

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT BUSINESS PROCESS MANUAL**

**US Army Corps of Engineers  
South Atlantic Division**

**Consolidated Review Comments**

**Only General Comments**

**October 2001**



1. I would rate this at about a 75% solution. This is an ambitious undertaking. I remain very concerned that we will have the corporate will to devote the kind of resources, primarily personnel, that will be needed to make these processes work and there will be much change at the District level regarding where many of these functions are now performed. **Response: It will take Corps leadership commitment to make the cultural changes in our organization.**

2. I know that it took a tremendous effort by very dedicated people to produce this document, however its size and complexity renders it unusable. **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.**

3. After reviewing all of the business processes and the predominant requirement that the PM be responsible for most of the activities it is apparent to me that we are going to have to:

- (1) Increase the number of project managers and reduce the number of projects each PM manages.
- (2) Add a significant number of analysts to do much of the data inputting and manipulation that is called for in the processes. **Response: Different Districts are at varying stages of PMBP implementation. Those that are not currently using a corporate AIS or best business practices will realize a significant change but those that have been currently utilizing these tools will only increase their efficiency. ER 5-1-11 requires the PDT be more heavily engaged in the PMBP process.**

4. The business practice thing is far too esoteric for this organization in the trenches where the work is done. Most people are severely overloaded with mission impossible tasks. Most people are dedicated and want to do a good job, but are increasingly, year after year, burdened with what the Corps is calling "management" activities. Huge data-hungry accounting tracking programs, planning flowcharts, and geometrically increasing reporting requirements have taken valuable person years of effort away from the tasks required to get things done, to answer the call of the tail that is wagging the dog. General Flowers' simple "just do it" kind of guidelines and operating principles are so refreshing, but are totally out of sync with the arcane labyrinth of this new business practices nightmare. Perhaps this new system for organizing and thinking about what we are doing can be of some use at a very high level, but for people who are designing, planning, coordinating, writing EIS's and planning documents and other documents, administering contracts, and so on, the business practices document is a huge enigma and for 99.9% of the workforce, a massive waste of time. Think of it this way - for those of us who are doing the work where "the rubber meets the road," we each have about 2000 hours per year to get it done. How much of this 2000 hours per year do we as an organization want to require be taken away from the real product to spend on support activities of administrative, managerial, "bean-counting" and tracking, and the like? It should be our goal as an institution to ask the front-line workers what they need and give it to them. Since we have so much work force effort dedicated to CEFMS and travel and IM and admin and project management, all of this activity should be re-molded as "servant-like" support to the front line workers. Let them fight the actual battles and give them total support. The goal should be that the front line workers spend as little as possible, say no more than 1% of their time on management stuff. We have team leaders and workers (engineers, scientists, economists, and so on), spending massive amounts of time on funds management. It's a joke and not a very funny one, either. It's actually a disgrace. But more to the point, and in a positive vein, it's a grand opportunity staring us right in the face. We can massively increase our productivity by relieving the planners, designers, and real workers of this important and capable outfit, of all administrative duties. It is ridiculous and very wasteful for the frontline people and their team leaders to spend time on funds and travel vouchers and tickets and photocopying and reporting requirements. Most of the reporting is fictional anyway, because we usually don't really know what the work is going to look like, due to the complexity of the problems we are solving. Let's get things done. Wake up and smell the roses. Live a clean and healthy life, don't smoke, don't do drugs, and stay away from alcohol. Take a shower and rinse off with cold water. Make every HQ and Division leadership job a temporary assignment, so that it isn't a career. Make every front line worker spend a few years at Division and HQ. Keep our eye on the target. Our mission is to

serve our ultimate customer, the citizen taxpayers. Place ourselves in their shoes and it's pretty easy to see what we need to do. We forgive our leadership for going off in this insane business practices waste of time direction. Come on back home and get with the program.

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

5. Too complicated.

Keep it simple.

We don't have the luxury to be on top of this tedium. Instead, it's tedium on top of us.

**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.

6. The whole package is very well done. **Response:** Thanks for your support.

7. If you really are into this stuff, then you are very likely completely out of touch with reality. **Response:** Incorporation of many comments has improved the PMBP manual.

