

## HQ GENERAL COMMENTS

Sections on communication, QA, Risk and analysis, and change management are well-done, inclusive. Good! **Response: Thanks for your comment!**

Document is very prescriptive. Suggest adding an intent statement at beginning on how to use. Otherwise, in danger of recreating the original PM guidance that established a bloated, bureaucratic, expensive process unneeded for smaller projects. Also suggest adaptation for smaller projects (from any fund/program source—doesn't need to be separate for Military or CW or environmental.) **Response: This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. The level of detail required is dependent on size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects.**

Also suggest including a section explaining Military Prog. Business Process and how we interface with ACSIM, MACOM's, and installations. This is equivalent to the CW processes described in manual. (Although we aren't proponent for military process, we are engaged with Army during process.) **Response: There will be a Military Program specific section.**

Process should consider customer groups and how they prefer to get information on their projects from USACE. In case of Army, project info should link into AKO and installation systems. **Response: AKO and Army systems outside of CAPCES are not being considered at this time for interface. P2 will allow customers to view project information similar to PPDS and will allow customized reports for customers.**

Manual discusses MSC and district roles extensively, but nothing regarding HQ roles or how HQ PM should operate. Suggest adding section on HQ **Response: HQ processes have not yet been written. Please contact the PMT regarding the anticipated completion of those processes.**

I believe the documents reflect the great work of all members of the team on this crucial effort. The team has done an outstanding job. I do not want to detract from their achievement by the comments I have proposed in the attached word document above. I truly mean them to be supportive.

**Response: Thank you for your support!**

My overarching concern is with the O&M Phase of the business process. I truly believe this should be worked now -- simultaneously not sequentially. It is simply too important to delay and I think it is vital to success of the entire effort to unify the Corps across the entire life cycle of project management -- including the O&M phase. I suggest that the IT enabler for the O&M phase is already in process of being implemented -- FEM. I recommend USACE embrace this approach and pursue full court press across all phases of the PM life cycle simultaneously. Recognition and endorsement of this approach could unify the entire effort and speed its implementation. I believe it is critical that the Chief and Senior Leaders across the Corps have the opportunity to validate this concept -- either accept or reject it. Right now, I think we risk sending mixed signals to the work force, OMB, and the Congress. **Response: Concur. The need to incorporate all work is essential to the success of this effort. The system will interface with ABS and FEMS.**

Thank you for your exceptional work and opportunity to provide comments.

**Response: Thank you for your effort.**

## ISSUE

I am concerned that current focus of PMPB and P2 is emulating a stovepipe approach that tends to limit perceptions of applicability. Instead, I believe the intent of PMBP is expansive and all inclusive. The effort should include and roll up all the supporting processes, systems, and efforts required to support and implement PMBP and P2I believe that PMBP becomes truncated if it does not fully include and capture the vital and significant O&M phase of the PM life cycle.

- And without supporting automated systems, P2 will be an empty shell.
- Yet when the Chief and senior leaders are briefed, efforts in the supporting system areas such as FEM are not covered.

Furthermore, I am concerned that instead of approaching Congress with a comprehensive PM approach to implement the PMBP, we are presenting pieces, e.g., the P2 piece (which we convey inaccurately as all encompassing), the FEM piece (which is not linked into the overall

PMBP and P2 as it should be as the enabler of PMBP and P2 in the O&M phase of the project life cycle). .

## RECOMMENDATION

Recommend the PMBP team and process thoroughly review and consider the importance of associated supporting processes and systems, e.g., FEM.

- This capability represents and fully supports the significant portion of the PMBP that applies to and during the O&M phase of a project.
  - FEM and the O&M phase of the PMBP that it supports cover major business areas of navigation, hydropower, parks and recreation, flood damage reduction, environmental stewardship.
  - It also will be the supporting business process enabler for vehicle fleet management, property management, repair parts management.
  - Even more importantly, it will support the key management decisions that must be made to ensure continuing, uninterrupted mission support of our customers.
- The Corps of Engineers in its implementation of FEM is actually acquiring and implementing a Facility and Equipment Management (vs. simply maintenance) System capability.
  - This focuses on the PM work that must be accomplished to support the mission and our customers for those projects that the Corps continues to manage (vs. handoff to customers) into the Operations and Maintenance Phase of the PM life cycle.
  - For our Civil Works projects in particular, this is a significant continuing workload – the heart and muscle of what the Corps stands for and accomplishes everyday across the nation over the long haul for our Civil Works mission and customers.
- FEM should actually be part of the critical path to implementing the complete PMBP across the Corps. **Response: Concur. The need to incorporate all work is essential to the success of this effort. The intent of P2 is to incorporate or interface with many Corps systems such as PRISM, ABS, FEMS etc. There are some systems such as REMIS and HAPMIS that will not be included in the first phase of P2 implementation but sufficient functionality will be present to provide the expansive nature you are seeking compared to where we are today. All HQ processes have not yet been written. Please**

**contact the PMT regarding the anticipated completion of those processes.**

ISSUE: O&M Phase of the PM Life Cycle

The brochure on the PMBP Manual shows the PM Process in phases: Program/Project Initiation; Program/Project Planning (comprised of Project Management Plan Development); Project Execution and Control; Project Closeout. It also shows “Operation and Maintenance Phase” after Project Closeout Phase as “under development”. However, the executive summary of the PMBP Manual states that:

The USACE Project Management Business Process (PMBP) Manual provides the foundation for execution of *all work* accomplished by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The USACE Project Management Business Process Manual establishes Corps-wide corporate business processes ensuring:

- consistency to program and project execution
- focuses on meeting customer expectations
- sets parameters for a tool to measure progress across the entire organization
- enhances our ability to function both regionally and virtually with efficient management of diverse resources

What is the status of O&M Phase? Who is working the development of this phase? How does it relate in a wholistic fashion to the overall PMBP? How does Project Closeout Phase come before the O&M Phase? **Response:**

**There was a recognition early on of the need to involve O&M. However, it was not until recently that an Operations team was formed to develop the required overarching processes. O&M will be included.**

The document should prove to be an excellent reference source when completed and the complete context of the processes are understood. It was difficult reviewing the manual as a standalone document. The relationships with P2, P3e, CEFMS and Oracle Projects are not readily apparent to the reviewer. Consequently, it is difficult to provide complete comments on the

content. **Response: Concur. The AIS are integral to and will be used to implement these processes.**

There were several instances of PMs being identified as being responsible, such as the PMP development. The concept behind our team oriented business process is not to assign responsibility to an individual, but a shared responsibility among the team. Teams need to understand and appreciate that they succeed or fail as a team not as individuals. The development of the PMP is a team responsibility. The PM shares that responsibility, as does every member of the team. The PMs true responsibility in PMP development is in leading and facilitating its development, assuring integration. **Response: Reworded. See master document.**

There were a number of new items that were introduced throughout the manual that should be further explained, such as a Project Delivery Process Review Report, the BP/P2 Program Office, Resource Manager. A careful review of these new items needs to be made. **Response: Concur.**

Projects should be identified initially into the system by the type/source of funding (*U.S. Military, USACE Civil Works or Other*) and then the type of project template to be used needs to be selected (*(1) Military/Vertical Construction, (2) Water Resources related, (3) Environmental or (4) Technical Services (non-construction related work)*). This is different from the current proposed process of selecting the type project (Military, Civil, Environmental or IIS) because IIS projects may be civil or environmental and it is confusing to the data input personnel. **Response: A template for Support for Others will be developed.**

The Project Management Business Processes reviewed from the web site seem to be totally resource and funding requirements and don't seem to provide a continuous flow of necessary specific data and information, services and products for decision making throughout the life cycle of a project (initiation, authorization, appropriations, reconnaissance, feasibility, PED, design, construction, and O&M). **Response: 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.**

Under contract to USACE, LMI developed a series of studies that were related to how we do business (see the attached files). What is the relationship of these PMBP files to the current simplified flow chart.

