServiceNow pertaining to cost clawback for unused HR module have been deprioritised due to the schedule impacts, and will pick up in the coming weeks.

1.3. Program Performance *(Slide 3)*

GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] presented the program performance, summarising that the program is following two live issues causing red milestones in the schedule tracking. Good progress made on all other key critical path items and RFQ process kicked off this week for testing services to supplement the AC3 development.

- **Program achievements**
  - Assumed read.

- **Program performance**
  - The 2 Issues are impacting the release of SoW2, creating a delay in development work, being a critical path activity.
  - The core of this issue is in the additional form volumes discovered in the analysis phase.
  - Inability yet to fulfil the SMO role is also creating a delay in SMO design work.

- **Finance**
  - Continues to track as reported previously, with unrealised spend which will balance out in coming months.
  - Successful in the second DiSC submission for final funding round.
  - Currently working on a view to unpack the budget, actuals and spend better, providing categories/ spend type to showcase next session.

- **Timeline**
  - A High-level timeline of key activities showing streams are predominantly on track, with a few milestones tracking red in the build and development phases due to the 2 issues being tracked.

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested a more granular profile of the risks and issues slide. This is in-train with the UPMO.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the UPMO are currently developing a new pack for programs so they are consistent and will highlight the risks and issues component.
- GIPA s.3.4 Noted that the schedule impact risk that has been tracked from Feb/Mar, relates to the requirements and one of the contributing factors to the issues tabled for discussion.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested a more granular view of the financials, noting that the key items the Committee are interested in are;
  - YTD performance against phased budget (forecast)
  - Understanding as a result of YTD variance, what are our forecasts at completion.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Also requested a better view of the financials, sharing some metrics he is used to profiling at Committee-level in previous engagements.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked what the critical path looks like.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that the SOW #2, following into the ITU service transformation, platform build and engineering activities, testing and then to go-live were our critical path for Release #1. With SoW2 the critically impacting delay at this point.

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION

2.1. Knowledge Management (KM) Strategy *(Slide 8)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the Knowledge Strategy noting the following:

- Recognition that knowledge, like digital experience, is a much wider concept across UTS.
- This knowledge strategy and approach is a joint AC3 and UTS deliverable, setting out the program's approach to dealing with knowledge, addressing our needs in service management for Release #1.
- The KM Strategy was developed in reference to the Australian Standard for knowledge management, and in conjunction with representatives across UTS and IT Digital Working domain.
- The current SharePoint environment houses a lot of knowledge and are we shifting this into ServiceConnect. ServiceConnect will not replace StaffConnect like-for-like.
- GIPA s.3.2 is leading an assessment and review of StaffConnect with MCU and People Unit, commencing with a content audit to design an approach which ties in with the overarching digital experience.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Raised that this is an enterprise system and needs assurance that Knowledge is not being done in isolation.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested a listing of contributing members of the KM Strategy.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that you need a narrow scope of KM to make this program successful. The future of KM across the university needs to be addressed. There is a change in landscape and how we go about knowledge narration to curation and the servicing of it.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Agreed and it needs to be contextualised in the strategy and context of how this will be done and applied. If this is not going to replace StaffConnect, what architecture will we end up with? Will we potentially be running a Portal, StaffConnect and sharepoint sites in parallel which is not the experience being sought.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded with the program is working with departments on their knowledge articles and the program's scope stops at user-requestable knowledge.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented on experience with professional services, that success is in providing structure and an overlay of what is knowledge and what isn't.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned why ServiceConnect cannot replace StaffConnect.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that our mission is to make our services better for users, we are focussed on "I want to know …?" or "how do I ….?".
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that is potentially dangerous to think using it as a replacement for a CMS intranet.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated that the knowledge is decommissioned in StaffConnect as it becomes published in the portal to avoid any confusion.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the enormity of the knowledge held in SharePoint and various platforms, the digital working review will provide a wider view as to how the knowledge would be best stored.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested that in terms of reviewing the strategy,
  - clarity on objectives and explain how they will be achieved.
  - clarity on the timeline.
  - reduce the number of guiding principles.

UTS

  - which reference group has provided faculty perspective for users.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Noted that the user reference groups are progressing well with portal design development. A new group being formulated for ITSM.

3. ITEMS FOR NOTING

3.1 AC3 Progress Update *(slide 10)*

GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] provided a snapshot on the AC3 engagement providing an overview of the last 11 weeks in the discovery phase of Release #1 scope of works, noting the following:

- 1101 requirements reviewed, with stories to build.
- Engaging with the business to build stories in a consultative manner.
- Capabilities demonstration workshop for stakeholders successfully delivered.
- HCD playbook has influenced the portal design.
- These foundation pieces are important setting AC3 up in the next phase of build.
- SoW1 due for completion end of June
- Commencement of SoW2 scheduled for 12th June.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Requested an example of a requirement which resulted in 'no story'.
- GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] Come back to the committee with no story examples.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Shared a view that a lot of the original Enable requirements defined were considered Out Of The Box (OOTB).

3.2 Release #1 Schedule Impacts *(slide 12)*

GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] presented on the Schedule Impacts for Release #1 stating that we are in week 11 of the engagement nearing the conclusion of the planning and discovery phase. Also noting that on the GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]

Problem #1 The commencement of platform development is delayed;

GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]

[redacted]

As a response to this critical path issue, GIPA s.3.4 [redacted].

UTS

GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] talked about the impacts on the schedule as a result of this problem, explaining that there are 2 parts to the issue.

1. Build did not commencing on the 15th May as scheduled GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] Identified that discovery is not yet complete and are engaging with the business and ensuring the quality is not compromised. We believe that incident / problem / change elements will be contained and that release #1 will still be delivered in September for those elements.
2. GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Noted that most of these forms are IT forms, Legal, and legacy.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Suggested a pie chart breakdown to show form level. AC3 to provide.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Suggested an alternative for IT forms, take them as-is with no transformation, what would that mean. AC3 to provide a second PVR that covers this approach specifically, and outlines any associated impacts.
- GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] Confirmed AC3 will provide an option of "lift and shift" for forms.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Noted that there is a big opportunity here for consolidation.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – If we took the view to do IT and Legal and then include HR, what that would look like in the schedule and with financial constraints.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Asked what the user experience would look like with a lift and shift? Will there be any re-work? Nice portal with old problems. GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] responded that the program (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] will provide that view.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Do we have the full schema for HR service catalogue, we have the initial process catalogue, but are they linked? We need to look at the business readiness piece and guidance of discovery before any decisions made.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Stated we are going through the motions, IT and Legal are getting the full service transformation. Legacy forms will be brought over with limited improvements. 2024 in release #2 will have fully transform the services and knowledge of People.
  With onboarding if People are the trigger of a workflow, that form will belong to People.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Feels that the mapping of journeys hasn't been explored thoroughly with triggers from faculties is not clear.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Noted that it doesn't matter that in recruitment where the trigger is started, it is still and HR process, therefore HR needs to own the E2E process regardless of if it touches finance or IT.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Mentioned there is still confusion around definitions and language. Need clarity from UPMO. E.g. Service catalogues are Process catalogues. 300 forms are a service catalogue.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Confirmed that the bottom line is we have an 8-10 week delay, however the core piece is still set for September and need to look at the options on the scope.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Expressed that additionally to orientate the plan around the user experience, offering perhaps featured release drops or a magic day in November to roll out.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Commented that the other issue is the change management plan, and to GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]'s point on user experience and processes, how we are going to deliver this change and setting expectations? What is the strategy, guiding principles and communication messaging, elevator pitches?

- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded with where there is an underlying document, there will be supporting summary slides for discussion.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that these 2 options are really important and what service experience are we going to achieve, based on what we can do.

Problem #2 Service optimisation scope misalignment

As a result of alignment activities, we have discovered a minor misalignment in approach and outcome to improve processes and workflows.

The programs ambition is to improve services and workflows and idea of how to achieve that. Having reviewed AC3's plan we believe we are about 70% of the way through of where the program needs to be. The plan does not include working with ITC customers to understand those pain points presenting 2 decision points;

1. Do we continue as we are, and do this internally.
2. Push for AC3 to do that additional piece of work.

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned if it was worth getting the extra 30% efficiency in the process in doing the additional work and the context on how much re-work there would be.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Advised that this is a result of alignment activities revealed some minor gaps in approach, with very little <20% re-work presented.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Reminded the Committee that we want to set this program up showcasing a whole culture of efficiencies, process mapping and workflow optimisation. The Committee still does not have a view on how we will get business processes established.
- GIPA s.3.2 – ITU are looking at the business process engineering and will take ownership of that piece in BAU.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that the program is going through each business and reengineering it, not as yet assigning business owners. We will handover the BP ownership to BAU.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that organisationally, business processes requires improvement.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested a view of leading methodologies or basic frameworks on approach.

3.3 Multi-year Release Plan *(slide 16)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the program's multi-year release plan setting out the wider journey to achieve our organisational objectives. This outlined the sequence of activities and set the context beyond 2023.

3.4 Enterprise Service Design Authority *(slide 18)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the High-Level Enterprise Service Design process, being an ITU-oriented extension of the existing Solution Design Authority (SDA) and architecture review board governance constructs driving consistency and effectiveness with a high specificity service management focus. It will own design authority for the new ServiceConnect and provide a review and approval framework to ensure strategic alignment, compliance and intentional design decisions that govern the planning, implementation, and ongoing operation of ServiceConnect. This authority will be a key part of the SMO design this year.

3.4 Business Case *(slide 20)*

The Business Case is noted as read.

GIPA s.3.2 commented that this is a work-in-progress and subject to UPMO review, this represents the work being undertaken to provide a comprehensive update to this key artefact. With a lot more work to do, this will eventually reflect the full end-to-end investment and take more shape with a UPMO review.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented on the implementation approach option #2 which was endorsed. GIPA s.3.2 sought clarity on the high risk, this was understood to be high transition risk but lower user experience risk. GIPA s.3.2 requested that this be better articulated in the options analysis to reflect a lower inherent risk. The 'big-bang' approach was chosen because the Committee prioritised user experience and believe the other options would cause confusion for staff and requested the commentary reflect this.

4. APPENDICES

4.1. Forward Business List *(slide 22)*

- No Discussion

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business

- GIPA s.3.2 thanked the program team for the continued good work.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 2.00pm.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 4th July 2023 | 11:00 – 12:00pm

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____

CHAIR

____

DATE

SERVICECONNECT PROGRAM (SCP)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 04/07/2023

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the SCP Steering Committee meeting, held on Tuesday, 4th July 2023 from 11:00am to 12.00pm at CB01.04a.26 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	

ACTIONS REGISTER

New Actions added to the register:

- **Program Management** – Recognise the lack of schedule float and contingency as an issue in the issue register.
- **Program Update** – Clarify the program's approach and deliverables in the CMBD and IT Operations Management space in the next (August) Steering Committee, ensure inclusion in the timeline and milestone tracking.
- **Foreground Critical Path** – Include gold milestones and flag the critical path on the program timeline.
- **Program Update** – Update UPMO with details of the new Go-Live date given the delays with CASS milestones and potential clash.
- **Glossary** – Revisit the Glossary in consultation with the "Process Centre of Excellence in ITU" to identify any gaps to support the key audience here in the IT community.
- **Forms Analysis** – Summarise the forms optimisation (simplicity and effectiveness) for Steering Committee's endorsement. Noting that the delegations have changed since most of these forms were developed.
- **Change Strategy** – Bring back to the Committee for endorsement, removing any triggering words such as "centralising" and "self-service". Socialise with the Committee out of session for endorsement to allow the program to execute the plan.
- **Communications Plan** - Include treatments for channel shift resistance in Communications Plan
- **Change Strategy** – Build a slide on channel shift strategy and our approach to identify and deal with resistance, including how we communicate it.
- **Change Strategy** – Create a separate user reference group for International/Students.

UTS

DECISIONS	
1	**Portal Launch Communications Plan** The Steering Committee approved the Portal Launch Communications plan with the following inclusions: • Engaging the Heads of School group, Leadership team meetings and Faculty Student Newsletters to communicate out to faculties, schools and student communities. • Guidelines on the new ways of working in submitting requests as phone calls and shared email boxes for email enquiries will no longer exist. • A plan to specifically address the student audience with the support of the Head of Students and the faculty student engagement teams.

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

The Chair welcomed the Steering Committee, GIPA s.3.2 as the GIPA s.3.2 for the Operations Division and noted apologies.

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

Minutes taken as true and accurate and read.

1.3. Program Performance *(Slide 3)*

GIPA s.3.2 asked the Committee for a quick whip around on front of mind concerns on the program;

- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested more visibility around the CMBD and ITOM on the program achievements and schedules.
    - Operations Module - most complicated transformation of the tool and riskier than incident management, needing clarity on path to end state.
    - Operating Model
- GIPA – Raised concerns at the amber and red RAG status and the key will be in managing timelines effectively.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted the delay in the CASS milestones raising issues on whether UPMO has capacity for competing activities in a similar timeframe.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requires clarity in how training will be managed.

GIPA s.3.2 presented the program performance, summarising the following;

- **Program achievements**
    - Taken as read.

- **Program performance**
    - Evaluation of vendor submissions received for the Testing Services RFQ.
    - The Program's Partner Panel has expanded to include a further three vendors.
    - The reference group has included the portal design chapter of their journey
    - The complexities of forms and workflows have been clarified with the analysis provided by AC3 on Friday, subject to business unit validation.

- Build and Development will commence shortly on the incident problem & change processes.
- Our new Change Manager, GIPA s.3.2 [redacted], commenced today replacing GIPA s.3.3 [redacted]. An offer was made for an SMO Manager candidate, however it was declined, now considering the other interviewed candidates.
- The Business Case continues to evolve and will bring the full document back to the Committee in August.
- AC3 incorporating the feedback received for the Knowledge management strategy and approach.
- The program is transitioning from a multi-SOW construct, which presented administrative burden, to a single, consolidated SOW for all AC3 deliverables remaining on Release #1.

- **Finance**
  - Continues to track as reported previously, with unrealised spend which will start to balance out next month with AC3 invoicing and SMO role being filled.

- **Timeline**
  - Portal design is complete, waiting on the taxonomy which is 14 days late. Now due on the 21st July.
  - Platform build is 8 weeks behind schedule. The first tranche of the ITSM build is planned to commence this week. Thereafter the plan is to complete platform on 25th August.
  - Delivery of the Solution design has been re-baselined to 7th August.
  - 3 Key ITSM elements are on track for September.
  - Critical path schedule variance is projecting an 8 week delay to the planned go-live date for Release #1. This will be confirmed at the conclusion of business validation.

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] Addressed GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]'s point on visibility of the ITOM and CMBD E2E, the challenge for us is to be able to commit to the schedule given the SoW has not yet been written.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Called out that this is a complex set of requirements and needs to be visible.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Required clarity on the RAG status with schedules indicating red, while resources are green.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Confirmed that workload has levelled out, it is the effort which is taking longer with additional activities.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Requested that the program be very clear on the whether we have the budget to cover a potential 14-week extension in internal resource costs.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Expressed that the finance slide be updated to reflect the projected spend until end of the budget period.
- GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] Commented that on the assumption that we can bring back the number of forms to 90 for build to 90, as a measure to reduce the time to build and go-live, however not all services may be available in such a case.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Stated that the lack of float in the schedule in now an issue.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Asked the program to communicate the new Go-Live date with the UPMO, given the delays with CASS milestones and potential a clash.

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION/DISCUSSION

2.1. Portal Launch Communications Plan *(Slide 8)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the Portal Launch Communications Plan in recognition of the portal's significance and scale of impact. It has been developed to support the launch communicating to the university from the top-down utilising avenues such as the all-staff town hall among others detailed.

The launch also supported the development of training materials and other steps in alignment with the sequence of activities (rather than dates), given the uncertainty of go-live date and in line with the academic calendar.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if the training support will be in the portal and is there a change and comms piece to support the change in process?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Explained that the Portal training can be built into the portal, in that first log in where there will be user notes and "how-to" videos pop-up. The program is working with LX labs as to what been successful in the past and leveraging their experience to develop materials. ServiceNow also has OOTB animation videos built into the portal that UTS can access.
  AC3 will provide back-end training to Service providers and provider managers around dashboards, reporting and day-to-day workings.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested that the culture shift needs to be assessed.
- GIP A – Suggested engaging the Heads of school group and leadership team meetings to gain support and will provide a lot of coverage.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out that the level of resistance and view of transferring work out into the faculties out of the centre, making sure single request submission eliminating the multiple follow-ups and the language used to turn this into a positive.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if there was analysis on the current requests (phone, tickets, email). HR Client Service Inbox is not accurate, double counting due to contact/ cases.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the lack of discussion on the student audience. Engage Head of Students or GIPA s.3.2 to engage best cause of action.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that students are being considered within the Reference Group engagement piece.
- GIP A – Noted that the Faculty Student Newsletters are an effective channel for students.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if there is an opportunity for the entrance portal to be similar to the ServiceConnect for Students?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that the inbound journeys are addressed in the pack.

2.2. Glossary of Key Terms *(Slide 9)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the Glossary of Key Terms illustrating the common terms supporting a common understanding that these are subject-specific terms, often used to describe the program's plans and progress.

The committee acknowledges that this is an internal glossary of terms used in the context of the program.

UTS

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Views the definition of workflow as traditionally, sequential steps of an activity within a process - part of a SIPOC.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Revisit the Glossary in consultation with the "Process Centre of Excellence in ITU" to identify any gaps to support the key audience here in the IT community.

3. ITEMS FOR NOTING

3.1 AC3 Discovery and Analysis *(slide 11)*

GIPA s.3.4 provided a snapshot on the AC3 Discovery and Analysis noting the following;

- GIPA s.3.4 .
- 722 forms in the current legacy environment, of which 300 are active.
- 158 forms have been identified as having a single workflow, as a result of organic growth and various customisations.
- AC3 are in the process of optimising and consolidating these forms where possible, to reduce the complexities in building, testing and maintaining.
- AC3 requires endorsement of the recommendations to be able to confirm delivery by November 2023. AC3 are preparing a dossier customised and tailored for each business unit.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed concerns on the number of processes where there are many approval layers and getting decisions made. AC3 can escalate issues if business units cannot make up their minds.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested for AC3 to expedite relationships already built and have discussions to move forward.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented if there are design parameters on approval levels that would simplify arguments.
- GIPA s.3.4 .

3.2 ServiceConnect user Journey Analysis *(slide 13)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the current ServiceConnect User Journey analysis, illustrating the inbound paths into ServiceConnect.

Noting that there is no single central source of truth for service management on public site or linking back to service management.

Whilst the information is relatively accurate, there is no consistency of brand, outdated knowledge revealing a lot of opportunities there to apply principles in visual identity and usability working with the faculties and units.

There are also international/students to take into consideration.

UTS

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- GIPA s.3.2 – We need to look at that student service holistically, not just the ServiceConnect.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted the need for integration with GIPA s.3.2's team, the Digital Presence Program and MCU around tone of voice and design.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that StaffConnect are conducting an audit, could be of benefit.

3.3 OCM Interactive Engagement Plan *(slide 15)*

- Taken as read.

3.4 Release #1 Change Strategy Overview *(slide 17)*

- Taken as read.

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented on the trigger words in our language to be mindful of. In the ServiceConnect vision we talk about "centralising ServiceConnect". Review of the word "centralising" bring the Change Strategy Overview back to the committee for endorsement.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Indicated that the vision statement needs to describe a "future state".
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the vision statement will be revised in the Business Case.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out that students need to have a separate User Group.

3.5 Reference Group Update *(slide 21)*

- Taken as read.

3.6 Testing Services RFQ update *(slide 23)*

- Taken as read.

3.7 Business Case Cost/Benefits Summary *(slide 25)*

- Taken as read. GIPA s.3.2 to bring the Business Case to the Steering Committee for an in-camera session in August.

4. <u>APPENDICES</u>

4.1. Forward Business List *(slide 22)*

- Taken as read.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business.

- GIPA s.3.2 thanked the program team for the continued good work.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 12.00pm.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 8th August 2023 | 11:00 – 12:00pm

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____

CHAIR

____

DATE

UTS

SERVICECONNECT PROGRAM (SCP)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 08/08/2023

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the SCP Steering Committee meeting, held on Tuesday, 8th August 2023 from 11:00am to 12.00pm at CB01.04b.12 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]

ACTIONS REGISTER

New Actions added to the register:

- **Program Management** – Assemble a bullet-point summary of lessons learned from Release #1 to demonstrate how we will benefit from their application over the next 5 months. (What lessons are we going to use to increase our chances of success for R#1?).
- **Program Management** – The January re-plan will include:
  - Revised portal launch plan
  - Updated comms plan
  - Amended change strategy
  - Flagging all impacts to adoption success
- **Program Management** – Review and update the Steering Committee's Terms of Reference.
- **SMO** – Design and implementation planning approach to be presented for approval in next steering committee.
- **Change Management** – Provision of summary of delay, causes and impacts to the sponsor.
- **Business Case** – Steering Committee members and UPMO to provide feedback on the business case for update and remittance to the September meeting.
  - Review the business case cost/benefit table to determine why the benefit cost ratio with contingency is higher rather than lower.

UTS

- Add an efficiency of scale part to the business case to reflect what value we are realising by moving from release 1 to release 2 in the form of approach and requirements definition, along with the initial foundational elements such as portal and platform delivery.

- **Release Management Scenario Evaluation #1** - Evaluate the prospect of establishing the BAU capabilities to deliver SCP Release #3, and beyond in-house.
- **Release Management Scenario Evaluation #2** - Evaluate the prospect of accelerating the establishment of ICT's BPM capabilities, to deliver the service optimisation elements of SCP Release #2 and beyond in-house.

DECISIONS	
1	**Program Schedule Realignment** The Steering Committee confirmed a revised Release #1 go-live for the end of January 24, in light of the cited delays, and added contingency (December>January). This is contingent on consideration for change saturation and collision at the wider portfolio-view, along with the academic calendar.
2	**Strategic Business Case** The Steering Committee Note – The Steering Committee has provided some guidance on the Business Case, in particular; ○ Explore scenario where the Program will operationalise at the end of Release #2 ○ Ensure there is an integrated plan with the IT Operating Model and ERP.
3	**Change Strategy** Released for review; feedback and approval sought.

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

The Chair welcomed the Steering Committee and noted apologies. GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] representing GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] and Welcomed GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] from AC3 as a guest for today's proceedings.

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

Minutes taken as true and accurate and read.

1.3. Program Performance *(Slide 3)*

GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] presented the program performance, summarising the following;

- **Program performance**
  - Tracking red due to the delays in completion of design and commencement of development in the ITSM space.
  - Service Management Office Manager commenced, with an focus on development of an approach to design and implement the SMO.

UTS

- **Program achievements**
    - Procurement for test management space in appointing a vendor.
    - Integration activities including identity with OKTA, Cass integration and Asset track.
    - Aiming to complete development of remaining ITIL Modules in the coming 8 weeks.

- **Finance**
    - GIPA s.3.4
    - Finance slide now depicts the trajectory of anticipated spend of program costs to complete.
    - Risk around the uncertainty which may impact this view is the option or treatment action the program will choose to treat the delay.

- **Timeline**
    - The timeline has been updated to illustrate the critical path and flagging the 14-week delay and currently investigating treatment options.

- **Scope Refinement & Revised Schedule**
    - Provides a of the AC3 scope has evolved and aligned to reflect the programs understanding of the need to perform additional discovery.
    - Shows a full commercial view of all SoW's and PCR's.
    - Revised schedule, in current state, provides a high-level scenario of delivery for release go-live in December.
    - Business validation is required on the analysis completed on the 300 forms, post workshops.

