

## CELRD – Overall Comments

Number	Comment	Annotation
1	<p>Need a new process titled: Regional Workload Analysis and Resource Leveling – Scope - Should read: This process covers the general process by which the Regional Management Board (RMB) accomplishes workload analysis and resource leveling for the region. - Workload analysis and resource leveling at the regional level involves the Programs Management office, Resource Management Directorate as well as the Business Management Office. The responsibility paragraph under "Command Workload Analysis &amp; Resource Leveling" implies that the Business Management Office in the MSC Headquarters is solely responsible for "workload analysis and resource leveling" for the RMB. The BMO does have a role to play in this analysis in looking at the strategic plan of the region and what skills are needed to meet future mission requirements, particularly with outreach efforts, but the Programs Management Office and Resource Management Office have important roles in this process that need to be delineated. Analysis of program dollars available is the responsibility of the Programs Office. . Analysis of manpower/FTE is the responsibility of the Resource Management Manpower Officer. In our current environment there are no tools available to roll up resource requirements at the MSC/Regional level other than thru the Command Operating Budgets. If P2 is going to give us the ability to analyze manpower/FTE requirements at the regional level it should be the responsibility of the Manpower Officer in Resource Management. We should not be fragmenting responsibilities for functions between different organizations. The Manpower Officer has responsibility for FORCON and CERAMMS and should have responsibility for all "manpower/FTE" analysis. This process at regional level also needs to be tied into and linked with the Command Operating Budget Process.</p>	<p>This was discussed at the RM conference and it was determined that the existing processes will be sufficient.</p>
2	<p>Gibson, when citing a regulation in the Policy section, recommend that the name or the subject of the regulation be included or a separate appendix be added to the manual with all of the regulations listed with the name or subject of the regulation. - Having the name or subject of a regulation listed along with the number of the regulation makes it easier to research for a topic or subject. If it's not feasible to include the subject every time a regulation is listed in the "Policy" section it may be easier to just have a separate appendix with the number and name of the regulation and keep the Policy section with the number only.</p>	<p>Every cite in the on-line manual will have a hyperlink to the regulation or reference. The goal is to move away from the paper manual to the on-line manual. Titles will be added.</p>
3	<p>While overall project success is measured by the goals and expectation in the PMP, it may be possible to establish internal goals and expectations for each procedure. - Measuring each appropriate procedure against a standard would provide the information necessary for continuous improvement. For example, in Proc 1016 perhaps the best metric for this process would be elapsed time. If the entire process took over 60 days say, the process and internal procedures could then be reviewed for improvement.</p>	<p>Part of Continuous improvement This is a living document and will be continuously modified as needed. You will find many modifications have been made as a result of the time and effort of reviewers like yourself.</p>

4	Acronyms should be listed in one place and be consistent. - PBAC has been defined three different ways. See pages 11, 143 and 160. None are the same.	Concur
5	It is somewhat disturbing that the bulk of the activities in the areas that I reviewed are at the HQs and District level - has the MSC disappeared??	This is oriented toward projects (therefore districts). However, it does not address all activities. The programs that are managed by MSC and HQ are governed by these processes, but at the programmatic level rather than the project level.
6	Recommend a staff briefing to describe what is intended by the Project Management Business Process (PMBP). This would help to educate the majority of the staff as to what the initiative involves and what all the components. After initial review of the draft manual I was left somewhat confused as to what is intended and why even needed.	Concur - There will be an entire curriculum associated with familiarizing all personnel with the PMBP and the USACE BP Manual
7	A simple introductory paragraph is needed to explain briefly what each of the table of contents subject covers. The manual is currently too detailed and very confusing as to what each section covers. Simple flow diagrams would help.	Concur
8	The table of contents could be shortened by not repeating the Scope, Policy, Responsibility, Distribution, Ownership, System References, Activity Preface headings for each section.	Concur
9	Figures list is incorrectly done. You have multiple figure numbers repeated. The pages are out of order and the figure on page 15 is omitted.	Concur
10	Tables page should include all tables and their titles to assist user.	Concur
11	The text that is included for each process flow should include additional detail over and above that listed on the flow to help explain the steps. Many flow blocks are the same wording as the text. The text could better explain what happens when a process owner has to loop back to a step. What needs to change to re-enter the step and not simply get the same output. I.e. If funds are not received and you have to go back to an earlier step, do you need to change the scope of the project, write a new proposal or what? Without added words you have a "don't loop."	will evaluate.- Additional verbiage was added to clarify the purpose and responsibilities of the actors.