**Response: Some of the LMI material has been used in the development of these processes. The goal was to develop the best business practices for use Corps-wide.**

Comment: Appears to be a rigid & inflexible process. Leaves little if any room for innovative management or creative thinking. Would suggest up front more leniency in approach and flexibility to change. However, this is a good primer for new employees on the process. It just needs to be less prescriptive and demanding **Response: This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. The level of detail required is dependent on size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects.**

I was pleased to see that the CW Budget process was covered pretty well in the 5 sections devoted to that process. **Response: Thank you for your comment.**

I've looked at the manual as requested and have just a couple of thoughts:

- First, I've long supported the concept of having corporate processes at some level so that work can be shared across geographic boundaries, project progress can be affirmatively measured, funds can be accounted for and information can be rolled up and commitments understood at district/division/HQ levels. Your efforts to achieve these goals are

commendable and I support them completely. **Response: Thank you for your support.**

- However, the manual is very long and very involved. I can't tell you that I fully understand the implications of the processes described or how they will be implemented by hundreds of well-meaning people in the Corps. Can the average person in the Corps understand and implement the processes better than me? Probably, since I'm a dinosaur. However, there are certainly a bunch of below-average folks out there like me. I'm worried about them. **Response: This is a web-based tool and the user will only be viewing a small portion at any given time. It is more critical to be complete than to reduce the size, when the total length will not be apparent.**

I'm also having difficulty correlating the processes describe in the manual to well-understood project phases (in CW those would be recons, feasibility, PED, etc.). Perhaps an explanation would be helpful. **Response: 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations. An attempt was made to avoid duplicating guidance available in such documents as ER 1105-2-100.**

- 
- I've long been concerned about our penchant as an organization to turn project managers into data collectors who spend their time at a keyboard instead of communicating with customers. My fear is that these processes will worsen that trend. **Response: The focus on PDT members is to allow the entry and management of data at the point of ownership of that data. PDT members will share the responsibility for data management, thus allowing PMs to be more effective. This system will also eliminate redundancy in data entry and eliminate the need for data calls.**

I apologize for my comments and realize they aren't particularly constructive. Hope you can use them. **Response: Thanks for your comments. Your comments and those of many others have helped to improve the Business Process Manual.**

1. There has been a great deal of work invested in the manual and the Corps has gone a long way towards implementing a valuable business process. The team should be proud of its efforts as the manual represents an excellent platform for launching the overall PMBP across the Corps.

**Response: Thank you.**

2. The structure that has been put into place within the PMBP is a solid structure that capitalizes on ideas from the field and then builds processes and policies to institutionalize them. In our view, while there was some HQ involvement in the first and second review, there is a fundamental HQ linkage still missing. The piece that has been missing is the overall intersection of HQ policy functions with the ideas being generated from the field. Hopefully, ideas that effect policy (and either set formal policy for USACE or create defacto policy) will get a detailed review by this HQ as part of the final review of this document. **Response: All HQ processes have not yet been written. Please contact the PMT regarding the anticipated completion of those processes**

3. The PMBP also misses out on the opportunity of bringing the processes of the Corps of Engineers more closely in line with the Army and the rest of the Government. Historically, we have claimed to be so different from the balance of the Army, that we had to build business processes and resource structures to manage the Corps. For example, the Corps currently has three work breakdown structures (civil, military, and R&D). Establishing a PMBP across the Corps is a golden opportunity to cause merger of the three WBSs into one WBS – and the resultant business process changes that would be required to each of the functional areas. While this may not be popular in the three functional areas, it is a needed move and will eliminate a great deal of the difficulty that we have with our current stovepipe structure, defending/justifying our resources with higher authorities, and the great difficulty that we have in moving across the boundaries that separate the three areas. In addition, the Corps should implement the Army Management Structure for managing the entire Civil Works program – again, to standardize our process with Army and DoD. The PMBP is a move to standardize much of our business processes within the Corps. However, it ignores standardizing existing processes with the Army, such as by utilizing a common WBS and moving to the AMS on the civil side. These two critical steps would help complete that standardization process. These changes would be massive and require process, system, and cultural changes. **Response: This is beyond the scope that was dictated to the development team.**

**Senior leadership in the Corps would have to reach agreement and provide direction.**

4. The PMBP also misses out on a golden opportunity to maximize the professional resources of district Resource Managers and their staffs. There are many opportunities within the PMBP where RMs can add more value and make an improved contribution to the process. The culture typically guards the critical management processes to include the President's Budget process within technical channels. The PMBP gives the Corps a new opportunity to better employ the expertise in the RM shops. Without question, this is another cultural change that will be hard for the stovepipes to accept.

**Response: Reworded. See master document.**

- Someone on the PDT must be responsible to assure safety and health is integrated into the process through the life of a project. The PM is in a likely position to take on this responsibility. The PMBP Manual never addresses this concept. It is a concern that unless safety is imbedded into the USACE business process, safety will not be truly integrated.

**Response: Reworded. See master document, Safety and Occupational Health Management Plan [REF XXXX]**

- The PMP should include the scheduling and integration of system safety working groups for the projects that need them. **Response: Reworded. See master document, Safety and Occupational Health Management Plan [REF XXXX]**

1. Overall the PMBP Manual provides a useful, if very general, framework for project management and program management activities. **Response: Thank you for your comments.**
2. The roles and responsibilities of the MSC, HQUSACE, and districts are not well defined. **Response: All HQ processes have not yet been written. Please contact the PMT regarding the anticipated completion of those processes. 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations.**

3. The manual is largely focused on budget and financial management with little information on other important business processes.

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

4. The roles and responsibilities of program managers are not clearly distinguished for MSCs. **Response: Program Management will follow the same basic process as Project Management**

5. There is no distinction made between activities of program managers in the execution vs. budget development offices at the MSC level.

**Response: The system is being designed to support all MSC efforts.**

6. There is no discuss or guidance on how the PMBP should be applied to planning vs. design vs. construction vs. operations activities.

**Response: 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations.**

The current flow chart is a good overview for our customers, but it does not identify the key requirements that our in-house PDT needs to successfully execute projects. The PMBP only covers resource and funding requirements, and does not provide the necessary data and information about services and products required to make decisions during the life cycle of a project (initiation, authorization and appropriation, planning, design, construction, operations and rehabilitation). We had a contract with LMI to develop a series of flow charts that relate how we do the PMBP on a life cycle basis (see the attached files). Including the results of the LMI studies would greatly increase the practical value of the USACE Business Process.

**Response: Some of the LMI material has been used in the development of these processes. The goal was to develop the best business practices for use Corps-wide. 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations.**

•

**Response: This is a web-based tool and the user will only be viewing a small portion at any given time. It is more critical to be complete than to reduce the size, when the total length will not be apparent.**

1. Project Management has long been associated primarily with the Civil Works community. The manual appears to perpetuate that mindset -- for example, four separate sections on the civil works budget process and none on military or support for others. **Response: There will be specific processes for all program unique activities. The goal is to provide generic processes applicable to all programs, but to also address unique activities in separate program processes.**

2. The meaning of some of the terms is not obvious to folks relatively new to the process -- for example, Outreach Coordinator. **Response: A glossary will be provided to alleviate this problem.**

3. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it needs to be made clear, early and often, in the manual, the regulation and any other guidance issued on project/program management that the PM does not have to be in the PM stovepipe. The PM may more appropriately reside in other functional areas - - for example, a multi-million dollar project, funded with MILCON appropriations, that is more than 90% land acquisition (little or no construction element), should perhaps be managed out of the Real Estate organization. **Response: Concur. PMs shall be chosen for their skills and abilities to successfully execute the project, without regard to their assigned functional or geographical location (ER 5-1-11).**

## THE MANUAL

The manual is overwhelming and needs to be simplified. The manual expresses the problem of USACE culture today, and what needs to be transformed to achieve a culture that empowers PMBP. The manual is highly detailed, repetitive, and discourages use (the reader = the customer). The manual makes PMBP seem very bureaucratic and that it will add work, rather than make the Corps “more agile”. The manual is two inches thick.