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out around the delay in the portal build and refinement.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Portal design complete, build is in early stages of commencement.
- GIPA s.3.4 Solution design is the architectural piece covering off the modules for each of the capabilities in Release #1. 90% complete with view to approval from the architectural board.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the work required on the transition of current state forms and how it relates to the solution design and portal? Or the rationalisation and optimisation.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Building a report on analysis on end state with business validation to understand the uncertainty and find a path forward.
- GIPA s.3.2 - Release #1 majority of the legacy forms are in the IT space and will be made redundant in the transformation.
- GIPA s.3.2 –Proposed that the Portal go-live for Release #1 is the week of January 24th with the program taking into account the January costs will fall into January 2024 budget.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the timing of training in December with staff going on leave.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Acknowledged that the training requirements will be revisited in the change strategy.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Flagged concerns that the two UAT activities for ITSM and portal service catalogue could be at risk and may need another scenario.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the complexities aligning awareness, communication and execution of training with the academic calendar.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Advised that the communications plan will account for the revised go-live dates.

UTS

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION

2.1. Strategic Business Case *(Slide 11)*

- GIPA s.3.2 – Acknowledged the vast improvement on the business case initially presented in June 2022. Drawing the Steering Committee's attention to the Benefits and Financial Analysis – Page 34 and Cost Benefits Analysis Page 44.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the summary indicates as spend of $28m, and asked how we demonstrate economies of scale as the program evolves? IT has the most forms, People has the most demand, and ERP will have deep involvement with Finance and People Units.
  Post Release #1, how do we continue?
- GIPA s.3.2 – We plan to release efficiencies in approach definition and refinement, along with the fundamental base portal and platform work which will complete in Release #1. There are many unknowns and complexities to investigate in the workflow space however. As the program evolves and begins to align further with ERP and IT Op Model, greater efficiencies will be realised at scale.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested some assumptions explaining the production costs year-on-year after Release #1. Evaluate operationalising the program completely to reduce costs at the end of year 1 (Release #2).
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the full IT op model 'product and platform capability' may not be achieved in this timeframe.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested that if we agree on this approach, it could happen, however is a change in direction.
- GIPA s.3.2 – The Cost Benefit Analysis does not show any bankable benefits or cash benefits
- GIPA s.3.2 – We have the non-discretionary IT spend and applied a proportion of Release #1 associated with getting off the current platform. GIPA s.3.4
- GIPA s.3.2 – Explore a scenario where the IT Op model accelerate the BPM capability and take on this activity from next year. Explore working with GIPA s.3.2 and the BPO
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that there are conversations to be had on strategic context for the realms of SMO and BPO and running the platform.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted with respect to the Cost Benefit Ratio - you inherit the debt of your predecessors.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Clarified these assumptions and we intend to secure guidance from the CFO on whether the sunk costs should be brought into the equation to benefit the Program.
- GIPA s.3.2 Configuration management database, was included in the pack to shine a light on the GIPA s.3.2 mitigate the cyber security risk.
- GIPA s.3.2 - CMDB and asset management, recognising that we won't see benefits on release date, they will improve over time.

2.2. Change Strategy *(Slide 12)*

- GIPA s.3.2 – Acknowledges the work involved in the Change Strategy and addressed the need to look into the engagement and traction of academics, utilising existing channels already in place. Please provide feedback to GIPA s.3.2

3. ITEMS FOR NOTING

3.1 Forms Tracker *(slide 13)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3.2 Portal Design - PRG Outcomes *(slide 16)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3.3 SMO Capability Maturity Model *(slide 18)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3.4 CMBD | ITOM Approach and Overview *(slide 20)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

4. APPENDICES

4.1. Forward Business List *(slide 23)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business.

- GIPA s.3.2 thanked the program team for the continued good work.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 12.00pm.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 5th September 2023 | 11:00 – 12:00pm

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

CHAIR

DATE

UTS

SERVICECONNECT PROGRAM (SCP)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 14/09/2023

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the SCP Steering Committee, held on Tuesday, 14th September 2023 from 12:30pm to 1.30pm at CB01.04b.12 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]

ACTIONS REGISTER

New Actions added to the register:

- **Timeline** – Remove Release #2 from the critical path in the program timeline slide.
- **Release #1** – GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to schedule a session (GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] / GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] on the end-state for Release #1, any objectives needed post go-live.
- **Schedule** – GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] to provide AC3's update on the schedule mitigation strategy in 2 weeks.
- **"AssetTrack"** – Agreement to validate and reassess the impact of AssetTrack to the critical path. Review with GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] and bring back to the Committee on preferred option.

DECISIONS	
1	**"AssetTrack" PCR Summary** The Steering Committee agreed that AssetTrack is critical to the Business, but would not be required at Go-live (i.e. the implementation could be delayed). Requested the program to review and unpack alternative options to bring back to the committee on October 3rd.
2	**Proposal to Appoint Test Services Vendor** The Steering Committee endorsed the engagement of Cap Gemini as the preferred Test Services Vendor.

UTS

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

The Chair welcomed the Steering Committee and noted apologies.

Front-of-mind issues for members;

- GIPA s.3.2 – Uncertainties on "AssetTrack"
- GIPA s.3.2 – Training and Change plan
- GIP A s 3 – Roadshows and working groups working well, preferences of no training over Dec/Jan
- GIPA s.3.2 – Release #1 dates potentially colliding with CASS.

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

Minutes taken as true and accurate and read.

1.3. Program Performance *(Slide 3)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the program performance, summarising the following;

- **Program performance**
  - Program team have been progressing with business engagement and working through expanding requirements relating to extra complexity and volume of Forms required to be built in the new Platform.
  - The program has spent approx. 110 days designing and building the new portal and platform for Release #1, which will cater to 40,000+ service requestors who will generate over 2k unique requests every month. This is expected to grow exponentially.
  - There are a number of complexities around forms and workflows that require some reverse-engineering to unpack composition and value. With the end goal of workflows being simplified and re-engineered to be more intuitive for the user and a better customer experience.
  - The Service Management Office design is progressing well.

- **Program achievements**
  - Higher confidence in outcome due to reducing uncertainties in finalising the end-state service catalogue and workflow design across departments for Release #1. (Bottom-up view)
  - Scheduling constraints are resulting in projected variances to forecast dates and the intention is to re-baseline the schedule to reflect current circumstance.

- **Finance**
  - The underspend trend is clearing as we draw closer to the end of the year.
  - The schedule re-baseline will present an additional impact in identifying deferred costs.
  - It has been flagged that some November and December activities and hence costs, may roll over into 2024. The team are working to minimise this roll over into January as the advice is that this will impact the 2024 budget (as 23/24 accrual/carryover is not available).

- **Timeline Recap**
  - The Program has completed the business workshops to review and rationalisation of forms providing a final view of the service catalogue.
  - With the original count of 300 forms and Deloitte's assessment to reduce the count to 90 forms, the goal was to achieve a September go-live. Complexities shifted this out to December and now January 2024.
  - The final form count, after considerable workshops and analysis, is currently at 137 (47 more than the anticipated Deloitte count). Resulting in potentially 4-5 additional weeks for development and 3 weeks testing. This potentially takes the go-live date to March 2024.
  - The current core focus for the Program, is to find a solution to close this gap without compromising quality and cost.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested that the program needs directors' sign off for top-down review given the IT Op Model changes.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Welcomed the inclusion of the "Lessons Learned" slides.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted the financial constraints going forward from the investment committee. The SCP is in danger of not making the cut for its forecasted $7m budget for 2024. The challenge is in deciding what Release #2 would look like if we have additional financial constraints. What are the options in scope and scheduling issues? SCP is competing with other large programs.
  How can the team restructure the program to minimise the overflow in 2024 capex?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that we need to re-baseline the anticipated spend and what is realistic.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned what the transactional volume would be relative to the 90 forms?
- GIPA s.3.4 Commented that AC3 will be recommending the prioritisation of the top 90 forms for go-live in January. The lower transactional forms to be developed in parallel in the background, after go-live.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented on the SMO capabilities and the IT Operating Model program with another 6 weeks to design this capability, what is going to be required and can we go to market for the SMO capability?
- GIPA s.3.2 – SMO capabilities design is the next level down from the IT Operating Model and needs to be kept aligned. Overall resourcing of IT Op Model and what elements can be brought forward?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Also asked that with the Release #2 plan, the resource contention issue can bring it forward.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that the Release #2 is currently taking shape and its initial planning has kicked off in the background. Not on the critical path.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated that there is some ambiguity around the IT Service Transformation, ITOM, Asset Management and CMBD and exactly where the program is leaving the department and where the department is taking over, and the SMO's role in that picture. The Steering Committee needs to have clarity on Release #1, and to recognise that on the go-live date, the IT Service Transformation is not complete, and that this would be a longer journey.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the SMO capability is important as we may need reconfigure the program for 2024 and investigate what could be operationalised.

- GIPA s.3.4 AC3 are finalising SoW4 which outlines the remaining deliverables to be delivered under the Contract. Also working with GIPA s.3.2 on the change impact assessment.

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION

2.1. AssetTrack PCR Summary *(Slide 15)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented on the AssetTrack plug-in currently in use by the AVS Team requesting approval for this change to be added to the scope of Release #1.

Key discussion points:

- The Steering Committee agreed that AssetTrack is not on the critical path, review with GIPA s.3.2 and bring back to the Committee on preferred option.

2.2. Proposal to Appoint Test Services Vendor *(Slide 17)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented a summary of the procurement in a Test Services vendor seeking endorsement for Cap Gemini recommended by the evaluation panel.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked whether we have any inherent capability to do testing?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated that we do have inherent capability, but not at this level.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned once work is completed by Cap Gemini, who would review to ensure it is high quality, and we are comfortable and consistent into the way we do testing?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that we can provide SME to review, there is no consistent way of testing as every project does testing differently.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that there is funding built into the budget for the Testing Services Vendor

3. ITEMS FOR NOTING

3.1 Revisions to the Release #1 Delivery Plan *(slide 8)*

GIPA s.3.4 presented on the revised plan socialising 3 critical path challenges threatening the January go-live, namely:

- AssetTrack plugin integration (4–6-week impact)
- Additional service forms and workflows (4–6-week extension)
- Validation of assumptions of UAT duration (3rd party 3–4-week testing period)

To mitigate the critical path challenges AC3 have scheduled a second round of workshops with the business to bring down the form count back to 90. Forms over and above the 90 will be prioritised to be developed post go-live and access to these forms will be switched off with approval from UTS.

GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]

Working with the test vendor to validate their assumptions on the 8 weeks of testing and how we can work in parallel.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Asked if there is a requirement for AssetTrack to come in before go-live?
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Responded that the AssetTrack was a tactical solution implemented 3 years ago to manage the university's assets and that it would be an acceptable risk for a month delay of implementation AssetTrack for go-live. Manage it in a manually if need be.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Stated that a mid-April go-live will clash with CASS.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Asked if there is an option in enabling functional teams to do the work? Can the People unit do the rationalisation to do their own continuous improvements?
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Commented that it is not conducive to citizen development for design.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Stated that for the update in 2 weeks to consider the CASS schedule, AssetTrack is not on the critical path. Challenges with training and timing.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Advised that the training services to be provided is separate from the IT Op model.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Commented that the UPMO is sensitive to schedule slippage across the portfolio for 2024. Requesting a level of confidence when returning to SC in 2 weeks.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Called out the lack of float built into the schedule.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Expressed a need to have integration on the training with IT Op model given experiences with the Safe Training.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] – Commented that the Program will be sharing the engagement, training approach and communications with the IT Op Model to ensure there is alignment.
- GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] Suggested that a champion is appointed for each area for each business unit in training activities.

3.2 Scale of Efficiency Model *(slide 19)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3.3 Release #1 Lessons Learned *(slide 21)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3.4 ServiceNow Forms Tracker *(slide 23)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3.4 AssetTrack Capability Implementation Options Analysis *(slide 25)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3.4 Stakeholder Management Plan Summary *(slide 30)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

UTS

4. APPENDICES

4.1. Forward Business List *(slide 34)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business.

- GIPA s.3.2 thanked the program team for the continued good work and commented that the committee is getting increasing confidence in the schedule.
- Look into the SMO capability looking for opportunities to accelerate operationalisation of functions.
- A preference for the Program to take into consideration Release #2 planning what looks like if there is a forced restraint on Capital funding. A reduction from $7m to potentially to $5m.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 1.30pm.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 3rd October 2023 | 11:00 – 12:00pm

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____

CHAIR

____

DATE

UTS

SERVICECONNECT PROGRAM (SCP)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 04/10/2023

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the SCP Steering Committee, held on Tuesday, 4th October 2023 from 4.15pm to 5.15pm at CB01.19.15 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]

ACTIONS REGISTER

New Actions added to the register:

- **Program Alignment** - UPMO to Investigate what resources are required to determine the principles of "what goes where" for ERP/ SCP alignment.
- **Financial** – Provide clarity on the forecast for 2024 with re-baselining.
- **Program** - Build learnings from rationalisation and consolidation work done this year so that the new BIS can benefit and not make the same mistakes for December Steering Committee.
- **Change Management** - Pre and post, channel shift strategy to be clear and determined by the department and the reference group, orientated by the user experience.
  This should be universally applied across all departments. Three options:
  1. forms only no exceptions
  2. email and forms open with a transition to forms only
  3. email and forms open permanently.
  Evaluate pros and cons of each scenario.
- **Change Management** – What is the change impact we want realised in February?
- **Schedule** - Re-baseline endorsed to go-live first week of March, contingent on clarity around the training plan, and compliance with the academic calendar, and maintaining a 2 week buffer between ready-state and go-live, and a 6 week buffer between go-live and CASS. Outline any/all risks associated.

UTS

- **Forms** - Set up session with GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] and GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] / GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to review concerns around channel shift from email in Release #1, towards the existing form in consideration of the fact the people unit is unequipped.
- **SMO** - Work with the IT Op model to ensure the establishment of the SMO will not prevent the IT Op model from going into consultation before Christmas.

DECISIONS	
1	**"AssetTrack" PCR Summary** The Steering Committee approves the implementation of AssetTrack with AMI at a cost of approximately GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]. Noting that AMI delivery will include training and no impact to the schedule.
2	**Revisions to the Release #1 Delivery Plan** AC3 presented a delivery plan setting out a scenario to deliver 70 high priority forms by 9th February. After review and discussion, **the Steering Committee have provided the program a counter-proposal and provisional approval for a rescheduled go-live with the following key points and conditions:** - Formal go-live planned for 7/8th March - All planned activities completed / tools-down 22-23rd February (2 weeks contingency) - Go-live is characterised by high and medium severity forms ready for production consumption, requestors and fulfillers all using the new platform - The remaining forms delivered thereafter on a priority-basis in operationalised, agile feature drops using internal BAU development resources - The program is required to put together this revised delivery plan, along with any risks and implications for the next Committee - This approval is contingent on the following 5 factors: 1. Compliance with the academic calendar (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] 2. Inclusion of at least 2 weeks schedule float to provided demonstrable contingency between our ready-state and go-live (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] 3. Provisions of a clear buffer between our go-live and that of CASS' in April (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] 4. Clarification of change impacts as at go-live summarised for the next steerco (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] 5. Setting out a comprehensive training plan aligned to the new schedule (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

The Chair welcomed the Steering Committee and noted apologies.

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

Minutes taken as true and accurate and read.

UTS

1.3. Program Performance *(Slide 3)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the program performance, summarising the following;

- **Program performance and achievements**
  - SoW4 approved and AC3 have kicked of final phase of Release #1 and works have commenced.
  - E2E 64% through Release #1
  - Confirmed detailed Service Catalogue and gathering executive approvals..
  - Internal Audit has commenced and their scope is process and governance compliance.
  - Cap Gemini onboarded as testing services vendor.
  - Developing a pack around the evaluation of security requirements i.e.: Encryption at rest
  - Continued work into defining the "As Is" and "To Be" business impacts.
  - Portal design complete and build kicked off with the support of the reference groups.
  - ERP alignment and focusing on which system of record supports which business process or function.
  - GIPA s.3.2 and GIPA s.3.2 on the IT Op Model piece around internal capabilities
  - Commencement of Release #2 planning

- **Finance**
  - No material update from last session, current focus is on a forecast that will shift from 2023 into next year because of re-baselining the delivery plan.

<u>**Key discussion points:**</u>

- GIPA s.3.2 - Asked what kind of data is being stored which requires encryption?
- GIPA s.3.2 - Responded that it is deemed GIPA s.3.2
- GIPA s.3.2 - ServiceNow have advised that Western Australia have achieved similar with other means.
- GIPA s.3.2 - Asked the UPMO what the principles are, which will determine what goes where?
- GIPA s.3.2 - Commented that there is work still to be done on the broader Operating Model Definition and how we think about Service Delivery. Resources are needed to articulate this piece of work.
- GIPA s.3.2 - Clarified that there are bi-annual ServiceNow upgrades to stay compliant with the contract with a minimum of one upgrade per year.
- GIPA s.3.2 - Commented that the upgrades allow the platform to get the benefits from enhancements which happen over time.

2. <u>ITEMS FOR DECISION</u>

2.1. AssetTrack PCR Summary *(Slide 7)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented on the AssetTrack plug-in currently in use by the AVS Team requesting approval for this change to be added to the scope of Release #1.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked what the duration is of the AMI?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the duration will be approximately a month and delivered pre-go live with no impact to release date.

2.2. Revisions to the Release #1 Delivery Plan *(Slide 9)*

GIPA s.3.2 opened this topic recapping the 3 key factors impacting the Release #1 timeline.

1. AssetTrack
2. Form and workflow complexities resulting in over 90 forms.
3. Testing vendor requiring double the effort and duration than first estimated.

The program established a go-to-green squad to cover off 10 objectives to develop a treatment plan and recommended go-live date in mid-February.

GIPA s.3.4 presented a series of revised timeline schedules for Release #1, recommending the 4th timeline proposal.

- Timeline 1 depicting end of March go-live with AssetTrack removed from critical path.
- Timeline 2 focusing on deferral of non-critical path and non-dependent activities to bring forward go-live date.
- Timeline 3 compressing to 70 high priority forms to bring go-live to mid-February.
- Timeline 4 *(recommended)* 70 forms for mid-February with incremental drops of the remaining 58 form into prod from February through to April.

GIPA s.3.2 closed by recommending Timeline 4 to the Steering Committee for endorsement.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if the $329k the completion of all the development sprints 5-8 on slide 16?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that there are no changes to the costing, only it has shifted out.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed concerns with option 4 and the training and testing being scheduled over the Christmas period and availability of staff.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Explained the makeup of the training plan developed for end-to-end processes, personas for requestors.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned what will be the change in the staff experience with the reduction of forms?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed the new portal and design of the portal having been endorsed by reference groups. The navigations in the portal to get to the HR service will be easy to access.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if shared mailboxes are being closed down in Release #1?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the channels are being kept open.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated that the outlook email address will continue, however the outlook mailbox will be replaced by a ServiceNow queue.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Change Management to identify what behaviours we are seeking to change.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated that a pre and post channel strategy is to be determined for clarity on the user experience.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested the strategy is clear in the options of; immediate cutover, run in parallel, department by department or organisation wide deployment.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Proposes to the committee, that we need to stop working in silos and to take a view on behalf of the University in how we operate.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed concerns on the timeframe for training of the users and the training plan needs clarity.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Advised that AC3 will be ready to hand over the training in January.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Voiced the criticality of being careful with our language we use and to not diminish outcomes in creating a staff experience. Called out what is the change impact that we want realised in February.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented as to what is realistic in what we can deliver in 2024 with the reduction in budget.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the program is working on scenarios with a 36% reduction in budget.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Thought it would be remiss not to point out the streams post go-live in February, technically there will be training in releases and not in a block. Effectively pushing some releases post go-live.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned whether UAT is achievable over the close down period.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that AC3 are working through, the testing during this period is more backend engine room testing in the platform itself. Post go-live with the remaining streams, the testing will be smaller based on effort.
- GIPA s.3.4 Suggested provisioning a go-live mid-February with a readiness review of training and UAT in January.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted the lack of float in the schedule, take a view to keep the schedule of option 4 adding 2 weeks of float with a go-live 1st week in March providing a 6-week buffer.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed concerns with bumping into CASS go-live in April.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated it will be more or less all hands-on deck for CASS go-live.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Understand the impact of go-live in March, how much latitude we have with the audience. Training, and how much needs to be university wide.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed concerns on training in the back end for People Unit.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked the committee thoughts on option 4, with a 2-week float, what the worst case scenario would be without having the SMO stood up.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested that the stream 4 (purple) would move right into April.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that we are in the middle of an IT Operating Model change, can the SMO be stood up as a unique unit that doesn't require consultation. We need to start integrating the programs with the IT Operating Model.

3. ITEMS FOR NOTING

3.1 Service Management Catalogue Approach *(slide 19)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

UTS

4. APPENDICES

4.1. Forward Business List *(slide 34)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business.

- GIPA s.3.2 thanked the program team for the continued good work and commented that the committee is getting increasing confidence in the schedule.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 5.15pm.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 7th November 2023 | 11:00 – 12:00pm

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____

CHAIR

____

DATE

UTS

SERVICECONNECT PROGRAM (SCP)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 07/11/2023

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the SCP Steering Committee, held on Tuesday, 7th November 2023 from 11.00am to 12.00pm at CB01.04b.12 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	

ACTIONS REGISTER

New Actions added to the register:

1. **Service Portal** - Share New service portal video to the Committee
2. **Channel Shift** - Program to approach Reference Group for feedback on:
   a. the desired channel end state (noting exceptions)
   b. The proposed migration approach
3. **User Acceptance Testing (UAT)** – Ensure UAT is detailed in the program timeline and resource requirements from departments are clearly articulated with time booked in diaries as early as possible.
4. **Elaboration of Schedule in Program Timeline** – Update to reflect all Release #1 activities, including hypercare and transition support post-March
5. **Portfolio Accrual** – GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to meet with GIPA s.3 [redacted] to determine a unified portfolio position and criteria on funding carryover bnetween financial years. This was discussed to be possible if specific attributes exist such as contract and delivery underway and nature of spend (analyse liabilities owed and consider accruals required).
6. **SMO** - To clearly define the roles required inside each BU - eg. Departmental Process Manager

DECISIONS

UTS

1	**Preliminary SMO Design** The Steering Committee endorsed the high-level design and requested the SMO return with a detailed design incorporating; • ERP, HCD, staff experience, principles and articulate it all in through a lens of People / Process / Platform / Data / and Governance. • The envisaged relationship between SMO and BIS in a BAU realm.
2	**Channel Shift Approach** The Steering Committee deferred this decision, seeking the Program; • Invite feedback from Reference Groups. • Provision of and illustrated user journey (step by step). • Demonstrate access needs consideration.

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

The Chair welcomed the Steering Committee and noted apologies.

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

GIPA s.3.2 – Commented there was a conversation not referred to in the previous minutes on Release #2 and questioning whether we could commit to doing all of the People areas if we don't have fully defined processes. Critical challenge is credibility in change of Staff Experience, opportunities for the program to further review the pain points across the university.

Minutes taken as true and accurate and read.