12	The instructions on how to enter the data into systems should be made a separate document or handbook to the manual. The manual is designed to assist the users understand the process. The handbook would be referred to for how to enter exact data into a program or database.	Concur
13	Make sure all flowcharts have their process number and titles printed conspicuously on the page.	This is intended to be web-based tool and the titles will not be required since each process will be viewed independently.
14	I have a problem with the uses of the term "quality" throughout the manual. The words sometimes refer to levels of quality. The term quality is more correctly used to describe the adherence to a set standard or set of requirements. What is changed is the grade of materials or other requirements not the level of quality. Quality exists or it doesn't.	Reference ER 5-1-11 Quality expectations need to be negotiated among the PDT members (including customer) and are set in the PMP
15	I am in agreement with him regarding BMO Involvement and the addition of RM and PM. We need to use the 3 year COB Process in lieu of the Quarterly Triggers Value Chart and the associated process. In the development of the 3 year COB, the district is responsible for putting it together and submitting up to the MSC. The organizations referred to above are responsible for evaluating the district submission and making a recommendation to the RMB.	Process modified to show RM as a player in the process.  Quarterly trigger were determined to be best business practice. 3 yr COB can be used in addition.
16	We probably won't agree on some of the issues regarding "Workload Analysis and Resource Leveling" but I wanted you to see what I said. In the manual there are two processes dealing with workload analysis. The first is "Project Workload Analysis and Resource Leveling, PROC1014" and the second is "Command Workload Analysis & Resource Leveling, PROC1024". In my opinion both of these are district level responsibilities but the manual appears to give primary responsibility for both processes to the Business Management Office which is an MSC level organization. I believe Project and Command level resource issues are the responsibility of the District Commander and only become an RMB or Division issue when they have regional implications. I think the manual needs another process called "Regional Workload Analysis and Resource Leveling" in which BMO, Programs and RM at Division level all have a role. Programs should have primary responsibility for program dollars, RM for manpower/FTE resourcing issues and BMO for the strategic part for future missions, skills, etc.	This was discussed at the RM conference and it was determined that the existing processes will be sufficient.

17	I am confused in reading many of the sections and paragraphs because it is not clear as to which organization (HQ, MSC District) or program (Military, SFO, Civil Works etc) the narrative applies. There is some guessing as to what is intended, perhaps I misunderstand of the the PMBP process and roles etc. Suggest that the scope and responsibility paragraphs contain more explanation to increase understanding and decrease misunderstanding about the process and requirements.	Scopes and responsibilities reworded
18	Document Organization: It appears that most of the document is organized conceptually according to the flow chart on page 15, but this is not readily ascertained. Recommend major headings in the table of contents be the same as the process phases, with subtitles below such that the document is less confusing and looks less redundant.	Concur
19	Recommend including a bibliography.	Every cite in the on-line manual will have a hyperlink to the regulation or reference. The goal is to move away from the paper manual to the on-line manual.
20	Recommend for focus groups to form for O&M, regulatory and emergency management to determine how these programs should operate by PMBP. Recommend that these programs not be required in the majority of cases to operate in a project orientation, but rather in a program orientation. While the PMBP manual applies directly to military and civil works major construction programs, the effort required to apply the PMBP in a project- oriented fashion would not be cost effective. Environmental stewardship activities and operations of locks, dams, hydropower plants, recreation facilities do not fit the mold cast by the manual in terms performance of individual activities, closeout, etc. However these activities need to be planned, managed for risk and controlled for quality, cost and schedule. We need to make this useful and applicable, which could help solve many of the issues plaguing us now in Operations.	Concur - Ops should be handled as a program, note that the PMBP and the supporting USACE BP Manual directly applies to all work.
21	Portions of the document do not seem written to support internal customers, for instance, could not find discussion of handling of 100% federally funded FAD \$ acceptance, .	Not all district activities are addressed, some are below the line.
22	Regulatory Office has some unique processes that do not follow the PMBP. One large source of funds, customer definition is different, etc.	Need to handle regulatory as a program, note that the PMBP and the supporting USACE BP Manual directly applies to all work.
23	Ownership portion confused many.	Concur - will be revised

24	Need to communicate what will be trained, when, how.	Concur - Part of PMBP Curriculum
25	The processes seem to indicate PM's have to be experienced and knowledgeable in all facets of Corps business, with a sound background in budgeting, scheduling and planning. Current job recruitment actions do not support this.	PMs do need to be well versed in all those subjects and are being trained as needed. PMs also have the resource of the PDT SMEs to draw on to get the necessary expertise
26	I found the Manual extremely difficult to comprehend. It was especially difficult to determine how and where the technical organizations will fit. It appears to create massive new requirements for electronic data keeping and seems to put additional burden on not only the PM's but also the technical organizations. It creates several new positions/boards/committees with new oversight and decision-making roles. It appears (from a layman's view) that the primary purpose is to create a database solely for the purpose of having the database. While I am not a party to the estimated costs of implementation/operation, these costs will be significant and this is at a time when we are seeking ways to reduce costs of doing business. Speaking as the chief of a technical organization I found nothing in the Manual that I consider an improvement.	There are levels of work in the district below the level of this manual. There was no attempt to dictate how work below the line would be accomplished.
27	Documentation requirements appear to be extensive such that the work loads of LRN PM's would have to be reduced or a special cell of support staff created to handle documentation.	This may be required. It is a below the line district decision. There will be a transition phase from out-moded spreadsheet-type databases, but ultimate documentation requirements will not be beyond what they are today and will assure compliance with ER 5-1-11
28	The level of detail of the processes delineated in the manual keeps the PM focused on the minutia of management rather than giving him more freedom to be creative.	Actually the system we allow the PDT to be more effective in managing. In reality there is no more required here than is in the ER and the system will facilitate that use. Level of detail is in line with requirements of ER 5-1-11.