8. The concept is very good. As I read ER 5-1-11, ALL Projects & Programs are to have a Project/Program Management Plan developed. This is a good idea. However, the Significant Problem still exist. Senior Executives still look at this as an Organization and not a Process. When program plans are to be developed, they always ask for a PM from the Project Management organization instead of the Program Manager who has the responsibility to manage the program. **Response:** These processes are intended to be implementing guidance for the ER. Project managers do not have to be in PM.

9. Gen Flowers' motivational video (and brochure) use all the right buzz words and build a valid case for the USACE Business Process: strong PMs, PDTs, streamlining, a uniform process, quality, teaming with customers, empowerment, etc. I found it disheartening when the same home page invited review of FORTY-TWO BUSINESS PROCESSES. The different presentations clarify that there will be a new, and improved, automated reporting system; that's great. In itself, that will create a structure that leads to uniform project development and administration. What is not clear is that this really is a new way of doing business. Gen. Flowers' "Permission Slip" was a refreshing morale booster. The ONE USACE Business Process gives the Corps a new automated reported reported system; there is a promise of a new, empowered way of working. How soon the "old guard" relents to that promise remains to be seen. **Response:** Thank you for your time and effort.

10. I have reviewed this document from one end to the other and find it very difficult to understand, especially the diagrams **Response:** The final documents will include navigation tools to aid the user.

11. The districts are have trouble nation wide with meeting HQUSACE expectations on ITR(Independent Technical Review) such that it would seem that a module or process is necessary and warranted to cover this process and requirement on CW activities. **Response:** This is a governed by local SOP; however the virtual capability of P2 will greatly enhance the ability for ITR to be conducted anywhere.

12. A general comment is the Manual has a bureaucratic cookie cutter approach methodology that makes it appear we are trying to reduce the individual characteristics that set the districts apart. I understand and support that for regional consistency we want and need more uniformity for some of our actions. There is a danger in forcing uniformity just for the sake of uniformity. It is the district's unique individual characteristics that have helped the Corps of Engineers to sustain difficulties and be around to prosper when other agencies who were more uniform lost favor and standing with the public and elected officials. **Response:** The business processes develop a consistency necessary to readily and efficiently share and execute work among various USACE elements.

**Response:** The business processes develop a consistency necessary to readily and efficiently share and execute work among various USACE elements.

13. The processes appear to be based on the assumption that there is much more certainty in the way we do business than has been present in my career. **Response: These processes are intended to document best assumptions and provide tools to analyze workload and resources to the maximum extent possible.**

14. The potential exists to tie up the functional staff in a series of planning do loops on evaluating different execution scenarios and other organizational activities rather than actually accomplishing the work. In my career, I have worked to eliminate staff members who do not direct charge. Section and Branch Chiefs are chosen with strong technical skills as well as strong leadership and managerial skills. I expect those people to charge a portion of their time directly to projects. This can be done as a part of mentoring or as a part of the added support needed to execute the project. The process described in sections such as Project Workload Analysis and Resource Leveling - Resource par. 3 using Standard and Recommended Computations for Workload Analysis and Resource Leveling will require a much larger functional staff than is now being provided. **Response: This is a living document and will be continuously modified as needed. You will find that many modifications have been made as a result of the time and effort of reviewers.**

15. I find the reference to the functional Chiefs (Section, Branch and Division Chiefs) as just resource providers insulting. Based on conversations with other senior and middle managers in the functional areas, they also find this term limiting and not recognizing their many contributions. It is true that they are resource providers and take pride on doing that to the best of their ability. However, these people are much more than resource providers. The middle managers are the firm foundation upon which the organization derives much of its technical excellence. It is as our DDPM once told me. "I don't want you to just provide me a PDT member for whatever strengths or weaknesses that person may have. I want you to provide me your entire engineering organization's expertise to meet that PDT team's needs." Some of our PM's and some of our PDT members have limited experience - less than 2 years experience working as a GS-11 or GS-12 with the Corps and perhaps less experience working on Civil Works projects. I expect those people to understand the areas where they have expertise and areas where they are weak. In the areas where they don't have sufficient expertise or where the decision is beyond their capability, I expect them to call on their Section Chief and Branch Chief for advice on the final decision. This goes beyond mentoring. It goes to them on an ad hoc basis serving on the PDT to assist their person in making the correct technical call. The middle manager must then have the skill to step back as the work requirements become such that their employee can again be empowered to handle the assignment. As you can see, these people are much more than resource providers and mentors. They have 15 to 30 years' technical experience and have been involved in many of the situations where decisions are required. They are fully trained competent and, in most cases, professional engineers, and I expect them to be involved in key decisions. **Response: These business processes are not intended to limit middle management to simply resource providers. These processes do not address specific requirements of technical staffs.**

16. What does the asterisk beside the names listed in distribution mean?  
Processes assume that studies and projects are set up in P3e and fully operational.  
Is that realistic?