1.3. Program Performance *(Slide 3)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the program performance, summarising the following;

- **Program performance and achievements**
  - Re-baselining complete for 8th March go-live
  - Release #1 schedule tracking well – 70% complete
  - New Service Portal – 95% complete
  - Showcases have commenced with OCG and Business School
  - Development commenced – 2/8 sprints complete
  - CapGemini commenced today to test the product of the first 2 sprints
  - Overall Risk profile reduced with the design and float insert
  - Focus now is around the scope and approach for Release #2 and the dependacy on establishing detailed scope boundaries with ERP in the People Unit
  - In discussions with ServiceNow for an extended trial in compensation for unused functionality.
  - Approval of an exemption for GIPA s.3.2

UTS

- **Finance**
  - October financials not reflected, however estimation of total budget utlisation at end of December to be 89%
  - Identified $998k in unutilised funding for 2023 due to
    - Re-baseline of Release #1 to end in 2024
    - 12 months grace we have on the ITOM module subscription
  - Release #1 tail for ITU now flows into 2024, and presents a $747k impact (noting that's less than we are giving back this year) to 2024 solely to complete the release 1 tail for ITU.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked whether the 70 legacy forms for R#1, migrations and how these are progressing?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the forms (0-51) will be presented to requisite audiences late November with a view to mid-December will be the E-2-E.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that there will be a dry-run with AC3 this week in preparation for OGC.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Queried the UAT, will the Reference Groups be involved? As we have been touting the "designed by staff for staff", need clarity in what will be showcased.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated the strategy agreed is that CapGemini will conduct the "user" testing. The test cases developed with the uses will be the basis in which the "user" testing will be conducted. Followed up with a business signoff process.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Agreed that the Programs Reference Groups will have a point of feedback to have responsibility for signoff on final product.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if there was any schedule risk over Xmas period for sign-off?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented a need to confirm Reference Group sign-off in the schedule.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked for clarity on sprints 7&8 post go-live are the extra 30 forms.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested clarity for the Steering Committee on what will not be delivered on 8th March in Release #1a.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that in the appendix there is a detailed R1/ R2 Capability Release Sequence (slide 26).
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested the post go-live enhancements are reflected in schedule slide
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed the 3 week float incorporated end of February.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if we are overstating the issue in RSK2224 as the float mitigation is not being called out?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that this risk is centred around the unknown of unknowns, CapGemini commenced today, we won't know what they will find. Mitigations and measures have been implemented to lift the quality of the product.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the RSK2254 appears very high level, not detailing the what will go where, and commented that Andy Hurst would complete the alignment by end of 2023.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that they are tackling this in 2 levels;
  - Establishing guiding principles of how do we know what goes where and the system of record to support which business function. Commencing with the Caudit Model, identifying a need to engage with the business if there is alignment with Caudit and review the service catalogue and not work in isolation.

UTS

  - Requesting 2 BA's as a squad to map out the what goes where.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested an opportunity to speak with GIPA s.3.2, People Program Business Lead.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Reflected that ERP know we have clear and present urgency for the People Unit and need the scope boundary defined. Commented on 2 time horizons, developing for the Now, and the ERP enabled Future state.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the need to understand the value of these, work through it and prioritise what needs to be done.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented also the need to review the pain points across the university, high level mapping of the processes has not been done yet.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Raised the issue on the BAU dev capability being a potential constraint impacting the schedule
- GIPA s.3.2 – Replied with bringing onboard to the Program, Zameer with a history with the ServiceNow platform.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that they are in active recruitment for a BAU resource.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that of the $998k of underspend in 2023 will be rolled into 2024 and consume the Programs 2024 allocation.
- GIPA s.3 – Commented on being happy to assist the Program to review options to accrue costs based on the nature of the spend eg: vendor payments.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked about the considerable up-tick in burn rate for the remaining month of 2023, is this realistic.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that it reflects the spend in AC3 invoicing and CapGemini coming onboard.

2. <u>ITEMS FOR DECISION</u>

2.1. Preliminary SMO Design *(Slide 10)*

GIPA s.3.2 introduced GIPA s.3.2 to the Committee to illustrate the preliminary design for the service management office, which the product of engagement and consultation with GIPA s.3.2 Doc and across the ITU to represent what we need to support our first release and beyond. Requesting endorsement from the Steering Committee.

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- GIPA s.3.2 – Clarified for the Committee that even though the Service Management Office sits within IT, there is a combined focus on IT as well as non-IT services. Ultimately to be a whole of university type of function.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested clarity on what the Committee is being asked to endorse. Considerations taken would be what are the alternatives? And what are the consequences of making a decision.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out that a lot of these capabilities already exist, but not in the form of an SMO. This is a subset of the new IT Operating Model.
  - Eg: Incident and Event Management, Asset and Configuration are roles which already exist, bring these together with Service Catalogue and Knowledge to create an SMO.

UTS

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked In terms of headcount, can we reassign people in these roles?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that a good portion of the team would be filled by existing staff.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Shared that endorsement of the preliminary design, the services, roles and how do they expand across UTS, will allow us to explore the objectives of those services how they are resourced and their responsibilities.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the SMO is largely based on an ITIL foundation catering towards SIAM ready for cater for internal and external service providers.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the 4 roles on the right of the table are the Platform team (Platform administrator, Test analyst, Engineer and Functional analysts), not part of the SMO, they look after the tool. The remaining roles look after the project.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that yes organisationally the teams are separate but they will be intrinsically linked.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked what the capability within the units will be and what would be expected of them?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that there would be an expectation of the platform manager to set up model of guardrails for responsibilities or RASCI. Activities that would be suitable for internal unit fixes vs what the platform team would need to do?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Added that there is an intention to build in the flexibility at the beginning of your engagement, to what extent do you want to create your own dashboards etc.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out that as we develop this concept, the understanding of the process manager and what the responsibilities are. Each function would have a process manager, understanding what training would be involved.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the process owner and manager roles would be defined.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Made it clear that ownership is critical as a technical technology company.

2.2. Channel Shift Approach *(Slide 13)*

GIPA s.3.2 opened this topic defining the channel as a method or means for a user to request a service. Channels are currently scattered all over the place, are manual and inconsistent across different departments.

The Program is seeking endorsement of the "soft-shift" option in the channel shift approach based on productivity, simplicity and digitisation in the forms of:

- Live Chat
- Virtual Agent
- Forms in the Portal

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested the Program return to the steering committee with a clear view on what a soft-shift means and evidence of consultation with the Reference Groups.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested a high-level view of what happens in a soft-shift on the user journey
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted the need to considerations of access needs.

UTS

3. ITEMS FOR NOTING

3.1 Change Impact Summary *(slide 17)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3.2 Release #2 Options Analysis *(slide 19)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented 3 scenarios for investment options for Release #2, stipulating that risk and compliance has been deferred due to Release #1 falling into 2024.

The Program is re-visiting the business case into the new UPMO format for presentation to the investment committee this month focussing on the most optimal investment scenarios.

- Original Approach (c$7.4m)
- Reduced Budget (c$5m)
- Value-Targeted Approach (c$5)

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed the difference between scenarios 2 and 3;
    - Scenario 2 will take longer to achieve the same outcome as scenario 1 with 100% Completion in April 2025.
    - Scenario 3 where the Program is splitting out the benefits to get value quickly and defer the lower hanging fruit till 2024 and will not achieve all of the People Unit under the Program (BAU). Effectively will create an inconsistent staff experience.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that scenario 3 may have a higher impact on People Unit
- GIP A s 3 – Noted that with what we learn more on ERP over the next 12 months, may be the natural way of moving forward as we are more informed of what will sit where.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested that looping in the Reference Groups would be a good opportunity to see what staff want when ERP comes.

3.3 SCP/ SMO/ BIS Scope Boundary & Interconnects *(slide 21)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

4. APPENDICES

4.1. Forward Business List *(slide 24)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

4.2. R1/ R2 Capability Release Sequence *(slide 26)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business.

- GIPA s.3.2 thanked the program team for the continued good work and commented that the committee is getting increasing confidence in the schedule.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 12.00pm.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 5th December 2023 | 11:00 – 12:05pm

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____

CHAIR

____

DATE

UTS

SERVICECONNECT PROGRAM (SCP)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 05/12/2023

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the SCP Steering Committee, held on Tuesday, 5th December 2023 from 1.00pm to 2.00pm at CB01.04b.12 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]

ACTIONS REGISTER

New Actions added to the register:

- **Licencing** - GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] – To share with business owners and SteerCo greater clarity in the form of an impact assessment into how the program is directly impacted by the absence of the ITOM Module. Specifically which tasks and activities require it and why that is impacting 8th March 2024.
- **Implementation Plan** – GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to present draft Implementation Plan for January Steering Committee.
- **RSK2224** – GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to provide more clarity required on the risk splitting out the defects, issues and the mitigations.
- **OCM** – GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to ensure that the messaging and communications to support and enable channel shift are woven into the Communications Plan for December Steerco.
- **Training** – GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to Provide overview including approach, learning objectives, what groups, numbers, schedule, format, which users/departments for December Steerco.
- **Portal Design** – GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to review and possibly revise video (forms video) to avoid the People Unit's prominence on the front page. The People Unit cannot have feature real estate on the new portal as at Release #1, as any premature channel shift towards forms (away from the current shared mailboxes) in the next 8 months would present a substantially adverse impact on the department.

UTS

- **Portal Design** – [redacted] to return to December SteerCo back with a 'portal design summary', a design that the training will be based on, including a prominence that [redacted] and [redacted] are happy with prior to showcasing to the Committee.
- **SMO** – [redacted] to write to [redacted] and [redacted] flagging the importance on establishing dependency dates on recruitment of the SMO roles and BIS to protect the program schedule

New Risks

- [redacted] – Raised the risk, that the IT Op Model will not be ready to receive and manage the platform and manage it.
- The Committee raised the risk of availability, short notice and compressed training timeframes for both fulfillers and requestors. Mitigation is requested by the need to have bookings out and in calendars by the 2nd week of January.

	DECISIONS
1	**UAT Approach** The Steering Committee does not agree with the proposed UAT Approach flagging the schedule risk and conflict between testing and training coming into the Float period. Return to the Steering Committee in January with overview of where the Steering Committee can support the program in resourcing or scheduling to achieve a more realistic, lower risk UAT plan.
2	**Steering Committee Timing** The Steering Committee endorsed the realignment of the meeting schedule to orientate around key decision points, activities and governance needs. Immediate changes include another December meeting and a February meeting to support the go-no-go decisions.

1. <u>MEETING PROCEDURE</u>

1.1. Open/ Welcome

The Chair welcomed the Steering Committee and noted apologies. Introduced [redacted].

Key issues:

- [redacted] Video portal – impacts of release #1 on the People Unit

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

Minutes taken as true and accurate and read.

UTS

1.3. Program Performance *(Slide 3)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the program performance, summarising the following;

- **Program performance and achievements**
    - Capgemini have commenced testing activities
    - Successful delivery of Incident, Knowledge, Problem and Change capabilities at the completion of Sprint 4.
    - Sprints 5 and 6 on track for completion 22nd December
    - Sprint 7 scheduled for 10-23rd January (representing deferred capabilities and remaining forms)
    - Sprint 8 scheduled for 24-6th February (representing deferred capabilities and remaining forms)
    - Continued negotiations with ServiceNow on our licencing position (ISS0968)
    - Working with AC3 on the Implementation Plan
    - Showcases in progress on key features as sprints complete
    - Detailed timeline of activities at the technical delivery level

- **Finance**
    - Business case revised
    - Presented 3 options to the Investment Committee for consideration

- **Timeline**
    - More detailed UAT Timeline in 2 weeks

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- GIPA s.3.2 – Liaised with ServiceNow today and is expecting a response in a few days.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned why the ServiceNow licencing will impact the go-live date.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded with trying to renegotiate overall licencing position prior to the ITOM module requirement. It is a core capability requirement for the development to build out the IT operations features of the platform. The Program is reviewing the dependencies (CMBD) and evaluating options to incorporate in Release #1a (R1a).
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that most of the functionality CMBD enables is mostly in R1a, questioned if we don't get the module soon will that push our R1a but not impact R1?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Mentioned that the module is not on the critical path for 8th March, however the further delays could potentially impact 8th March.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that RSK2224 needs further clarification as it covers both defects and issues. Defects being something not built to requirements, Issues are the functional gaps.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that there is potentially a gap whereby the OOTB maybe too vanilla to meet requirements.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out if the fixes take longer than the 10-day float built into the schedule.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that AC3 are working on co-development for R1a in that time to get ahead.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned what the end state looks like for R1 and R1a, the SMO and have we started recruiting?

- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated that they have identified 7 key roles which need to be in place for go-live, 5 of which will commence active recruitment in January. The challenge though, is around the IT Op Model and in discussions with GIPA s.3.2
- GIPA s.3.2 – Raised the risk, that the IT Op Model will not be ready to receive and manage the platform and manage it.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that if Customer Satisfaction was a RAG status, it would be trending low given the tension on the IT Ops side.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that from a change perspective, that the reference groups designed the portal for staff by staff.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Explained that the R1 spilling into 2024 presents an economic impact to complete R1 tail. Investment Committees focus was principally on 2024 with requirements to finish R1 and R1a.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that if R1a blows out, so too the $1.7m budget

- GIPA s.3.2 – Queried when we will be in a position to communicate the Training schedule, to be able to lock into calendars.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked who will be doing the training as Jan/ Feb is not ideal
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that current service providers and IT teams, supporting staff with communications and videos. Train the trainer and training champions.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested that a training plan will be available within the next 8 days.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if the training might shift if we can't get the ITOM module?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that there are 21 functionalities going live in R1a and 20 forms, level of detail in the timeline is not reflective of the training and testing activities.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that we need to be clear in the communicating the value and acknowledging the differences in what the portal will bring as well as clarity on the support with culture change in channels shifting/ closing.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned how many hours of training will staff need to undertake, raising a risk given limited time available for faculties.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded in that the Training Needs Assessment needs to be completed to determine level of training required.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted the need for clarity on Change Management Plan addressing the needs from the Impact Assessments.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Shared that progress on training scope is approximately 550% complete.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that this was contingent on completion of build activities.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Scope of training/ needs assessment
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested clarity on the Training approach and impact on operations for the next meeting and training scheduled into calendars by next December SteerCo.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Echoed the concerns of time limitation given time of year and leave
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the need for any additional support for the training packs, major risk to the schedule. Supports the prospect of engaging the services of a training manager.

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION

2.1. User Acceptance Testing Approach *(Slide 11)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the UAT Approach for endorsement

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned if there was alignment between UAT and the groups identified in the Training Needs Analysis.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Replied that there is a sequence relationship in verifying the product being built in UAT and the training focusing on adoption.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented on the overlaps of UAT and Training delivery, testing doesn't finish till 16th March by which point half the training has been completed, what is the purpose of user testing, and training staff if testing is not finished?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that there is a high degree of things won't need to be changed at that point, but still a risk that there will be bug fixes.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if there is an opportunity where we can compress the timeline?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested that typically the training is high level functionality, whereas the UAT will be into the detailed user cases.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked when is the build going to be in a position we can base the training on and resources to provide training?
- GIPA s.3.2 – ITU process training will be in a sandpit environment with a multi-dimensional setting.
    - Service Providers – Train the trainer for legacy teams
    - UTS Process Owners – Change Training Champions
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that Capgemini will continue into R1a for a second round of UAT.

2.2. Committee Timing 2024 *(Slide 13)*

GIPA s.3.2 introduced this topic calling out the proposed schedule has no meeting in February when crucial activities are occurring and go-no-go decisions to me made.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated that the cadence be structured around decision points and no more that 4 weeks apart. Include a pre-Christmas and February meeting.

3. ITEMS FOR NOTING

3.1 Go-Live Readiness Report *(slide 17)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3.2 Program Business Case *(slide 18)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3.3 Knowledge Management Update *(slide 19)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3.4 SMO Design *(slide 21)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

4. APPENDICES

4.1. Forward Business List *(slide 23)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business.

Portal Design

- GIPA s.3.2 – Raised concerns around the prominence of the People Unit in the Portal promotional video as People Unit are yet to get the change support needed move properly onto the portal and the Client Services team have not yet been engaged.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Agreed to reduce the portal prominence for the People Unit to ensure there is no unintended channel shift ahead of R2.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that the video is a mock-up of the portal, not the finished product.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Raised concerns about setting expectations on the video from a change perspective and requested confirmation on the Portal Design approved by the reference group, so we are clear on what we are basing training on and not confusing people.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted the portal still needs polishing.

- GIPA s.3.2 closed the meeting thanking the Program teams high levels of enthusiasm and engagement when meeting with them on Monday.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 2.00pm.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 19th December 2023 | 1:00 – 2:00 pm

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____

CHAIR

____

DATE

UTS

SERVICECONNECT PROGRAM (SCP)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 19/12/2023

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the SCP Steering Committee, held on Tuesday, 19th December 2023 from 1.00pm to 2.00pm at CB01.04b.12 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	[redacted]

ACTIONS REGISTER

New Actions added to the register:

- **RSK2250:** (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Transfer to an issue, SMO has no resourcing and will have high impacts
- **SMO Office:** (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Discussions required around framing the SMO, IR complexities and IT OP Model transitioning.
- **Finance:** (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Return to Jan meeting reforecasting the remainder of R1 as a result of Investco decision.
- **Schedule:** (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Notify the Steering Committee of any decision on extra float needed.
- **ITOM Licencing:** (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Circulate to the Steering Committee a clear view of what capabilities/ processes are being delivered in R1 and R1a.
- **Training Scheduling:** (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Placeholder of a 3 week block in February to UAT Process Owners
- **Training Approach:** (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Return to the Committee with further clarification as to the delivery type for each Persona.
- **Training and Awareness:** (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Emphasise the targeted, day 1, week 1 plans for release to let people know it's in. Ensure that we focus on the school managers - specially called out as they're the back stop on the academic side.
- **SMO Office:** (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Brief GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] on the "ticketing system", include GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] or delegate

UTS

	DECISIONS
1	**ITOM (IT Operations Management Module) Licencing Impact** The ITOM licensing impact was presented and attributed it's source as a misunderstanding between Releases #1 and 1a, with these specific capabilities being delivered in 1a. The licensing is now in place and no decision is required. All capabilities outlined in the impact assessment slides is delivered in Release #1a. • Circulate to the Steering Committee clarification of the two delivery horizons (R1/ R1a)
2	**Training Approach** The Steering Committee requested the Program to return in January clarifying further on the training delivery, process of change and the artefacts that show the change before the approach can be endorsed. Specifically: • The support to service requestors, online or F2F? • Scope • Catchup training sessions • Embedding process • Activation of the TTT and champion groups • Marketing for launch on the 8th March – Posters/ walkthroughs?

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

The Chair welcomed the Steering Committee and noted apologies for the last meeting of 2023. Noting that the Investco decision to execute the Program to Release 1a, acceleration the operationalisation beyond into the SMO.

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

Minutes taken as true and accurate and read.

Action Items

- **1144: Forms Analysis** – Schedule meeting with GIPA s.3.2 and GIPA s.3.2 to address channel shift concerns.
    - GIPA s.3.2 – Would like to explore basic functionalities in the platform enabling self-help for managers and employees, accessing key information and trunking of tickets raised into client services group.
- **1149: Timeline** – Capgemini has more testing detail to include
    - GIPA s.3.2 – The action is not capturing the point around schedule 1a activities and scope will be completed.
- **1154**: **RSK2224** – Splitting out defects, issues and mitigations
    - GIPA s.3.2 – As UAT commences, may discover functional gaps. Require access to pre-prod environments ASAP.

1.3. Program Performance *(Slide 3)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented on an abridged version of the standard Steering Committee focusing on the action items arising from the 5th December noting;

- Clarity around the Programs Training Approach
- Impacts of not having ITOM
- Clarity on testing
- Portal Design overview
- Roles required to stand up the SMO
- AC3 Sprints on track having commenced sprint 6/8

- **Finance**
  - Release #2 early planning activities paused
  - Impacts on the Investco budget announcement and replanning the remaining budget to deliver Release 1/ R1a
  - Role clarifications for the SMO

- **Timeline and UAT Approach**
  - Timeline separation between testing and training

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned the criticalities of ISS0968 and ISS0944.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that ISS0698: ITOM is now active in the ServiceNow instance.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that BAU resource needed is in recruitment, once onboarded the Program can work with them to build out the final view.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that RSK2250, the SMO resourcing is now an issue given we don't have resources and will have high impacts. SMO Office needs capabilities as there is IR complexities and the IT OP Model transitioning.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that there are 6 new roles which need to be filled.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked what the timeline slides are illustrating to the Steering Committee
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that UAT is taking shape and on track to getting invitations into calendars 2nd week January.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested clarity as to when UAT will start and if there are any risks on the commencement of UAT?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that UAT will commence at the end of January and the availability of staff is always a challenge. Noting the need to find a balance between leaving as late as possible so its front of mind but also getting into diaries early.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Stressed the importance of maintaining the float to make the 8th March.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that AC3 will continue to do development work through the float/ contingency period, where as UTS will keep these 2 weeks as a float.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if the committee were comfortable with the number of test scenarios in the testing approach?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that Capgemini has recommended this approach.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if the business areas being targeted, have seen the test scripts?

- GIPA s.3.2 – Answered that the intention is to take the business units through the scenarios from an awareness perspective, setting a frame in January on a risk-based approach.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned where the assurance is for the committee, on the test plan?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that based on the stories and requirements on the needs of the business unit
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that 3 weeks is not a lot of time to conduct 370 scenarios, and have we identified the people needed for testing?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that there will be several parallel sessions, from a general sense we have an idea of who, just not locked into calendars yet.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested putting in a 3 week block/ placeholder in diaries for first 3 weeks of February to flush out who is unavailable/ on leave.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Also noted that those on leave in February will be getting ready for beginning of semester.

2. <u>ITEMS FOR DECISION</u>

2.1. ITOM Licencing Impact *(Slide 13)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented the ITOM Licencing Impact for endorsement noting the impact is to R1a.

GIPA s.3.4 addressed the committee explaining the two impacts of delay.

1. As at today, discovery is enabled where we are collecting information which hasn't happened yet. R1a is slightly delayed with low impact.
2. High impact is the core capability of ITOM is event management, where servers go down there is an alert. The assumption here was that the business required event management to be able to respond to alerts.

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that this is a prime example of not having a clear and detailed schedule of what features are going to be dropped and when. Also noting that there is approximately GIPA s.3.2 per month which is manageable.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if we are clear on scope on what will be tested and delivered.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that there is a slide on release sequencing.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if all the capabilities listed will be delivered as R1a and the impacts on existing ServiceNow functionality?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed the capabilities will be delivered in R1a and there will be no impact to the existing ServiceNow functionality. Also noting that the impact on catalogue forms has been removed now as ITOM has been turned on.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested a clear view of what is exactly in R1 and R1a in terms of capabilities and to confirm the processes.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if anything being delivered in R1a will affect the 8th March in terms of Staff Experience?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that possibly the remaining forms not completed may have an impact on the Staff Experience, however there is a generic form in place.