How can we make the manual 1/4” thick? When we achieve that, then we should try to make it 1/8” thick. Then people will read it, and more easily accept and use what it will say. It will read ‘agilely’. **Response: This is a web-based tool and the user will only be viewing a small portion at any given time. It is more critical to be complete than to reduce the size, when the total length will not be apparent.**

## THE CUSTOMER

One of the essential PMBP ideas is that everyone, and the PMBP teams, needs to be focused more on the relationship with the customer and less on the relationship with other stovepipes. How can the team help the customer succeed? That is the question for everyone, not how do I relate to you, and who is in charge? How can *we* help *our* customer succeed? **Response: The customer is an essential member of the PDT. Emphasis has been provided on the customer as an active and key member of the PDT in determining scope and quality for project execution. Your comments and those of many others have helped to improve the Business Process Manual.**

## THE CULTURE

We need to develop a process to change culture. Consistent program and project execution, meeting customer expectations, measuring progress, building teams and functioning regionally and virtually with efficient management of diverse resources cannot be mandated. We cannot mandate changing the culture. This requires strategic leaders to lead in a particular way. Today’s culture undermines and makes PMBP difficult. We need to move from a hierarchical, stovepipe culture of experts who like to work autonomously to a team-based culture that integrates experts’ knowledge to help the customer succeed. Today’s culture is an action-focussed operational culture which allows little time for dialogue and learning. We need a culture which requires strategic thinking at the top and the integration of strategic and operational learning throughout the organization. To achieve this, we must develop a process to change the culture based on these elements:

- A business logic that shows why PMBP is necessary

- A definition of the Corps' ideal future (more than a vision statement)
- Systems thinking, aligning all the parts to achieve the strategic ideal future; a recognition of the different contributions of strategic and operational leaders and a process for their regular interactive planning for culture change.
- Transform work, including organizational learning in the work process; continual organizational learning as a major, regular focus of strategic and operational leaders, including organizational case histories (what we did, what worked and what did not work), best practices; and innovations.

## LEADERS, MANAGERS, SUPERVISORS

We need to select supervisors, managers and leaders with the competence to change the culture necessary to support the PMBP. We have to define the style of leadership and the competencies these leaders must have. We have begun to do this in terms of the learning culture in our draft doctrine, "Learning Culture and Leadership".

## THE WORKFORCE

Developing the workforce toward PMBP. This involves managers taking a much more active role in the development of the workforce. This is not simply sending people to PMBP training. The PMBP curriculum is a good start. But managers need to facilitate PMBP dialogue and learning in the workforce. Managers need to be expected to develop their workforce, *as part of their job requirement*.

## PMBP PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE

The key here is not only the mechanical process of including an objective in supervisors' and managers' performance plans, although this is necessary. The Corps needs to create the expectation that we will implement the PMBP process. First, people must understand, at all levels, what PMBP means and what it looks like when it's working properly. Some case examples of where it has worked well would be very helpful. Secondly, the organization must ensure that the behavior supportive of the PMBP process is reinforced through rewards.

**Response: Concur. The real key to understanding will be in the PMBP curriculum being developed. Training will play a key role in ensuring this transformation takes place.**

FASS:

1. Need to ID the purpose behind ER 5-1-11 and the PMBP Manual. Which do I reference and why? Also, they should list the other in their references. **Response: As LTG Flowers has indicated, this manual is intended to be treated as a doctrinal extension of ER 5-1-11. Refer to Executive Summary of the Business Process manual.**
2. I did not see where we establish the make up of the PDT. Key to success is establishing the right PDT make-up from the start. What guidance is provided? **Response: Please refer to the Team Establishment process.**
3. Does HQ have a PDT or do we simply have PgMs? **Response: HQ may have a PDT for some work, but normally have PgDT's. They will also serve on many District PDT's as a member of the vertical team.**
4. A problem within all agencies is that it is impossible to know who is responsible for what. The only way to eliminate stovepipes is to make it easier to find out who the smart person is on certain issues. I would argue that most of USACE has no clue that Dan Duncan is the PM for PMBP. What is the mechanism for them finding this out? How does Tom Fass find out that Gary Hardesty is the PgM for the Everglades Restoration???

**Response: All PM's will be identified in P2.**  
What does a PMP or QMP look like? Should we have specs that folks modify to suit the requirements? My guess is that we will start with one and then everyone will cut and paste. I just hope that first one is a good one.

**Response: PMP's will be an online document, with capability to publish as necessary. The requirements are set forth in PMP Content. The level of detail required is dependent on size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects.**

**There will be basic templates provided in P2.**

Finally, I believe in Kiss and the fact that no one reads anything. This needs to be simplistic that it will succeed without anyone reading the manual.

**Response: This is a web-based tool and the user will only be viewing a**

**small portion at any given time. It is more critical to be complete than to reduce the size, when the total length will not be apparent.**

**5.**

a. Acronyms and Glossary should be placed in the beginning of the document, with all acronyms and terms of art defined. **Response: There will only be one Acronyms & Glossary. This is a web-based tool; the printed manual was provided for review purposes only.**

b. The manual is neither particularly user-friendly nor well written. It should be written in a manner that team members from all disciplines can more easily understand. **Response: The real key to understanding will be in the PMBP curriculum being developed. Training will play a key role in ensuring this transformation takes place.**

c. Notations should be made on the Table of Contents indicating which topics pertain to either civil or military or both. There are several places where something is identified as being civil, but this isn't always the case for military. **Response: This is a web-based tool; the printed table of contents was for review purposes only. These processes apply to all projects, civil or military, but there are program-specific documents for unique requirements.**

d. Depending on the type of learner one is, the flow charts are very helpful in understanding the narrative portions of the manual. However, the flow charts and the narrative do not always match. If the narrative is intended to expand on the flowchart, it would be helpful to have them using the same reference point numbers (or letters) and process names. **Response: The flowcharts are created automatically from the steps in the narrative by Oracle Tutor.**

e. Use of term "acquisition" to mean contracting" may be confused with acquisition of land. **Response: These terms will be well defined in the glossary.**

f. How have ISO Certifications been incorporated in these processes? **Response: These processes will serve as the over-arching processes for**

**any ISO certification effort. We have both Corps & private industry personnel evaluating the processes against ISO standards.**

g. The Military budget process and SFO budget process are not adequately addressed. (Several comments) **Response: Accepted. Specific processes for both will be developed for the unique aspects of these programs.**

4. h. The placement of project managers in PPMD at the District level should be reviewed organizationally, as this may not be the best way to manage all work. **Response: Concur. PMs shall be chosen for their skills and abilities to successfully execute the project, without regard to their assigned functional or geographical location (ER 5-1-11).**

i. It would be useful if the processes were placed in the order in which they occur. **Response: This is a web-based tool and the user will only be viewing a small portion at any given time. The overall business process flowchart is being reevaluated, also.**

j. The Business Process Manual should outline the process and a Technical Manual should contain the P2/P3e systems process. There is a lot of information in the Process Manual and it may be better to break it down into smaller parts. **Response: Navigation documents, which show specific software functionality, are being developed to augment business processes. These documents will be used to develop training materials.**

k. The Manual contains more business processes that appear to apply only to Civil Works. There is a perception that PMBP is only Civil Works and this re-enforces it. **Response: Many of the documents have been reworded. These processes apply to all projects, civil or military, but there are program-specific documents for unique requirements.**

l. a. Page 34: Because the processes apply to all work, “Civil Works Program and Budget Process” should be replaced with “Program and Budget Process” with subsets for CW, Military, RE, etc. if needed. Alternatively, programs in addition to CW should include processes similar to those for CW in this manual. **Response: Concur.**

m. Under Policy for each of the business processes, an ER and web site to obtain the ER is given. It would be helpful if the name of the ER also is given. **Response: Concur.**

Scanned the 231 page manual, not to mention all the other stuff that's on the website. Candidly, I think we are way off target--It's a great piece of work if you believe that we can establish "the mother of of all process charts" and fit every project within the process. I guess my experience says that customers don't really give a flip about process -- they are looking for results and long-term relationships that come from receiving quality projects on time and within budget. **Response: The need to incorporate all work is essential to the success of this effort. The intent of P2 is to incorporate or interface with many Corps systems such as PRISM, ABS, FEMS etc. There are some systems such as REMIS and HAPMIS that will not be included in the first phase of P2 implementation but sufficient functionality will be present to provide the expansive nature you are seeking compared to where we are today. There was a recognition early on of the need to involve O&M. However, it was not until recently that an Operations team was formed to develop the required overarching processes. O&M will be included. Emphasis has been provided on the customer as an active and key member of the PDT in determining scope & quality for project execution. Based on your comments and those of others, many improvements in this manual are being made.**

In my estimation, effective PM 's are not going to rely on this process manual to conduct their business, the truly excellent ones are out working with sponsors and delivering products and services and adjusting the process as necessary to make things happen. This "manual" will make their eyes glaze over. If we think that this will provide an enduring process that all districts will embrace and adopt, then I believe we are sadly mistaken.

