

Arlene Croucher

From: Shaurin Shah <Shaurin.Shah@health.qld.gov.au>
Sent: Tuesday, 11 August 2009 8:19 AM
To: brian.cox@corpotech.qld.gov.au; Brian.Frederick@corpotech.qld.gov.au; Jane.Stewart@corpotech.qld.gov.au; john.gower@corpotech.qld.gov.au; mark.dymock@corpotech.qld.gov.au; nick.kwiatkowski@corpotech.qld.gov.au; Amanda Doughty; Brett Cowan; Pierre Pienaar; Terry Burns; Anthony Price; Janette Jones
Subject: Re: UAT entry and exit
Attachments: QHIC UAT e2e Entry Criteria v1.1_Final.doc; QHIC UAT e2e Exit Criteria_1.1.doc; Defect Classification Guidelines_ver 1.0.doc

Hello All,

Thank you for your feedback. Here is the final version of Entry and Exit Criteria and Defect Classification Guideline document that can be signed off at the Project Directorate today.

Kind regards,

Shaurin Shah
[Redacted]

>>> <john.gower@corpotech.qld.gov.au> 10/08/2009 5:04 pm >>>

Shaurin,

Attached are the updated UAT entry and exit criteria following a meeting with Jane, Nick and myself this afternoon. The files have been renamed as "_Batch" to reflect the nature of the changes.

Jane has suggested you to call her directly if you wish to confirm the changes marked in the documents.

Regards,
John

(See attached file: QHIC UAT e2e Exit Criteria v0.2 Final Draftwith QHIC feedback_Batch.doc)(See attached file: QHIC UAT e2e Entry Criteria v1.0 with QHIC feedback_Batch.doc)

John Gower
Project Director
QHIC Project
Level 20, 313 Adelaide St

Email: john.gower@corpotech.qld.gov.au
[Redacted]

This email and any attachments may contain confidential, private and/or legally privileged information and may be protected by copyright and/or the subject of moral rights. You may only use the email and attachments if you are the person(s) they were intended to be sent to and you use them in an authorised way and for the purpose for which they were supplied. If you are not the addressee, you are strictly prohibited from reviewing, using, altering, disclosing, distributing, publishing, printing or copying the contents of this email and/or attachments. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender by return email or telephone immediately, destroy any copies

of the email and attachments and delete them from your computer system network. Any legal privilege or confidentiality attached to this email and attachments is not waived, lost or destroyed by reason of mistaken delivery to you.

Unless stated otherwise, any opinions expressed in this email and attachments represent the views of the sender and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the State of Queensland.

The State of Queensland does not accept any responsibility for any loss or damage that may result from reliance on, or the use of, any information contained in this email and/or attachments. It is your responsibility to ensure that this email and any attachments do not contain and are not infected by computer viruses, defects or interference by third parties or replication problems (including incompatibility with your computer system network).

Unless specifically stated, this email should not be construed as a purchase order nor as an arrangement to provide a service.

Automatic software scanning, filtering and blocking of emails and attachments (including emails of a personal nature) is carried out for detection of viruses, malicious code, spam, executable programs or content deemed unacceptable. All reasonable precautions will be taken to respect the privacy of individuals. Personal information will only be used for official purposes, e.g. monitoring Departmental personnel's compliance with Departmental Policies. Personal information will not be disclosed to third parties, unless authorised or required by Departmental Policy and/or law.

Thank you.

*

Queensland Health

Enterprise *Solutions*
Transition

QHEST

QHIC Project
User Acceptance Testing
End to End Entry Criteria

Version 1.1



Queensland Government
Queensland Health

End to End UAT Entry Criteria

Document Control

PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to document the UAT End to End Entry Criteria based on revised project scope and schedule for target delivery date of November 2009. For the purpose of this document UAT means the end to end UAT that will be executed.

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Version	Date	Prepared by	Comments
0.1	30 June 2009	Amanda Doughty	Initial Draft
0.2	13 July 2009	Pierre Pienaar, Brett Cowan, Shaurin Shah	Revised Draft
0.3	14 July 2009	Pierre Pienaar, Brett Cowan, Shaurin Shah	Further revisions
0.4	27 July 2009	Shaurin Shah	Revisions as per the discussion within the working group on 22/7/09
0.5	28 July 2009	Shaurin Shah	Revisions as per the discussion within the working group on 27/7/09
0.6	03 Aug 2009	Shaurin Shah	Revisions as per the discussion within the project directorate and project board during the week ending 31/7/09.
0.7	03 Aug 2009	Shaurin Shah	Revisions to include comments from IBM and as per the discussion within the working group on 04/08/09.
1.0	05 Aug 2009	Shaurin Shah	Revisions to include feedback from Project Directorate & a meeting between CorpTech & IBM regarding error handling.
1.1	11 Aug 2009	Shaurin Shah	Revised item no 10 and 11 to reflect the agreement based on the meeting between John , Jane and Nick on 10/8/09.