2.2. Training Approach *(Slide 19)*

GIPA s.3.2 introduced this topic outlining the Programs Training Approach and Objectives for endorsement noting the following;

- Delivering training by persona and featuring capability
    - Service Providers
    - Service Providers Managers
    - Service Requestors
- In collaboration with AC3 deliver Train the Trainer to Legacy Business Leads and ITU Leads
- Flexibility in training to be able to adjust to audience needs
- Summary of outcomes of the end-user training

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if the training being delivered is "hands-on" training?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Explained the training will be classroom style training with access to the system. We have identified who the TTT and Champions for each area in IT.
- Legacy engagements have been booked in January to validate the training needs and impacts.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked at what point will the Program be ready to have the training materials finalised, validated and ready to be rolled out? Will there be opportunities for catchup training?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the week commencing 8th January 2024 and explained there is 6 weeks of follow-up training in the schedule to allow for staff unable to attend initial training scheduled.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned what the ratios' of training for TTT and next levels
- GIPA s.3.2 – Explained there is 20 hours of TTT, who will essentially train their own team size. For example: GIPA s.3.2 's team would split the team to next level down leaders.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned the flexibility of the training, ie: online training
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that some of the features would be an online as drop-in sessions, such as the Portal. These will be recorded and edited for handover.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Summarised that the training will be:
    - Service Requestors – short videos, light broadcast, on demand
    - Service Provider and Service Providers Managers will F2F with TTT support
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if there is a help function if the user gets stuck on a particular screen?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that all the services will have a step-by-step view, help on the ServiceConnect website and pop-ups in the portal with new features to support the training and user experience.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked what the follow-up after the training? Will the TTT become the champion group and who is leading this? How is the SMO going to support users? What will happen in GIPA s.3.2 's team in terms of channel shift?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded with the Program is collecting thoughts and feedback on the channel shift, whether it be big-bang or a phased approach.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the SMO will be there to support the TTT group, process managers on an ongoing basis on which ever shift is decided. Supporting the knowledge base with quick reference guides for example.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented further that on the change component in equipping staff with the tools, scripts and templates to slowly steer people in the direction.

UTS

- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented on how we motivate and activate the change within teams and have we had a conversation with GIPA s.3.2 if this can be included in the induction training? Furthermore, how we get into the minds of people? Visual posters?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out that what has been provided today, conceptually makes sense, however needs clarity on;
    - The support to service requestors, online or F2F?
    - Scope
    - Catchup training sessions
    - Embedding process
    - Activation of the TTT and champion groups
    - Marketing for launch on the 8th March – Posters/ walkthroughs?
- GIPA s 3 2 – Suggested focussing on training the School Managers to support the academics

3. ITEMS FOR NOTING

3.1 Portal Design Update *(slide 24)*

- GIPA s 3 2 – The new service portal can be seen as part of the portal update. The prominence of the People Unit in the new service portal is equal or less than the prominence today in the current service portal which has four prominent buttons for IT and Digital service, HR Services, Financial services and Legal services. The prominence will be reviewed with GIPA s.3.2 and GIPA s.3.2 in the new year for alignment.

3.2 SMO – Recruitment Update *(slide 27)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

4. APPENDICES

4.1. Forward Business List *(slide 23)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business.

- GIPA s.3.2 closed out 2023 Steering Committee meeting thanking the Program.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 2.00pm.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 23rd January | 10:30 – 11:30 am

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____
CHAIR

____
DATE

SERVICECONNECT PROGRAM (SCP)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 23/01/2024

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the SCP Steering Committee, held on Tuesday, 23rd January 2024 from 10.30am to 11.30am at CB01.04b.12 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	[redacted]

ACTIONS REGISTER

New Actions added to the register:

- **RSK2392 UAT –** (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] The Steering Committee has determined that both user testing and unit sign-off are critical prerequisites for go-live. The sponsor requested Exec Director support and offered to provide communications to support the requirement. Program will call-upon if required.
- **RSK2223 B&I Testing –** Clarification received regarding the specific mention of Sev 3 defects. This is due to the fact at (by definition) Sev 3 defects can be resolved by workarounds – the risk is that if there are too many workarounds then the business may find it unacceptable. The same does not apply to Sev 1s and Sev 2 defects as (by definition) these must be resolved by Go-Live. The risk wording has been updated.
- **ISS0967 ITOM Config Delays –** Return next Steering Committee with confirmation of schedule for R#1a.
- **Forms –** (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Forms IT transaction report for next Steering Committee, review of historical transactional data for 2023 statistics.
- **Resourcing –** (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] To share support plan to determine how best to manage the go-live helpdesk support staff, additional staff.
- **SMO –** (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Provide next Steering Committee a mitigation strategy, through a customer service lens, on staffing at go-live and considering the residual impact of seconding staff and can we go-live without an SMO stood-up in its entire endstate.

- **Impact Assessment** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Review and update the impact assessment to reflect that the staff service experience remains inconsistent and analogue for services outside of IT and Legal.
- **Testing** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to provide approach and schedule to GIPA s.3. [redacted] in order to advise FGMs and school managers in testing for the student cohort.
- **Release #1 schedule revision** - (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to undertake a schedule review and evaluate an alternative go-live date with a focus on relieving schedule pressure and de-risking the go-live. Return to next Committee in two weeks with findings and a proposal.
- **Testing** – Review of the Testing plan in its entirety next week for feedback.
- **Change** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Share the Change Management Plan with GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
- **Portal** – Showcase of the updated portal for GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]

	DECISIONS
1	Implementation Plan • The Steering Committee did not address the Implementation Plan, no decision made.
2	SMO Implementation Plan • The Steering Committee expressed concern about the absence of a full SMO model at go-live, and with a lack of critical path and approach definition for SMO mobilisation, has requested that a contingency plan be submitted to mitigate the resourcing risk for endorsement at next Steerco.
3	Testing Approach • The Steering Committee expressed concern about the lack of detail provided and requested the Program return to Committee in 2 weeks with; a. Review of the Testing Plan b. Testing summary and outcomes
4	Training Approach • The Steering Committee requested the program further develop and integrate the integrated training approach and requested the Program to return to Committee in 2 weeks with a. Review of the impact within ICT, understand the operating environment within the faculties. b. Can we push back to the last week of March without risk to CASS to the Cloud

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

The Chair welcomed the Steering Committee and noted apologies for the first meeting of 2024. Introducing GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]

Noting the Service and Operating Model Design (key artefacts) which references what was current state vs future state will be. Recognising the amount of work which has been done and the potential of the Program.

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

Minutes taken as true and accurate and read.

Action Items

- Not discussed taken as read.

1.3. Program Performance *(Slide 3)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented briefly on the Programs performance noting;

- Change team focusing on training capability uplift, adoption and key communications.
- Project team focusing on completion of UAT, defect resolution and finalising platform elements.
- The Portal now resembles the end state, with a demo / showcase being organised for Committee.
- In Development sprint 7 completes today, and the final sprint 8 commences tomorrow for completion 6th Feb.
- In Testing, 82% of SIT is complete with sprint 7 due to end 30th Jan.
- Capgem business testing, identifying half of the expected defects and 52% complete.
- Introduced the Service Delivery Squad team to mitigate identified risks for R1.
- Delay in turning the ITOM module on will present some impact to the schedule for R#1a.
- Training has been pushed back a week due to slip in acquisition of scenarios.
- Service Delivery Squad mobilized.

- **Risks**
  - RSK2392 – UAT: Business areas required to sign off on UAT conducted by Capgemini.
  - RSK2223 – B&I Testing: too many Sev 3 defects.

- **Issues**
  - ISS0967 – ITOM: R1a baseline not yet determined, remains open.
  - ISS0991 – Config not ready for BPT: Open
  - ISS0993 – Feedback register: Open
  - ISS0994 – Additional licence cost: yet to be resolved, potential budget constraint.

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked who we are dealing with for BU sign-off?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed the Program is liaising with Business Managers/ team leaders as they are the one's with the knowledge of business functions.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Raised that from a Steering Committee perspective need to identify the functional gaps where Capgemini do not know the business processes. Its not acceptable for the Business unit to absorb UAT responsibilities by accepting Capgemini testing.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that some faculty member may not know what processes need to be tested and will need some guidance.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested that communications to the FGMs outlining the significance of UAT and offering support where needed.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Raised that RSK2223 is close to critical, referring only to sev 3 defects. There are also major functional defects which would impact go live. Need to differentiate between defects and functional gaps, UAT will surface functional gaps where hard decisions will need to be made. Feedback register, Service Delivery Squad and Hypercare as mitigations.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked what "functional gaps" looks like?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded in that the system may have the functionality to support the business process. ITSM has unique business processes – how do we de/escalate a major incident, are the mechanisms in place. GIPA s.3.2 – Acknowledged the great work in completing the integrations testing milestone.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the financial forecasted surplus of $311k would cover the ITOM licence of GIPA s.3.2 .
- GIPA s.3.2 – Mentioned the additional resourcing for hypercare would also be covered within the surplus.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Explained the current discussions around staff augmentation of the helpdesk for a short time to support the new platform.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed the risk on too much hand-holding in the shift between platforms and questioned what the number of expected transactions per day on the impacted forms?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the prioritisation of forms was based on usage.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that March is generally the busiest time of year in terms of IT transactions, largely service desk requests and changes.

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION

2.1. Implementation Plan *(Slide 19)*

- Not discussed, no decision was made.

2.2. SMO Implementation Plan *(Slide 20)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented on the SMO Implementation Plan outlining the following;

- How we are establishing key capabilities
- Target readiness where 4/10 processes will have a process owner by go-live
- FTE for process owners along with virtual process owners where there existing capabilities today. Eg: Change Manager also Printing Services Manager
- Dependencies on the IT Operating Model
- From a risk perspective, a number of key roles to be implemented/ onboarded. Conversations occurring with virtual process owner in flight and which services to prioritised.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked when the SMO will be staffed up given the dependencies on the IT Operating Model? Will we have enough people by go-live?

- GIPA s.3.2 – Replied that 6 new capabilities are required for 8^{th} March. 1 role has been filled, 5 more roles yet to be filled and recruitment business case is in development. There is a risk that wont have all roles onboarded.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented with the recruitment timelines it is highly likely we will not have enough staff to go live. Is the risk large enough that we will not go-live?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Replied that Plan B is in augmenting existing staff temporarily to some of those functions.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if there would be training/ upskilling required to support Plan B?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that it would depend on the specificity of the roles.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the need for a mitigation strategy and understanding of the risk of being understaffed at go-live.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Addressed the impact on the Staff Experience on customer service element for day 1
- GIPA s.3.2 – Also noted the risk of impact carries through to the end of hypercare
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out if we need to extend the go-live date, would pushing out 2 weeks help mitigate the issues at hand.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Raised again that the timing is not great given the start of session.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that the date was set considering CASS to Cloud roll out.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested a review of the people impact assessment on who will be impacted.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Explained that on the process side, the SMO is in a relatively good position, subject to availability of the virtual process owners. Able to provide reactive supportive services the SMO provides, not ideal but also not a showstopper for go-live. The platform, resource availability to focus on the platform. AC3 can advise on any large knowledge gaps prior to go-live.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Summarised with, are we sufficiently resourced enough for a successful go-live and how much risk are we going to bare?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that the capabilities needed for day one on the Platform Team, is dictated by the functional gaps and determining how much resourcing is required.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the target date is the 8^{th} March, the Committee needs to make a decision if the 8^{th} is carrying too much risk.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that problems generally occur in the first week, moving it out a week cant see a difference, but may remove a risk of affecting core business where people need support.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Summarised with a review of historical transactional data, contingency plan for resourcing and a review of the impact assessment.

2.3. User Testing Approach *(Slide 23)*

GIPA s.3.2 summarised the User Testing Approach noting that the scene is now set, and the scheduling of testing and training activities are locked in diaries.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if in terms of the testing plan is there float in the schedule?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that we have provided minimal coverage for a small amount of resolution. The Program is not equipped for major testing defects.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggesting this is putting more pressure on the go-live date, need to create more float to manage the testing risk and proposed to move the launch date out by 2 weeks.

- GIPA s 3 – Asked if the school managers be engaged for testing and when would that be mobilised?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Advised that the testing approach will need some engagement from the school managers for the student cohort.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented on the absence of the faculties not listed on the Testing key dates slide
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested that the next Steering Committee be brought forward a week to the 6th Feb.

2.4. Training Approach *(Slide 26)*

GIPA s.3.2 introduced this topic outlining the Programs Training Approach and Objectives for endorsement noting the following;

- Training window for the service providers UAT now in diaries
- GIPA s.3.4
- The first TTT session being held tomorrow, 24th January with ITU process owners
- Training Approach now shifted with the condensed timeframe
    - TTT will be delivered based on scenarios developed with AC3 and UTS SMEs
    - Tutorial style lessons with a 2 hour duration
    - SME's to further develop content for team training
    - 3-4 week window to deliver all training
- Working in parallel with build, SIT and BVT cycles
- Current outcomes is to develop scenarios into virtual tutorials

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if from AC3's point of view, will be able to meet the training requirements and would pushing back the go-live would that reduce the training risk?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the Program will meet the minimum training requirements and delaying the go-live date would be helpful in delivery sequencing of training events and bring together all the artefacts. Mitigations already in place include catchup training to bridge any gaps.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested the Program to return with a review of the impact within ICT, an understanding the operating environment within the faculties and noting if we can push back to the last week of March without risk to CASS to the Cloud.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked how people would access training materials without getting 3rd parties involved.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed there will be a collaboration site which would be populated with training materials and user guides as well as the ServiceConnect sharepoint site. Post implementation ramping up communications sharing catchup sessions and knowledge where to access materials.

3. <u>ITEMS FOR NOTING</u>

3.1 Knowledge Management Update *(slide 31)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

4. APPENDICES

4.1. Forward Business List *(slide 23)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that there will be more impact than you think, communications were never sent out around the differences between the old and new portal in terms of support and IT issues.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that the Program will provide an overview of the Portal on the People Unit side.

- GIPA s.3.2 closed out the first meeting of the year thanking the Program.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 11.30pm.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 6th February | 2:00 – 3:00 pm

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____

CHAIR

____

DATE

UTS

SERVICECONNECT PROGRAM (SCP)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 06/02/2024

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the SCP Steering Committee, held on Tuesday, 6th February 2024 from 2.00 pm to 3.00 pm at CB01.04a.15 Meeting room and via Zoom.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	[redacted]

ACTIONS REGISTER

New Actions added to the register:

- **RSK2251 – Legacy Tickets:** Return to the Steering Committee with a detailed mitigation plan including adequate resourcing, cutover dates, and parameters of closing aged tickets.
- **Financial** – Provide a detailed breakdown of contingency (Sev1 & 2, resourcing).
- **Go/no-go** – Present go/no-go criteria plan to the Steering Committee by 20th February
- **Readiness Dashboard** – Include as a continuing agenda item moving forward
- **SC Meetings** – To retain increased (fortnightly) cadence throughout the period up until and after go-live.
- **Training** – GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to provide feedback on TTT to GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]
- **Training** – GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to re-baseline schedule to 28th March
- **Testing** – IT to review the testing plan for next meeting.

DECISIONS

1	**Proposed Go-Live Date Adjustment** The Steering Committee endorsed the shift of the go-live date to the 28th March 2024. Dependant on the go/no-go criteria which is to be presented to the Steering Committee by 20th February 2024.

UTS

2	**Change Plan** The Steering Committee endorsed the Change Plan with continued monitoring of feedback received.

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

The Chair welcomed the Steering Committee and noted apologies.

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

GIPA s.3.2 drew the committee's attention back to the last meeting whereby 4 items for decision were considered however no decisions were made.

- Training approach has been tabled again for today
- Having not approved the Implementation Approach is problematic
- SMO Implementation Plan, identified risks and needs further unpacking
- UAT Approach, clarity on business process and signoff required

The Programs risks and issues are largely based on schedule constraints on the current go-live date of 8th March.

1.3. Program Performance *(Slide 3)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented briefly on the Programs performance noting;

- Testing and defect resolution are key focus.
- 4 weeks, 2 days away from planned go-live of 8th March.
- Sprint 8 completes on the 13th February
- AssetTrack the Business has signed off on UAT
- Unpacking of the CMDB and Asset Management
- Discovery function enabled

- **Risks**
  - RSK2223 – Sev 3 Defects:
    - 40% testing completed over 6-week duration
  - RSK2251 – Legacy Tickets
    - 5000+ open tickets, a quarter of these are >12 months old
  - RSK2392 – UAT in Business areas
    - 18 teams currently actively testing and signing off
  - RSK2404 – Sev1/ 2 Defects
    - Low chance of test outcomes being poor

- **Issues**
  - ISS0967 – ITOM Config
    - Testing module delayed however will not affect the critical path for R#1a
  - ISS0881 – Config not ready for BPT

UTS

        - Items in feedback register have been actioned, not tested as yet
    - ISS0993 – Feedback Register
        - Register now closed for AC3 to address the feedback items
    - ISS0994 – Additional Licence
        - $71k not provisioned in the 2024 budget
    - ISS0995 – IT Op Model

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Raised concerns that the summary of performance slide is not substantiated by the detail in the pack, specifically the R#1 Readiness Dashboard.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned if remaining testing can be completed in 4 weeks?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the vendor resourcing will be ramped up for BVT to complete remaining 60% within 4 weeks.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked what the mitigation was for legacy tickets and closing these out.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Described the method that fulfillers have access to their old ticket data and working to provide users with this access also. Engaging with the assignment group leaders to establish ground rules and narrow the field with grouping tickets.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Recommended that a condition of go-live, to have the legacy ticket mitigation plan in place with parameters of closing tickets >9 months old and resources available to avoid any change shock.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Added possibly running parallel environments closing out tickets in old system to a cut over date and re-keying tickets in new platform.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented on the timing challenges on completing UAT for items to be resolved in the feedback register.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked why the additional licencing costs were an issue when there is a $100k surplus.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that the $100k will cover the costs, however gratification is required.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out understanding the go/no-go assessment and the criteria would force a no-go as well as understanding the constraints for CASS to Cloud.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the acceptance testing should not be tracking green.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested clarity on the Training milestones being completed by end Feb and this should be tracking amber.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that it will be a challenge to get training completed.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that if the go-live is re-baselined to the 28th, will that bring the status back to green.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Summarised the financials in that pushing out to the 28th March will cost the Program and additional $125k, with a surplus of $175k.
    - Can we wisely invest that $175 to mitigate the schedule and quality risk in the Program.
    - Additional resources, support from AC3 to reduce launch risk.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Replied with coordinating of the helpdesk augmentation and this option presents the internal resource costs of $100k.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Queried on the additional time if there was a risk on contractors leaving.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the blend of fixed term and contractors have had ample time of notice on program closure. However, there is an exit risk.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if the surplus covered the additional ITOM licencing costs.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Replied that the contingency has not been applied to any source.

UTS

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION

2.1. Release #1 Proposed Go-Live Adjustment *(Slide 14)*

GIPA s.3.2 summarised the proposed go-live date for 28th March 2024 providing an additional 15 days to minimise the risk on schedule pressure, training and UAT signoff.

- Pre-loading integrations and applying configuration
- CASS to Cloud has a full dress-rehearsal on 8th March
- No change to R#1a date of 26th April

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out staff availability over the Easter break
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed the Program team is available should cutover not go to plan
- GIPA s.3.2 – Queried pushing back R#1, but not R#1a and completing all the activities for R#1a in the 3 week period.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed current thinking is that R#1a activities will be accomplished in 3 weeks.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Added that AC3 will have completed all activities up to SIT and handing over to Capgemini conducting UAT/ BVT. R#1a is capabilities ie: ITOM discovery.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Raised concerns of impacts to the IT Op Management team without a testing approach and the change involved.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Acknowledged the high likelihood of impact to R#1a, any contingency will need to be considered.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the high-ticket volume, new ways of working and high impact on the helpdesk and lack of a mitigation plan.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed that the increase in tickets will be on the old system in the first 2 weeks.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Acknowledged the systemic issues on the ticket load and the legacy problem needing a different approach which the new system cannot fix.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed at the Steering Committee has no choice but to delay to the 28th March, post Easter runs the risk of bumping into CASS to Cloud.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested the go/no-go criteria to be presented to the Steering Committee within 2 weeks, table the business readiness dashboard moving forward and increase the frequency of the Steering Committees to a fortnightly minimum.

2.2. Change Plan *(Slide 17)*

GIPA s.3.2 presented on the Change Plan outlining scheduled activities for engagement, training and communications aligned to the Change Plan.

- Data gathered from current platform is helping target high value/ impact requests from faculties providing a view of top 10 requests and understanding of what the change needs are and how we can support.
- Current focus is on TTT with generally positive feedback.
- Some processes are not complete to fully understand what the change is, dependant on the feedback register and testing completed.
- Gaps identified given running TTT is being conducted before UAT/ BVT is finished.
- Universal Request features and work arounds to be delivered in R#1 and how this may impact teams.

UTS

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned if the squad is prioritising training issues?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Ensured that training is being covered within the squad and OCM.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked what the biggest risks executing the change and the training after go-live?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded with the dependency on UTS capability in the ServiceNow team to help with where the change is in the as-is state, as there is no documentation on the current ways of working. Understanding the workarounds to communicate to requestors on the change for day 1.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked what the transactional view on a normal day would be for most used forms, to be ready for day one on a process and technical level.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Most impacted teams would be the service operations centre and Lx.labs, training for Lx.labs has been brought forward and they have access to the environment. Ensuring the top requests for SO&C have the highest level of detail and support for go-live.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that the lead-times need to be re-baselined to the 28th March.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if there has been any collaboration with GIPA s.3.2 in terms of on-boarding/ induction training?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Replied that GIPA s.3.2 has picked up this piece of work with GIPA s.3.2 to embed into BAU.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Raised concerns on how training will be managed for infrequent users.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Suggested that there will be more training materials available post go-live which will be developed with incorporated feedback from delivery and the SMO will be operational.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out that there is an audit of StaffConnect in progress and requested for GIPA s.3.2 to include in that audit a reference point to the portal is being considered.

2.3. Implementation Approach *(Slide 22)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3. ITEMS FOR NOTING

3.1. Business Readiness Dashboard *(slide 23)*

- To be tabled for agenda item for meetings moving forward.

3.2. UAT Departmental and Signoff Summary *(slide 27)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3.3. SMO Platform and Resourcing *(slide 30)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3.4. Go-Live Day Impact Profile *(slide 32)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

UTS

4. APPENDICES

4.1. Forward Business List *(slide 40)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 3:00 pm.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 5th March | 10:30 – 11:30 am

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____

CHAIR

____

DATE

UTS

SERVICECONNECT PROGRAM (SCP)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 20/02/2024

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the SCP Steering Committee, held on Tuesday, 20th February 2024 from 3.00 pm to 4.00 pm at CB01.04b.12 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	[redacted]

ACTIONS REGISTER

New Actions added to the register:

- **R#1a** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Program to return to the committee with confirmation of revised timing for the delivery of Release #1a, consequent to the adjusted Release #1 go-live date.
- **RSK2404** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Request to upgrade risk consequence assessment 'major risk' and increase the rating to **high** in recognition of the revised assessment.
- **ISS0967** – (GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]) AC3 to provide follow-up to IT Ops, mapping out the subnets, dates and credentials required for delivery by COB 22/02/24.
- **Scope boundary between R#1/ R#1a** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Update the Committee (via E-Mail out of session) on greater clarity on which deliverables are in each release.
- **ISS0993** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Provide visibility on the extent to which we are closing out of items in the feedback register in summary form at next Committee.
- **Testing** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Provide a detailed list of test phases/ types with completion dates and signoff for next Committee.
- **Testing** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] UPMO to consider the UTS' test management strategy and it's application across key Programs.

UTS

DECISIONS	
1	**Test Plan** The Steering Committee has acknowledged the Test Plan and provides endorsement with the acknowledgement that UTS is limited in its subject-matter expertise, and the fact that it is in-flight, relying on the expertise of both AC3 and Capgemini under the test management of GIPA s.3.2 as the Program's Test Lead. In the absence of a specialist internal testing capability, the committee requires the program work closely with ITU to ensure UTS' needs are represented and met in all aspects of testing.
2	**Implementation Plan** The Steering Committee acknowledges the Implementation Plan.
3	**SMO Implementation Plan** The Steering Committee has endorsed the SMO Implementation Plan based on the business owners' recommendation in support of the SMO initiating "plan-b" for recruitment. Noting the fair amount of movement in the timeline and confidence that the SMO is in a place to support go-live and acknowledge a growing level of maturity.