29	The manual does not adequately address the role of first line supervisors.	The BP Manual addresses the roles of required personnel in execution and application of the PMBP. The BP Manual is not intended to be a job description or checklist for job duties.
30	The focus of the manual appears to be on management of the PM business process by higher headquarters rather than empowering the project manager with broad authorities to execute his/her duties.	Do not concur. The manual addresses the entire spectrum of effort by the PM, PDT, the MSC and HQ
31	There appear to be many areas that will need to be modified to effectively adapt the PMBP to the O&M Arena. None of these suggestions violate the plan, but they might challenge some existing beliefs.	Noted - Education issue
32	The first challenge to conventional thought is that an O&M program manager, and probably even the Outreach Coordinator for O&M Projects, should be in Operations Division. In Locks case, a work request is probably going to come from a field employee who either directly sees a need or has been notified by one of the users of the project. This external notification might come from direct contact, comment cards, or some other means. Once the District Office has been notified, it seems reasonable that the Outreach Coordinator for O&M be in Operations. If necessary, to be decided by the project's complexity, size, or ownership, the project can then be assigned to a PM in PPPM.	Concur - Reworded to allow districts flexibility. The BP Manual does not intend to direct staffing at the district level. Changes will be made accordingly.
33	The PDT for O&M would probably be made up from Operations Personnel as well.	The BP Manual does not intend to tell districts where PDT personnel should be pulled from. PDTs are fluid, absorbing and releasing necessary personnel throughout the life of a project.
34	I like the necessity of a formal PMP. The owners (field people) will appreciate knowing they have something to point to if they think the work progress is not following what they expected.	Noted

35	There seems to be very little guidance on O&M line items. Perhaps that's why PPPM has never pushed too hard for control of this money. They don't want to mess it up.	Noted - Ops can be accomplished as a program. The BP Manual does not intend to tell districts who should manage funds. District flexibility is maintained at every opportunity.
36	Will emergency work be covered by the fact that the budget is a living document? We can currently move funds with relative freedom.	It is in the flexibility of the system
37	If this manual truly does incorporate all work, it needs to incorporate in its discussion how we would react at 0945, 11 Sep 01, to activate the EOC, accept funds to deploy people and roll the RRV down the road in a matter of minutes without performing the Workload Analysis and Resource Leveling module, Initiating a Project in P2, Customer Scope Definition and a few other of the requirements in order to be responsive to the American public. No Emergency Management activity is even alluded to in the processes described in the manual.	Obviously, situations dictate that that some work will require expedited process. However, the work will still be part of a project/program. Pre-placed plans will be in existence just as they are today. Management and execution of them will be IAW the PMBP. "All work" is "all work".
38	This takes to the extreme the situation we've come to expect at our field offices – more and more work being pushed down with no accompanying reduction in other requirements. Our OM's, 2nd level supervisors, budget technicians and office assistants are facing the daunting task of spending more time inputting data, which in the end does not help them accomplish their real job – executing the O&M program. OMBIL, FEMS, new SPS requirements and simply trying to log on and get an AKO account are all being mandated at the same time. We have passed the point of diminishing returns.	As systems are linked and interfaces established, there will be a need to enter data only one time. The goal is to minimize data entry
39	I see in many parts of this manual “interface under development.” If this system is not fully operational when fielded, it will be a massive task to correct data, after the massive task of inputting it initially. I was a participant in the Beta test when CEFMS was originally fielded for the 1st time in an operational district, and the inadequacies of that system as it was given to us nearly drove the district to its knees. We don't need to make the same mistake again, although all appearances indicate.	Noted - Concur

40	While much has been made of capturing all work in the PBMP, this manual, as currently written, uses the current concept of a “typical” project to diagram the work process. In today’s lingo, a “typical” project bears no relationship whatsoever to an operations project, or a regulatory program, emergency management or many of the inter-office requests for work that the PBMP is trying to capture. The manual needs to relate to all current conditions.	Concur- We recognized that some work will be program oriented. BPs address all work but do not try to provide individual processes for every activity. The BPs provide processes that apply to all work directing execution and application of the PMBP. Providing individual processes for all activities would defeat the "corporate" approach.
41	Ref comment immediately above, there are many processes in this manual, such as “Initiating a Project,” that would not apply to currently operated projects funded with O&M. The manual needs to be re-worked to address these irregularities.	In this case it would be initiating a program (education issue) and work is being defined, see comment above.
42	I hope nobody, when chain-teaching the PMBP, is faced with the question of how is this going to be implemented and then innocently holds up a 231 page manual. I would like to hear that explanation.	Noted
43	I find it fascinating in this day of dwindling resources that we are creating more boards, more meetings and more top-down oversight. There is some mention early on in the document about empowerment, but I think that urge is sufficiently quashed by the requirements of later chapters in the manual.	Noted - We need to educate the difference between oversight and approval. . There are no new boards created in the BP Manual. Misunderstanding may occur with current vague-ness on level of particular meetings and/or boards. This will be clarified.
44	Will internal work, i.e. work asked by one technical element of another (such as design work for a paint job or preparation of a solicitation) have to go through these processes? What about accepting funds from an outside agency (TVA) to perform a piece of ongoing maintenance – will that have to go through the Receipt of Funds module?	The ER is clear that all work will be accomplished using this process. In the area of work to other organizations, they will activities unde rthe project, not new projects.