**Response: This is a web-based tool and the user will only be viewing a small portion at any given time. It is more critical to be complete than to reduce the size, when the total length will not be apparent.**

My impression is that the folks who created this document believe that, if followed to the letter, the "process" will deliver great results. Nothing could

be further from the truth. People deliver excellent products and services -- not process. While the process helps define the way ahead I get very uncomfortable when it starts to define specific roles for specific individuals down at the district level -- that's commander's business. One of the things that many folks didn't like about the "stovepipes" was that they compartmentalized too many things. I see the same compartmentalization taking place in the PMBP process -- except its organized differently.

**Response: Concur, people do deliver excellent products and services. This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities, but does not address specific technical or support functions which are well defined in existing policy and regulations. The level of detail required is dependent on size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects. PMs shall be chosen for their skills and abilities to successfully execute the project, without regard to their assigned functional or geographical location (ER 5-1-11).**

My 32 years says (and the events of the last 30 days) reinforce the fact that this world and our business is far too dynamic to believe that we can create the "master" process manual. Better to have highly trained individuals who can use their wits and relationship building skills to deliver the kind of service clients expect under the conditions of the moment. They will tune the process to achieve great results if we let them! Process manuals are great in an unchanging world -- unfortunately that world is a fantasy. **Response: This is a living document and will be continuously modified as needed. We have steps in place to ensure the process manual remains dynamic.**

Bottom Line: My own belief is that we still don't get it. I have the same uneasy feeling in my stomach as when I wrote the HON. Bob Page a few years ago and asked him what he was smoking because PM's didn't have appropriate information systems. Eleven years later we are proceeding at light speed to the other end of the spectrum to developing the "super" PM information system -- which in this world will not be of much use. End of diatribe. **Response: Thank you. You will find that many modifications have been made as a result of the time and effort of reviewers such as yourself.**

I have reviewed the PMBP manual, and find it to be troubling, extremely long on process, and not a practical approach. I believe in the PMBP process, and have applied the principles of team building in most of my efforts. I do not believe this document will improve nor effectively train those who do not currently understand nor practice good management skills.

**Response: The real key to understanding will be in the PMBP curriculum being developed. Training will play a key role in ensuring this transformation takes place.**

I know I'm a bit late with my comments, but things have been hectic. From a very cursory review of the Project Management Business Process Manual, I have to echo the comment I've heard from many others, i.e., the manual leaves much to be desired when it comes to covering our main missions of design and construction. I know it is a "process" manual, but it just doesn't track that "what we really do" is seldom if ever mentioned. There is also no doubt that the sheer volume of the manual is a definite turn-off. Thus, it should be very user friendly so a person is easily led to the section/portion of interest. My cursory review indicates just the opposite. For example, the USACE Project Management Business Process Flowchart (apparently page 15, but unnumbered) that is included after the Preface is not explained in the Preface as far as I can tell, nor does it show up in the Figures or Tables listings. Many of the activities on the flowchart include PROC (assume this means process) numbers, yet when I refer to the manual I can't locate process numbers. No doubt, I'm missing something, but again the manual needs to be structured in a manner to make such things easily discernable. The bottom line is I believe the manual requires quite a bit more effort before it becomes a useful tool.

**Response: This is a web-based tool and the user will only be viewing a small portion at any given time. It is more critical to be complete than to reduce the size, when the total length will not be apparent. Processes and references will be 'hot-linked' to allow simpler use.**

The military, HTRW, R&D specific information is buried at the end. Although there is a section at the end on the Civil Works program and budget process which seems to be on the same footing as the other funding sources, there are 5 sections (pages 41 - 62) in detail in the body of the manual. Why not make the main part generic with the flowcharts noting receive funds and then put each different funding type in a separate section. **Response:** Reworded. See master document.

The part on budget development seems to take place early on, prior to customer scope, the creation of a PMP and the PDT. So the Resource Estimates done by PDT seems to be after you have a project. But you may not really have a project until you get a funding source. **Response: This is a web-based tool, the order in which they are shown in the printed manual (which was furnished for review purposes) does not necessarily reflect the order they follow in the process. Resource estimates will also be accomplished for outyear, unfunded work prior to funding availability. Hotlinks will guide the user to the appropriate part of the manual.**

I guess everyone will understand that not every project will have to have procurement - it could be totally in-house or not covered by procurement, such as real estate disposal and outleases. **Response: Concur. 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations.**

Its confusing to review how MSC and HQ members of the team play in this PMBP...I don't think we should force this into a "one size fits all" but maybe we should have some annexes our supplements on the other echelon involvement in the process. **Response: All HQ processes have not yet been written. Please contact the PMT regarding the anticipated completion of those processes. It is recognized that PDT members may also come from MSC & HQ.**

I can tell that this was generated by SME's for each part of the PMBP, however the whole seems less than the sum of its parts...I sense some parochialism in some areas (e.g. Advanced Acquisition Strategy) and

recommend that a few experienced PMs give the whole thing a scrub as part of this review process. **Response: This is intended to be part of the Corps-wide review process.**

- The Manual does not address many Headquarter actions and responsibilities. **Response: All HQ processes have not yet been written. Please contact the PMT regarding the anticipated completion of those processes.**
- Are their actions needed that will also bridge communication/integration between Civil work and Military programs. **Response: This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE programs. Subteams are evaluating consistencies between all programs; program-specific processes are established only when necessary.**

Identify the corporate HQ behavior and performance standards that are needed to promote corporate integration, and address external environment in support of PMBP. **Response: The real key to understanding will be in the PMBP curriculum being developed. Training will play a key role in ensuring this transformation takes place.**

The manual should address in some way our business processes for development and approval of decision documents (recon, feasibility, GRR, etc.) and development, approval and execution of cost sharing agreements (FCSAs, Design Agreements, PCAs, etc.). These are major milestones in the Civil Works authorization and appropriations processes that need to be recognized. **Response: 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations. An attempt was made to avoid duplicating guidance available in such documents as ER 1105-2-100.**

SUMMARY - My vote is to reassess what USACE is doing in P2 software development. Cut our losses and adopt an existing integrated project management software system. Simplify our process(es). Do not further complicate it/them. Define the output in terms of information required at the various organizational levels [HQ, MSC & District]. Then let the districts & MSCs have latitude for meeting their needs. **Response: P2 and the business process are being created to provide the PDT a tool to manage all work. Data availability to all Districts, MSC, and HQ will be a result of day-to-day management of projects.**

My Specific comments – The document on P2 that we were required to review encompasses **231 pages** and yet it does not include the **Operations Functions of Civil Works (a function that has over ½ of the Civil Works spaces in the field and approximately ½ of the Civil Works Budget- \$2 Billion)**. Many of the pages are flow charts, which presuppose an economy of presentation and there are varying degrees of inconsistency across the many pages. The order of magnitude for the PMBP/P2 Manual will exceed 1000 pages and still not contain the necessary detail to make unlike processes alike so that “one size will fit all.” **Response: This is a web-based tool and the user will only be viewing a small portion at any given time. It is more critical to be complete than to reduce the size, when the total length will not be apparent. This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. The level of detail required is dependent on size and complexity of the project. That doesn’t change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects.**

While I believe that all work can be conceived or conceptually portrayed as being PROJECT Work, I do not believe that all of our projects follow the same process and require the same level of effort to manage. There are significant differences in policies, procedures, funding mechanisms and rules for the work performed by USACE. There is a significant difference in the Project work that is performed at the District, the Division and the Headquarters organizations of the Corps. If there is no difference, Why then do we have different roles & functions for the organizations? My own belief is that our paying/cost sharing customers do not care how we deliver the product so long as it performs according to specifications, and is delivered within some specified tolerance on Cost and

Schedule parameters. **I believe that if we continue developing P2 as I see it evolving, the Corps will spend more energy reporting on how we are internally coordinating our efforts than we do on delivering products to our customers. Response: The basic purpose of the business process and P2 is to provide tools to PDTs and resource providers to allow them to effectively execute their mission. Emphasis has been provided on the customer as an active and key member of the PDT in determining scope & quality for project execution. Based on your comments and those of others, many improvements in this manual are being made.**