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

The Chair welcomed the Steering Committee, noted apologies, and acknowledged no quorum.

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

GIPA s.3.2 drew the committee's attention back to the last meeting whereby the issue was raised on the release date of R#1a, 26th April being day after Anzac Day and whether it was appropriate on a short week. Asking the Program to return to the committee with confirm the delivery date taking into consideration the adjustment to Release #1 go-live date.

1.3. Program Performance *(Slide 4)*

GIPA s.3.2 introduced the program performance, taken as read and requested GIPA s.3.2 outline any critically impacting or urgent issues.

GIPA s.3.2 – Expressed the following;

- The remaining forms not yet complete, split between IT Op Management team and AC3 to resolve.
  - ITCMP Invoicing, DAB and FEIT form not prioritised in R#1
  - 96 Forms complete.
  - Internal form development commenced last week.
- Delays in UAT, however do have sign-off in some areas.
  - 21 Business units engaged, 2 have endorsed UAT and 4 have committed to signing off within 2 weeks.
  - 8 not yet engaged, due to being in various stages of SIT and not ready for UAT. Testcases unable to be completed as there are a few defects.

UTS

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if there would be any more form requests?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Replied that the circle back to the business engagement flagged all of the forms not prioritised and believes we have clear line of sight as to what was outstanding.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Added that when AC3 were provided access to the test environment, there was a slight mismatch to what was in prod versus test, this is since resolved.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out the business process testing and concerns to schedule risk.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Explained the overall test approach, where the systems integrations testing (SIT) is being done by AC3 who pass on to Capgemini who owns the business process testing (BPT), followed by user acceptance testing (UAT) by the Business.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented again on the risk of UAT, that this would be the first-time people would be exposed to the environment and the rocky experience. How many people haven't started UAT and how many people can't start UAT as the environment is not ready? GIPA s.3.2 Requested the program use a daily dashboard detailing blockers to be addressed.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that the is 75% units yet to endorse UAT, is there an issue with the environments? GIPA s.3.2 and GIPA s.3.2 did not believe there were any environmental issues and requested an outside-session follow up with GIPA s.3.2 to clarify.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked GIPA s.3.4 what his level of confidence in meeting the testing timeline.
- GIPA s.3.4 Provided his view that business enablement is critical for the go-live, UAT and training. His GIPA s.3.4 Teams are working through issues and defects with mitigations and fixes daily. The number of defects will impact whether we will make go-live or not.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Questioned what our options are now.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that we need a good week of UAT to make any call on the trajectory.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated preference on working out how we can go-live this side of the CASS window, rather than waiting a couple of months for the perfect landing.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out for next meeting, the committee needs to be realistic in what can be achieved for go-live and commented on the possibility of absorbing flat if required. Requesting we put a hard stop on any changes as the business have had their chance.
- GIPA s.3.4
- GIPA s.3.2 – Called out that there cannot be any more forms for the program to deliver, and asked if we have got all the environments ready for testing?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Responded that some of the user permissions were not in place.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Added that requirements captured early were perhaps not of the best quality. Now that the Program has progressed, new requirements are being discovered/refined. The program is handling these on a case-by-case basis, however there are not many.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed the Program needing to focus on "progress, not perfection", with an understanding that the backlog will grow. Also asked for clarity on the level of realisation around requests.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Advised that the ticket reduction strategy has kicked off (slide 32).
- GIPA s.3.2 – Made comment on the program's achievements that the UAT 90% complete will not close out UAT and that the current R#1 Go/No-go checkpoint status should reflect amber.

1.4. Risks and Issues *(Slide 6)*

- **RSK2425** – Raising a change functionality
  - Functionality for raising a change in the new platform not working.
  - GIPA s.3.4 Confirmed that this is an access issue and now closed.

- **RSK2404** – Unforeseen Sev1/ Sev2 Defects
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Stated that there is a functional gap which could put the go-live in jeopardy.
  - GIPA s.3.2 – provided a quick snapshot of testing status: SIT completed, 10 defects outstanding. BPT – 387/420 test cases passed, with 81 still to execute, 8x Sev 2, 1x Sev 1, 4x lower severity defects.
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Requested we upgrade this risk to high rating – flagging mitigation as more schedule or resourcing.
  - GIPA s.3.4 Agreed this is a high risk, need to track the defects that the business UAT is raising.
  - GIPA s.3.4 AC3 Engineers will be onsite from now to go-live and sit with the business.
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Co-location of all 3 teams – War Room.

- **ISS0967** – ITOM Config Delays
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Slow progress, commitment from AC3 to build table to map out the credentials required by COB Thursday
  - GIPA s.3.4 Not a capability to go-live for 28th
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Happy for this to be is a R#1a activity, not mission critical for go-live
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Clarity required on scope for both R#1/ R#1a due to items moving to R#1a with reduced timeframe.

- **ISS0993** – Feedback Register
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Register now closed for AC3 to address the feedback items
  - GIPA s.3.2 – AC3 committed to finalising the remaining forms in/ out of scope.
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Confirm the degree of close-out of feedback items.
  - GIPA s.3.2 – May have to make some hard calls on some of the outstanding items.
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Proposed to give GIPA s.3.2 proxy authority to make these calls on outstanding items as business owner.

- **ISS1020** – Discussed as defect resolution impacting the substance of the training in the OCM stream, characterised as minor-to-mid sized impact to training proportionally.

- **ISS1021** – Quality Issues impacting stakeholder engagement, discussed and under management.

- **ISS1022** – Forms requiring reprioritisation.
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Impact to the business on forms implemented for go-live will be relative to how much the EAS can build in BAU.
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Requested ticket transaction data analysis to identify potential areas which could be impacted with high volume of tickets.
  - GIPA s.3.2 – Analysis has been done by AC3 on usage and impact which is informing the prioritisation for EAS team.

- **ISS1023** – Blended Assignment groups impacting OCM Comms, about to be resolved.

- o **ISS1024** – Continuous Change to Scope, discussed and a distribution will be circulated out of session to confirm no shift in scope between the releases.

1.5. Financials *(Slide 10)*

- Not discussed. Taken as read.

1.6. Business Readiness Dashboard *(Slide 12)*

GIPA s.3.2 opened this topic calling out the user training and UAT, and this was taken as read.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Stated that the TTT Complete column relates to the trainer signing off on competency to train staff.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Acknowledged the parallels of TTT and UAT therefore possibility of fixes needed for TTT and trainers will be able to adapt.

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION

2.1. Day 1 Impacts and Go-Live Blockers *(Slide 16)*

GIPA s.3.2 acknowledged the Program is on top of a wide range of issues, there is a line of sight, however the next 2 weeks are critical period where the Steering Committee will need to make the decision on execute fully on the 28th March or initiate a scope reduction. Noting it would be highly problematic if a no-go decision was made and the workload on the IT Operations Management team. The possibility of a 2-month delay to manage issues was discussed but not endorsed.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Requested that we consider the experience lens, and focus on what would prevent going live from a staff experience perspective.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Expanded by adding that there is confidence and reputational impact to consider too.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Addressed how we may encourage users who move away from self-service, back to the platform to get the full staff experience.

2.2. Test Plan *(Slide 19)*

GIPA s.3.2 expressed that it is not really for the Steering Committee to decide whether a test plan is acceptable or not, but to acknowledge and support the governance around it. Noting that UTS does not have a dedicated testing capability or framework in place which will change in the Operating Model.
UTS ITU staff endorsed the test plan, entry criteria for testing is the approval of the test plan. This is a consideration for the UPMO to pick up around the sequence of governance and management controls for all programs.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Recognises the level of expertise in the Program, in Capgemini, and in AC3 in developing the plans. Have we completed accessibility, usability and pen test, stress volume, browser compatibility testing?
- GIPA s.3.2 – To confirm and revert to the committee
- GIPA s.3.2 – Talked to combined acceptance testing between the Program, AC3 and UTS and that this has not happened yet. Requesting a list of all tests detailing completion and signoff to provide the committee visibility of what has been executed and what is outstanding.

2.3. ITU Approved Implementation Plan *(Slide 21)*

GIPA s.3.2 noted that we are at the tail end of the Implementation Plan and that internal audit will also provide a view in which we can inform subsequent Programs.

2.4. SMO Implementation Plan *(Slide 22)*

GIPA s.3.2 explained that what was presented in the Steering Committee slides is not an implementation plan, more a schedule of work. That the key challenge of this is bridging the gap between ITOM and SMO.

Key discussion points:

- GIPA s.3.2 – Raised the need for a sense of critical path also noting the process models clarified is late in March.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Replied that the processes are already executed to a certain extent and the platform gives a level of guidance.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Does this plan provide minimum viable product to support release date?
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that this represents implementation of what is in the SMO design. This plan highlights the resources, related roles and governance ready to run.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed happy with this version of the implementation plan, go-live focuses on tool transformation followed by process transformation. Process and reporting swim lanes are not critical path for go-live.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Added that the customer service governance forum will be ready to support and govern the framework.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Asked if GIPA s.3.2 would be comfortable to endorse the Implementation Plan without the level of detail.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Confirmed support of the SMO Implementation Plan
- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that the people side is key for go-live explaining that the SMO is pursuing plan a, however plan b is more likely.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Noted that position descriptions are still being written and the time involved it is too late, requested moving to plan b now.

3. ITEMS FOR NOTING

3.1. Timeline *(slide 25)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3.2. Criteria for Enhancement Evaluation *(slide 29)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3.3. Approach for Reduction of In-flight Tickets *(slide 31)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

4. APPENDICES

4.1. Forward Business List *(slide 34)*

GIPA s.3.2 referenced the go/no-go assessment, testing outcomes and review of blockers will provide some guidance on where the decision will land in the readiness to go-live, are we still comfortable with the 28th March and what will stop us from going live. Taking into account any potential degradation in the staff experience.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Raised concerns on training and will take that off-line with GIPA s.3.2

GIPA s.3.2 closed the meeting acknowledging the Program team, IT Operations Management team and AC3 teams for continued dedication to the Program.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 4:00 pm.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 5th March | 10:30 – 11:30 am

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____

CHAIR

____

DATE

SERVICECONNECT PROGRAM (SCP)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 05/03/2024

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the SCP Steering Committee, held on Tuesday, 5th March 2024 from 10.30 am to 11.30 am at CB01.04b.12 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]

ACTIONS REGISTER

New Actions added to the register:

- **Portal:** GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] / GIPA s.3. [redacted] - Ensure the Out of the Box forms are removed from the Portal, streamlining the search functionality for People Unit. (closed)
- **Portal**: Develop a Leave form Knowledge Base article to provide guidance in submitting leave. (closed)
- **New Risk:** If the Portal deviates from the Reference Group's expectations, develop a risk mitigation plan around this uncertainty by re-convening the PRG to validate the design.
- **Testing:** Clarify the full construct of testing – who/when/how/to what extent. Provide the Committee a full listing of tests and participants engaged in testing activities.
- **Timeline:** Present back to the Committee a week-by-week timeline moving forward to go-live and include R#1a by COB 6th March.
- **Cutover Plan & Rollback:** Return to the SC with confirmation of completion of the Release #1 cutover plan including associated governance (eg. roll-back decision makers and notification chain).
- **G/NG Criteria:** Return to the Committee for endorsement with:
  - Successful portal testing to be included in criteria
  - Closed criteria requirements prompting Yes/No answers.
  - Additional column detailing accountability of the requirement.
  - Higher specificity and references to data points within where possible.
  - Both the PRG and each fulfiller department has actively tested their search functions as requestors for their most sought-after forms and is comfortable with the search results presented for each.

- Have ITU provided validation of both the cutover plan and the roll-back plan.
- **Release #1a:** Engage with CASS2Cloud program; discuss, anticipate and plan for any further delays and envisaged impacts should they defer any further.

	DECISIONS
1	**Release #1a Schedule Adjustment (2-week shift)** The Steering Committee notes the proposed change in R#1a in go-live. More work is required to validate the consequences of the delay (i.e. sufficient resources, other dependencies to manage). Whilst the Committee acknowledges the Program is working on it, the level of detail needs to be further unpacked to provide the confidence considering, limited funding for resourcing to extend further. Prior to going live with Release #1, present back to the Committee R#1a schedule of activities. Item deferred.

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

The Chair welcomed the Steering Committee, noted apologies and welcomed GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] representing GIPA s.3.2 [redacted], GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] representing GIPA s.3.2 [redacted].

- Calling out the volume of the pack and focussing on key highlights, testing summary located at slide 34 and understanding the current position of the Portal.

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

- Actions and minutes taken as read.

1.3. Program Performance and Achievements *(Slide 4)*

<u>**Key discussion points:**</u>

- The "AV Room" mandatory field has been deemed a critical requirement by the Business. However, GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] agreed that it would not be required at Go-Live (noting that it does NOT currently exist in the current system.

- Training delivery continue to evolve, incorporating new discoveries and requirements.

- <u>Current status of the Portal</u>:
  Concerns have been raised that the Portal is not ready to be showcased, as UAT has not been completed.
  Does the design of the Portal meet the agreed requirements and positioning of People Unit button?

The Portal was designed by a reference group in 2023 for a whole of UTS impact, led by GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]. UAT has been conducted by a wide range of participants (students, staff, faculty members) providing feedback, actively managed by the Program and AC3.

For the People Unit, there has not been a positive staff experience as to-date the training has been more of a bug fixing exercise and the search functionality was not effective.

The ServiceNow OOTB forms will be turned off by Wednesday morning eliminating ambiguous search results and presenting a cleaner experience for People Unit. Promotion of the Knowledge based Article linking to Ascender will assist in the improvement of staff experience.

Portal Showcases presented to the School Managers has generated positive feedback on the general taxonomy of the portal and what the actual need is from the user. Looping in the Reference Group champions to validate the design is as intended will be beneficial.

Clarity is required on whether the Program is ready to showcase to the FGMs without UAT being complete.
The challenge that data cannot be promoted to the new system until it has completed UAT. Ass such the complete data will not be in the Portal until just prior to go-live. The showcases will need to be presented including what is in the pipeline to illustrate a complete product.

The risk has been raised around conducting UAT and training in parallel, highlighting that no final verification testing by UTS staff would be completed prior to go-live under the current plan. Capgemini and AC3 cannot execute this testing.

The Change and Comm's training schedule currently involves community-based group training daily, catchup sessions allowing all Service Providers, (Fulfillers) to attend to meet the condensed timelines. Concerns on shifting the date will generate more effort in re-training.

The Program is required to return to the Committee with verification of UAT of the portal, potentially revisit the GnG date from the 20th to the 26th March.

1.4. Risks and Issues *(Slide 6)*

- **New Risk**: The Staff Experience of the Portal is not what was expected by the Program Reference Group. Develop a risk mitigation plan around the Portal Staff Experience meeting expectations by reconvening and revalidate.

1.5. Financials *(Slide 10)*

- Discussed by the Committee in a closed session.

1.6. Business Readiness Dashboard *(Slide 12)*

Key discussion points:

- UAT column: Items at risk, dates to be updated if unable to meet 8th March and those activities to the right moved to red.
- PVT column: Requiring UTS staff to be conducting PVT rather than Capgem. Is there a cascade of those dates and is there time to conduct PVT before/ after GNG decision.
- Business availability to conduct PVT is the challenge, relationships are in place with the business to engage and participate in PVT activities.
- PVT will mainly impact People, Legal and IT.
- Suggestion of conditional GnG subject to PVT.
- Lack of detail in the R#1a readiness dashboard may impact the timeline decision.
- R#1a is more IT than business focussed.

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION

2.1. Release #1a Schedule Adjustment *(Slide 19)*

Key discussion points:

- 20th March currently is the GnG decision date.
- A two-week delay in go-live for R#1a would allow the Program to preserve the integrity of R#1.
- Contingency if R#1 does not go well. Rollback plan is detailed in the Implementation Plan. However, the longer the new system is operational, the harder it will be to roll back. Mitigations are in place with the sequencing of activities in the cutover plan for go-live.
- Completion of the cutover plan is a pre-requisite for GnG, monitoring the governance of cutover is being managed by CAB in the technical sense being an IT system.
- CASS to Cloud has been delayed by 2 days, no further delays for R#1a have been anticipated that would impact CASS. However, both programs are utilising same resourcing and continued liaison with CASS to make informed decisions ensuring no collisions.
- Should CASS defer again, general feel is that R#1a would need to be delayed as well. There is not enough contingency to undertake all the activities required for R#1a to support the 9th May. IT Ops team will be heavily involved in the outcomes of R#1 to be able to assist with R#1a. Noting that the hypercare for R#1 overlays R#1a activities.

3. ITEMS FOR NOTING

3.1. Go/No-Go Criteria *(slide 23)*

- GnG Criteria document to be refreshed with closed questions inviting a yes/no answer, include accountability column and data points to provide more comfort in the report.
- Item 27: Testing summary is slide 35 - Does not specifically cover off what was in the test plan as to what has been done and when. Test plan to be updated to reflect a completion report detailing all tests and who responsible for signoff.

UTS

3.2. Resource & Supplier Roll-Off Plan *(slide 24)*

- Discussed by the Committee in a closed session.

3.3. Variation Summary *(slide 26)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3.4. UAT Progress Dashboard *(slide 30)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

4. APPENDICES

4.1. Forward Business List *(slide 34)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 11.30 am.

NEXT MEETING

Monday, 25th March | 11:30 – 12:30 am

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____

CHAIR

____

DATE

SERVICECONNECT PROGRAM (SCP)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 25/03/2024

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the SCP Steering Committee, held on Monday, 25th March 2024 from 11.30 am to 12.30 pm at CB01.04b.12 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]

ACTIONS REGISTER

New Actions added to the register:

- **Feedback Register** - (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Add consideration of the feedback register into GNG Criteria.
- **UAT** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]) Provide details of who has not completed UAT to GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] where escalation is required.
- **ISS0995** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] In the Go/No-go criteria, update reference to imply that Plan B is an overlay to Plan A. "Interim Transition Plan".
- **Portal** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Provide list of all feedback on the Portal and group by Concern, Compliment, Other.
- **Portal** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Provide list of academics involved in the testing and user groups.
- **GNG Criteria** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Update all items with Due Dates.
- **GNG Criteria** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Distribute update to the Steering Committee post Thursday review.
- **GNG Criteria** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Expand the GNG Criteria final report indicate the highest criteria by symbol or colour.
- **Testing** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Penetration testing is noted as not complete, CISO signoff required for this to be marked completed.
- **UAT Dashboard** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] #9 Change Management: Drew is awaiting specific functionality demonstration.
- **Communications** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Draft commentary which includes a redirect link and work with IT Ops Management Team. Include the banner of old platform and add the implementation to the runsheet.

DECISIONS	
1	**N/A**

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

The Chair welcomed the Steering Committee, noted apologies and welcomed GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] representing GIPA s.3.2 [redacted], GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] representing GIPA s.3.2 [redacted].

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

- Minutes taken as read.
- **Action AS1200:** Release #1 Cutover Plan
    - Cutover Plan to be approved by the CIO and Head of IT Ops, itemised in the GNG Criteria

1.3. Program Performance and Achievements *(Slide 4)*

The Program is tracking amber due to the 6 teams not having signed off on UAT coupled with a few Sev 2 defects.

With 4 business days from go-live, the Program is tracking well on the OCM side, transition approach running parallel systems has been communicated distributed.

2 Remaining training sessions to be conducted, successfully engaged over 600 people in training.

3 Code Drops into production complete, all integrations in place and full-dress rehearsal scheduled Wednesday 27th March.

Hypercare and governance plan also in place along with an End-of-Week Report designed to summarise what 5-days in looks like.

Key discussion points:

- 6-7 areas yet to complete UAT as at the time of this session
- 80-90% business units have provided their testing results
- Tracking approx. 30 open risks and issues in project connect and targeted ones flow through to Steerco.
- Penetration testing has gone through 3 rounds of feedback, none of which are showstoppers.
- Sev 1 = 0, Sev 2 = 6, Defects = 6
- AC3 has given commitment that these will be resolved by Wednesday, with a final drop this week.

- Noting across all the Risks and Issues, universal request forms, some functional gaps and too many Sev 3's, what wasn't cover off was the Sev 5's which are not in scope for R#1. Internal management of developing 30 out of scope forms have driven down the need for universal request.
- Post Implementation Review (PIR) needs to cover how all these things became clear during testing. There is an opportunity to review business process management and take into account cultural change and what people are comfortable with as opposed to what is possible.

1.4. Risks and Issues *(Slide 6)*

- **RSK1292** Business Areas not Completing UAT in time
  - GIPA s.3.2 to escalate with those business units not prioritising UAT.
  - Understanding needed as to where the blockers are.
- **ISS0995** IT Op Model
  - Clarifying that Plan B is an interim solution to support Plan A
  - Plan B is well on track and Plan A will be incorporated with in the IT Op Model

1.5. Design Outcomes *(Slide 10)*

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- The Program Reference Groups encompassed 50-60 people across academics, faculty members, professional staff and students led by GIPA s.3.2 .
- A number of HCD techniques were incorporated into these focus groups to co-design with UTS staff in designing the portal.
- 26 pieces of feedback thus far received with compliments and a few concerns raised and being managed.
- Noted that changes to the taxonomy may occur as the portal matures and evolves.
- Program Reference Group membership to be socialised for greater understanding of cross-section of participants/ testers involved.

1.6. Financials *(Slide 11)*

<u>Key discussion points:</u>

- Current remaining budget approximately $7k
- First tranche of staff rolling off on Thursday 28th
- What circumstances are we likely to need more funding for R#1a?
  - Potential need for a few more days than the 9th May will have some financial impact
  - Scope management considerations for R#1a to avoid going over budget.
  - Highlighting poor process management culture.
  - 60 forms will come out of the operational budget not program budget.
  - Once R#1 complete, we will be much clearer on R#1a.
  - Warranty and hyper-care measures in place with AC3.

1.7. **Business Readiness Dashboard** *(Slide 12)*

Key discussion points:

- Not discussed, taken as read.

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION

2.1. N/A

3. ITEMS FOR NOTING

3.1. **Release Timelines** *(slide 13)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

3.2. **Go/No-Go Criteria [GIPA s.3.2 – OWNER]** *(slide 17)*

Key discussion points:

- #3: UAT – Business areas continue to finalise testing and sign off.
  - Final list to be provided on who is blocking sign off.
- #16: Does everyone have confidence to go-live, will be the last activity to complete.
  - Most concerned stakeholder would be GIPA s.3.2 and team.
- #32: Ensuring ITU process owners have signed off on the Implementation Plan, including the run sheets and cutover plan for go-live.
  - Inserting a link on the front door of old system directing to new portal (hard controls)
- #35: Ensuring technical and support handover is signed off.

- Highlighting a lot of “On-track” activities with 4 days to go.
  - Daily combined program standups
  - Final Rehearsal go-live in test - 27th Mar – 1.00 pm
  - ITU Technical Validation - 28th Mar
  - GNG Decision combined meeting - 2nd April – 8.00 am
  - Steering Committee - 2nd April – 11.00 am

- Possibility of staff needing to work over the Easter break.
- Stakeholder Decision group – Data and Legal representation not required.
- Review criteria on a risk based approach, the activities and note which ones are totally binary for complete clarity on a GNG decision.