The role of the PgM and Program Analyst will vary dependent upon the organization structure. Many DE's believe that P2 is upward reporting and will require much PM time to support.

**Response: asterisks indicate an active actor on a given process. Those listed on the distribution without an asterisk are not actors for that particular process but should be familiar with the process.**

**Response: Data transfer is part of the BP/P2 Team scope of work.**

**Response: Concur**

**Response: a goal of the Business Process initiative is to provide upward reporting as a by-product of day-to-day business of the PDT.**

17. There are at least three different things trying to happen in the draft PMBP manual. One is defining the functionality of managing individual project time and cost that will be coded in P2. The second is taking PMBP to the next level and rolling in advanced functions like workload management and acquisition

planning. The third is expanding both the project and the program management functions beyond traditionally defined “projects” to “all work.” The first effort answers an urgent need. The second is important to the future of the Corps but does not need to be tied too closely to the first. The third in my opinion needs to be approached very cautiously lest we impose expensive processes with no value added.

What we need in P2 is a relatively simple, robust AIS that tracks project time and cost. It needs to work well enough and be easy enough to use that project managers will in fact take the time to feed it their data. This is the most immediate task, and we should be careful not to jeopardize it by being too ambitious. Why does this same software have also to do program management, civil works budget formulation, civil works fact sheets and acquisition planning? It’s too much to take on at one time. Get the project management software right, and use flow charts and “soft” links to tie it to the other processes. To hard code in this system such specialized, advanced functions as regional work leveling is risky and unnecessary. The business process mapping and the computer programming are related tasks, but they not congruent. I’m afraid that by getting too ambitious on the business process piece we’ll fail on the project-tracking piece. Although I understand the idea behind the bullseye chart with ER 5-1-11 at the center, in reality P2 will be a hard center, too, because once it is fielded it will be very difficult to change. The flow charts and doctrinal regulations of the business process are comparatively easy to alter from year to year.

For the last twelve years, PMBP has been about getting districts to do work in PM-led customer-focused teams. That journey is not finished, yet we are taking on a new set of objectives related to regional workload management. Strategic workload management is a worthwhile process that needs to take place, but I suggest that we establish a separate computer system from P2 to do it. Workload forecasts are fuzzy data, while project funds are hard figures. Project management takes place on a different time frame than does strategic workload management. In many cases different people are involved. It doesn’t make sense to make workload management decisions on individual projects as described in the proposed Work Acceptance Flowchart. These are program decisions that should already be in place so that when individual projects come in the organization is ready to take them on. Making the project management and the program management systems distinct does not mean they have to be disconnected, but it allows them to be optimized separately and prevents problems in one system from hurting the other.

Why do we feel compelled to develop a theory of everything? Why does P2 need to be the system that does it all? The PMBP is a powerful model for delivering products and services, but there are many functions in USACE that do not fit well under the PMBP model. “All work, regardless of funding source, will be managed with P2.” Do we really mean this? How about Regulatory, non-project real Estate, and routine water project operations? These actions are already tied to multiple AISs, including CEFMS, RAMS II, REMIS and (soon) FEM. What is the value added of shackling them to P2 as well? (The time spent in feeding these AISs is expensive and must be worthwhile.) Probably none, and we probably don’t intend to. So if it’s not all, let’s not say “all.”

Regional Advanced Acquisition Strategy. What is broken that this is trying to fix? Who is going to staff this Board? Since the people are most likely to be District contracting staff, how will we justify pulling them away from their jobs for this? What is the value added that justifies this additional expense? Since all the functions described for this Board (identifying needed capabilities, balancing resources to meet contracting goals, meeting customer needs) are currently the responsibility of districts, how can we say that performance of these functions by a regional Board is not usurping district functions? Why do we believe that managing acquisition at the regional level will be better than managing it at the district level?

If we are going to have models of project-specific information for military, civil and HTRW projects, it probably would be worthwhile to have a similar model for Support for Others projects under the Chief’s Economy Act or the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act.