DOCUMENT REVIEW

Name	Title
Tony Price (QH)	
John Gower(IBM)	
Amanda Doughty (QH)	
Terry Burns (QH)	
Pierre Pienaar (QH)	

End to End UAT Entry Criteria

James Brown (CoprTech)	
Janette Jones (QH)	
Jane Stewart (CorpTech)	
Shaurin Shah (QH)	
Mark Dymock (IBM)	
Brett Cowan (QH)	
Brian Fredrick (CorpTech)	
Michael McMahon (CorpTech)	
Brian Cox (CorpTech)	

DOCUMENT APPROVAL

Name: Bill Doak
Position: Program Manager (IBM)
Signature _____ / / _____

Name: Margaret Berenyi
Position: Executive Director (CorpTech)
Signature _____ / / _____

Name: Adrian Shea
Position: Executive Director (QH Corporate Services)
Signature _____ / / _____

End to End UAT Entry Criteria

1 INTRODUCTION

The entry criteria below reflect the concurrent UAT End to End execution for HR Payroll, HR /FI Integration and CorpTech Service Management testing. These reflect previously defined entry criteria which have been modified to provide clear and measurable criteria and responsibilities.

For the purpose of this document:

- Business Stakeholders will be nominated delegates of QHEST, QH SSP, HR and Finances Branches, CorpTech Service Management and CorpTech Technology Services.
- UAT includes the execution of defined tests by QH and CorpTech Service Management including Operations and Payroll Bureau, HR Applications Management, Finance Applications Management and Customer Service Solutions.
- Business Stakeholders need to note the residual risk associated with the Changed UAT Entry Criteria (refer RS-00254 in RPM) that may adversely impact target UAT completion date.

2 ENTRY CRITERIA

#	Entry Criteria	Responsibility	Status
1	All parties agree to the Severity1, 2, 3 & 4 definitions as per Definitions of Severity of Defects -Appendix-1.	IBM, QH & CorpTech	
2	All defects identified and agreed as severity-1 defects from all Test phases are resolved.	IBM	
3	All defects identified and agreed as severity-2 defects are resolved, re-tested and scripts passed successfully as entry criteria into UAT e2e.	IBM	
4	All parties agree that defects identified and agreed as severity-3 priority-0 and priority-1 defects will be resolved for re-testing and successful script completion as exit criteria from end to end UAT test.	IBM QH CorpTech	
5	All parties agree that defects identified and agreed as severity-3 priority-0 and priority-1 with End-of-Financial-Year (EOFY) indicators will be resolved prior to EOFY test cycle, to enable EOFY scripts to be completed successfully during UAT e2e EOFY test cycle;	IBM QH CorpTech	
6	All known work-arounds resulting from all outstanding severity-3 defects (excluding Severity-3 priority-0 and priority-1 defects) and severity 4 defects have been designed and approved.	QHEST & IBM	
7	UAT close-out plan for Severity 2, Severity 3 priority 0 and Severity 3 priority 1 defects has been agreed as per the defect impact spreadsheet.		
8	All parties agree to the UAT escalation criteria as per	IBM	

End to End UAT Entry Criteria

#	Entry Criteria	Responsibility	Status
	section-3 below.	QH CorpTech	
9	<p>All parties agree that the Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM) is an IBM Document to be used to facilitate UAT and decision making RTM is not a contractual document and not a representation of the full QH and CorpTech Business Requirements. RTM is to be treated as an open document until commencement of UAT E2E to enable any further requirements to be agreed and added for testing.</p> <p>The RTM will be used by IBM to assess defects found in UAT.</p> <p>Defects not reflected in the RTM will be assessed for work effort and Go-live Impact.</p> <p>If Go-live is NOT affected the defect will be dealt with in the usual agreed manner according to severity.</p> <p>If Go Live is affected the defect will be sent to the QHIC Board for resolution</p>	IBM QH CorpTech	
10	<p>All Configuration and System processes have been provided by IBM to the business stakeholders. The following documentation will be current as at start of the end to end UAT and is subject to change in accordance with the agreed master schedule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solutions Blueprint • Process Design Documents including Payroll Procedures and Work Instructions • Functional Specifications • Technical Specifications • Configuration Specifications • Batch Framework • Solution Automation <p>The outcomes from the payroll process discussions need to have been detailed sufficiently within the above documents (or others as agreed) to allow running of the E2E payroll in UAT.</p>	IBM	
11	Agreed plan for the resolution of outstanding issues with the Batch Framework and Error Handling to support HR Application Management.	IBM CorpTech	
12.	SSP Error Handling is documented.	QH	
13	UAT Plans have been developed, reviewed and approved by agreed business stakeholders.	QHEST CorpTech IBM (review)	