3.3. **UAT Progress Dashboard** *(slide 21)*

Key discussion points:

- The items showing as complete but reflect amber
  - A couple are blocked due to AC3 development and fixes
  - Others have been returned to user for re-testing
- #6: IT Cloud Ops and IT TS Ops

UTS

    - In regular contact to progress and complete
- #8: IT Network (red) - Called out as a miss-representation
    - 2 forms were consolidated and needed to be split out again which will not happen before go-live. Identified that UAT is required on the existing.
- #9: Change Management
    - Drew awaiting a functionality demonstration
- #15: Data Analytics and Insight
    - Staff was on leave delaying the testing – in progress
- #16: Asset Management – in progress
- #17: CMDB/ CSDM – in progress

3.4. Testing Outcome Summary *(slide 25)*

Key discussion points:

- UAT was technically closed on 22nd March, 28th March for completion noted in the slide reflects the timeframe for any fixes required for go-live.
- Capgemini business process testing is complete
    - UAT components, Regression, Technical and Production verification testing due to complete 28th March.
- Penetration testing has not been approved by the CISO.

Next steps

- Final Rehearsal go-live in test - 27th Mar – 1.00 pm
- Final run through of sequence of activities - 27th Mar – 4.00 pm
- Program review - 28th Mar – 4.00 pm
- Command Centre set up on Level 18
- Hypercare queue set up
- Call volume monitoring
- 3x daily sitreps with process owners
- End of day stand-ups
- Right of reply by end of that day
- ITU to provide a daily sitrep to the steering committee

General Comments

- GIPA s.3.2 – Commented that we are set up to manage with support mechanisms and hyper care in place. The team is well-resourced in technical and procedural matters to provide support. SMO will be present and work closely with the teams.

- GIPA s.3.4 Reflected that the biggest risk is the final sign-off from business units on UAT.
    - The concerns are with #8, #10, #12 – blocked by final test/ fix

- GIPA s.3.2 – Summarised that the community-based training is progressing well, survey results filtering through and receiving positive feedback in session. Caveat being that the test environment not quite complete and the portal will have some tweaks coming through and advising that there will be changes to come.

4. APPENDICES

4.1. Forward Business List *(slide 34)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business.

Front of mind

- GIPA s.3.2 – Working with the Program team in relation to the feedback for People Unit forms and resolving this week.
- GIPA s 3 – Redirecting people to the new platform.
  - Transition approach communications being sent out to fulfillers and requestors.
- GIPA s.3.2 – The platform will be new to everybody, there will be varying opinions on what version is better.
  - GIPA s.3.2 – There will be interim prioritisation governance in place.
- GIPA s.3.2 – This program sets the tone for the changes coming ahead and increasing interest from the executive.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 12.30 pm.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 2nd April | 11:00 – 12:00 pm

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

CHAIR

DATE

UTS

SERVICECONNECT PROGRAM (SCP)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 02/04/2024

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the SCP Steering Committee, held on Tuesday, 2nd April 2024 from 11.00 am to 12.00 pm at CB01.04b.12 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	[redacted]

ACTIONS REGISTER

New Actions added to the register:

- **RSK2392** – Business areas not undertaking UAT
  - Downgrade current rating to Low. UAT complete.
- **RSK2404** – Unforeseen Sev1/Sev2 defects
  - Consequences of the defects are minor, downgrade the current rating to low based on the work being completed.
- **RSK2251** – Legacy Tickets
  - Additional staff augmented on the service desk, downgrade current rating to low
- **ISS1023** – Blended Assignment Groups – Close issue
- **ISS1091** – Pen Test Result – Close issue
- **ISS1093** – Sev 1 or 2 Defects found late– Close issue
- **GNG #3** – Email to HDR students if Sev 2 not resolved indicating the remediation and workarounds.
- **GNG #18** – Update to Completed
- **GNG #19** - Provide documentation of the gaps of accessibility between 2.0 vs 2.2 in order for GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to advise affected teams accordingly.
- **GNG #26** – Update to Completed
- **GNG #28** – Distribution of week summary Report post go-live
- **GNG #28** - Internal audit called out the Benefits Profile, opportunity to re-validate the Benefits Profile prior to closing out the Program as part of the PIR.
  i. Handover of the Benefits to UPMO as the owner

ii. Data collection over 12 months to inform the Benefits

- **GNG #28** – Conduct end of Hypercare satisfaction survey
- **GNG #33** – ITU to review technical handover today

DECISIONS	
1	**Go-Live Readiness | Go/No-Go Checkpoint** The Steering Committee has endorsed the Go-Live Decision for 6.00 am 3rd April 2024.

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

The Chair welcomed the Steering Committee, noted apologies and welcomed GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] representing GIPA s.3.2 [redacted], GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] representing GIPA s.3.2 [redacted].

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

- Minutes taken as read, true and accurate.

1.3. Risks and Issues *(Slide 3)*

- **RSK2392** – Business areas not undertaking UAT
  - Downgrade current rating to Low. UAT complete.
- **RSK2565** – Defect or Functional Gaps
  - Current rating of Medium still stands, won't know until go-live
- **RSK2586** – Reference Group Expectations
  - The Portal will evolve with continuous improvements
  - Academic representation was involved in the Portal validation process within the Program Reference Groups comprising of a number of Schools reps and FGMs.
  - "Professional" in the menu comprises a number of forms not relative to faculties or Legal, may cause a bit of confusion.
  - Feedback button option on the Portal is out of scope for AC3
  - Acknowledging the decisions made by the design committee, with broad representation across the university. To be included in the PIR.
- **RSK2404** – Unforeseen Sev1/Sev2 defects
  - Consequences of the defects are minor, downgrade the current rating to low based on the work being completed.
- **RSK2251** – Legacy Tickets
  - Additional staff augmented on the service desk, downgrade current rating to low
- **RSK2566** – Project Resource Flight Risk
  - Not discussed
- **RSK2223** – Too Many Sev 3 Defects
  - Not discussed
- **RSK2500** – Call Volumes
  - Not discussed

- **RSK2567** – New Tickets Entered in Old System
  - Not discussed
- **ISS0995** – IT Op Model
  - Keep open until recruitment is completed, consequence remains at minor
- **ISS1023** – Blended Assignment Groups
  - Resolved and closed
- **ISS1091** – Pen Test Result
  - Resolved and closed
- **ISS1093** – Sev 1 or 2 Defects found late
  - Resolved and closed

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION

2.1. Go-Live Readiness | Go/No-Go Checkpoint *(slide **8**)*

1. Support and training materials created
2. GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]
3. Testing completed
   - Sev 1 = 0 | Sev 2 = 3
     - i. **SBE-1839** TVT CASS Student import has wrong title in HDR field - Mitigation of communication email to students indicating remediation time and workarounds.
     - ii. **SBE-1837** TVT NEO company imports – won't fix however user group has accepted it.
     - iii. **SBE-1878** Unable to use the search bar to find forms correctly – impact where it's expected to not function properly is expected to be limited, if not already resolved by tomorrow morning.
   - Realtime (go-forward) fix approach in place and teams are equipped to deploy fixes as needed.
   - Tracking calls through the service desk.
   - Monitor staff experience post go-live.
   - Steering Committee will accept three Sev 2's, contrary to initial view, due to the consequences of the Sev 2s have been downgraded, the overall impact on staff experience is minimal and on the understanding the Program will resolve before 03/04/24.
4. Out of the Box reports tested
5. Equipped BAU adequately to be operationally ready
6. SMO Established
   - Endorsed approach
7. Departmental knowledge in the new platform (741 Knowledge Articles)
   - Staffconnect will link to ServiceNow article, there will be some functional overlap
8. Knowledge – privacy, information and data tagging
   - Linked to SBE-1878
9. All integrations in place
   - Log in screen flashes up momentarily - not a functionality block
10. Okta integrated
11. Platform passed security testing

UTS

   - TRIMed this morning
12. Platform passed performance testing
13. Transition approach communicated
14. Communication channels in place
    - Multiple communications channels approach, hypercare, how to raise a ticket, pre-go-live communications drafted etc.
15. CAB Approval
16. Support and alignment from key stakeholders in go-live
17. Hypercare defined and resourced
18. Data Migration reviewed and complete
19. Accessibility Plan completed
    - Backlog of residual activities where ServiceNow are responsible, however no contractual commitment from them when these will be resolved.
    - ServiceNow = 2.0 – UTS = 2.2
    - Maximum level of compliance the platform can provide.
    - Provide documentation of the gaps of accessibility between 2.0 vs 2.2 in order for GIPA s.3.2 to advise affected teams accordingly.
20. IT Operational Policies for IT Service Management
    - IT has provisionally approved the policies, CIO not formalised approval as yet.
    - GIPA s.3.2 to follow up with CIO.
21. Fulfillers and requestors been trained
    - 700+ fulfillers have been trained, with around 10 survey responses.
    - Effectiveness of training at a 70-80%
    - Reaching out to areas checking in around training, results fairly positive.
    - Publishing road map of further training commencing next week on various focus areas
22. Knowledge Articles Updated
    - Owners have signed off on these articles and links work on both platforms
23. Design Credibility and Traceability
24. Usability Testing
    - Feedback and recommendations raised in Jira
    - Prioritisation of backlog activities in place between SMO and BAU
    - How large the backlog will be post go-live at this stage is unknown and subject to growth
25. Reference Group validation completed
26. CIO dashboard
    - Redesign and improvement activity underway - Completed
27. Targeted Training Programs
28. Measuring the go-live experience
    - Command Centre established
    - Weekly report to be distributed capturing ticket volumes, time spent in the platform and access of knowledge
    - Internal audit called out the Benefits Profile, opportunity to re-validate the Benefits Profile prior to closing out the Program as part of the PIR.
        i. Handover of the Benefits to UPMO as the owner
        ii. Data collection over 12 months to inform the Benefits
    - Recommendation of conducting a survey at the end of hyper-care month.
29. Universal set of criteria evaluating all requests for platform
30. Support defined and integrated into hypercare model

31. Program Reference Group and fulfillers actively tested search functions
    - Search function will be managed by IT Op Mgmt team if not closed out today
32. Implementation Plan Validation
    - Final run through of the Implementation Plan conducted over the weekend
33. Test Summary Report provided
    - ITU still to review today
34. Platform Resilience
35. Technical Handover for R#1
36. Go-live Dress Rehearsal

Based on the criteria assessment, the overall group consensus is to: **PROCEED**

3. ITEMS FOR NOTING

3.1. N/A

4. APPENDICES

4.1. Forward Business List *(slide 34)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business.

- GIPA s.3.2 – Anticipating people will need further training. Training by interest not necessity.
    - Catch up training in place
- GIPA s 3 – Number of Sev 4's and 5's
    - 7-8 Sev 3 for workarounds
    - Sev 5's transferring to BAU
- GIPA s.3.2 – Happy to work through last items with IT Op Mgmt Team post go-live
- GIPA s.3.2 – Search function is covered off and clarified, keen to see how that progresses
- GIPA s.3.2 – Program to provide a daily bullet-point update over the next 3 days to the Committee.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Rollback plan in place will not require a Steering Committee to convene in the unlikely event that we should elect to trigger a rollback.
- GIPA s.3.2 – Risks around R#1 nor the budget, may result in scope issues for R#1a.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 12.00 pm.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 7th May | 11:00 – 12:00 pm

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____

CHAIR

____

DATE

UTS

SERVICECONNECT PROGRAM (SCP)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 07/05/2024

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the SCP Steering Committee, held on Tuesday, 7th May 2024 from 1.30 pm to 2.30 pm at CB01.04b.12 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.4 [redacted] GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	[redacted]

ACTIONS REGISTER

New Actions added to the register:

- **Business Case** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Review the benefits projected in the business case based on where the Program is at now.
- **Survey** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Share survey draft and a review of data from survey responses.
- **Ticket Reduction Actions** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] - SC authorises 12m or older tickets to be closed after release of communications to resolver groups immediately (problems excluded). Subject to an appraisal of how that goes, will authorise all tickets older than 6m from 1/6.
- **Ticket Reduction Strategy** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]) Provide an updated plan for reducing tickets out of session, including cyber, and looking at type - no problems, no cases, everything over 6 months.
- **Communications** – GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]) Ensuring the communications around closing out old tickets include directors to help drive the ticket reductions in their areas.
- **StaffConnect** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] StaffConnect does not reference ServiceConnect on a "leave request" search. SMO to include in backlog.
- **Program Closure** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Program closure report lists all handover artefacts.
- **R#1a Tracker** – (GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] Ensure the R#1a tracker contains a UAT owner / business owner > for all R#1a components.
- GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]

UTS

DECISIONS	
1	**Legacy Platform Open Tickets Checkpoint** The Steering Committee has endorsed the cut-off date remain at 26th June. • Authorised the closure of tickets older than 12 months • Subject to the response, authorise the closure of tickets older than 6 months from the 1st June. Program is to provide an out of session Ticket Reduction Proposal outlining other bulk actions for approval for the purpose of reduction on the backlog with the intention of keeping to the 26th June.
2	**Release #1a Delivery Approach** The Steering Committee acknowledges that, as a result of change saturation, additional effort required on incident management and the capacity of the service desk to support the introduction of additional change, SailPoint integration, SharePoint integration and ITOM discovery will be released by IT Operations. • MS Teams • Sharepoint integration • Virtual agent chatbot
3	**Impacts from Unanticipated Incident Volume** The Steering Committee endorses Option 1 to Establish and mobilise a 2/p development squad to focus on resolving the most impactful complex platform problems for 4 weeks.
4	**Universal Request Problem Analysis & Decision** Item not discussed, no decision reached.

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

The Chair welcomed the Steering Committee, noted apologies and welcomed GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] representing GIPA s.3.2 [redacted].

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

- Minutes taken as read, true and accurate.

1.3. Program Performance and Financials

- This is the first Steering Committee since go-live 5 weeks ago, during that time the Program has received a range of feedback.
- GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]

UTS

- There has been a positive impact overall on the platform, however the transition has caused some pain and the team are working through these.

- Estimated overspend of $100k.
- Vendor invoices are reconciled with the exception of GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]
- Several resources have rolled off the Program to date, with 5 remaining team members.
- March actuals reflect 5% overspend of approximately $99k which includes the unanticipated spend of the ITOM module licence ($GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]) and $GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] in cross charges of ITU staff over and above of agreed funding not approved.

1.4. Program Achievements

- Not discussed, taken as read.

1.5. Program Change

- Training is ongoing, direct team support is ongoing, and the issue for R#1a OCM is ongoing and dependent on the delivery and testing approach agreed with SMO to handover.
- Feedback has mostly been positive.
- FGMs have been meeting regularly providing a forum to share experience and problem solve. Feedback collected from the faculty stakeholder has been working well.
- UPMO will be rolling out surveys in the context of the PIR.

1.5. Risks and Issues *(Slide 3)*

- **RSK2251** – Legacy Tickets
  - Tracking impacts of staff not closing tickets
- **RSK2500** – Call Volumes
  - Not discussed
- **RSK2631** – R#1a Change Approach
  - Actualised as an issue reflecting impacts associated with showcases and training combined for R#1a.
- **RSK2676** – R#1a Deployment of capabilities
  - GIPA s.3.3 [redacted]'s exit and the mounting organisational change demands of the Program before this time.
- **ISS1041** – CMDB Stakeholder Expectations
  - CMDB is an ongoing investment requiring commitment of resources to evolve, sustain and maintain.
- **ISS1082** – Re-alignment Impacts
  - Addressing the impacts of what we can do about the cessation of the Program.
- **ISS1145** – Delayed Delivery of R#1a capabilities
  - Arising from the unforeseen volume and complexity of incidents from R#1
- **ISS1148** – Incident and Issue Backlog
  - Management of backlog
- **ISS1154** – Scope Contention
  - GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]
- **ISS1155** – Sailpoint Integration Delayed
  - A key deliverable for R#1a, resource allocated. Closed…

UTS

1.6. Program Benefits Report

- The Program is revising the benefits forecast in line with the Programs impact to-date and closure.
- The business case was predicated on 4 releases. There exists now a need to recalibrate what the benefits were proportionally and understated the benefits in IT Operations and the potentially overstated benefits outside of IT Operations.
- Model bringing to the IT will be managed as a platform product and the maintain and enhance will be the major funding source going forward.
- The Benefits Report reflects 40% view to reflect the foundation of the Program.
- The PIR will encapsulate the savings achieved, time saved, provide advice on future releases and best practices.
- One benefit not captured is that having moved off a heavily customised system, back to OOTB best practice environment and being in a position to turn on the features in R#1a.

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION

2.1. Legacy Platform Open Tickets Checkpoint *(slide **14**)*

The Program is seeking endorsement from the committee to turn off the data in the old platform to read only on the 26th June2024.

Key discussion points:

- Actively engage departments top down or extending the date to give areas more time.
- Departments are impacted differently. ie: GIPA s.3.2 [redacted].
- There was logic placed around bulk closures of low hanging fruit which represent big drops in the timeline. Eg: if ticket older than 4 years.
- Conversation required with cyber around GIPA s.3.2 [redacted].
- Categories of tickets:
    - Incidents (things are broken)
    - Requests
    - Problem tickets - naturally have long life span
- Sticking to existing date may create extra work, as at some point tickets will need to be rekeyed.

2.2. Release R#1a Delivery Approach *(slide **15**)*

The Program is seeking endorsement from the committee to adopt the transition to agile feature drops for Release #1a.

Key discussion points:

- Big bang launch for R#1a has been determined will not work.
- A small number of features will not be launched, not yet finalised as to which one these are.
- Clear signoff is required from each feature owner, with clear UAT responsibilities for R#1a where applicable.

UTS

R#1a Reports and Dashboards	04/05	✓
R#1a Workspaces	04/05	✓
R#1a MS Teams Integration *	21/05	
R#1a DevOps Change Velocity	21/05	
R#1a NowMobile & NowMobile Agent *	21/05	
R#1a Virtual Agent / Chat Bot *	21/05	
R#1a Enable Service Graph Connectors	24/05	
R#1a JIRA - Bi-Directional Integration	24/05	
R#1a SailPoint Integration	31/05	
R#1a SharePoint Integration *	24/05	
R#1a ITOM Service Mapping	24/05	
R#1a Automated Testing Framework	24/05	
R#1a ITOM Event Management	24/05	
R#1a ITOM Discovery	24/05	
♦All Release #1a components delivered	24/05	

The Amber has been clarified to indicate that the delivery of these three are at risk:

- **SailPoint Integration**: UTS resources were not available so this slipped. UTS (and AC3) resources are now available -we are just waiting a plan and committed date from AC3 to deliver. Trending Green (expectation is that it will be delivered by EOM).

- **SharePoint Integration**: Functionality is nearly ready, but the agreed strategy is that it will only be enabled for targeted, quality data repositories, onboarded via the SMO if the repository meets standards. Messaging will be: "If you have a library you'd like to connect to the portal, opt-in here". So, by definition, the delivery date is not clear and will be managed under BAU/SMO.

- **ITOM Discovery**: No clear Delivery/completion date as this is ongoing discipline (many errors being troubleshooted) and normal for this component. Will be managed under BAU/SMO.

For completeness then (and perhaps the reason for the confusion) the items with **Asterisks** above (**MS Teams** integration, **NowMobile**, **VA** and **SharePoint**) designates where the program will deliver and test functionality, equip BAU teams and validate that they are able to release, but not complete the full end user deployment.

2.3. Impacts from Unanticipated Incident Volume *(slide **16**)*

The Program is seeking endorsement from the committee to establish and mobilise a dedicated 2/p developer-level squad to focus on resolving the most impactful complex platform problems for four weeks. (Option 1). In order to support the resolution of the five problems outlined in the Hypercare update. (Slide 20).

Key discussion points:

- Delays to R#1a due to the volume of incidents recieved
- Interim resourcing for SMO and platform team worked well, partnering with a 3rd party providing 2 resources.
- Confidence in clearing the complex backlog before looking at smaller issues
- The $60k would be additional to the $99k over budget.

- This option will not treat the late delivery of R#1a components.
- 70 defects related to core issues. Some tickets maybe duplicates.
- Option 4 – Program team and AC3 rolling off leaving all open tickets to IT Ops team to manage. Possibility of not being able to resolve the 5 key underlying causes for R#1. R#1a will be delayed.
- Option 1 – Will minimise the burnout of IT Ops team and enhance capacity of delivering part of R#1a.

2.4. Universal Request Problem Analysis & Decision Volume *(slide **17**)*

The Program is seeking endorsement from the committee to keep using the Universal Request form (Option 3).

Key discussion points:

- Item not discussed, no decision reached.

3. ITEMS FOR NOTING

3.1. Hypercare Update as of 2nd May *(slide **19**)*

- Hypercare closed Friday 3rd May.
- Number of incidents received were unexpected and the large number of tickets moving into backlog to be fixed.
- AC3 has completed hypercare and now in a warranty capacity for a limited time.
- Need to lock down on what the scope of warranty is.
- StaffConnect does not reference ServiceConnect in a Leave request search.
- Technical handover was completed prior to go-live as part of the go-live criteria.
- GIPA s.3.4
- Once the Program closes, the scope being handed over to the business is clear as well as the benefits. Handover document that shows the closure of the Programs steps of what has been done and what remains for the business with agreed sign off.

3.2. New ServiceConnect First 2 Weeks *(slide **21**)*

- Not discussed, taken as read.

3.3. Release #1 Delivery Tracker *(slide **22**)*

- Not discussed, taken as read.

4. APPENDICES

4.1. Forward Business List *(slide 34)*

- Not discussed taken as read.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Any other business.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 1.30 pm.

NEXT MEETING

Friday, 7th June | 2:00 – 3:00 pm

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____

CHAIR

____

DATE

UTS

SERVICECONNECT PROGRAM (SCP)
MINUTES OF PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING 07/06/2024

Unconfirmed minutes of meeting of the SCP Steering Committee, held on Tuesday, 7th May 2024 from 2.00 – 3.00 pm at CB01.04b.12 Meeting room and via Teams.

PRESENT:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
APOLOGIES:	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]

ACTIONS REGISTER

New Actions:

- Program to provide the Closure Report out of session.
- Chatbot testing feedback from GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to be shared with GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] and GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]
- SMO to involve GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] with Chatbot maturity, evolution and requirement development.
- A schedule for the remainder of R#1a will be provided by the SMO towards the end of June.
- Benefits realisation plan progression – UPMO to work with GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] over the next fortnight.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] to write to those specifically commended in the PIR (page 6.pdf).

1. MEETING PROCEDURE

1.1. Open/ Welcome

The Chair welcomed the Steering Committee and noted apologies.

1.2. Previous Minutes and Action Items

- Minutes taken as read, true and accurate.
  - 235 Steering Committee Actions closed over the duration of the Program.

1.3. Program Performance and Financials

- The Program has been focussing on closing out remaining complexities in R#1a leveraging expertise from TMLabs resources.

- Program closure activities in building a repository of handover documents and archiving into TRIM.
- Financials presents an overall look back view of the Program from the outside-in.
- GIPA s.3.2 and s.3.4 [redacted].
- $60k variation to fund critical problem resolution came in under budget.
- Overall total position is approximately 5% over budget, rounding out to $100k (attributed to unanticipated license costs, additional helpdesk augmentation and expanded testing scope for Capgemini).
- Overall position in 2023 was an underspend against the adjusted budget which has offset the 2024 overspend to deliver the end-to-end program within budget.
- Acknowledgment of coming under budget as a whole, however unable to deliver the full scope of works envisioned (a few Release #1a components temporarily defered) within that budget.
- GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] raised the matter of an upcoming ServiceNow licensing cost for the IT Operations Management module with the Committee and received direction from Sponsor that this will be funded out of UTS' operational budget.