I do not believe that the Corps is a Franchised organization [like McDonalds or Burger King] where all elements produce the same product(s) in the same way for the same set(s) of customers, for the same cost/price, etc. Rather, we are an organization that attempts to use the same principles, policies, etc., but we do produce different outputs. To believe otherwise is folly. The facts do not support a contention that all districts look alike, have the same structure, produce the same products, etc. The Corps is a collection of restaurants that produces localized products for the localized markets and environment. A CorpsBurger in Portland might be a Salmon sandwich; a CorpsBurger in Fort Worth might be a Taco, while a CorpsBurger in New England might well be a Clam Sandwich. Why should we believe that by using the same process for everything will produce the desired (localized) results at our individual locations?? **Response: 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations. An attempt was made to avoid duplicating guidance available in such documents as ER 1105-2-100.**

Based on my experience in the Army, the Corps, and Private industry, **I believe that anything that claims "One Size Fits All" in truth fits no one satisfactorily.** I believe that the PMBP/P2 Manual is attempting to create a myth that does not exist. While good intentioned personnel are working their hearts out, History has shown that the Corps is NOT a good developer of Software Systems. It is often said that all we ever learn from studying History is that mankind learns nothing from History. I do not believe that any single district uses the process that is being developed. The described process appears to be based on products produced by teams from different districts writing up how they do it in their

organization. Given that our districts are not franchises, I anticipate problems as we attempt to export a new process across the board. No current district is using the PMBP/P2 methodology that is being generated. I will be happy to provide from my perspective examples of current failures in processes and software currently in use in the Corps that I believe are counterproductive. **Response: The Corps is not writing P2 software; it consists of COTS software. The BP manual and P2 are an output of evaluations done on best practices from all levels of the Corps and private industry.**

From what I have read in the P2 manual, **I am very skeptical that the system will ever be able to exercise the workload balancing/leveling function at any degree of resolution that will have any practical value.** Simply stated, in most cases the Corps does not turn out standard parts/components/products/projects. The Corps is a Public/Governmental organization that has to balance many considerations in the development of its products. There are many intangibles outside of our control and we must fashion compromises on most projects. Getting cost sharing agreements and building coalitions is hard, complex and non-standard work. Profit or cost efficiency isn't the primary concern. I do not believe that our parts are independent and interchangeable, and that the degree of data as currently described in the P2 manual will either be too voluminous to digest at the MSC or HQ levels or will be too macro to be of any practical value at the project manager level in the district. **Response: The workload balancing will be an output of day-to-day management of projects. Also, this is a web-based tool and the user will only be viewing a small portion at any given time. It is more critical to be complete than to reduce the size, when the total length will not be apparent.**

- General comments are to be applied throughout the manual. Recommend using search to find other instances.
- Recommend the “Activity Preface” parag be moved up-front after the “Policy” parag in each section of the manual. **Response: Rejected.**  
**Oracle Tutor doesn't support this functionality.**

This manual is very long. It contains policy, philosophy, guidance, P2 instruction, and process procedures. Recommend you stick with

documenting process procedures. Other documents contain the policies and cultural philosophies. **Response: This is a web-based tool and the user will only be viewing a small portion at any given time. It is more critical to be complete than to reduce the size, when the total length will not be apparent. 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations.**

When I printed the manual the page numbers were not the same as other printed versions in my branch. Didn't realize it until I was almost through the review process. Probably a font problem. Listing the page numbers for comments was useless. **Response: This is a web-based tool and the user will only be viewing a small portion at any given time. Page numbers will be irrelevant. All your process specific comments were captured..**

- “DPM” = Deputy for Programs and Project Management (IAW HR classification standards). **Response: Followed the title in the ER.**
- Outreach Coordinator: Need HQ policy letter or reference to one that states the duties as described in this manual. **Response: Actor removed.**
- HQ/Higher authority upward reporting requirements need to be incorporated into the process steps and flowcharts, especially the mandatory reports/info (data elements/statutory requirements, etc.). **Response: Upward reporting is a by-product of day-to-day project management. Web based reports as well as ad hoc reporting capability will be available.**

Roles and Responsibilities of PROGRAM Managers - Need this developed, as reflected in many comments above, whether MSC/Activity or HQ Program Managers. If Headquarters, need to articulate the ‘rules of engagement’ between the PgM and the RM, duties with respect to the CCG and CMR, and most importantly the authority and responsibility of the PgM in the resource identification, planning, and allocation process. In addition, the PgM has the primary responsibility to establish the Program Delivery Team, and follow with the development and implementation of a USACE-wide Program Management Plan for the assigned program. It is understood that the extent and complexity of the PgMP will depend on the Program

itself, but must be in place. CCG information will derive from this PgMP, as will CMR reporting requirements. PgMs must have access to CEFMS/P2/P3e, as appropriate, for review of data pertaining to their assigned programs. **Response: All HQ processes have not yet been written. Please contact the PMT regarding the anticipated completion of those processes. Thanks for your comments. Your comments and those of many others have helped to improve the Business Process Manual.**

Customer Relations - We should incorporate into our PMBP what information we make available to the customer, whether it be through periodic updates or through PPDS. PPDS should also be made capable of representing the smaller projects, not just MILCON. In addition, we should consider a process to develop a "Program" element in PPDS, which could present to customers a roll-up of specific, high interest Programs. **Response: Concur, PPDS functionality will be available in P2. Program reports will also be available. P2 will also allow us to create customer specific reports.**

### **General Comments:**

1. The Manual represents a tremendous amount of work and effort by lots of people. After nearly 15 years, it is the first substantial attempt to design and document the PMBP in a systematic and detailed manner. **Response: Thanks for your support.**
2. The Manual in its present state both over-reaches and under-achieves. The intent of applying this process to all work at all levels makes it almost impossible to succeed for any work at any level. Almost all of the 'procedures' in the manual really address only the 'classical' engineering, design, and construction' projects. However, the stated application is for all work at all levels. That target definitely is not met by this document. There is little to nothing in the Manual for MSCs, labs, and Headquarters operations/organizations, and non-design/construction work at the district level. **Response: 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations. All HQ processes have not yet been written. Please contact the PMT regarding the**

**anticipated completion of those processes. This is a living document that will be revised and improved as required.**

3. Not only does the proposed PMBP appear to be centered around only 'classical' engineering, design, and construction projects, but around large ones. These are the only ones that can 'afford' the 'full Monty' of sophisticated plans such as:
  - a. Program Management Plan
  - b. Project Management Plan
  - c. Communications Plan
  - d. Safety Plan
  - e. Risk Management Plan
  - f. Quality Management Plan
  - g. Change Management Plan
  - h. Advanced Acquisition Plan

And then it doesn't even include some plans like the construction management plans (e.g., contractor's quality control plan, etc). Our customers and we simply can't afford this 'system' on all work or even on all design/construction project work. **Response: 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations. There is no regulation with regard to documentation for PM. The purpose of this manual is to implement the doctrine set forth in ER 5-1-11.**

4. A complete read of the Manual not only leaves one exhausted, but with a distinct impression that the 'process' has become our 'product'. Full application of this will condemn the PM and the PDT to work for the process, rather than the other way around. That is not good. And the overall process and many subprocesses (e.g., resource estimate development) are simply too complex to be executed consistently in the real world for other than the larger projects at districts. **Response: This is a web-based tool and the user will only be viewing a small portion at any given time. It is more critical to be complete than to reduce the size, when the total length will not be apparent. This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. The level of detail required is dependent on size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects.**