End to End UAT Entry Criteria

#	Entry Criteria	Responsibility	Status
14	Additional Retro on Retro test Execution Plan (Refer Retro on Retros Test Execution Plan ver 1.0) has been developed, reviewed and approved by the key stakeholders.		
15	Parallel Pay Run Testing (PPRT) has finished and the Test Completion report has been developed, reviewed and approved.	IBM	
16	QHIC Pay Run Fortnightly Cycle is updated to reflect the agreed pay process entering UAT. The outcomes (timings) of PPV3 test results have been updated into the QHIC Pay Run Fortnightly Cycle.	IBM	
17	The End-to-End test environments for Payroll/Finance (HEU300, CWU) and HR Applications (CEK300, CWJ) have been established and are available.	QHEST	
18	All known data issues required for end to end UAT execution are resolved.	QHEST	
19	Test data subset for HRAPPS UAT is verified and reconciled by UAT Team.	HRAPPS-CorpTech	
20	Skilled resources that are available with relevant business experience have received appropriate training and knowledge transfer in all systems to conduct the UAT. (SAP including HR/FI Integration functions, Workbrain, CPS and HP Quality Centre) prior to testing commencement.	IBM	
21	Final Security Roles have been documented and agreed. Necessary user access based on the roles is provided for UAT execution.	IBM	
22	a) IBM have agreed to provide resource allocation for SAP and Workbrain support and assistance during execution of UAT. b) QH and CorpTech have agreed to provide resource allocation for business requirement / process clarification and operational SMEs.	a) IBM b)QH /CorpTech	

3 ESCALATION CRITERIA

All parties agree that anytime during the execution of the end to end UAT if the below mentioned thresholds are reached, a risk assessment process will be triggered. This process will be managed by the QHIC-program board which will determine whether UAT need to be suspended or any other remediation is required:

- a) If the cumulative severity-1 defects discovered reaches 2 defects during the execution of e2e UAT; or
- b) If the cumulative severity-2 defects discovered reaches 40 defects during the execution of e2e UAT; or
- c) If additional 50 severity-3 defects are discovered during the execution of e2e in addition to the known existing severity-3 defects at the entry of UAT.

Appendix-1: Definitions of Severity of Defects

Following definitions are agreed by IBM, Queensland Health and CoprTech for the execution of end-to-end UAT test:

I. **Severity-1 defect** – Any defect because of which

- The entire application, component or function will not work, and no bypass is available.
- Testing cannot proceed. Major impact to testing schedule.
- A severity 1 defect must be addressed as a matter of the highest priority.

II. **Severity-2 defect** – Any defect because of which

- Major component or function will not work.
- Testing is severely impacted, but can proceed.
- Payroll results are incorrect – e.g. a Payrule in Workbrain is incorrect.
- Major impact to testing schedule.
- A severity 2 defect must be addressed as a high priority.

Defect Classification Guidelines Document ver. 1.0 will be used as a guideline to classify the severity 2 defects.

III. **Severity-3 defect** – Any defect which has a significant impact on application, component or function but an acceptable work-around is available to Queensland Health and CorpTech stakeholders.

Priority -0 : Defects which were agreed to be moved from Severity 2 to Severity -3 in order to commence the end to end UAT.

Priority -1: Defects which are not severity 2 but which require code changes / fixes prior to go-live and has no work-arounds.

During the execution of the end to end UAT, maximum priority assigned to severity 3 defects would be priority 2 onwards to allow for clarity.