1.4. Program Achievements

- Milestones tracking amber due for completion by end of June
    - MS Teams integration delays due to a technical platform issue fixed this morning with the help of ServiceNow and working with the SMO to launch the POC.
    - DevOps Change Velocity was blocked due to a technical issue and ServiceNow provided a solution
    - Sailpoint integration, AC3 and the sailpoint team working together to implement in production next Wednesday
- A schedule for the remainder of R#1a will be provided by the SMO towards the end of June.
- Virtual agent functionality for the chatbot is complete, however UTS has elected to build this out further before end user deployment. SMO and platform team including a few extra key words to include and further testing within the faculties needed.
- Chatbot not to be released until fully tested and signed off.
- Chatbot is focussed on IT support, with 10 conversations.
- Confirmation required on who the platform and product owners are, preference is that for the business to own the platform and not IT.
- SMO does not yet have a product team embedded however is making do with what resources they have.

1.5. Issues *(Slide 7)*

- **ISS1041** – CMDB Stakeholder Expectations
    - CMDB is an ongoing investment requiring commitment of resources to evolve, sustain and maintain.
- **ISS1145** – Delayed Delivery of R#1a capabilities
    - Arising from the unforeseen volume and complexity of incidents from R#1

UTS

2. ITEMS FOR DECISION

2.1. N/A

3. ITEMS FOR NOTING

3.1. Outstanding/ Ensuing Deliverables & Deviation as at Completion *(slide **9**)*

- Presents deliverables within the scope of the Program, detailing the approach and ownership for completion as well as additional elements to avoid any adverse impacts which may arise moving into BAU.

3.2. Post Implementation Review – Lessons Learnt *(slide 13) (pages 4-6 pdf)*

- A series of surveys and interviews conducted to build the findings of the lessons learnt.
- What went well to ensure other programs use as best practice
    - Objectives captured and signed off by stakeholders
    - Use of reference groups
    - Role characterisation, role charters
- 6 findings/ lesson learnt
    - External testing, technical issues not picked up, too generic
        - Test framework now implemented
    - Recommendation for a technical knowledge at program leadership level to manage the vendor
        - Technical analysts would have filled a void
    - More visibility over the feedback registers and whether the feedback was addressed for consultation groups.
    - BAU & SMO under-resourced
        - Delays in the ITOM Part B covering SMO
    - Re-casting of the original benefits
        - Consider the proportion of benefits review per program
    - Governance framework of the steering committee

3.3. End of Transition Period Tracker (slide 14)

- Not discussed, taken as read.

3.3. Problem Update *(slide 15)*

- Not discussed, taken as read.

3.3. Release #1a Delivery Tracker *(slide 16)*

- Not discussed, taken as read.

3.3. AC3 Statement of Methodology *(slide 19)*

- Not discussed, taken as read.

UTS

4. APPENDICES

4.1. Program Benefits Report *(slide 21)*

- The financial benefit noted a saving of $2.6pa based on ITU and Releases 1,2,3. Mindful of the overlap with ITOM as to how much would have been claimed.
- The Program has formed a view that roughly 40% of the $2.6 would be claimable, proportionate of the 4 releases having only delivered release 1.
- The benefits slide is to illustrate what has the Program delivered against the $2.6 so we can understand the delta.
- Acknowledgement that the benefits will not be received as soon as go-live, potentially 6 months to see the benefits.
- Non-financial benefits, productivity savings which do not equate to headcount and unable to scale time savings. Maybe able to capture via time sheeting or time and motion studies.
- Enhanced experience and pulse surveys, no current baseline figure in the pulse survey.
  - Utilise the survey results from old platform to use as a baseline.
- Evident that the Program did not focus on the benefits profile regularly enough.
- Benefits should be tracked ongoing during the life of the platform.

4.1. Program Achievements Summary *(slide 22)*

- Delivery of a new platform despite a few false starts in the years prior.
- First of the reports are provided advance tracking capabilities
- Notably the reduction in time to resolve incidents
  - Comparison of samples from Oct/Nov 2023 and Apr/May 2024
  - Incidents have been re-prioritised to ensure they are managed appropriately
- UPMO to acknowledge the staff experience in their communications
- Numerous surveys have provided sufficient feedback gauge
- 9% of users have submitted staff responses to the new platform
- Spin the focus from an IT perspective to Staff Experience
- SMO meeting with ServiceNow in switching from input to output focus. Setting standards to swap the metrics and people mind shift to what we are getting for future reporting.
- Knowledge can be powerful, however those who write the articles are not necessarily the consumers of the knowledge.
- Cultural change goals for the IT operating model, is to have IT focussing on the organisation and not on itself.
- It was a going-in expectation that the program would not deliver an immediate impact to staff experience in Release #1. With the foundations in place, the realisation of the benefits starts now. It is also difficult to lift the staff experience without the Finance and People Units on the platform. Once all units are included in the platform, a more holistic staff experience measure and benefit will start to emerge.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1. Wrap up/ Reflections.

GIPA s.3.2 Pleasure to be involved and see the Program to the end. A few ups and downs along the way, all accounted for transparently and addressed. Not a big bang system driving peoples work, an occasional platform. No-one has complained to me, and as a Dean, this generally means things are pretty good. Steering Committee has at times delved into too much detail, felt like a project management meeting rather than a steering committee meeting, keep the management within the program. Good outcome.

GIPA s.3.2 Recently chaired a faculty operations executive meeting in FEIT, feedback has been good in terms of user experience. However ITU staff supporting the faculty have been struggling a bit in the back end, some of the actions are harder in the back end. In future consider both sides of the equation in terms of benefits. Lessons learnt for the 3 reference groups, for continuity in future programs for feedback from faculties/ divisions, engage people from the start to move through all phases of the program and recognise contributions in work plans.

GIPA s.3.2 The project has been going a number of years, at the beginning of the project there was a lot of confusion in which direction the program was going in and the People Unit were pushed around. Clarity on what is happening at the beginning of a project, understand there is change that impacts us as a unit in resourcing. Overall appreciate the level and depth of detail needed to get the project right and across the line. Hope that staff experience will improve as we get the platform up and running properly.

GIPA s.3.2 This program and the UPMO broadly started at the same time and this program did not have any of the benefits or the framework or establishment of services which have matured over 2 years. Testing and handover to BAU teams, need the right mix of business and program resources in future programs to ensure transition to BAU.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 3.00 pm.

SIGNED AS A TRUE RECORD

____

CHAIR

____

DATE

UTS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY SYDNEY

SCP – Service Connect Program Post Implementation Review

11th June 2024 GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]

UTS CRICOS 00099F
UTS TEQSA PRV12060

Table of Contents

Objectives of the SCP Post Implementation Review

- To assess all aspects of the program’s performance.
- To identify good practices.
- To identify areas of improvement, and how these can be conveyed as positive, actionable, lessons learnt for the entire portfolio.

Approach:

- A survey was circulated to an agreed selection end users, governance (steering committee members) and ITU business as usual (BAU) team, which was supported by targeted interviews.
- The findings were grouped by theme, topic, lessons learnt. The themes are as follows:
  - Objectives and Stakeholder Support
  - Solution Effectiveness
  - Execution and Control
  - Risks and Issues Management
  - Communication and Change Management
  - Program Transition
  - Team Performance
  - Assurance
  - Benefits
- Numeric scoring was included as part of the survey to give an indication of sentiment across the themes, which is found in section 1, page 7.
- The PIR also took into account the recent health check from Internal Audit to ensure any ‘actions’ were aligned.

01

Program Overview and Program Outcomes

Service Connect Program Overview

The Service Connect Program (SCP), formerly known as the Enterprise Service Management (ESM) program, evolved to be a multi-year strategic investment. In its origins, the program aspirations were to deliver an enterprise-wide uplift in service experience, knowledge and productivity by implementing an upgraded enterprise service management platform. The new platform would offer standardisation and new capability aligned to industry best practice.

Through its evolution, the program sharpened its focus to what was most imperative - delivery of a new core foundational ServiceNow platform, co-created by users, as a base to build a strong service experience culture. The transformed platform provides teams with base capability for a modernised IT service, and good practice workflows to adopt and embed into ways of working.

Date/ Period	Comments	Dates for Release 1
2014	ServiceNow platform introduced at UTS and utilised for IT Service Management, low uptake for other work processes across UTS.	NA
2020	Heavy customisation has meant that systems upgrades to the legacy ServiceNow platform become difficult, and costly. Over-customisation has also led to Cyber-security vulnerabilities.	NA
2021 August	ESM program commences with a focus on the technical uplift of the service management platform to the latest version.	NA
2022 February	ESM program recast as SCP, a transformation program with four phases. Release 1 implementation planed for September 2023.	September 2023
2023 September	SCP Benefits Register signed off. Range of financial and non-financial tangible benefits. Release 1 implementation date slipped to March 2024, and split into Release 1 and 1A. Work has already commenced on Release 2.	Delay to March 2024
2023 November	Investment Committee cease SCP beyond Release 1 and 1A. Release 1 scope is mainly platform upgrade and enablement, and establishment of the Service Management Office (SMO), implementation date for Release 1 and 1A now 8th March 2024 and 26th April 2024. Work on Release 2 ceases.	Delay to 8th March 2024 (R1) and 26th April 2024 (R1A)
2024 January	SteerCo presented with a potential slippage of Release 1 and 1A to 26th April 2024 and 9th May 2024. Refocus of program to ensure go-lives for Release 1 (3rd April 2024) and Release 1A (now not one date, is multiple feature drops).	Delay to 26th April 2024 (R1) 9th May 2024 (R1A); then brought back to 3rd April 2024 (R1), April (R1A)
2024 April	Go live for Release 1 (3rd April), and four weeks of hypercare. Go live period for Release 1A from early May 2024.	3rd April 2024 (R1), April (R1A)
2024 June	SCP PIR completes, review of benefits and scope by UPMO, identification of a significantly reduced pool and quantum of likely benefits (refer later in this report). Final SCP team resources rolled off in mid June 2024.	

Program Director's presentation 07-06-2024 SteerCo - key program outcomes

ServiceConnect has enabled a new chapter in staff experience, productivity and efficiency at UTS, achieved through improved business processes, digitised workflows and process automation, powered by a modern enterprise service portal

Key Program Outcomes…

Enhanced User Experience:

Streamlined self-service portal and improved communication channels for a more intuitive and user-friendly experience.

Data Accuracy and Integrity:

Resolved systemic data issues, ensuring reliable insights for data-driven decision-making.

Modernised Platform:

Successful migration to new latest ServiceNow, providing a robust, scalable, and flexible platform for service management.

Operational Efficiency:

Automated workflows and improved processes have reduced manual tasks and accelerated response and resolution times.

Established Service Management Office (SMO):

Created a dedicated team to provide centralised support, governance, and continuous improvement for IT services.

Complexity Removed

Value Delivered

Eliminated Barriers: Consolidated disparate systems and tools into a single, unified platform.

Simplified Processes: Streamlined workflows and reduced manual tasks, freeing up staff time for higher-value activities.

Improved Visibility: Greater transparency into service requests, incidents, and problems for both IT staff and users.

Enhanced Reporting: Smarter reporting capabilities to track performance, identify trends, and measure the impact of IT services.

Program Director's presentation 07-06-2024 SteerCo

Real World Impacts for UTS Staff & Students

Automation

Access privileges are no longer manually administered. Once workflow approvals are granted, requests to revoke, modify or add access to UTS digital platforms and tools is now undertaken automatically.

Accelerated Fulfilment

Optimised workflows and forms reduces time-to-resolution meaning things get done more efficiently.

Smarter Asset Management & Utilisation

Automated asset discovery and monitoring that unlocks new support and fleet insights

Data-enabled Insights

For the first time, UTS has accurate and reliable operati onal data to inform decisions, predict demand and anticipate trends.

Free From the Old Platform

No longer constrained by an un-upgradeable, legacy platform with constraining customisations. Reducing risk through the removal of key cyber exposures.

ServiceConnect

By The Numbers

321 forms and workflows enhanced and streamlined into a new service catalogue of **252.**

Up to **142** application access requests per month will be completely automated. With more coming. **Okta SailPoint*

8% increased adoption since the introduction of the new platform.
Measured by platform utilisation/ unique logins

Knowledge search and utilisation has widened in category span by **40%** and increased in demand by **81%**.

Avg. incident resolution timeframe reduced by **82%** and **76%** since introduction of the new platform Sampled over two months compared to last year

Nearly **50%** reduction in average case closure from **16.3 days to 8.44 days**

5x more knowledge article access relative to the legacy instance.
From 3,376 to 16,359 views

Over **40%** reduction in average problem ticket closure from **36.29** days to **19.19** days

3x reduction in incident closure time from average of 26 days to 9 days.

Further insights and impact metrics in progress, subject to resource availability and workloads.

02

Summary of Lessons Learnt and Actions, Commendations

Top Six Lessons Learnt and Actions

Highlighting five major actions for UTS, covering most of the eleven High rated findings/ lessons learnt.

There are a total of 33 substantiated findings/ lessons learnt for the program, this includes the six remaining open audit actions from the SCP Internal Audit.

Finding/ Lesson Learnt	Actions	Who	When
• The Testing Strategy was inadequate in terms of depth, partly due to incomplete technical specifications, leading to generic testing, which failed to find a number of technical issues.	• Review Testing Strategies across the Transformation Programs, report back to SteerCo. • Sponsors to oversight Programs updating of Testing Strategies.	• CIO / Sponsors	August
• GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]	• Review technical knowledge of all Program Directors, Program Managers and Stream Leads across the Transformation Programs, report back to SteerCo. • Sponsors to oversight training/ resource replacement of Program Leadership.	• UPMO / Sponsors	Ongoing
• While feedback of issues was often captured, it was not always fed back into the design to address business needs, and the feedback register was not always visible to key stakeholders.	• Ensure all Transformation Programs have feedback registers, and reporting processes with stakeholders, report back to SteerCo. • Sponsors to ensure feedback registers upgraded and visible to SteerCo.	• UPMO / Program Director / Sponsors	July/ Ongoing
• Both the BAU team and the SMO were under-resourced to support the transition and the ongoing activities.	• Seek detailed resource planning from each Transformation Program, with a focus on the BAU teams, report back to SteerCo. • Sponsor to champion addressing under-resourcing.	• UPMO	August/ Ongoing
• The Program did not deliver the majority of the original benefits (including financial savings and incremental productivity), there was no substantive recasting of benefits after the November 2024 descoping.	• Refresh the benefits management process for the portfolio, review and recast benefits across the Transformation Programs. • Ensure programs review benefits at major stage gates, and UPMO is regularly engaged to review those benefits.	• UPMO and Programs	June
• It was at times unclear on the purpose and role of the Steerco, and the type of decision-making being presented.	• Refresh the governance framework and supporting materials to ensure clear definition of roles and responsibilities of Executive Sponsor, Business Sponsor and Program Team. • Conduct refresher training for all sponsors, all SteerCo members, and all key program leadership roles.	• UPMO	August

Lessons Learnt – What Could be Improved

Below is a selection of the post implementation review (PIR) findings and lessons learnt that would lead to improvements, which have been rated utilising the Internal Audit key. Further details and actions are found in section 2, page 9 of this report.

Theme	Topic	Lesson Learnt	Rating
Solution Effectiveness	• Whilst objectives were detailed, outcomes were not always visible, or were generic rather than detailed for individual units (concerns were raised about both business requirements and change impacts)	• Ensuring that objectives are tailored to impacted units within the scoping/ objectives document from the Delivery Framework	High
	• Whilst there was a Testing Strategy, the discrepancies in objectives and requirements appeared to lead to generic testing, which failed to find a number of technical issues.	• Ensure a detailed set of requirements is captured, to give clarity to testers about what to test and when. Ensure a traceability matrix enables tracking of testing of requirements.	High
Execution and Control	• Limited deep technical expertise of the platform within the program (ServiceNow)	• Ensuring direct (UTS) team resources, especially at Program Director and Program Manager level have significant knowledge of the technical aspects of the solution, or they have SME capability within the program.	High
Risks and Issues Management	• Lack of visibility to some stakeholders, including most team members, about risk and issue management	• Ensuring a wide range of stakeholders, including all direct program resources, can participate in risks and issues identification	High
		• Ensuring Programs are prompted on standard risks – such as interdependency risks and data risks, develop a risks checklist	High
Communications and Change Management	• While feedback of issues was often captured, it was at times unclear if this had been fed back into the design to address business needs	• Provide regular updates to the Steering Committee and stakeholders about how major feedback is responded to	High
Program Transition	• GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]	• Earlier development of a detailed training plan, with validation with Strategic Change and key stakeholders – to ensure sufficient depth	High
	• Both the BAU team and the SMO were under-resourced to support the transition and the ongoing activities	• Ensure early resource planning for the BAU teams, to ensure adequacy of resources for transition and beyond	High
Program Assurance	• Lack of standardised independent review of the program	• Develop a standardised Assurance Framework and templates, within the Governance Framework	High
Benefits	• The Program did not deliver the original scalable (financial) and non-scalable (non-financial) productivity benefits	• Establish a panel of independent assurance providers, to conduct Health Checks, PIRs and Benefits Reviews	High
		• Ensuring adherence to the UPMO Benefits Framework, and ensuring early engagement with the UPMO in benefits characterisation and any recasting	High

Rating key:

Critical	Resolve within a month	High	Resolve within two months	Moderate	Resolve within three months	Low	Resolve within six months

Lessons Learnt – What Went Well

Below is a selection of the post implementation review (PIR) findings and lessons learnt that should be reinforced as good practice, which have been rated utilising the Internal Audit key. Further details and actions are found in section 2, page 9 of this report.

Theme	Topic	Lesson Learnt	Rating
Objectives and Stakeholder Support	• Detailing objectives early and getting key stakeholder sign-off ensured broad support for the program objectives	• Ensuring early sign-off of detailed objectives, integrated into a scoping/ objectives document within the Delivery Framework	Low
Communications and Change Management	• Reference Groups offered an efficient way to promote engagement with large groups of stakeholders	• Reference groups as an important mechanism to ensure voice of academics and staff outside ITU are considered in co-creation of solution	Low
Team Performance	• Roles characterisation was well done for direct resources, ensuring clear responsibilities for those resources	• Reinforce need for detailed role characterisation for both direct and indirect resources on a program	Low

Commendations

Survey and interview respondents were impressed with the SMO/ Process owners/ Platform team trying to drive the best outcomes for UTS.

In particular GIPA s.3.2 [redacted] and his whole team, GIPA s.3.2 [redacted].

Rating key:

Critical	Resolve within a month	High	Resolve within two months	Moderate	Resolve within three months	Low	Resolve within six months

03

Survey Numerics

Themes and Numerics

Summary:

- There was significant differences in feedback from ITU versus Program Team versus Governance and Faculties (Governance are members of the Steering Committee).
- Governance population far more positive than other groups.
- Fairly low scores on many questions from most participants, especially those who were to gain functionality in later SCP releases.
- Congruency of numeric scores in survey with verbal feedback in interviews.

Approach for survey:

Survey results (from 1/3 of the population) were grouped into:

- ITU
- Program Team
- Faculty/ Business and Governance (SteerCo)

Value scores are - A little, somewhat, moderately, significantly, completely (1 – 5)

Full list of survey participants is listed in the appendix.

	Objecitves and Stakeholder Support		Solution Effectiveness		Execution and Control		Risks and Issues Management		Communication and Change Mgt		Program Transition	Team Performance		
Q02	Q04	Q05	Q07	Q08	Q10	Q11	Q13	Q14	Q16	Q17	Q19	Q21	Q22	Q23
Which grou did you belong to?	How clearly defined were the objectives for this project?	How much do you think the stakeholders supported the program?	How much do the program outcomes meet your stated needs?	To what extent do you feel the objectives and goals of the program were realized?	How satisfied were you with your involvement in the development and/or review of scope during the program?	Were changes t cost, scope, schedule and/or quality effectively managed?	How much wer team members involved in risks and issues identification and management?	How effective was the risks and issues management of the program?	How effectively were stakeholders involved in the program?	How well were users communicated and engaged with, in this program	How smooth was the transition of support from the program team to the ongoing team?	How clear were you on your role in the program?	How adequatel involved did you feel you were, in program decisions?	To what degree did you feel the entire team were committed to the scope and schedule?
IT Unit	4.00	4.25	1.50	1.50	2.50	1.25	2.50	2.25	2.50	2.25	2.25	3.50	2.00	2.25
Program Team	2.70	2.70	2.00	1.70	1.30	3.00	2.00	1.30	2.30	2.30	2.30	3.70	2.70	2.70
Business and Governance	3.50	3.75	2.75	3.00	2.75	3.00	3.25	2.75	2.50	2.50	3.00	4.25	3.75	3.50

Score of 1.0 to under 2.50

Score of 2.50 to under 3.50

Score of 3.50 or higher

04

Details of Lessons Learnt

Theme: Objectives and Stakeholder Support

Theme	Topic	Lesson Learnt	Rating
Objectives and Stakeholder Support	• Detailing objectives early and getting key stakeholder sign-off ensured broad support for the program objectives	• Ensuring detailed objectives are presented regularly in the Steering Committee and other communications	Moderate
		• Ensuring early sign-off of detailed objectives, integrated into a scoping/ objectives document within the Delivery Framework	Low
Solution Effectiveness	• Whilst objectives were detailed, outcomes were not always visible, or were generic rather than detailed for individual units (concerns were raised about both business requirements and change impacts)	• Ensuring that objectives are tailored to impacted units within the scoping/ objectives document from the Delivery Framework	High
		• Ensure larger programs have access to a traceability matrix template within the Delivery Framework	Moderate
	• Whilst there was a Testing Strategy, the discrepancies in objectives and requirements appeared to lead to generic testing, which failed to find a number of technical issues.	• Ensure a much more detailed set of requirements, to give clarity to testers about what to test and when. Ensure a traceability matrix enables tracking of testing of requirements.	High
	• The scope delivered has not significantly improved ways of working, and in some cases the implemented processes have not been correct	• Ensure there are clear unit level QA and unit-based sign-offs on implemented processes, and handover document within the Delivery Framework	Moderate

Rating key:

Critical	Resolve within a month	High	Resolve within two months	Moderate	Resolve within three months	Low	Resolve within six months

Theme: Execution and Control

Theme	Topic	Lesson Learnt	Rating
Execution and Control	• GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]	• Ensuring direct (UTS) team resources, especially at Program Director and Program Manager level have significant knowledge of the technical aspects of the solution	High
	• GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]	• Ensuring that vendor responsibilities are clearly delineated, with a granularity of milestones for payments *(**also an Audit action**)*	Moderate
	• Not all stakeholders felt they had the opportunity to input to program and scope development	• Supporting larger programs to have a wide-ranging input process for program scope development	Moderate
	• Some members of the SteerCo felt that the SteerCo was not accurately informed and not used to support strategic decision making	• Ensuring all SteerCo members are trained in Program Governance *(**also an Audit action**)*	Moderate
		• Ensuring SteerCo decks adhere to standard UPMO template, and that Health Checks review accuracy of SteerCo decks	Moderate
		• Supporting a decision centric focus in each SteerCo versus deep dives on technical matters	Moderate

Theme: Risks and Issues Management

Theme	Topic	Lesson Learnt	Rating
Risks and Issues Management	• Lack of visibility to some stakeholders, including most team members, about risk and issue management	• Ensuring a wide range of stakeholders, including all direct program resources, can participate in risks and issues identification	High
		• Ensuring Programs are prompted on standard risks – such as interdependency risks and data risks, develop a risks checklist *(**also an Audit action**)*	High
	• Risks and issues were not always adequately represented	• Ensuring Programs adhere to existing UPMO risks and issues management processes *(**also an Audit action**)*	Moderate
		• Ensuring regular risk reviews include consideration of threats to the approved schedule *(**also an Audit action**)*	Moderate