5. The Manual professes to include the customer in the ‘business.’ However, it falls far short in actuality. Were ‘customers’ included in the development? Are they included in this review? We need to walk our talk here, or customers will walk away from us. **Response: The customer is an essential member of the PDT. Emphasis has been provided on the customer as an active and key member of the PDT in determining scope and quality for project execution. The BP/P2 team did include the customer experience in preparing these processes.**
6. The Manual has an inconsistent level of content. One paragraph is at a global level, and the next is at the molecular level. Also, it is unclear whether this Manual is policy, procedures, or practices – or all of the above, or none of the above? It is way too much to be a policy document and falls far short of being a complete procedure or practices document. **Response: 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations.**
7. The ‘policy’ references in the Manual are woefully lacking. Many are simply repeats, reflecting a lack of homework or some other gap. There is only one ‘AR’ cited (385-10) while in reality there are many ‘customer’ and Army regs that are critical to our doing work/business. **Response: Reworded based on specific input from reviewers. See master document.**
8. Basic terms such as ‘project, project life cycle, work’ are not defined in the glossary. Without clear, workable definitions of these, much of the remainder gets fuzzy. **Response: Concur**
9. A significant amount of the text is painfully complex and confusing/confused. See references to Dilbert in specific comments. **Response: Rejected. Oracle Tutor doesn’t support this functionality.**
10. The Manual appears to not be fully cognizant of many other corporate AISs such as REMIS, CACES, RMS, the construction and A-E contractor performance evaluation systems, etc. Teamwork and awareness are needed to put together a true corporate Manual. **Response: Subject matter experts have been identified to assist with the AIS which will be interfaced. Concur with second sentence.**

Appreciate the opportunity to be candid. It is refreshing. My overall impression of the document is that it is overly detailed and simplistic to the point of being insulting (cookbook). This overall initiative of PMBP seems to be heading down the same slope of planning and planning guidance in Civil Works; to the point that it was difficult to tell whether planning was intended to be a tool, a discipline or a religion. **Response: Thanks for your comments. Your comments and those of many others have helped to improve the Business Process Manual.**

Specific comments:

- a. The stated objective and the manual come across as one size fits all. If, for example, this level of detail is required in the future to manage CW O&M projects, then the efficiency of that program would seem to be severely impacted. Another example is on pages 92-93 which discusses bringing in expertise from within the region. International SOF projects, in contrast, and conceivably numerous other domestic projects could conceivably well require that expertise be pulled in from throughout the Corps. **Response: This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. The level of detail required is dependent on size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects.**
- b. Page 12 states that the manual addresses both program and project management. Program management is relegated almost exclusively to bean counting yet we have major customers both regionally and nationally at the program level (i.e. Navigation, Flood/Coastal protection, etc) . This is totally ignored by the manual, yet would go a long way to break down stove pipes and foster teaming both vertically and horizontally. **Response: The manual recognizes that some work will be program oriented as opposed to project oriented. The processes will be the same. PDTs and PgDTs will include horizontal and vertical membership.**
- c. Related to 3(b) above, the PMBP ER identifies innovative technology infusion as a role of the MSC's in PMBP, yet there is no discussion at all in the manual of how this is to be implemented. **Response: 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations. It is anticipate each MSC will accomplish this differently.**

- d. Very little recognition of a vertical teaming requirement (HQ??); particularly so for major/controversial projects. **Response: PDTs and PgDTs will include horizontal and vertical membership. All HQ processes have not yet been written. Please contact the PMT regarding the anticipated completion of those processes.**

An overview of the document indicates that the major concerns are budget, financial accounting and schedule with little if any focus on the results or end product (the facility provided to the customer) and with essentially no mention or recognition of the technical requirements. If this is the intent then the title should be changed especially since the PMBP is suppose to be how the Corps of **Engineers** does business. A review of the index only confirms this. There are over 80 references to “schedule”, over 35 references to “budget” and 25 to “CEFMS”. There are 3 references to “accountant” or “accountants” over 85 to the “project manager” and none to “designer”, “architect” or “engineer”, only one to “design services” and none to “design”. There are two references to “engineering” but both of these are titles; one to Value Engineering and one to Engineering as a division in the district office. There is no reference to “professional”; however on the positive side there are five references to “professional standards” and a number of references to “quality”, and “customer”. Our priorities and emphasis does not appear to match our stated goals. How can we even strive to become “the world’s premier public engineering organization” if the basic document for our business process does not really reference engineering, architecture, design or technical competence and only has one reference to the “expertise required”? **Response: 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations. An attempt was made to avoid duplicating guidance available in such documents as ER 1105-2-100.**

- Index needs format change to more easily identify the major sections of the manual. You have 46 different sections (most with subsections) in

the manual. It is hard to take in all 46 sections at once and discern any real structure of the manual. Recommend you group these sections as appropriate into smaller groups -- thus enabling the reader to better understand manual format (and use the manual). **Response: This is a web-based tool and the user will only be viewing a small portion at any given time. It is more critical to be complete than to reduce the size, when the total length will not be apparent.**

- Are there standard activity lists for the specific processes that people can upload for particular projects? Much of what we do is similar from one project to another. We could avoid repetitive typing (with many opportunities for input errors) and save a good bit of time in the process. **Response: Standard templates will be available in P2 and will allow PMs to copy existing projects.**

#### Antiterrorism/Force Protection (AT/FP)

Comment: There is no real discussion of Antiterrorism/Force Protection in regards to projects. While there are clear cut DoD standards for MILCON, there are no promulgated standards for Civil Works projects. There should at least be something in the PMBP Manual that points the PgM to the resources for AT/FP and a check at the proper point in the process to ensure that the necessary coordination on AT/FP issues has been performed.

The bulk of this manual pertains to the Civil Works process with coverage of Military Programs and HTRW Programs being weak/almost an afterthought.

**Response: 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations. An attempt was made to avoid duplicating guidance available in such documents as ER 1105-2-100. The PDT member from Engineering should address this during the project effort.**

I have a general comment that the process is high level and leaves each of the old stovepipes (such as design) free to develop there own individual sub-processes. We have been working with one of the CADD vendors, that have

a product called Projectwise, that might support a design sub-process, which may serve us well. **Response: 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations.**

1. This manual seems to be written to implement a project where a decision has already been made or where we already have Congressional authorization to construct a specific project. It seems to have been written to implement a project for a non-Federal sponsor or customer. That customer may be the Navy, Air Force or some other interest, but the PMBP Manual does not seem to acknowledge or recognize that the Corps of Engineers foremost work is evaluation of and implements of Federal projects that are developed through a complex and detailed planning process, which upon Congressional authorization are considered for implementation. **Response: 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations. An attempt was made to avoid duplicating guidance available in such documents as ER 1105-2-100.**

2. The PMBP Manual does not seem to assist the planner in helping the planning organization complete the more complex portion of the Civil Works project implementation to define the project, determine Federal interest and get the project authorized by Congress. **Response: See above response.**

3. It is troubling that the group tasked with writing the PMBP Manual choose to disregard numerous comments made by the planning community on the draft ER. A lot of good planners made very good detailed comments to try to redirect this process so that it includes and recognizes the Civil Works planning and authorization process. **Response: The BP/P2 team was not charged with developing the ER.**

4. The flow chart on page 15 seems to start with project implementation. This chart does not seem to recognize, nor does it include the planning and project authorization process. **Response: The planning & project authorization process is part of project delivery and is included in the PDT process of PMP development.**

5. While it certainly could be argued that the Corps Civil Works Planning process is understood to be a “project”, it does not recognize the uniqueness of the planning process, as well as the necessary steps that must be followed by the Corps to approve and authorize projects that could then be considered for design and project implementation. There is not one flow chart in the document that would lay out the planning process. The PMBP Manual is set up show the necessary steps that the Corps must follow to implement/construct already authorized projects. **Response: 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations. An attempt was made to avoid duplicating guidance available in such documents as ER 1105-2-100.**

JENNINGS:

a. First, this manual clearly represents a phenomenal, if not Herculean, effort on the part of initiative team. And, it is a quality product. Having said that, I do have some issues or concerns. **Response: Thank you for your encouraging comments.**

b. In its final iteration, the ER was revised to reflect all USACE's employees' overriding responsibility to represent the public interest. In a clear reflection of that paramount responsibility, the ER revision included this responsibility in the first substantive paragraph (ER 5-7-11, para. 6a). Although there were certain statements included in various parts of the manual (e.g. page 13, preface) which recognize these responsibilities, in my view, the Manual should be revised to include a parallel and comparable statement of this overriding responsibility right up-front, to emphasize it. **Response: The Executive summary and preface are being rewritten.**

c. Further, the Manual included a number of references to the responsibilities of certain elements, other elements -- Office of Counsel --

are not mentioned at all. Although I recognize that the purpose of the manual is not as a laundry-list of directorates or offices, there does not appear to be a rationale for the offices that were listed, and those omitted. For example, on pages 18-20, the process requires determinations with respect to the applicability of the Thomas Amendment. Although this clearly is a legal determination, the process does not require that the Office of Counsel be consulted for that legal determination. Similarly, the manual does not outline how each element's activities dovetails with the PMBP. Is each USACE activity supposed to develop an annex or appendix for each separate element within the USACE activity which outlines those relationships? **Response: The glossary item for PDT will be redefined to include examples of members, such as Office of Counsel. Yes, separate elements will need to rely on local SOPs or develop the SOP if it does not exist.**