45	Adherence to all of the processes outlined in this manual, while slightly possible for PM's with only one or two projects, appear virtually impossible for PM's with more than a couple of projects. The required data input is reminiscent of the days of LRS. LRS was a data management system that very few people actually used as a management tool, yet its upkeep required a large amount of every PM's time. Will the data input requirements in the PMBPM have a B/C greater than one?	Needs to be evaluated at each district as the PMBP is deployed. There is an assumption that empowered PDTs will also be engaged in data entry. . This is a BP system, established to implement and execute the PMBP, supported by an AIS designed specifically for that purpose. It is anticipated that this new system will be more efficient rather than less.
46	The manual constantly has references such as [PROC1014] but I never saw these cross-reference numbers on the procedures.	In the web-based version all the references are hot linked. Procedures will be cross referenced and titles will be used.
47	PM responsibilities, collectively, appear to be burdensome and unworkable. The PM responsibility for any one activity in the manual may not be that great, but taken in total, the requirements are very significant. The result could be a return to the 1988 era of project management, where the PMs spent the large majority of their time at a computer doing reports and relatively little time doing more productive PM activities, working with team members and the customer and resolving issues. Certainly, other PDT members can assist the PM with these responsibilities. However, it is unrealistic to believe that other PDT members are going to carry out a significant portion of the requirements assigned to the PM. This comment is not only valid for PMs of traditionally PM-managed projects, but even more true for those work activities that have not been traditionally PM-managed. Those new PM or PgM managers are going to be overwhelmed with the responsibilities assigned to the PM in this manual.	It is recognized that this requires a Culture change of organization. This does not expand upon the PMs duties. It follows the PMBOK and best practices of project management. Accurate workload analysis and management will be one of the benefits of the new AIS. This will be an on-going effort of analysis and fine-tuning to meet the needs of our missions.
48	The roles of Project Manager (PM) and Program Manager (PgM) are confusing and conflicting. Some parts of the guidance assume that the duties are essentially interchangeable, depending only on whether a project or a program is being managed. This seems appropriate. However, other parts of the guidance appear to use the term to apply specifically to the position that is currently Chief of Programs within PPMO organizations. For example, Ref 1011, Contingency Funds, Project Level, provides for very different duties for the PgM than the PM.	The glossary will provide definition of PM and PgMs, recognizing in the PMBP, there are instances where PgMs will do thing very similar to PMs for some programs.

49	<p>PM requirements are very significant and will add greatly to the burden of getting the work done. While these processes may give us the ability to assimilate all aspects of projects, some customers may not feel that value has been added, only cost. These requirements might also discourage anyone from considering work as a PM. I am overwhelmed with the PM responsibilities.</p>	<p>Needs to be evaluated at each district as the PMBP is deployed. There is an assumption that empowered PDTs will also be engaged in data entry. This does not expand upon the PMs duties. It follows the PMBOK and best practices of project management. Accurate workload analysis and management will be one of the benefits of the new AIS. This will be an on-going effort of analysis and fine-tuning to meet the needs of our missions.</p>
50	<p>The roles of PM and PgM are unclear. My assumption is that any work that cannot meet the requirements of a Project will be considered under the Program heading. All work will be accounted for as a Project or a Program.</p>	<p>The glossary will provide definition of PM and PgMs, recognizing in the PMBP, there are instances where PgMs will do thing very similar to PMs for some programs.</p>
51	<p>The Preface notes that the "Manual defines the minimum standards for project data requirements". I hope that these are much more than "minimum" and that we consider phasing some requirements. Implementation will require extensive training and cultural changes.</p>	<p>There is a phasing process. The minimal is define to meet upward reporting requirements and will allow districts to add information not monitored at higher levels and concur with training &amp; culture issues. The BP Manual will define minimum standards for project data requirements. Additional information can be added at any level or for more complex programs and/or projects.</p>
52	<p>This system appears to be another database storage system like REMIS and CEFMS. The original design and testimony regarding REMIS and CEFMS was that each employee would enter data and/or interact with REMIS and CEFMS. Instead less than one-third to one-half the workforce utilize these systems. A large demand on a select minority of the workforce will occur to populate data into the systems to keep them operational. Large database systems are totally dependent on data input to keep current with day-to-day activities or the system is will not be reliable.</p>	<p>Concur it is a database system that interfaces with other systems. Since system will be used for day-to-day management of projects/programs data should be reliable</p>

53	A critical lesson learned from REMIS and CEFMS is that a great deal of time and feedback is needed from potential PMBP users on output from this system. Reports and data queries need to be user friendly, flexible and accurate. Otherwise, Districts and Divisions will expend funds to create report systems (i.e., SQL queries, Oracle reports, Microsoft Access reports) to extract the data from PMBP as they did for REMIS and CEFMS.	Concur - Common reports will be created and ad hoc queries will also be available. The key is to eliminate data calls to the field.
54	PMBP system will contain a large amount of data. Because of the vast amount of data in REMIS the Real Estate Directorate created a consolidated version of REMIS for corporate managers to use: RECIS. The implementation of REMIS and CEFMS required thousands of hours of data input and contract work to bring the systems on line.	Noted
55	The Desk Manual for each of the roles (PM, PgM, PRB, etc.) does not match the references in the Index in the back of the PMBP manual. Those serving in these roles need to know EVERY instance in which they play a part, not just some of the tasks.	Concur - There will be a roles and responsibilities section.
56	Many people were very dedicated and worked long hours to implement REMIS and CEFMS. There were many successes and failures in implementing these systems. I would recommend that the PMBP teams contact those System Administrators, Trainers, and Project Managers in Districts, Divisions, HQUSACE to learn from the successes and not repeat the mistakes.	Concur - This has been done especially with CEFMS
57	Many of the steps identified in the PMP Development, Customer Scope Definition, and Team Establishment sections are standard operating procedures or normal thought processes; however, the time involved in additional documentation will be very costly and having very little value added. Examples of additional work are as follows: change management "what if scenarios"; risk management on small projects, and the communication plan.	These are corporate standard operating procedures. It is recognized that the level of effort will be connected to each project and will vary by project