I'm still confused over what we are trying to accomplish with regionalization. There is plenty for divisions to do with the four traditional functions of Command and Control, Regional Interface, Program Management and Quality Management. Cross-leveling work between districts should be a possible but a rare event. One reason districts are project funded is so that they can expand and contract with the work, not from month to month as does an AE firm, but over years as we see programs coming and going. Districts are successful organizations because they bring different disciplines together in project teams that establish long-term relations with customers and deliver products and services to them. The proposed Work Acceptance Flowchart throws all this out and directs that districts make accept/decline decisions on each individual project. This is a huge departure that in my view will greatly undermine customer relations and service. Don't take my word for it: go ask a customer how they would feel if they approach District A with a project and get told that they have to get served by District B located 500 miles away. There is a place for strategic decisions about making program shifts from district to district, but these are to be made by district and division leadership with a long-term view, not by outreach coordinators. Also we probably can achieve efficiencies by forming cross-district teams, but that is done after work has been "accepted." **Response: The comment is verbatim to one received from NWD. Please see response there.**

18. Operating Budget - The fiscal year designation is confusing. In certain locations the time period is referred to as CY/ BY/BY+1. In other locations it is referred to as BY/BY+1/BY+2. On fact, the period for which we are developing a 3 year operating budget is CY/BY/BY+1 from the standpoint of the budget EC(EC11-2-18?) The designation of fiscal years need to be reviewed. **Response: Concur. Standardization is being accomplished.**

19. Comments since the Operation & Maintenance Phase is "under development:" Our Operations Managers (OMs) are the PMs for all Civil Works O&M actions. OP already has an established system for delivery of O&M products, which includes OMs and Site Managers (field) and Project Coordinators (PCs) and Technical Managers (TMs) in the District Office. The process and system that we have established includes an automated Access database which is maintained for the OMs and Site Managers by the PCs and TMs. Our process and system follow the spirit and intent of the PMBP for Civil Works actions. OP's system is effective in providing customer satisfaction, funds execution and product delivery. OP does not feel that this system will provide any added value to our execution. (DE note – the process needs to be standardized across the Corps. As the O&M phase is finished, it needs to be reviewed and then implemented in a standard fashion in all elements of the Corps) **Response: Concur.**

20. Many people are still seeing this "process" as strictly a function of those persons working in PM. This is not necessarily so, as we see in our day-to-day O&M work. **Response: Concur, per ER 5-1-11.**

21. This comment relates to the over all product, versus a specific section. In reviewing the over all product it appears we are creating a process for reporting and monitoring reports at various levels, but not focusing on project delivery. On pages 180-181 it lists 13 different reporting/plans/processes that must be developed by the PM/PDT for each project. In review, it seems the majority of these are to provide data for another element/level to review/report/or monitor. As a customer viewing this document, I would certainly question if the Corps was more interested it processes than project delivery and what is the added cost of all these reports/processes. Is this something private industry does or is this just unique to the Corps? If private industry has anything remotely equivalent, then this document needs to be benchmarked against it to determine the validity of these processes. If private industry does not, then the question would be why do we need these processes? We are often accused of being too lock-step process oriented rather than delivering the project to the customer in a timely/cost effective manner. **Response: A review and validation has been done by a nationally recognized PM**

organization. These are considered as best business practices for the PDT to manage a project and the level of detail will vary per project.

22. Suggest adding a section to the manual that describes the organization of the manual and what is to be discussed in each topic heading. The topical headings are not self-explanatory and information contained under similar headings in various portions of the document seems inconsistent. **Response: Are addressing this in revised document.**

There are a number of organizational titles and position titles that are not widely understood. Good examples are BP/P2 Program Office (p18) and program managers for Support Services (p25). Suggest that an organizational chart be developed and included that identifies the various organizational elements and positions and their inter-relationships. **Response: Glossary is being updated.**

The manual attempts to prescribe and require implementation of processes/procedures at too fine a level of detail. This could result in too much emphasis on data entry and upward reporting at the expense of execution. **Response: upward reporting is intended to be a by-product of day-to-day business of the PDT. Single point data entry and interfacing or eliminating other legacy systems are also goals.**

23. The new process is a potential good tool for management of a large project.

It is not as good a good tool for small recurring/routine jobs. Need some leeway for these type jobs. ER 5-1-11 recognizes this. **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 the 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.**

It is a burden if we have to use it on projects/programs that already have a well-defined, mandated process such as the Recruiting Facilities Management Information System (RFMIS) used by the Corps and our customers, the Armed Services Recruiting Components.