- e. The Manual appears designed primarily for field activities executing true projects. Do we really intend or expect that all work performed be subject to the PMBP? For example, if the Office of the Chief Counsel receives a phone call request at 4:00 p.m. one day from a congressional office asking for a drafting service to be prepared and delivered by 5:00 p.m. that same day, do we really want to expend time and effort going through the PMBP process? In my view, the primary value of the PMBP process is for traditional projects which require long-term, multi-disciplinary efforts (e.g. planning, engineering or design, construction, contracting). However, there are other categories of work which primarily involve one or two offices for which PMBP will increase cost and delay completion of the requested product. **Response: All work should be subject to the PMBP. See Departmental Overhead & Support Services.**

I don't have a lot of comments on the Manual and the summary. I note that both are short on any legal coordination - the words "counsel" and "public interest" are never used. "Legal" is used once in a real estate context and once in reference to identification of "professional standards including legal, environmental, economic, code, and life safety" (p.202). The terms "ethics" or "ethical" are also never used. However, on p. 163 there is a statement that "The true USACE customer is the American public." This assuages my concern somewhat about the brochure that you distributed which indicates that the Manual provides for a "Focus on meeting customer expectations." All of us who provided comments on the ER argued hard that customer

expectations cannot always be met because of legal and ethical constraints and because of the larger public interest. Of course, since the brochure is what most people in the public (and the Corps) may see, it is a little misleading. **Response: Noted. The PMBP Curriculum and associated training will help to clarify this at all levels.**

In what instances will we decline work, and how do we deal w/ severe obstacles (ie, insufficient funding) for work already begun? Do we have specific steps to be taken to end Corps involvement in a particular project if at some point it is no longer in the best interests of either ourselves or the customer? Knowing when to be “in” and when to be “out” could be key to the prevention of many legal issues. **Response: 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations.**

What about providing an example of how the PMBP works in ‘real life’? Maybe a good way to start, in order to introduce the PMBP to a completely new user (such as myself) would be a concrete scenario(s) of how this process would run. All the steps would be easier to understand if one went into it with a “picture” in their mind of how this actually works. (This comment reflects input from several others who looked at the manual but didn’t understand the context in which it should be read/applied.)

**Response: Noted. The PMBP Curriculum and associated training will help to clarify this at all levels.**

Why are there two different lists of acronyms? (in TOC and at the end?)

**Response: Reworded. See master document.**

I recommend that a section be added to the document or else the current active reg on the "one and only Corps PM system" be updated, i.e., ER 415-1-14, Corps of Engineers Automated Management and Progress Reporting Systems (AMPRS), dated Dec 86 at web page <http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/usace-docs/eng-regs/er415-1-14/toc.htm>. (see attached file PMBP Adds.doc). Notice I gave P2 and RMS equal billing since we are dealing with two systems, both supported as mandatory data management systems, a project system (P2) and a construction contract

system (RMS). **Response: Comment referred to BP/P2 Development Team.**

This document establishes no means for my DD Form 1391 Quality Assurance Team to register requirements that are badly needed but not part of PROMIS. We will continue to work via e-mail and data calls until a Systems Request/Change procedure is established. For example, the DD Form 1391, Planning and Design Data Sheet is something that the PROMIS system should be providing; and milestones for Environmental Documentation completion must be maintained with data calls (these are but a few examples). Besides systems management (Systems Change Committee) this document needs to talk "Users Groups" and "Steering Committees," rather than missions and functions. I suggest that the existing ER 415-1-14 be updated to give some authority to this whole effort. I have proposed in a separate attachment, a suggested update. The RMS system must be given equal billing as it is the system by all construction divisions.

Note from Mary Nash: Attachment he is referring to related to P2, not PMBP. Document was given to the P2 Project Manager

**Response: Comment referred to BP/P2 Development Team.**

- The Project Management Business Process (PMBP) is absolutely the way USACE should be doing business! While PMBP is a reality in some places, there are still far too many old practices, systems and organizational structures that impede effective PMBP. The fact that we have been trying for so long, and still have not succeeded in thoroughly changing our corporate culture to embrace PMBP, just underscores the need to once-and-for-all do it right -- and make it stick. I respect the hard work put into the present effort to "make it stick." Yet, in attempting to define in great detail a USACE standard for PMBP I fear the proposed manual will do more harm than good. We seem to have fallen into two common traps. These traps are not unique to engineers (but they seem to trap more engineers than most). The first trap is thinking there is one "right way" of doing anything. Therefore, the solution to any problem is to define the "right way" in great detail and mandate that things be done that way. The second trap is thinking

that no one else has ever found the "right way" that fits our situation. Therefore, we have to develop it in-house. The 231-page PMBP Manual seems to be a case study in jumping into these two traps with both feet.

**Response: This is a web-based tool and the user will only be viewing a small portion at any given time. It is more critical to be complete than to reduce the size, when the total length will not be apparent. This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. The level of detail required is dependent on size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects.**

- One of the essential advantages of PMBP is that it enables organizations to be more flexible, adaptable and innovative. The proposed highly prescriptive implementation of PMBP perpetuates the rigid thinking that undermines the flexibility, adaptability and innovation we need. Removing obstacles to PMBP and the broad guidance characterized by the "Just do it" card are far more likely to move the Corps to effective PMBP than a stack of detailed procedures. **Response: This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. The level of detail required is dependent on size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects.**

- A key obstacle to enabling true PMBP across the Corps is the need for HQ to practice what it preaches. As long as we are organized into stovepipes at the top, the stovepipes will impede PMBP from there all the way down through the MSC's and Districts. At LTG Ballard's direction the senior leaders (as the Senior Management Board) examined ways to reorganize HQ. Part of their research included "benchmarking" visits to other government agencies and private firms. One significant observation they brought back was that when they asked the organizations that are the most successful at practicing Project Management where PM was on their organization chart they were told, we don't have a PM box, the whole organization is PM. The HQUSACE reorganization they recommended was a truly PMBP based and fully matrixed HQ structure. I won't presume to

second-guess LTG Ballard's reasons for not implementing their recommendations. And, I honestly believe the changes he did implement were intended to move us away from rigid stovepipes to more corporate ways of operating. However, leaving two PM offices (instead of none); and putting E&C in CW and Strategic Planning & Interagency/International Support in MP (instead of making them resources outside of either major Directorate) did not strengthen our ability to work corporately. It just created more organizational complexity that inhibits our ability to establish PM managed, matrixed HQ teams **Response: HQ organizational structure not part of the BP/P2 team's charge. All HQ processes have not yet been written. Please contact the PMT regarding the anticipated completion of those processes.**

Too much Civil Works focus. Need stronger Military and Support for Others pictures. **Response: Reworded. See master document.** I thought that we were getting rid of the term PMBP because it focused on one stovepipe. That is why we changed ER 5-1-11 to the USACE Business Process. We use terms like PMBP, USACE Business Process, and USACE PMBP here. Still very confusing to some I'm sure. **Response: PMBP is a principle, not an organization.**

PMBP should be replaced with USACE Business Process and throughout the document. Also, is the reference to P2 premature? When is this document scheduled for final approval? When is P2? **Response: P2 will be based on principles in the business processes. Please contact PMT for schedule/approval dates.**

The word "goto" is used a lot. Is this computer flowchart talk or should it be "go to?" **Response: "Goto" is part of Oracle Tutor's functionality, which was used to create the business processes.**

I noticed that the processes have what appears to be a unique number like Work Acceptance (PROC1016). The number is only referenced in the body of the text. Recommend we include this in the title of the activity as well as the flowcharts. **Response: Accepted. Reworded. See master document.**