58	Project managers will not be able to handle as many projects; thus additional FTE's may be required. Our customers are having a hard time paying for our projects as it is. We need to be looking for ways to streamline our process.	Needs to be evaluated at each district as the PMBP is deployed. There is an assumption that empowered PDTs will also be engaged in data entry. . This is an effort to standardize our corporate processes. This should not expand upon the PMs duties. It follows the PMBOK and best practices of project management. Accurate workload analysis and management will be one of the benefits of the new AIS. This will be an on-going effort of analysis and fine-tuning to meet the needs of our missions
59	The entire document seems to be written by an individual with expertise in developing computer logic code. My first concern was that we were being locked in process so tightly that technical, administrative, and managerial judgment would not be effective. However, upon further investigation, that is not the case. For instance, on page 87 in "Customer Scope Definition", the role that the customer plays in decision-making is determined by the Project Manager through negotiation.	Noted
60	Congressional Adds - These are only addressed three times in this document which concerns me since they are a significant source of our workload.	Noted - congressional adds clearly fall under "all work" and the BP applies to all work
61	This adds to the duties of PM, some of whom will have to give up some projects to conform to this new process. It looks like we need a budget analyst for every 2 PMs to take care of all these requirements, and to let the PM have a little time to do productive work in executing their project(s).	Needs to be evaluated at each district as the PMBP is deployed. There is an assumption that empowered PDTs will also be engaged in data entry. . This is an effort to standardize our corporate processes. This should not expand upon the PMs duties. It follows the PMBOK and best practices of project management. Accurate workload analysis and management will be one of the benefits of the new AIS. This will be an on-going effort of analysis and fine-tuning to meet the needs of our missions
62	We also put in a ten year budget, which includes activities that are not currently underway. Who is responsible for getting this into P2? The Program Manager?	The PDT develops the entire project. It is recognized the level of detail for out-year work will be limited

63	Recommend including numerous checklists, e.g. PMP content; considerations for AAP; QMP considerations; use sample or standard formats when ever possible. Change management form is a good example.	Good idea, but a below the line issue
64	Software development and implementation is generally designed to improve and gain efficiencies with respect to current business practices. The PMBP business practices manual is flawed in that it is founded upon an automated information system that has not been deployed. The manual should be founded upon current business practices and then revised/updated as new tools are deployed. I.e., How should we be conducting business today?	Actually the PMBP Manual is setting the process which the software will be designed to support. The business process should drive the AIS, not the AIS driving our needed process. The manual will establish how we will do business and that will be different from today
65	The goal of the PMBP should be to give the project delivery team the tools they need to succeed.	The goal of the PMBP is to transform our culture and the approach to project management within USACE. Provision of tools to the PDTs which will foster success is a part of that over arching goal.
66	In the Corps of Engineers we deliver products and services. However, the manual is skewed and tends to address in detail the Corps' business practice of delivering products. It is relatively silent on our regulatory mission, emergency mission, and operation/maintenance mission. The application of the manual should be clarified.	The manual applies to all work including programs such as OPS, regulatory and EM.
67	An area where our performance is poor, is vertical integration of the project delivery team. Action items often sit in higher authority offices unresolved for weeks. The manual is silent on this issue.	PDT responsible for ensuring their products are delivered. In these cases the HQ will be part of PDT and therefore need to meet their requirements to support the project.
68	The manual is relatively silent on the role and responsibility of the PRB. This board should have a stand alone chapter.	The manual allows for flexibility of each district to define the roles of their PRB. Unless we want to make all PRBS the same , this is a below the line issue. Note that the manual provides PROCESSES; not a how to make a PRB manual.

69	The roles of the RMB, BMO, RBC, RAPB, AAPB, PRB are not clearly defined with respect to each other.	The BP Manual provides corporate level processes; it is not a how to manual for fielding an RMB/BMO/RBC/etc.
70	Within the document the Procedures and Reference Documents are not identified by their number and are difficult to locate. Procedures and Reference Documents should be differentiated.	Concur
71	How are the initial scope and PMP development funded?	With project funds. This may come from seed money in the district or from overhead for outyear projects, but the effort will be extremely limited
72	Recommend having the sections flow in the general sequence of events.	Concur and they do in the web-based format
73	Recommend that the Acronym section at the front be merged with the Acronym & Glossary from the back and be placed at the front.	Concur – However, it is standard and good writing practice for Acronyms and Glossaries to be at the end of a document.
74	The manual implies that the PMBP initiative is an aspect to the strategic goal of Process. It fails to address connection to the strategic goals of people and communication. I believe that a stronger conductivity with the Vision and Strategic Goals will make the manual more of a stand-alone document and be more readily embraced.	Noted
75	The manual fails to address the different USACE missions. The spectrum of USACE operations includes water resources, environment, infrastructure, disasters and war fighting. I believe that the systems that support these missions are so different that they require specific guidance. The manual does not readily address the uniqueness of these missions.	Manual addresses all work either in project or program form. It is recognized that there are nuisances but the process will be generally the same at this level. . Processes are corporate and across the board. Every mission is "unique" and will follow the standard operating processes in the BP Manual.