IV. **Severity-4 defect** – Any defect that is

- Cosmetic or has minimal impact.
- Spelling or format error on internal report – no material impact on client.
- Inconsistency of formatting.
- Alignment of fields on a page. Cosmetic or minimal impact.
- A severity 4 defect should be fixed when practicable.
- No impact to Test Schedule

Queensland Health

Enterprise *Solutions*
Transition

QHEST

**QHIC Project
User Acceptance Testing
End to End Exit Criteria**

Version 1.1

UAT Exit Criteria

Document Control

PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to document the UAT End to End Exit Criteria based on revised project scope and schedule for target delivery date of November 2009. For the purpose of this document UAT means the end to end UAT that will be executed.

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Version	Date	Prepared by	Comments
0.1	30 June 2009	Amanda Doughty	Initial Draft
0.2	28 July 2009	Shaurin Shah	Revisions as per the discussion within the working group 27/7/09.
0.3	4 August 2009	Shaurin Shah	Revisions as per the discussion within the working group on 4/8/2009.
1.0	5 August 2009	Shaurin Shah	Revisions based on the outcome of Project directorate on 4/8/2009.
1.1	10 August 2009	Shaurin Shah	Item 10 revised to reflect Malcolm(Corptech) Mark Dymock 's(IBM) comments.

DOCUMENT REVIEW

Name	Title
Tony Price (QH)	
James Brown (CorpTech)	
John Gower (IBM)	
Terry Burns (QH)	
Amanda Doughty (QH)	
Janette Jones (QH)	
Jane Stewart (CorpTech)	
Shaurin Shah (QH)	
Brett Cowan (QH)	
Mark Dymock (IBM)	
Brian Fredrick (CorpTech)	
Pierre Pienaar (QH)	

UAT Exit Criteria

DOCUMENT APPROVAL

Name: Bill Doak

Position: Program Manager (IBM)

Signature _____ / / _____

Name: Margaret Berenyi

Position: Executive Director (CorpTech)

Signature _____ / / _____

Name: Adrian Shea

Position: Executive Director (QH Corporate Services)

Signature _____ / / _____

UAT Exit Criteria

1 INTRODUCTION

The exit criteria below reflect the concurrent UAT End to End execution for HR Payroll, HR /FI Integration and CorpTech Service Management testing. The exit criteria for these have been combined. These reflect previously defined exit criteria¹ which have been modified to provide clear and measurable criteria and responsibilities.

For the purpose of this document:

- Business Stakeholders will be nominated delegates of QHEST, QH SSP, HR and Finances Branches, CorpTech Service Management and CorpTech Technology Services.
- UAT includes the execution of defined tests by QH and CorpTech Service Management including Operations and Payroll Bureau, HR Applications Management, Finance Applications Management and Customer Service Solutions.

2 UAT EXIT CRITERIA

	Exit Criteria	Responsibility
1.	Payrun Performance Validation test activities are completed and the test completion report approved by the Business Stakeholders. Any impacts to the UAT associated with the PPV are accommodated within the UAT cycle.	IBM
2.	Parallel Pay Run (PPRT) test activities are completed and the test completion report approved by the Business Stakeholders. Any impacts to the UAT associated with the PPRT are accommodated within the UAT cycle.	IBM
3.	External Interface Testing (EFT, QSuper, Deductions and Payslip print interfaces, IMS, HRDSS, FIDSS, ATO (TFN declarations, EMPDUPE lodgment and payment summary print file)) are completed by relevant teams and approved by the Business Stakeholders and external service providers. Any impacts to the UAT associated with the external interfaces testing are accommodated within the UAT cycle.	QHEST, CorpTech Service Management
4.	Stress and Volume (S & V) test activities are completed and the test completion report is approved by the Business Stakeholders. Any impacts to the UAT associated with the S&V test are accommodated within the UAT cycle.	QHEST, CorpTech Technology Services
5.	Additional Retro on Retro tests as per the Refer Retro on Retros Test Execution Plan ver 1.0 are completed and the test completion report approved by the Business Stakeholders. Any impacts to the UAT associated with the additional retros on retros tests are accommodated within the UAT cycle.	
6.	All updates are scheduled and a plan is agreed to update the	IBM