The flow charts do not flow, pardon the pun. There can be a better job linking the activities together in a much better fashion. Right now it is not a

user-friendly system. The text provides some useful data, the flowcharts provide some useful data but in many cases they are not the same. They are both incomplete as far as providing the same information and providing useful links to the next activity, where applicable. **The flowcharts are created automatically by Oracle Tutor from the tasks in the processes.**

What does “PROC” and “REF” mean? They appear to be activity identifiers of some sort or another. **Response: PROC=Process. REF=Reference document. See PMBP web site (<http://www.hnd.usace.army.mil/p2>) for overview of Oracle Tutor functionality.**

Document is very long and complicated. Need better graphics. May look good in color but can hardly read some of the charts because you end up with black on dark grey. Need to have better integration with the processes so that you can understand where you came from and where you are going. All activities should be linked somehow into the overall process. This is very difficult to put together while reading this document. I think a lack of the corporate process puts the cart before the horse. This document should provide a clear flow showing the processes from HQ to the District. Overall it appears that we are trying to meet a deadline (which we probably have missed) instead of trying to produce a good product. There is too much information missing or still being developed to make this a valid document. **Response: This is a web-based tool and the user will only be viewing a small portion at any given time. There will be hot-links from document to document which will make it flow better. The real key to understanding will be in the PMBP curriculum being developed. Training will play a key role in ensuring this transformation takes place.**

Add a Communications checklist. We have a real problem, now that we have so many small projects, of getting them to remember media milestones. These are part of the Celebrate Success equations. Would like to see their PRB package include:  
PAO-Approved Strategy in Place (in whatever form)  
PCA Signing Ceremony  
Groundbreaking Ceremony

Sponsor Tour 25%

Sponsor Tour 50%

Sponsor Tour 75%

Dedication Ceremony

First Operation Notification

First Year Follow Up

Five Year Anniversary

10 Year Anniversary, etc. We are missing great opportunities to tell project stories when we overlook anniversaries. **Response: Public Affairs, as a member of the PDT, should provide this information to the PDT.**

It is not clear to me yet just what we intend to accomplish with the PMBP. Consequently, I'm having difficulty deciding whether or not this is a good thing to do. **Response: The manual is the implementing guidance of the doctrine set forth in ER 5-1-11.**

I'm stumbling over things like the fact that we don't start the PMP until after we have the project and the funds. To me, that takes away the commitment to the customer, and instead of project management it is a project observation and reporting exercise. **Response: The customer is an essential member of the PDT. Emphasis has been provided on the customer as an active and key member of the PDT in determining scope and quality for project execution.**

I also think that teamwork, while often required, is not an essential aspect of project management. More essential, in my estimation, is personal commitment to customer service and accountability. Without that, there is no teamwork. **Response: The first imperative of the ER is one project, one team, one project manager. PDTs are an essential element of project success.**

I think, too, that if we want this embraced by everyone in the Corps, then we can't name it after a political entity in the Corps, or vice versa. **Response: Project Management is a role not an organization. PMs shall be chosen for their skills and abilities to successfully execute the project, without regard to their assigned functional or geographical location (ER 5-1-11).**

1. General Comment. Complements to the team for an outstanding effort is defining our processes. **Response: Thanks for your support and comments.**

2. General Comment. Recommend an “Introduction” section be added following “Preface” to explain the layout of the manual and the standard layout of each Process Chapter.

a. For example: “The PMBP Manual is divided into chapters that deal with each PMBP Activities identified by [PROCxxxx]. Each Activity Chapter contains sections on Scope, Policy, Responsibility, Distribution, Ownership, Systems References, and Activity Preface followed by detailed Process Steps and finally a Flowchart of the Process.

b. Define or explain the purpose of each section. The purpose of “Distribution” and “Ownership” are not clear to me. Especially the same “Ownership” paragraph seems to be repeated in each chapter.

c. Define or explain: [PROCxxxx], [REFxxxx], [NAVxxxx].

d. Explain that a Process Flowchart is located at end of each section.

f. Provide an explanation of “P2”, and “P3e”.

**Response: Concur. The real key to understanding will be in the PMBP curriculum being developed. Training will play a key role in ensuring this transformation takes place. In addition, the Preface will be re-written. There is an Oracle Tutor presentation on the PMBP website that explains many of the items.**

3. General Comment. Add word “Process” and process identifier to each section heading. For example: Work Acceptance Process [PROC1016].

**Response: Accepted. Reworded. See master document.**

4. General Comment. Distribution Section. What do the “\*” refer to? Provide an explanation in the Introduction Section. **Response: Asterisks indicate an active actor on a given process.**

It is obvious the team has spent many hours developing these procedures. They are to be commended for the effort. Overall the processes are well stated and generally accurate. **Response: Thanks for your support.**

The procedures are written as if they are intended to be used to prepare an AIS and not as a guide for USACE personnel to use in implementing the PMBP. The manual should be rewritten/revised so USACE personnel in implementing the PMBP can use it as a guide. Use of the manual to prepare the AIS should be secondary to providing a guide for USACE personnel. **Response: The original BP team was charged to do as you stated, but after several months in this process it was obvious that the BP/P2 needed to be one team. We could not provide an adequate AIS without defining the business processes. The incorporation of many comments has improved the processes.**

The procedures described in the manual read like a narrative flow chart. This makes the description of the procedure very difficult to follow and understand. The narrative should be revised to flow more smoothly and to be more easily understood by the PDT member attempting to follow the proper procedure. **Response: The BP/P2 team was aware that people process information in different manners, therefore the information was provided in both a text and flowchart format (Oracle Tutor).**

The procedures described document specific individual unique processes associated with our entire cradle to grave project delivery. This method of documenting processes gives the perception that we are attempting to functionalize our processes and move away from the team concept. The detailed roles and responsibilities defined in the processes add to this perception since specific functions or positions are tasked to do specific activities. There is no overall documentation that defines our cradle to grave process for delivering a project. The documentation needs to be revised to remedy this situation by being less directive concerning the specific functions or positions responsible for specific actions/tasks and by providing an overall cradle to grave process that walks a user through our entire delivery process. **Response: 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 which are well defined in existing policy and regulations.**

Who, what and where is the BP/P2 Program Office. None exists. This needs to be addressed as a policy matter before it is placed in the manual.

**Response: This has been changed to the Configuration Management Board and the board defined in the glossary. This is a living document and will be modified as needed. The Board will be responsible for incorporating future changes.**

The manual defines positions, organizational structure or boards/panels for various processes. The manual should not attempt to define how the Commander organizes to accomplish a process. The manual should only define the process. Let the Commander define how his organization should be staffed and organized to accomplish the process. Revise all processes that dictate a Commander's staffing or organization. **Response: The manual provides the best business practices throughout the Corps and although it requires some boards/panels (most are already in existence), it does not dictate the structure of those organizations, allowing commanders to make their own call with regard to staffing.**

There are numerous sections that do not define processes. These may be appropriate for inclusion in this manual, however, if they are included, they need to be defined and placed in the proper context at the very beginning of the manual. If their purpose in the manual is not defined at the beginning their inclusion will be confusing to users of the manual. **Response: Reference documents are included in the manual. The purpose of these documents to augment the business processes.**

- Although the title shows this to be a USACE document, the content repeatedly references Civil Works budgets and activities. Need clarification. **Response: Many processes have been reworded to make them more generic.**

- I didn't find a clear description of the application of this tome to HQ matrix team management. Suggest a HQ annex. **Response: All HQ processes**

**have not yet been written. Please contact the PMT regarding the anticipated completion of those processes.**

- If we are to effectively apply the PMBP to HQ management and special initiatives having a site licensed software package, like Microsoft Project or something even simpler, seems appropriate. Training should accompany introduction of the software. **Response: The real key to understanding will be in the PMBP curriculum being developed. Training will play a key role in ensuring this transformation takes place.**

- This 231 page document is far more detailed than it needs to be for most of us headquarters types, and as noted above I don't feel it adequately addresses much of what we do in HQ. **Response: This is a web-based tool and the user will only be viewing a small portion at any given time. It is more critical to be complete than to reduce the size, when the total length will not be apparent. All HQ processes have not yet been written. Please contact the PMT regarding the anticipated completion of those processes.**