76	The roles and responsibilities of the Regional Management Board, Business Management Office, Corporate Board and Project Review Board are not well defined. This vagueness may put at risk the goal of defining a “baseline project delivery process” for all work. Additionally the roles of the Project Delivery Team are not well defined through the lifecycle of the project.	Roles and responsibilities will be expanded within the context of the processes. It is not the intent of the BP Manual to define the charter for each of these groups.
77	The Departmental Overhead & Support Services Organization chapter inadequately address the funding challenges posed to those organizations funded through G&A. These types of administrative offices have challenges in direct charging as part of direct contribution to the project delivery team. These funding restrictions enable other resource leveling techniques to effectively compete with the Project Manger.	Noted
78	The manual is stagnant in regards to integration with corporate Automated Information Systems. The manual uses P2 as a basis for all systems but does not reflect the fact that P2 is not fully on-board. The manual fails to address our processes in the absence of P2 and does not provide flexibility for future AIS incorporation.	The manual is written to allow the development of supporting software and is the business process that the Corps wants to move toward.
79	The manual does not adequately address the Operation and Maintenance Phase of the PMBP flowchart. They are unique relationships between facility managers, support elements and project managers that require a baseline categorization of responsibilities.	Noted
80	The manual is not readily consistent with terminology found in the Project Management Body of Knowledge that Project Management Institute publishes. USACE has the opportunity to synchronize common Project Management terminology with an established body of documentation. This would aid in the purpose of implementing/executing a corporate quality management practices and providing a culture of customer focus.	Noted - The manual is consistent with the terminology found in the PMBOK and is taking advantage of synchronizing PM terminology with the established body of documentation developed and published by PMI. This is part of the cultural change and education process that will drive us towards a common corporate language.
81	The chapter on Corporate Relations is vague. The idea of corporate outreach is closing associated to the old idea of “growing the program”; consequently, more guidance would be helpful on this sensitive issue. I think the chapter is accurate in portraying our mission in outreach but more detail would be helpful superficially expansion on the relationship between planning functions and outreach efforts.	BP/P2 Team will review and repond.

82	<p>The manual is a prescriptive document on each step to follow to implement the USACE Business Process. This is fine for the purpose. However, the governing document to the USACE Business Process, ER 5-1-11, is written in a very general terms on the basic concepts and philosophy of the USACE Business Process. It would seem that before issuing a prescriptive document, some intermediate document would be necessary to further develop and define the concepts in ER 5-1-11. Among other things, this intermediate document would define specific roles and responsibilities for PM's, PDT members, and other positions discussed in the manual such as Program Managers, Business Management, etc. The format contained in the appendix to EC 5-1-48 would be a good example to follow for purposes of adding this clarity.]</p>	Noted
83	<p>Manual is cumbersome to follow and use. At a minimum, recommend follow through with labeling sections similar to what was started on page 1 identifying phases of Project Delivery Processes through Activity Project Closeout, then identifying regional processes, then identifying remaining support efforts from Workload Analysis and Resource Leveling through Financial Management, and then finally acronyms, glossary, and index.]</p>	Manual designed to be web-based with hot links.
84	<p>The manual has lots of emphasis throughout focusing on Program Managers. At the District level I have few of these. I have Project Managers. Focus on them. My major program manager is basically my DPM.</p>	Redefine program managers to allow for much broader interpretations, such as the in the area of Ops, Regulatory, and EM
85	<p>Don't focus decision making on regional resource leveling. The focus of decisions should be how to best deliver the project to the customer. Might decide to purchase skills from outside the government, if that's the best decision. We are in this to serve our public, not to maintain jobs. Maintaining jobs has its place, but should not drive a decision.</p>	It is recognized that decision making must address a wide array of issues. Concur with remaining comment
86	<p>The manual has its function and is needed but there needs to be a bridge between ER 5-1-11 and the Manual. Something is needed that helps the understanding of roles and responsibilities in greater detail than what the regulation outlines. We got the big picture (regulation = strategic focus) and the how to (manual = tactical focus), but we still need the lay of the land (roles and responsibilities = operational focus).</p>	R&R will be expanded and clarified.
87	<p>At the commander's course less than two weeks ago it was realized by most that for PMBP to work in the district, middle managers (resource managers and PM chief) must communicate. It is the only way PDTs can function without being isolated and equip the overall PRB process to proactively solve issues. We don't want issues to have to wait until the monthly PRB requiring the senior leadership to solve issues after the fact. Middle management can solve issues proactively. The Manual doesn't address this. Maybe explaining this in a document as suggested in comment above would help?</p>	Concur- Internal district communications is a below the line activity for the BP that every district must figure out how to do best within their environment

88	Understand the drive to complete the entire PMBP process and fielding of systems by Oct 2002. Hope that it can be done. But only do so if the system, software, training, etc is really good to go. Don't field a flawed system. Get it right. Oct is not critical if Dec will yield the right fruit...]	Noted
89	Better define Program Management Plan requirements indicated in manual, and provide examples of programs requiring plans as well as typical plans.	Education issue
90	A needed effort. Full implementation depends on completion of P2 and interconnections with CEFMS and other systems. Manual should provide standards for processes and procedures while allowing districts flexibility in implementation based on project needs. While flexibility is addressed in the executive summary, it appears many of the manual sections are more prescriptive.]	Some portions of project activities are prescriptive, because our own regulations make them so. There was an attempt to only go to a prescriptive level where required by regulation.
91	Throughout the manual, the point that projects can be very simple or very complex or anywhere in between is made a few times. However, much of the info is highly prescriptive at a level for complex projects. Suggest that the point that simpler is OK for most work should be emphasized even more often than is currently.	Noted
92	Suggest that the manual have a good introduction and that the order of presentation follow the chronology of the typical project. Mention variations from the typical where appropriate. For example, the typical Civil Works project goes from Recon, to Feasibility, to PED, to construction, to more phases of design and construction to operation and maintenance. How does the PMP develop from start to finish? What are the constants and what are the variations? How does change management vary?	All the specifics are covered in Program (Civil Works, Military, HTRW, etc) specific documents and the introduction will be revised. The PMP Development Process covers PMP development
93	Using the Project Management Business Process (PMBP) to operate as One Corps, regionally delivering quality goods and services, is one of USACE's strategic goals. USACE is instituting an on-going program to make it easier for everyone to meet that goal.	Noted
94	Corporate Relations: Text narrative is good but the reader is not sure what guidance is being provided.	Concur. BP/P2 team will review and comment
95	Add Program Analyst and Budget Analyst to the index.	Will be added to roles and responsibilities section