Theme: Communications and Change Management

Theme	Topic	Lesson Learnt	Rating
Communications and Change Management	• While feedback of issues was often captured, it was at times unclear from business users if this had been fed back into the design to address business needs	• Provide regular updates to the Steering Committee and stakeholders about how major feedback is responded to	High
		• Maintain a widely viewable feedback register for the life of the program	Moderate
	• Engagement felt inconsistent	• Ensure communications plan and roll out has adequate input by key customers/stakeholder groups	Moderate
	• There was a perception that the Strategic Change framework was not always adequate for program needs	• Ensuring Programs adhere to the UTS Change Management framework	Moderate
		• Review adequacy of the UTS Change Management framework	Moderate
	• Reference Groups offered an efficient way to promote engagement with large groups of stakeholders	• Reference groups as an important mechanism to ensure voice of academics and staff outside ITU are considered in co-creation of solution	Low

Theme: Team Performance

Theme	Topic	Lesson Learnt	Rating
Program Transition	• GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]	• Earlier development of a detailed training plan, with validation with Strategic Change and key stakeholders – to ensure sufficient depth	High
	• Both the BAU team and the SMO were under-resourced to support the transition and the ongoing activities	• Ensure early resource planning for the BAU teams, to ensure adequacy of resources for transition and beyond	High
Team Performance	• Program team structure was sometimes unclear and hampered the program	• Ensure Program leadership structures avoid overlapping responsibilities (Program Manager/ Workstream Lead level)	Moderate
	• The team lacked cohesion, and there was not a shared view on scope or schedule	• Ensure a clear schedule, aligned with the Delivery Framework, including all key milestones, and clear provisions for slippage *(**also an Audit action**)*	Moderate
	• Roles characterisation was well done for direct resources, ensuring clear responsibilities for those resources	• Reinforce need for detailed role characterisation for both direct and indirect resources on a program	Low
		• Develop a pro-forma set of standardised delivery roles (both for direct and indirect resources) within the resourcing component of the Delivery Framework	Moderate
	• Program meetings did not always have a clear agenda and clarity on outcomes	• Support full team visibility of shared goals, both through whole-team stand ups and making key scope and schedule goals a regular part of team meetings	Moderate

Theme: Program Assurance and Benefits

Theme	Topic	Lesson Learnt	Rating
Program Assurance	• Lack of standardised independent review of the program	• Develop a standardised Assurance Framework and templates, within the Governance Framework	High
		• Establish a panel of independent assurance providers, to conduct Health Checks, PIRs and Benefits Reviews	High
	• Lack of timely independent review of the program	• Establish a calendar for Health Checks (minimum of every six months), PIRs and Benefits Reviews for each major program and ensure budget coverage	Moderate
Benefits	• Whilst the program created an upgraded platform that removed cyber security risks, and created a work practice improvement capability for UTS, it did not deliver the original scalable (financial) and non-scalable (non-financial) productivity benefits.	• Ensuring adherence to the UPMO Benefits Framework, and ensuring early engagement with the UPMO in benefits characterisation and any recasting	High

*These two themes were not part of the survey, but were covered in many of the interviews

05

Appendix – Benefits Recasting

UPMO mapping of Benefits Journey

September 2023	November 2023	April 2024	May 2024
SCP Benefits Register signed off. Range of financial and non-financial tangible benefits (refer slide), tied to a scope encompassing four releases. Baselines to commence from December 2023.	Investment Committee cease program beyond release one. Release one scope is mainly platform upgrade and enablement, and establishment of the Service Management Office (SMO). No work commenced on baselining of benefits or any recasting of benefits.	First recast of benefits done by the program, no baselining has commenced. SteerCo deck alludes to a program claim that only 40% of the value of savings in the ITU will now be attained – no supporting documentation or engagement with UPMO to validate statements.	SCP PIR, review of benefits and scope by UPMO, identification of a significantly reduced pool and quantum of likely benefits.

UPMO Benefits Recasting - Summary

Type of Benefit	UPMO recasting – May 2024
Financial benefits ($2.6m p/a)	**None attained**, no net headcount reduction in units with work practice improvements as part of Release One. Headcount and cost increases from the establishment of the Service Management Office are netted within the ITU budget.
Non Financial – productivity gains for ITU and General Counsel	**Net productivity gains possibly attained**, now masked by increased workload. Program does create an upgraded platform for future productivity gains through new process improvements and automation.
Non Financial – productivity gains across UTS	**Net productivity gains possibly attained**, but given scope of Release one, likely under 10 minutes per week per FTE. Not measurable without time sheeting. Program does create an upgraded platform for future productivity gains through new process improvements and automation.
Non Financial – Staff Experience uplift	**Net experience uplift possibly attained**, but unlikely that the scope of Release One will have a measurable significant impact on the UTS Staff Experience measures. Within ITU staff experience uplift likely to be masked within greater uplifts stemming from ITOM implementation.
Non Financial – Reduced in Cybersecurity risks	**Achieved**, upgraded platform removes a number of key cyber security weaknesses of the legacy platform.

September 2023 Benefits Register (approved by Sponsor)

Benefit Title and Description	UTS Benefits Category	UTS Benefits Sub-category	Quantum	Baseline Value	Baseline Measurement Date	CY24	CY25	CY26	CY27	CY28	Final Goal (p.a.)
Cashable - ITU Release 1 (ITU), and then separately for Release 2, and Release 3	Financial - Cashable	Reduced Costs	$'s	Current cost	15-Dec-23	$2,619,576	$2,619,576	$2,619,576	$2,619,576	$2,619,576	$2,619,576
Cashable - Other Core Units staffing and other costs Release 1 (ITU), Release 2, and Release 3	Financial - Cashable	Reduced Costs	$'s	Current cost	15-Dec-23	None given	None given	None given	None given	None given	None given
Incremental Productivity Improvement - ITU Release 1 (ITU), Release 2, and Release 3	Non-Financial	Incremental Productivity	Hours saved per FTE/ week	Total hours currently spent	15-Dec-23	None given	None given	None given	None given	None given	None given
Incremental Productivity Improvement - Core Units staffing Release 1 (ITU), Release 2, and Release 3	Non-Financial	Incremental Productivity	Hours saved per FTE/ week	Total hours currently spent	15-Dec-23	None given	None given	None given	None given	None given	None given
Incremental Productivity Improvement - outside of core Units Release 1 (General Counsel and ITU), Release 2, and Release 3	Non-Financial	Incremental Productivity	Hours saved per FTE/ week	Total hours currently spent	15-Dec-23	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26
Incremental Productivity Improvement - outside of core Units Release 1 (General Counsel and ITU), Release 2, and Release 3	Non-Financial	Incremental Productivity	$'s	Total hours currently spent	15-Dec-23	$4,943,652	$4,943,652	$4,943,652	$4,943,652	$4,943,652	$4,943,652
Enhanced Experience (Staff)	Non-Financial	Enhanced Experience	%change	Rating	15-Dec-23	None given	None given	None given	None given	None given	None given
Risk Reduction (Cybersecurity for Service Connect)	Non-Financial	Enhanced Experience	GIPA s.3.2								

May 2024 UPMO Benefits Recasting - Details

Benefit Title and Description	UTS Benefits Category	UTS Benefits Sub-category	Quantum	Final Goal (p.a.)	UPMO Recasting to Release One only
Cashable - ITU Release 1 (ITU), and then separately for Release 2, and Release 3	Financial - Cashable	Reduced Costs	$'s	$2,619,576	No financial benefit realised - no reduction in licensing costs, Any ITU productivity improvement has not been scalable, it has been absorbed within ITU to support the costs of establishing the SMO and addressing increased workloads. Any net headcount reduction in ITU Operations teams will be ascribed to the ITOM program.
Cashable - Other Core Units staffing and other costs Release 1 (ITU), Release 2, and Release 3	Financial - Cashable	Reduced Costs	$'s	None given	No financial benefit realised, any General Counsel administrative functions productivity gain has been absorbed within General Counsel to address increased workload.
Incremental Productivity Improvement - ITU Release 1 (ITU), Release 2, and Release 3	Non-Financial	Incremental Productivity	Hours saved per FTE/ week	None given	Refer to the earlier statements, while there may be limited non-scalable productivity gains in ITU, these are masked by increased workload.
Incremental Productivity Improvement – Core Units staffing Release 1 (ITU), Release 2, and Release 3	Non-Financial	Incremental Productivity	Hours saved per FTE/ week	None given	Refer to the earlier statements, while there may be limited non-scalable productivity gains in ITU, these are masked by increased workload.
Incremental Productivity Improvement – outside of core Units Release 1 (General Counsel and ITU), Release 2, and Release 3	Non-Financial	Incremental Productivity	Hours saved per FTE/ week	0.26	Refer to the earlier statements, while there may be limited non-scalable productivity gains in General Counsel, these are masked by increased workload.
Incremental Productivity Improvement – outside of core Units Release 1 (General Counsel and ITU), Release 2, and Release 3	Non-Financial	Incremental Productivity	$'s	$4,943,652	With the limited changes to work processes delivered in Release One, it is extremely unlikely that incremental productivity savings across UTS are as much as 15 to 30 minutes per week.
Enhanced Experience (Staff)	Non-Financial	Enhanced Experience	%change	None given	With the descoping down to Release One, it is extremely unlikely that there would be a measurable change to the Staff Experience scores.
Risk Reduction (Cybersecurity for Service Connect)	Non-Financial	Enhanced Experience	GIPA s.3.2 [redacted]		

06

Appendix – Financials Analysis

Financial Analysis

It is not possible to comprehensively determine the complete financial picture of SCP and predecessor projects, due to poor recording.

Both Internal Audit and UPMO have looked at expenditure across 2021 to 2024.

Internal Audit (total $13.1m) (prior to program finalization and a $0.15m further overrun).

UPMO (total $13.6m (High confidence) - $14.1m (Low confidence)).

- UPMO quantified expenditure for 2023 and 2024 (total $8.4m), Internal Audit for the same period was lower (total $7.8m).
- Informal feedback from ITU Operations Management flagged further 2024 costs, not recovered from the Program (estimates of up to $0.5m).

Financial Analysis – Internal Audit Report (March 2024)

Appendix F

Evolution of ServiceNow Costs from 2021 to 2024

Year	Proposed Costs (not including 20% contingency)	Approved Budget	Actual Spend
2021			$944,788 (Note 1)
2022	$7,155,000 (Note 2)	$4,182,000 (Note 3)	$4,282,836 (Note 3)
2023	$7,398,000 (Note 4)	$7,398,629 (Note 5)	$6,152,713 (Note 6)
2024	$1,688,312 (Note 7)	$2,000,000 (Note 7)	$1,688,312
TOTAL SPEND for Release 1			**$13,068,649 ****

Notes:

1. Figure extracted from '*Enterprise Service Management – Current State Assessment and Program Reset Plan*' document prepared for ESM SteerCo Meeting 17 February 2022.
2. Figure extracted from *Business Case version 1.3* dated 27/05/2022.
3. Figure extracted from *Digital SteerCo (DSC) pack dated 15 Feb 2023* – 2022 Digital Working Sub-Domain.
4. Figure extracted from updated *Business Case version 2.0* dated July 2023.
5. Figure extracted from SCP SteerCo pack in Dec 2023.
6. Figure extracted from SCP SteerCo pack in Jan 2024.

** This is more than the proposed cost (without contingency) outlined in the original Business Case (dated May 2022) for the entire ServiceNow Program.

Financial Analysis – UPMO (May 2024)

SCP Finance Report

Costs - $'000	2023 Budget	2024 Budget	Total Program Budget	2023 Actuals	2024 Forecast	Total Program Totex	Variance B v Totex
Program & SME resources	GIPA s.3.2 and s.3.4 [redacted]						
Vendor - Testing							
Vendor System Integrator							
Software costs							
Helpdeck augmentation & cont							
Totals	6,400	2,000	8,400	6,228	2,157	8,384	16

notes:-

2024 Foreacst an estimate based on actuals to April 2024 and Vendor contract / payment analysis and resource plan May 2024

2023 Budget reset in Business case (Nov 2023)

	FY2023
Approved Budgets	7,398
Approved Business Case	6,400

(BC based on 2023 Budget $7398 less $998 c/f AC3 to 2024)

07

Appendix – List of Survey and Interview Participants

GIPA s.3.2

Survey sent to

Role in Program
Executive Sponsor, Chair SteerCo
Business Sponsor, SteerCo member
SteerCo member
SteerCo member
SteerCo member
SteerCo member
SteerCo member
SteerCo member
SteerCo member
SteerCo attendee
Program Director, SteerCo attendee
Program Manager, SteerCo attendee
Strategic Change Lead, SteerCo attendee
Change Leader, SteerCo attendee
SME, Business Rep, SteerCo attendee

Role in Program
Business Rep
Business Rep
Business Rep
Business Rep
Business Rep
Business Rep
Business Rep
Business Rep
Business Rep
Business Rep
Business Rep
Business Rep
Business Rep
Business Rep
SME, Business Rep
SME, Business Rep
SME, Business Rep
SME, Business Rep
SME, Business Rep
SME, Business Rep
SME, ITU Rep
SME, ITU Rep
SME, ITU Rep
SME, ITU Rep
SME, ITU Rep
SME, ITU Rep

UTS

Survey Questions

Biographic Material (3 questions)

What is your email address?

Which groups did you belong to?

Program Team, Faculties, ITU, Governance

What was your role in the program?

Owner/ Sponsor, Program Delivery, Program Support, Business Analysis, Change Management, Technical, Subject Matter Expert, Business/ End User, Other

Objectives and Stakeholder Support (3 questions)

4 How clearly defined were the objectives for this project (1 to 5)

5 How much do you think the stakeholders supported the program (1 to 5)

6 Free text Objectives and Stakeholder Support ("Comments on Objectives and Stakeholder Support")

Solution Effectiveness (3 questions)

7 How much do the program outcomes meet your stated needs (1 to 5)

8 To what extent do you feel the objectives and goals of the program were realised (1 to 5)

9 Free text Solution Effectiveness ("Comments on Solution Effectiveness")

Execution and Control (3 questions)

10 How satisfied were you with your involvement in the development and/or review of scope during the program (1 to 5)

11 Were changes to cost, scope, schedule and/or quality effectively managed (1 to 5)

12 Free text Execution and Control ("Comments on Execution and Control")

Risks and Issues Management (3 questions)

13 How much were team members involved in risks and issues identification and management (1 to 5)

14 How effectively was the risks and issues management of the program (1 to 5)

15 Free text Risks and Issues Management ("Comments on Risk Management")

Communication and Change Management (3 questions)

16 How effectively were stakeholders involved in the program (1 to 5)

17 How well were users communicated and engagement with, in this program (1 to 5)

18 Free text Communication and Change Management ("Comments on Communication and Change Management")

Program Transition (2 questions)

19 How smooth was the transition of support from the program team to the ongoing team (1 to 5)

20 Free text Program Transition ("Comments on Program Transition")

Team Performance (4 questions)

21 How clear were you on your role in the program (1 to 5)

22 How adequately involved did you feel you were in program decisions (1 to 5)

23 To what degree did you feel the entire team were committed to the scope and schedule (1 to 5)

24 Free text Team Performance ("Comments on Team Performance")

General (3 questions)

25 What were the most significant issues on the program (free text)

26 What were the lessons learned on this program (free text)

27 What on the program worked well? Is there anyone you would like to commend (free text)

Interviews

GIPA s.3.2

Name	Title	Role in Program	Did Survey	Did Interview Go Ahead
[redacted]		SteerCo member	Yes	Partial
		SteerCo member	No	Partial
		SteerCo member	Yes	Yes
		SteerCo member	Yes	Yes
		SteerCo member	No	Yes
		SteerCo member	No	Yes
		SteerCo member	No	Yes
		Program Director, SteerCo member	No	Yes
		Key Stakeholder	Yes	Partial
		Key Stakeholder	Yes	Yes

08

Appendix – Internal Audit Findings

Internal Audit report – March 2024 – open actions

Detail	Action Plan Summary	How Addressed in the SCP PIR	Owner	Due Date
Program funding and governance framework does not clearly report full program cost. Benefit realisation plan is not revised when program scope changes are made.	Benefits update to reflect single release.	Benefits Recasting in the SCP PIR (refer Section 4), then action is complete. Full program costing and funding initiative addressed in next row.	D-UPMO	Jul-24
Financial planning to be uplifted with new UTS program methodology – reporting and monitoring for multi-year program.	Develop policy re full lifecycle funding and commitment.	Full program costing and funding initiative with CFO, proposed date of completion July 2024. This action was for three programs, and action is being taken for the entire portfolio, it is not addressed in this SCP PIR.	CFO	Jul-24
Enhance vendor management process, particularly in coordinating multiple vendors delivering overlapping IT services, leading to inefficiencies and potential conflicts.	Improved supervision of existing RFP/ RFT processes	Vendor management (refer Section 2 – Execution and Control).	Head of Shared Services	Jul-24
Enhance vendor management process, particularly in coordinating multiple vendors delivering overlapping IT services, leading to inefficiencies and potential conflicts.	ITOM to ensure ITU also build capability of visibility of vendors and their performance	Vendor management (refer Section 2 – Execution and Control).	Head of Tech Transformation	Aug-24
Program / project management practices need uplifting on risk management / reporting, contracting, CAB reporting, and financial controls.	Review program delivery and management processes, with focus on schedule and threats to milestone timing.	Schedule management (refer Section 2 - Risks and Issues Management, and Team Performance)	D-UPMO & Prog Dir	Jul-24
Providing Program team with training and support to understand the new UPMO project and program methodology.	Formalised training and coaching to key program leadership to support go-live and related risk management and governance.	Methodology and governance training (refer Section 2 – Execution and Control).	D-UPMO & Prog Dir	Aug-24

Internal Audit report – March 2024 – actions in Progress

Detail	Action Plan Summary	Action Plan	Owner	Manager	Secondary Owner	Due Date	Action Led by	Status at end of May 2024
Program funding and governance framework does not clearly report full program cost. Benefit realisation plan is not revised when program scope changes are made.	Benefits update to reflect single release.	The review and reporting on benefits realised against original benefits realisation plan will be conducted as part of PIR after the implementation of the system.	D-UPMO	COO	None given	Jul-24	D-UPMO	Progress
Financial planning to be uplifted with new UTS program methodology – reporting and monitoring for multi-year program.	Develop policy re full lifecycle funding and commitment.	The lifecycle of programs funding process will be reviewed – taking into consideration the following recommendation, to identify the best fit approach for the University: -Funding for programs to be locked into the capital for the duration of the program unless overridden by the leadership of the University. -Full business case for program with defined value to be developed, specifically for programs which are likely to run over a single financial year. This value will be defined by the ULT based on risk appetite and funding delegations. -Restrict the funding tranches based on earned value and deliverables. -Benefits and cost analysis against original benefit realisation plan to be conducted and reported to Senior Management as soon as they become aware of possible changes and impacts, including both time and cost.	CFO	COO	D-UPMO	None	CFO and D-UPMO	Progress
Enhance vendor management process, particularly in coordinating multiple vendors delivering overlapping IT services, leading to inefficiencies and potential conflicts.	Improved supervision of existing RFP/ RFT processes	Going forward, effective supervision over the existing RFP / RFT process should ensure that: -Organisational requirements and vendor expectations are clearly articulate in the RFP / RFT to avoid ambiguity. -Collaboration with legal and business stakeholders to develop a concise and accurate Statement of Work (SOW) or Service Level Agreement (SLA) outlining project scope, deliverables, timelines, and performance metrics to ensure alignment with UTS / Program's objectives and guidelines to mitigate potential conflicts during vendor engagement.	Head of Shared Services	COO	CFO	Jul-24	Head of Shared Services	Progress
Enhance vendor management process, particularly in coordinating multiple vendors delivering overlapping IT services, leading to inefficiencies and potential conflicts.	ITOM to ensure ITU also build capability of visibility of vendors and their performance	Going forward, the ITOM Program should ensure the following capabilities are in a program to: -Maintain comprehensive visibility over all aspects of vendor interactions, including adherence to timelines, quality of performance, and communication effectiveness. -Implement structured vendor performance monitoring protocols to systematically evaluate vendor performance against predefined metrics. GIPA s.3.4 [redacted]	Head of Tech Transformation	COO	Head of Shared Services	Aug-24	Head of Tech Transformation	Progress
Program / project management practices need uplifting on risk management / reporting, contracting, CAB reporting, and financial controls.	Review program delivery and management processes, with focus on schedule and threats to milestone timing.	Project delivery and management process will be reviewed and parameters re-baselined if required to take into consideration: -Adequate float and contingency in the program timeline. -Reporting on any variances to the overall timeline or potential threat to the timeline and milestone timing.	D-UPMO & Prog Dir	COO	None given	None	D-UPMO and SCP Program Director	Progress
Providing Program team with training and support to understand the new UPMO project and program methodology.	Formalised training and coaching to key program leadership to support go-live and related risk management and governance.	Audit recommends that the University provide formalised training / coaching for all key program leadership appointed to major programs at the University. It would be helpful to provide, just in time, coaching and support to business leadership at a time where the key decisions surrounding the final go-live of the system will need to be made.	D-UPMO & Prog Dir	COO	None given	Aug-24	D-UPMO and SCP Program Director	Progress

UTS

Internal Audit report – March 2024 – actions completed

Detail	Action Plan Summary	Action Plan	Owner	Manager	Secondary Owner	Due Date	Action Led by	Status at end of May 2024
Change management activities were inadequate to support the transformation program.	Boost change management resources prior to go-lives and Hypercare.	Audit recommends that change management resources and communication teams be increased in the lead up to the go-live and be ready for Hypercare especially where there are workarounds and known defects. Audit notes the plan is to have a Hyper care model in place as per the plan however it is unclear if sufficient resources are allocated considering the risks identified by the project teams.	D-UPMO	COO	None given	"ASAP"	D-UPMO	Completed
Validation of Data Migration and Testing outcomes before clearance to go-live.	Review data migration testing, ensure no Sev 1 or 2 open issues before go-live.	Review of the data migration testing and completion of the migration activities including history should be reviewed by Steerco and approved. No severity 1 or 2 open issues on the migration should be evident before go-live.	CIO	COO	CDO	"ASAP"	CIO and SCP Program Director	Completed
Validation of Data Migration and Testing outcomes before clearance to go-live.	Review of the UAT testing and completion of the re-test activities to be approved by SteerCo.	Review of the UAT testing and completion of the retest activities should be reviewed by Steerco and approved. No severity 1 or 2 open issues on the migration should be evident before go-live. Audit noted the reporting of several defects of S1 and S2 levels. It is important that grading of issues raised at testing be carefully considered. When there are multiple high and moderate defects the rating of the individual issues needs to be considered in context of the volume and type carefully by all stakeholders. Impact analysis across these should be encouraged.	CIO	COO	CDO	"ASAP"	CIO and SCP Program Director	Completed
Business readiness activities i.e. cutover and rollback plan were not finalisation and communicated to impacted stakeholders well in advance of the planned go-live date.	Risk assessment prior to cutover, cutover plan and workarounds, resourcing for help-desk.	Audit recommends that the business and IT engage to complete a risk assessment and prepare the cutover plan with due consideration of all workarounds and issues likely to create the largest workload on helpdesk post go-live. This should be taken to SteerCo for endorsement before go-live. This work is focused on risk and impact – completing scenario analysis would provide improved outcomes for the help desk and support teams as they will be better prepared. The 'what could go wrong' discussion and then mitigations are valuable to conduct but must have SMEs in the room to ensure the solutions are viable.	Head IT Ops	COO	CIO	1/03/2024	Head of IT Ops	Completed