UAT Exit Criteria

	Exit Criteria	Responsibility
	<p>final documentation before go live: The documentation is to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Solutions Blueprint - Process Design Documents - Payroll Business Process training material (including Work Instructions) - Batch Framework - Solution Automation - Functional Specifications - Technical Specifications - Configuration Specifications. - Documentation of error handling to be addressed within each of the above documents. 	
7.	SSP Error Handling documentation completed to reflect the detail of errors and their resolution processes identified during UAT execution.	QHEST
8.	All the planned UAT test cases have been executed with no failed test cases due to outstanding severity 1, 2 and severity 3 priority0 & priority1 issues. Any exceptions to be agreed by business stakeholders.	QHEST, CorpTech Service Management
9.	All severity 1, 2 and severity 3 priority 0 & 1 issues (from any test phase) have been fixed and retested by the responsible team. Any impacts to the UAT are accommodated within the UAT cycle.	IBM for Solution QHEST for business
10.	<p>All severity 3 and 4 issues outstanding have been reviewed with Business Stakeholders and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Workarounds have been developed, tested, documented and agreed by business stakeholders. - Workaround support processes and associated tools have been developed, tested, documented and agreed by all stakeholders. - A plan for the management of these defects is agreed. The plan will be based on the outcome of the Project Board's determination as to management of these defects. 	IBM/QHEST
11.	<p>Business Stakeholders agree that they can execute and resource the full set of workarounds arising from outstanding defects within critical processing windows and without undue risk to integrity of the payroll.</p> <p>Fortnightly Payroll Process Model is updated with the agreed go-live workarounds and accepted by the business stakeholders.</p>	QHSSP CorpTech Service Management

UAT Exit Criteria

	Exit Criteria	Responsibility
12.	UAT has been completed by QHEST and CorpTech Service Management and UAT Completion Report has been approved by the Business Stakeholders and the project board.	QHEST
13.	The security profiles matrix has been updated, configured and tested to reflect the agreed outcomes required by the customer as per the final solution design and documentation.	QH SSP, CorpTech

Queensland Health

Enterprise *Solutions*
Transition

QHEST

Defect Classification Guidelines

Version 1.0

Defect Classification Guidelines

Document Control

PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to document the guideline for classification of the severity 2 defects. For the purpose of this document UAT means the end to end UAT that will be executed.

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Version	Date	Prepared by	Comments
0.1	04 Aug 2009	Shaurin Shah	Initial Draft
1.0	05 Aug 2009	Shaurin Shah	Updated based on discussion between John and Amanda about reporting (point

DOCUMENT REVIEW

Name	Title
Tony Price (QH)	
John Gower(IBM)	
Amanda Doughty (QH)	
Terry Burns (QH)	
Pierre Pienaar (QH)	
James Brown (CoprTech)	
Janette Jones (QH)	
Jane Stewart (CorpTech)	
Shaurin Shah (QH)	
Mark Dymock (IBM)	
Brett Cowan (QH)	
Brian Fredrick (CorpTech)	
Michael McMahon (CorpTech)	
Brian Cox (CorpTech)	

Defect Classification Guidelines

DOCUMENT APPROVAL

Name: Bill Doak

Position: Program Manager (IBM)

Signature _____ / _____

Name: Margaret Berenyi

Position: Executive Director (CorpTech)

Signature _____ / _____

Name: Adrian Shea

Position: Executive Director (QH Corporate Services)

Signature _____ / _____

I. INTRODUCTION

The severity 2 classification guidelines reflect the process that has been adopted as at date to define severity 2 defect and differentiate them from severity 3 defects.

During the execution of the end to end UAT, business Stakeholders within QH and CorpTech will use this as a guideline.

II. CLASSIFICATION GUIDELINES

1. Interfaces from SAP to Workbrain (Employee Master Data, Cost Objects, Jobs, Team Structure)

E.g. If any of these items are not interfaced correctly employees will not be rostered / costed correctly which directly affects pay outcomes. Files out of SAP must equal files into Workbrain. There is no workaround and our end users do not have the ability to correct any missing/incorrect data that is not interfaced.

2. Interfaces from Workbrain to SAP (WB time codes mapped to Attendances and Absences, Leave Balances)

E.g. If any of these items are not interfaced correctly employees will not be costed/paid correctly which directly affects pay outcomes. Files out of Workbrain must equal files into SAP. There is no workaround and our end users do not have the ability to correct any missing/incorrect data that is not interfaced. ALCS, LSLCS, Liability Reporting cannot be Worked Around and cannot be corrected through manual data entry.

3. Workbrain paycalc rules

E.g. The system drives award interpretation via the calc groups and therefore pay results for employees. Users cannot control/overwrite those rules. Workarounds are complex and very time consuming for the end user. Whenever leave is affected by an incorrect pay calc rule, there is not manual workaround.