96	Should this documents reference something about a grandfathering process	It is recognized that there will be a transition process. This is a district decision.
97	Must have a District business policy to direct the compliance of the PMBP at local level. For team members to feel comfortable in carrying out the prescribed processes we must clarify all measures of authority and responsibility and 2) team members must know and understand their role.	Noted - Below the line issue
98	Contractural support to the the PDT's for loading and maintaining P2 and P3e throughout the life of the project is essential.	Needs to be evaluated at each district as the PMBP is deployed. There is an assumption that empowered PDTs will also be engaged in data entry.
99	Does there need to Program Manager and Project Manager throughout the document.	Yes these are roles that need to be defined.
100	Recommend that “customer” be clearly defined to distinguish between the public at-large, the local partner, the military installation, or someone within the Corps.	In glossary
101	It should be emphasized in the EXECUTIVE SUMMARY that application of the BPs will not manage a project for the PDT. The purpose of the BPs is to allow the USACE to better manage their resources. The PDTs must continue to to apply the principles of PROJECT MANAGEMENT (i.e. earned value, critical path, etc.) in order to delivery quality goods and services to our customers.	The PMBP Manual is not a “How to” manual, rather the processes depict general management principles. They are not intended to cover anything already covered by existing policy and regulation.
102	The CBP is so focussed on the process it leaves the impression that the product itself is of secondary importance. It seems to embody the philosophy that if processes are followed, the actual product will be somehow realized as a natural byproduct. The CBP should include an overarching document which clearly emphasizes that product realization (i.e. product that meets/exceeds customer expectations that encompasses the elements of quality/cost/schedule) is the critical goal and the compilation of standard processes contained in the CBP is for the basic purpose of supporting achievement of that ultimate goal.	They are interrelated
103	A related comment deals with the apparent omission of focus on “project management” as if this is synonymous with the CBP/P2. While these two initiatives will certainly be helpful in the accomplishment of effective project management they are not a substitute for day-to-day project management duties and responsibilities.	Noted

<b>104</b>	In the Distribution Section of each process, specific positions are listed such as Budget Analyst, Program Analyst, Project Manager, and Project Review Board but the level is not indicated (i.e. Division, District, etc)	Document modified to be clearer
<b>105</b>	Where is manpower mentioned in any of the BPs?	Manpower is a resource in the resource leveling processes. There will be a specific process with regard to manpower.
<b>106</b>	The content of the BPs pertains more to HQUSACE than to the Districts.	Do not concur, it is focused on the PDT
<b>107</b>	The flowcharts were easier to understand and follow than the written procedures.	Noted
<b>108</b>	Each of the Civil Works Program and Budget Process sections were written with basically the same text. For example under Scope for the Budget Process and Budget process-Section Sections 1 and 2, the wording is basically the same.	Will be clarified in final document
<b>109</b>	Not much emphasis is placed on why an operating budget is prepared and the stages of that budget and how it relates to business, employees, customers, and the Corps.	Noted
<b>110</b>	An detailed overall flowchart that shows at what stage all these various procedures and references are employed, would greatly assist a new user in understanding the overall system as well as how the various documents interrelate. The brochure flow chart is insufficient in detail and explanation.	Will be considered
<b>111</b>	One of the imperatives of ER 5-1-11 is that “The PDT is responsible for project success.”, yet the CBP is so “prescriptive” in nature it significantly reduces PDT flexibility and authority. A more “performance” related approach would be more consistent with the ER imperative.	Noted - This is an effort to standardize our corporate processes. This should not expand upon the PMs duties but it will place strong emphasis upon PM responsibilities being in line with the PMBOK. It follows the PMBOK and best practices of project management. Accurate workload analysis and management will be one of the benefits of the new AIS. This will be an on-going effort of analysis and fine-tuning to meet the needs of our missions.

<b>112</b>	As a general observation, it appears that application of the CBP (in its current form) will overburden product delivery costs for smaller projects making the Corps unattractive for some customers. Even though most procedures are qualified with statements such as “commensurate with the risks involved” it still appears the minimum overall documentation requirements for small projects will exceed prudent expenditure. For example, see paragraphs titled “PMP Minimum Content” and “PMP Minimum Level of Detail” found in document “PMP Content [REF 1018]”.	It is recognized that the level of effort will be connected to each project and will vary by project
<b>113</b>	Include a reference document on EARNED VALUE	Concur
<b>114</b>	<p>General Comment on entire BP Manual - Do not see an effective quality management system being incorporated into the PMBP Manual like ER 5-1-11 says should be done. A system has to have structure -- this manual does not define a structure for 'acting' in the Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle of quality. Putting Lessons Learned into a database is not an effective 'Act' to incorporate what you have learned into 'action'. We have had Lessons Learned systems in the Corps for years and years -- none have been very effective because people do not have time to review a huge database to find what they need each time they perform their project duties. We have to have a plan-do-check-act system that discovers the problem in a timely manner, analyzes them in a timely manner, finds the root cause of the problems, and acts on them in a timely manner by changing our procedures or training personnel to perform the procedures that are defined. Waiting until the end of a phase or the end of a project to list the lessons learned and put them into a database is not a quality system that incorporates the PDCA cycle of quality.</p> <p>When you wait until the end of a project or phase to review what went wrong, you usually don't get everyone involved that needs to be involved and people forget half of what went wrong when you wait until the end. It must be a system that catches things as they happen and we must act on them as soon as possible after they happen. The process of getting all employees involved in catching the issues, determining if we did something wrong or if the process is messed up, determining what the root cause of the problem was and determining corrective action so it doesn't occur again is a proven quality management system. That is what must be done in have a true PDCA cycle of quality management.</p> <p>.</p>	Lessons learned is a continuous activity as required by Change Management Process. Dr. Checks is currently being evaluated for its potential use in the USACE lessons learned system.
<b>115</b>	Add the PROC# of the individual work processes to the text headings, the table of contents and the index.	Concur

