

## General Comments. \_CELRD

1. On entire set of processes and references the terms MSC, Region, and Division are used alternately throughout. Usage should be uniform. Response: Accepted.
2. Add simplified acquisition threshold , EROC, PB3, PB2a, BP/P2 Configuration Manager, SOH, TMA\_Project Operations Manager (Operations Manager) to glossary Response: Accepted.
3. Process 7120 and 7130 should be eliminated. They are customer specific and should be below the line procedures that are agreed to with that customer and the involved districts. Response: These are HQS level processes, and not project level processes.
4. PR&C should be used or consistency throughout entire document. Response: Accepted.
5. When navigating by the flow charts, there is a problem with using the browser's back button. When navigating through different processes after leaving the flowchart, using the back button, threw us back to the flowchart rather than the previous process. When we used the back button again to get back to another flowchart from which we had entered, we were thrown out of the flowcharts. Response: This is a software specific feature of the Browser. The arrow and/or page-up/down keys may be used to navigate through PowerPoint slides.
6. Not all of the links have screen tips (when the cursor stops for more than a second, a box appears with the URL). Most are there. It appears that most of the missing are those that have non-rectangular flowchart icons. But, as an example – **but not limited** – the following are missing the tips:
  - “Program Specific Processes” on Pgm/Proj Plan Phase chart
  - “Continue From Program/Project Initiation Phase” on Pgm/Proj Plan Phase chart AND Pgm/Proj Exec Phase chart
  - “Continue From Program/Project Closeout Phase” on Pgm/Proj Exec Phase chartSec 508 accessibility requirements for web pages require these because they also provide ways for reading software to convert to audio. I would also recommend that, on mouseover, a link should show the link's destination (either as a URL or as a Destination Description) on the status bar at the bottom of the screen. This would help users decide if that is a link they want to follow or need to go to. Response: Will be reviewed by the Edit Team.
7. Recommend that all reference links (e.g., to U.S.C and others) open up in a new window rather than the existing window. Allows user to keep reference

open while continuing to simultaneously view the PMBP Manual. Response: Edit team will research and resolve, if possible.

8. Use “standard” colors for links (i.e., blue for unvisited links, purple for previously visited links, red for active links (mouseover). They are this way on the Index sheet and then the colors are backward on the process sheets. Also, the Index sheet isn’t updating visited links. Using these defaults allows for greater ease and consistency. Currently, the colors are reversed causing confusion (esp. during a review process when needing to know what’s visited and what’s not). Response: Edit team will research and resolve, if possible.

9. Clarify what the Thomas Amendment is ... somewhere. From a continued search, it appears that the Thomas Amendment must somehow deal with Sec 211 of WRDA 2000. To those who work daily with the Thomas Amendment, this may be obvious. However, when we followed a hyperlink for the Thomas Amendment (<http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/cecs-i/ISWWW/WebLinks/Author2.htm>) , a list of Corps authorities came up without seeing the word Thomas anywhere. Response: Is defined in the glossary.

10. There are hyperlinks that look like they should be identical but are not. For example, <http://www.hnd.usace.army.mil/p2/tutor/REF8017.htm> and <http://www.hnd.usace.army.mil/p2/tutor/ref8017.htm> are NOT the same ... unless IE 5.5. is lying by telling me that I visited one and not the other. Check out the hyperlinks very carefully. Check out the html documents to verify that you don’t have two with the same, or nearly the same, names. Response: Edit team will research and resolve.

11. Still need to define Middle Management team (MMT). ER5-1-11 does not give a definition and only mentions in passing. Response: Accepted.

12. PROC 7000 – The Civil Works Budget Process image is hard to read and the image is reversed. It will not work well in the on-line manual. Response: Edit team will resolve.

13. PROC 7010- PROC 7050 - At the end of the activity, there should be a “Return to Process 7000”

14. REF8001 - The figure of 1776 for effective hours is different than the 1784 hours used by CEFMS. Please clarify Response: Each district uses a different number, use the value for your particular RBC.

15. REF 8006 - Need to review font and formatting consistency.

16. Ref 8016, Appendix C - If this is a sample, put it in a sample format. As it stands now, it appears to just be narrative. Use an example similar to that used in the Earned Value reference; an example would be very useful.

17. PMBP Flowchart - We learn lessons not just in Execution and Control Phase but in Planning and Initiation Phases as well. For example, handling a customer wrong can lead to the loss of that customer. We have to treat our customers as individuals and this would only be learned through experience (aka "Lessons Learned"). We need links to lesson learned from several sources. Response: Accepted.

18. Need to list Resource Providers in the distribution when the process impacts them. If we list all USACE personnel, then we need to include Resource Providers in that list. Response: Do not want to cross the line of empowered PDT members. Resource Providers need to ensure by ITR the work by their assigned PDT members or play that role themselves.