4. Workbrain leave accrual rules

E.g. The system drives award interpretation via the leave accrual rules and therefore pay results for employees. Users cannot control/overwrite those rules. Whenever leave is affected by an incorrect leave accrual rule, there is not manual workaround. Leave liability, ALCS, LSLCS cannot be Worked Around and cannot be corrected through manual data entry.

Defect Classification Guidelines

5. Job chains – CPS - Users are at the mercy of the job chains. If these fail, at any point, employees will not be paid on time due to delays in recommencing job chains:
 - a. System(s) Processors including but not limited to:
 - i. Leave, Attendance and Absence Files
 - ii. XI
 - iii. File Processing/Importing/Exporting
 - iv. Job Scheduler and Job Chains
 - b. Pay Processes including but not limited to:
 - i. SAP Time Evaluation
 - ii. SAP Pay Calculation
 - c. Pay Error Reports:
 - i. Pay Exception Report
 - ii. Pay Distribution Report
 - iii. Pay Reconciliation Report
 - iv. Control Interface Listing
6. SAP wage types (for time transactions of attendances and absences) - Wage types drive the calculations of an employees pay. If these are incorrect or missing from configuration then employees will not be paid accurately. Users do not have the ability to correct wrong configuration of wage types.
7. Pay scale rates – Pay scales are core configuration requiring table updates which the end users have no access to. These rates can not be worked around.
8. SAP wage types for allowances) - Wage types drive the calculations of an employees pay. If these are incorrect or missing from configuration then employees will not be paid accurately. Users do not have the ability to correct wrong configuration of wage types.
9. SAP wage types for deductions) - Wage types drive the calculations of an employees pay. If these are incorrect or missing from configuration then employees will not be paid accurately. Users do not have the ability to correct wrong configuration of wage types.
10. SAP superannuation – This is a system driven process and end users have little if any ability to adjust the outcome which will adversely affect the employee super entitlements/payments if incorrect.
11. Taxation (tax scales and tax concessions for PAYG calculation) - This is a system driven process and end users have little if any ability to adjust the outcome which will adversely affect the employee taxable liability /payments if incorrect.
12. Employee pay advice slips (\$ and leave balances) – the impact of incorrect pay advice will cause the SSP and the Agency an overwhelming backlash from employees which will result in time consuming explanation and client distrust.
13. EFT (employee pay to bank) – Without this capability functioning fully and correctly, we have no true method of distributing pays to our staff.
14. Balanced Posting docs – Incorrect or inaccurate posting documentation including reports will effectively destabilise our finance management and cost centre management at the cold face of our business. End users would be overwhelmed with the volume of journaling overrides and corrections that would make the Solution untenable.
15. On Cost calculations - (Work Cover, Super, LSL, Payroll Tax, ALCS, Accruals, Nurses PDE) – These are all legislative requirements and calculations need to be correct for the postings to the general ledger and for the payment to third parties to be correct.
16. Finance postings - (Balance sheet movements, EOM, Wage type mapping to general ledger, Cost assignments). This is to ensure that the general ledger is compliant and that costing per business unit is correct.

Defect Classification Guidelines

17. Finance reconciliation reports – These are reports that are being used to ensure that payroll and Finance are reconciling i.e. ALCS, Employee posting detail, Nurses PDE, Employee debt report
18. External interfaces – This is the interfaces to ATO, IMS and Super
19. Prior service – Not having this functionality will affect the employee entitlements and calculation of increments. The overwhelming workload this would place on the end user to manually calculate all entitlements and increments would make the system unusable.
20. Increments - Not having this functionality will affect the employee entitlements and calculation of increments. The overwhelming workload this would place on the end user to manually calculate all entitlements and increments would make the system unusable.
21. Higher duties - Not having this functionality will affect the employee entitlements and calculation of increments. The overwhelming workload this would place on the end user to manually calculate all entitlements and increments would make the system unusable.
22. Termination – the ability of the system to be able to terminate an employee effectively, is paramount as this is both a high volume task and a complex series of processes to ensure terminating employees are paid correctly and entitlements are granted, in accordance with Legislative compliance. The end user needs consistency in the Solution to ensure this happens.
23. Reporting – Core Queensland Health business (including Ministerial obligations) relies on correct reporting and the most trusted data is from the source system. Any defect resulting from failed performance or incorrect data will be treated as severity 2 where as defects resulting from formatting issues will be treated as severity 3.
24. System internal control and reconciliation processes – to ensure the process is defined for the verification of accurate data moving from one system to another (including system reports to validate data between SAP and WB).
25. Security defects – where too little access is available for the role to continue execution of test.