116	Pages should be added at the beginning of each phase to show when processes are changing phase. It may even help to insert the flowchart at the beginning of each process with the subject process highlighted to let the reader know where the subject process fits into the big picture.	Depends upon which role the Operations Manager is filling at a particular time. At times they may be fulfilling a PM role, at others they may be fulfilling a PDT Member role, and at others they may be fulfilling a Program Manager role. Roles and responsibilities should not be confused with position descriptions.
117	Complex projects should have a TPP (Technical Project Planning) meeting prior to the start of the project. Resource Providers should be included in this meeting. RPs should be included monthly to quarterly project review meetings.	Below the line issue
118	There is no indication of how the Operations Manager will fit into the process. What is their role? At a minimum it should be addressed in the Preface or the Executive Summary until such time as the O&M Phase of the process is completed. Are they customers? Stakeholders?, PM's etc. Should they be on the PDT? If the O&M community is expected to "buy into" the process then there needs to be more clarification of the benefits that will be derived by the O&M community. Otherwise it will continue just be viewed as increasing costs without sufficient value added. This is particularly true on projects that have a relatively low cost for construction or for maintenance projects that recur at regular intervals.	Noted - Ops can be accomplished as a program. . However, note that the BP Manual is not developing new POSITIONS. It will provide roles and responsibilities.
119	Suggest an introduction at each section to indicate what processes and terms are being changed; how the processes inter-relate, and why terms that have been used and understood are being renamed; what new roles are being created to assist the employee with new responsibilities.	It is anticipated that training will overcome the lack of understanding of the business processes and relationships.

<p><b>120</b></p>	<p>Some processes seem logical and well thought out Others seem to have gaps in logic. It is difficult for a reviewer to comment when so many terms are undefined and positions or roles do not currently exist in the structure of the district.</p>	<p>Noted - This is an effort to standardize our corporate processes. This should not expand upon the PMs duties but it will place strong emphasis upon PM responsibilities being in line with the PMBOK. It follows the PMBOK and best practices of project management. Accurate workload analysis and management will be one of the benefits of the new AIS. This will be an on-going effort of analysis and fine-tuning to meet the needs of our missions</p>
<p><b>121</b></p>	<p>Reviewer saw no reference to Office of Counsel or Real Estate roles in the process.</p>	<p>Noted - PDT membership was not dictated but dependent on project/program needs</p>
<p><b>122</b></p>	<p>Reviewer, a current Project Manager, believes the process is generally thorough and agrees that standard operating procedures are needed. The process will improve the management of large projects. However, the reviewer cautions that the ability of a PM to manage multiple projects will be severely limited by the requirements described in this process. Also, the reviewer's opinion is that strict adherence to the processes described may eliminate many of the "small" projects in the Continuing Authorities Program. Increased costs associated with the P2-P3e and increased requirements for the PMP will be prohibitive to the customer.</p>	<p>Needs to be evaluated at each district as the PMBP is deployed. There is an assumption that empowered PDTs will also be engaged in data entry.</p>
<p><b>123</b></p>	<p>My general concern is that I understand the necessity to say that the PMBP etc. applies to "all work" however many operating projects have to be thought of in the same context as military installations ie. the Corps delivers a product or project upon completion and turns it over for O&amp;M. To the extent we don't impose literal PMBP manual requirements on our military installation facilities for O&amp;M we need to think carefully about how we apply it to our own operating installations. In general, I would be concerned if we tried to directly apply many of the processes prescribed for designing and constructing a project to the operation or routine maintenance of it. While major maintenance projects certainly can benefit from application of the PMBP processes and principles, a less convincing argument has been made for the value added of an overly prescriptive process to the routine maintenance and operations of facilities. We can ill afford to overburden an already constrained O&amp;M program by requiring for example,</p>	<p>Concur - should be handled as a programs, however, note that the PMBP and the supporting USACE BP Manual directly applies to all work.</p>

rangers to have either a Project Management Plan or a Program Management Plan for interpretive services to school children. This is not to say they don't need to plan or manage their work but rather they don't necessarily need the same tools to do it that we use to design and construct local flood protection projects. If we are going to spend lots of resources on FEM/MAXIMO as a new tool for managing our maintenance programs we can hardly say that we need to add icing on the cake in the form of PMBP manual requirements that supplement, duplicate or interfere with the FEM/MAXIMO program. Let's adapt the principles to the O&M phase but lets make sure we don't force the applications of the same processes where they don't fit or provide low value added and we incorporate many of the good tools we either are already using or are going to have to use in the O&M arena. Emergency Management and Regulatory Programs likewise fit into the definition of "all work" but will require a set of processes and perhaps even principles (particularly for regulatory) far different from those prescribed in the current manual.