24. I need to state that this information was very hard to understand, confusing, and unclear. I still do not have a clear understanding of what this new Business Process does, its value, and its path that guarantees that we will be a "world class organization" over what we are today. The "process" is overstated and overvalued, whereas the value of the "ONE TEAM" concept is the real future of the Corps. This needs to be pursued more as our future path to greatness. **Response: Thank you for your time and effort. Incorporation of many comments has improved the PMBP manual. The final documents will include navigation tools to aid the user.**

25. The process seems geared toward upward reporting with systems that are yet to be developed completely. P2 is the core of the process, but it hasn't been fielded yet and its capabilities are as yet unknown. **Response: a goal of the Business Process initiative is to provide upward reporting as a by-product of day-to-day operations of the PDT.**

We've seen draft legislation which may require to start competing for work with the private sector. There are some tremendous expenses associated with the various boards and information systems that don't contribute directly to the execution of the customer's project. In a competitive environment, we can't afford such expenditures. **Response: The business processes develop a consistency necessary to readily and efficiently share and execute work among various USACE elements.**

There's a significant overlap of responsibilities between PM and Planning in the GI program

development. The PMBP pushes the lead to PM, however project development requires a different personality from project management. Recommend planning stay in the lead through Project development. PED is good time to shift that lead role to PM. **Response: The majority of Districts in the Corps have already combined Planning with Programs and Project Management. PM is a role not an organization.**

Need to keep in mind that it's all about the project...not the process. Any aspect of the process which isn't geared to project execution is an expense we really can't afford. The AIS systems need to be build from the bottom up – serving the PM and PDT rather than feeding the upward reporting beast. The process is important in that there needs to be a deliberate process that is consistently followed, but the driver of that process should be the PDT and the PM's needs to facilitate execution. . **Response: a goal of the Business Process initiative is to provide upward reporting as a by-product of day-to-day operations of the PDT.**

26. This is a series of general comments about the entire USACE PMBP Manual:

1. If the Manual is implemented as written, our effort will be redirected from executing projects to executing the project management business process. Recommend that this excruciatingly detailed manual be reduced in size by more than 2/3 and directed toward discussing general set of objectives required of the districts, divisions, and headquarters. **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.**

2. Based on our experience at implementing PROMIS and CEFMS, it takes a long time to bring these systems online so they function efficiently and effectively, even after startup. CEFMS and PROMIS, both many years old, are still working out many of the bugs. There was/is a lot of frustration and wasted effort for both of these systems -and people still are reluctant to use them. For HQ, divisions, and districts to write a Manual which greatly relies on P2, a system which has not even come on-line yet, means that much of our process is based on anticipation of what the program might do - not how it actually will perform. Recommend that the concept of the Manual be revised to reflect current conditions. Once P2 is fully developed, then re-write this Manual based on a fully functioning system - not what you think it will do. **Response: The goals of the Business Process initiative look forward and explain the benefits, actions and efficiencies that are intended to be realized. It is believed that having the business processes written first, then the AIS, will lead to success.**

3. Our concept of the PMBP is Customer focused. The PM is the single POC for the Customer in USACE. All of our efforts should be to provide the PM the tools, support and guidance necessary to do his job in the best interests of the client and USACE. The majority of the Manual is focused on providing information above the PM's level which will consume the PM's time and funds to provide. Recommend that the Manual be refocused to reduce the upward reporting burden and increase the ability to provide customer oriented services and information. **Response: a goal of the Business Process initiative is to provide upward reporting as a by-product of day-to-day operations of the PDT.**

4. The PMP has been expanded to include minimum requirements and minimum levels of details which will far exceed the PM's capability to develop within the cost and timeframe necessary to do it as written and satisfy the customer. If we do this "by the Book", the effort required will quickly consume the resources necessary to actually execute the project (do real work)! **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 the 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. It is also intended that PMPs will be automatically generated in P2.**

5. This Manual is written for a typical large MILCON or CW project. It is not written for the other 50% of USACE projects which include O&M, SFO, technical assistance, studies, year-end customer driven projects, etc. We would spend more time and funds setting up this project in P2, doing PMPs, AAPB, discussing it with RMBs, RAPBs, BMO, Corporate Boards, CMRs, etc than doing the project. Recommend that this process only be required for large,

complex military or civil works projects (>\$10M). **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 the 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.

