

CETAC

General Comments:

NJW: Suggest glossary be moved to up front. WHY: Easier to refer to and locate. Can promote gaining general familiarity with terms before proceeding to process and reference sections. Response: The manual is not intended to be printed, it is designed as an “on-line” manual. From every process/reference document, there will be a hotlink to the glossary. In addition, the PMBP home web page will have a hotlinked index to all processes and reference documents.

Suggest sections also be included on MILCON budget and project definition process. What about installation support work, other reimbursable work, FMS work? Why are these not included in the process manual? Response: Info is provided in the military program specific reference document. Additional info will be added to this document to help clarify.

Generally, an excellent how to manual. For the subjects covered, very very comprehensive, step-by-step instructions. Would of course like to see more emphasis on role of attorney advisor and ethics counselor in all processes. Response: These are PDT members, so their roles will not be separated, however, there will be added language on ensuring legal sufficiency where applicable.

Note: very difficult to follow text with all the brackets. Response: Oracle Tutor requires the use of brackets for hotlinks – processes, reference documents, etc. Will reduce where practical within limitations of those requirements.

CMT: I did not see any mention of support agreements as I read through the manual. Response: Language is being added to cover this.

The manual in very comprehensive and will written, I did, however, find it difficult to read due to the bracketed inserts ({}). I found it easier to follow the flow charts rather than going through to verbiage. Response: Oracle Tutor requires the use of brackets for hotlinks – processes, reference documents, etc. Will reduce where practical within limitations of those requirements. We are maintaining flow charts and text to aid in ease of application.

Surprisingly (but happily), I found nothing that was really wrong--that I would change. Therefore you will find my PMBP Manual (file BP RM-F-pk.doc) has no changes to date. However, I have the following general comments.

- **It appears to me that this document was not written to contain all that it might to improve the PMBP with regard to good financial management. Unfortunately, determining what all might be added would require more of my time than I have been able to devote so far. Besides...I may not be fully informed on the intended purpose and use of this document.** Response: This

is a living document and will be continuously modified as needed. You will find that many modifications have been made as a result of the time and effort of reviewers like yourself.

- **Execution seems to be given comparatively less attention than planning. For instance, where does it show the PM (or anyone else) concerning himself as to whether funds provided remain sufficient during execution? Is the PM provided an early warning system that monitors use of funds relative to execution in such a manner that the PM is aware when remaining work will require either a request for additional funds or better cost management? In addition, how does the PM review existing financial obligations to ensure they are expended as planned financially, and not over- or under-stated, or no longer needed at all? Reviewing financial use of funds throughout execution is a PM function, but I don't see it mentioned at all until Activity/Project Closeout (page 138)--when it could be too late! Reviews of unliquidated obligations should be done before closeout! Of course, this may be in there somewhere, and I may have missed it.** Response: 'Change Management' and the thresholds established in 'PMP Development' address these issues. We are evaluating the processes to make sure we cover this issue.
- **The term PDT is used so very broadly it is difficult to determine responsible offices or persons.** Response: ER 5-1-11 empowers the PDT as reflected by these processes. The composition of any given PDT will be determined by the requirements of the specific project/program.
- **Departmental Overhead & Support Service Organizations--this appears to include G&A offices. Phase 2 of P2--when is phase 2 scheduled to happen?** Response: Tentatively in FY 03.

Scope for each section should be very definitive as an example Civil Works and Budget Process sections Scopes all read the same. Response: Additional detail has been added .

CHL Work Acceptance page (page 16?) Distribution: It is not readily apparent what the asterisks mean. What are they keyed to? They occur throughout document. Clarify. Response: asterisks indicate an active actor on a given process. Those listed on the distribution without an asterisk are not actors for that particular process but should be familiar with the process.

CHL More work needs to be done in distinguishing a center from a district, and it should be made clear that a Center (such as Transatlantic Programs Center) generally functions as an MSC, but has some functions similar to a district. The whole document needs to be scrubbed to clarify this. Addition of the acronym, MSC, and the term, district, to the glossary is an opportune place to clear this up. It is critical to clear this up because there are many places where the term

'district' is used and places where MSC is used, with no mention of center. For instance: Response: MSC, district, and center will be added to the glossary. For your specific case, please use the processes for the level of the organization that applies to the particular action at hand.

CL My first concern is that this manual mixes operating procedures and technical procedures. This plan reads like a technical manual. Though I think it is nice to combine in one manual, to interface them in this fashion is cumbersome and confusing. Is it supposed to be a technical manual or a manual on how a PDT should operate? Response: This is a general business process manual which establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. It does not address activities that do not require consistency across USACE. These should be covered by local SOP's. Technical requirements are addressed by specific technical regulations and manuals.

CL This manual is to be the basic process guidance for all COE offices. It appears to be designed, however, on civil works projects.

Was that the intent?? Response: The wording that left this implication has been revised.

CL Should this manual be a guideline that a new PM or KO could pick up and now how to procedure with their responsibilities? Response: No, the PM and KO need to be versed in the specific KSAs for their own positions. This is a general business process manual which establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities, but does not address specific technical or support functions.