27. We do not think manpower and income projections should be based on info from P2. All projects for these projections will not be in P2. Many of the projects will be "wishlist", "maybe" projects which may/may not be actuals. Having projected projects in P2 will cause a lot of confusion and needless effort. **Response:** Our endeavor is to not require the Districts to input data into more than one system. Unknown/Unfunded/Outyear work will be entered into P2 (see PMP Content/level of detail) as a part of "All Work". "Wishlist", "maybe" projects have historically been used for this purpose in FORCON and CERAMMS which will be replaced.

28. 1. We fear that Workload Analysis and Resource leveling will develop into an upward reporting nightmare. RM, RMB, Corps Boards, etc all want info from PM and they all want different info. P2, which is not yet on line, will not have all the projects loaded - situations and projects change too fast, many projects are too small, some do not have many funds, etc.

**Response:** All work will be input in the P2 but at differing levels of detail depending on size and complexity.

2. None of this effort will be viewed by our client as a benefit - but they will have to pay for it. Recommend putting more emphasis on how we marry up projections and estimates with P2.

**Response:** Rollup and upwarding reporting will be a by-product of the day to day PDT operations.

3. Recommend reducing this workload analysis and resource leveling requirement throughout USACE. We go into so much detail now and the eventual results are something PM could have told you without RM assistance and in much less time. **Response:** The tool is to help the Resource Provider adequately manage the workforce and identify skill sets that are needed in the future.

4. Who pays for this? This effort is not currently in project budgets and the client does not want to pay for it. If USACE HQ and Division HQ does not think this costs money or it can be absorbed, then they are wrong. Look at just the PROMIS/PPDS and CEFMS AIS yearly costs. We have gone from no cost to over \$200K / year for just these two items in CESAM-PM in 4-6 years with no increase in funds coming in to pay for it. **Response:** The efficiencies that will be realized by this effort will cause the cost of business to decrease in the future. For example, single point data entry, elimination of data calls, elimination of redundant AIS systems, etc.

29. There is a strong concern that maintaining P2 will require too much of the PM's time. Updating and maintaining a system that only serves for upward reporting would not provide the value needed to justify the time required. P2 should be a system that primarily provides benefit to the PRB and the PDT. A PM's time would much better be spent with the sponsor and PDT.

**Response:** a goal of the Business Process initiative is to provide upward reporting as a by-product of day-to-day operations of the PDT.

30. Every project should not be input into P2 (small O&M projects are good examples). This problem needs to be addressed - minimum size, client, type??? **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 the 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.

31. Customer Scope and Definition was obviously written for Civil Works projects as was most all of this PMBP manual. Before the PMBP manual is implemented the portions that apply

to Military/SFO work must be separated from those portions applicable to Civil Works. Pg. 211 "Military Program-Specific Information" addresses Military projects with the P2 template. The rest of the manual does not support a viable process for Military/SFO projects with the deviations from the standard planning, programming and budgeting process used by the Army or the Air Force.

**Response: your concern is being addressed.**

32. 1. Who pays for this Resource Estimate Development at the Regional Business Center level? We do this now by project to develop a budget/schedule. But inputting all this info into a "system" costs money to input, maintain, and use! This process is not in the budget nor does the customer want to pay for it. **Response: The efficiencies that will be realized by this effort will cause the cost of business to decrease in the future. For example, single point data entry, elimination of data calls, elimination of redundant AIS systems, etc.**

2. WBS may be good for large projects but very inefficient for O&M, small projects, technical assistance, etc. Recommend limiting its use to >\$5M jobs. **Response: The level of detail required IS dependent on the 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.**

33. Again, having P2 set up to be the all-encompassing database for all budget/resource/etc decisions in USACE is not practical. PM is already burdened by constant budget calls and recalls and mandates of TLMs, percentages, etc. This system being set up in this manual is a formula for making PMs do nothing but data management. RM, HQ, etc are going to start asking for more, and more often. What happens to our customer and who pays for this extra work?

**Response: a goal of the Business Process initiative is to provide upward reporting as a by-product of day-to-day operations of the PDT.**

34. Neither the narrative nor flow diagrams reflect real civil works project execution constraints/influences. The initial phases of civil works projects (planning) are impacted by national/congressional civil works policy decisions as well as by the open public involvement process, NEPA Process, federal laws etc. The change management controls described in the manual do not reflect the necessary flexibility to react in a timely manner to these changes. **Response: Change management thresholds are developed on a project by project basis by the PDT in the PMP.**

35. The manual describes a system of controls and reports that in fact requires that the process will require an inordinate amount of time just to manage the process let alone the project. We will need fulltime system administrators as well as PMs just to manage the system. The ultimate result of this system as described by the manual will shift day to day management to HQ on case by case basis as the system requires a real time automated system accessible at all levels. **Response: a goal of the Business Process initiative is to provide upward reporting as a by-product of day-to-day operations of the PDT.**

36. Why do we insist on making a fairly simple system of management so complex? The basic concept is that a PDT is formed during the initial phases of a project, that the customer and other stockholders are part of the team, that we have a written document that outlines what is wanted, when it is wanted, the cost, a schedule to achieve, how to obtain (acquisition plan), built in reviews, and a self evaluation/lessons learned on progress.....simple stuff! Now however we have built it into a bureaucracy of layered over site from Washington on down no wonder we cost so much! The result of the proposed manual will be "show case projects" with static plans whereas most projects will be executed with something less than complete compliance. **Response: This is a general business process manual which establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. The business processes develop a consistency necessary to readily and efficiently share and execute work among various USACE elements.**

37. I would offer a word of praise. Having the ERs, regulations, etc. easily accessible (as links on the web) within the document is helpful. **Response: Thanks!**

38. Manual appears to have been geared more towards a large district rather than a small district. In a small district one person is often the program manager, project manager, and responsible employee all rolled into one. When one person has approximately 20 – 30 projects its virtually impossible for that person to effectively manage the projects plus keep all the information updated in the P2 Automated Information System. **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 the 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.**

39. It's great to have a business process but this manual is micro-management to the extreme. It appears the we are allowing the tools (P2 and P3e) to drive the implementation of the business process rather than establishing the business process and then obtaining the necessary tools to properly implement it. **Response: These business process are being finalizes so the chosen off the shelf AISs can adapted to our processes.**

40. Unless the P2 Automated Information System is very user friendly it will fail. Too much Program Analyst/Resource Management and financial knowledge is now being placed on the Project Manager. Faced with a multitude of pick lists is very confusing and ensures a lot of mistakes will be made and then have to be corrected. A lot of the initial entering of technical information on a project should be made by either an RM type or Program type to ensure accuracy of information i.e. appropriation type, type of funds, etc. **Response: Off the shelf software has been selected to make the system more user friendly. Additionally, much data will be interfaced and automatically entered from existing directive systems.**

41. While the intent of a standard process is to allow for a more corporate process and a common system for executing our core missions a critical element must be that the process, manual, and system must assist the PDT in delivering the product to the customer with quality, on time, and at budget. The draft PMBP manual appears to be built around an Automated Information System (AIS) that does not currently exist, and for which the field has not seen test results. The field will remain skeptical based on experiences with CEFMS, which while it does provide a system for tracking funds and execution, requires an inordinate amount of time and effort to learn, input, and update. **Response: the business processes and integration of software (off the shelf) is being designed by district level people from throughout the Corps. The team is attempting to standardize and streamline much of what we do.**

42. Project Managers and PDT's at the District level are focused on meeting customer expectations while balancing the cost of doing business, science, regulatory requirements, and law. There is a great concern that the effort required by the PM's to implement and maintain another AIS system and multiple plans to supplement the PMP will further detract from their already high OPTEMPO and further reduce their ability to communicate with and coordinate the PDT efforts. Is the AIS system to assist the PM in executing his duties or a reporting tool for the headquarters? **Response: a goal of the Business Process initiative is to provide upward reporting as a by-product of day-to-day operations of the PDT.**

43. Comments from the field and perceptions regarding the central role of the unfielded AIS system is it is focused on more "Centralization" by headquarters, and provides a greater risk of MSCs and HQ elements to misinterpret information. The field organizations may not realize any benefits of potential improvements to regional capabilities. While one of the capabilities the Chief of Engineers emphasizes is "Agility" and probably at the strategic level,

the system described in the manual seems to lack flexibility but dictates centralization that inhibits agility at the tactical level. Discussions on empowering teams seems to be clouded by centralization and rigid, detailed structure. The questions are how and at what level to hold teams accountable while balancing empowerment, agility, flexibility, and common processes. **Response:** This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. Empowered teams are responsible to those who empowered them including District Commanders and DPMs as dictated by ER 5-1-11. There needs to be an understanding and discipline in using information available in the corporate database.

44. While ER 5-1-11 seems to emphasize flexibility and provides broad imperatives, the PMBP manual seems to restrict flexibility and adds substantial reporting requirements on the PM and PDT. The field has concerns on how reports and data will be interpreted, long distance, in evaluating district missions, question PDTs and PMs who have the situational awareness on the ground with the project and the customers. **Response:** the goal is to provide project information to all PDT members, including the customers, automatically thru the day to day operations of the PDT. Upward reporting will be a by-product with the goal of eliminating data calls and other constant requests for information. Whether information is provided automatically or thru requests, how people interpret the data is dependent upon each individual.

45. The real test for this shift in operations will be development, testing, fielding and execution of P2 and P3e. Until the field sees how the system can help them and the data will be interpreted by MSC's and HQ, there will be concern and skepticism. The field will need to receive information that will provide assurance that the system will work and assist project execution. **Response:** Concur.

46. If P2 is truly used as a PM tool in the district on all work, then maybe it can be used to roll up data for the organization. It cannot be trusted for upward reporting or decision-making if it is not comprehensive and accurate. USACE should review our success in long-range predictions before we try and do it again. PMBP Manual seems to be in direct opposition to a decentralized, powered down organization and this concerns me. At every meeting I attend in which HQ staff members are present, I always walk away with the feeling that they do not know what I do on a daily basis. The PMBP Manual can lead to more decisions being made at a higher level within the organization. I am not sure these will always be the best decisions. **Response:** This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. The business processes develop a consistency necessary to readily and efficiently share and execute work among various USACE elements. How higher headquarters interprets data is up to each individual but it is deemed better to provide the information automatically thru the day to day operations of the PDT rather than thru constant data calls and requests for information.

47. AS PRESENTED IN THIS MANUAL THERE IS A BLENDING OF THE RM, BMO, PROGRAMS AND PM FUNCTIONS. MANUAL DOES NOT REFLECT "REAL WORLD" CHECKS AND BALANCES THAT CURRENTLY EXIST AT THE DISTRICT LEVEL AND SERVE THE DISTRICTS WELL....IF WE ARE TO FUNCTION AS PRESENTED IN THE MANUAL IT WOULD SEEM THAT A REVIEW IS REQUIRED OF FINICIAL FUNCTIONS WHICH MAY RESULT IN THE COMBINING OF PROGRAMS WITH RM AND A TRIMMING OF ENVISIONED BMO FUNCTIONS (SAD RMB REVIEW OF PROPOSED FUNCTIONAL STATEMENTS OF THE BMO POINTED OUT NUMEROUS CONFLICTS AS BMO FUNCTIONAL STTATEMENTS CURRENTLY WRITTEN. **Response:** The manual has been revised to address many of these concerns.

48. By attempting to flow-chart, in a rigorous logical sequence, the Project Management process, we have lost sight of the synergy that is required to make the Project Delivery Team and the delivery of a project work. In retrospect, it is a mistake to think that Project Management can be characterized as a process that

can be broken down into discrete steps that anyone can follow and arrive at a satisfactory result. It can't and won't happen. **Response: Incorporation of many comments have improved the manual.**

49. This document continues the intermixing of process and what appears to be policy. For instance in 1016 PROJECT WORKLOAD ANALYSIS AND RESOURCE LEVELING the statement is made that annual target workloads should not be more than 100% of effective hours. **Response: This is a suggested target that has been determined to be a best business practice. Gen. Flowers stated this manual is not prescriptive; the business process manual is more like doctrine.**

50. Construction documents are not ready for review! In terms of process this is fully half of the project management business process and probably 80% of the current problems. Need to continue review process as future segments of the manual are completed. **Response: The construction process as related to Resident Engineers and Contracting Officers is already well defined in existing policies and procedures. This manual is not intended to replace existing technical activities and requirements. However it does define the interaction of the PDT, Communication Plan, etc. that will work throughout the life-cycle of the project.**

51. The PMBP fails to assign singular responsibility for the success or failure of a project. Instead, it assigns this responsibility to the PDT. However, as indicated the reg, the PDT is composed of many varied individuals, with varying degrees of involvement in the project. One person should be accountable for the success of a project. Logically, this would appear to be the PM. However, in order to do this, the PM also needs to be given some real controls over the PDT, at least those members are Corps assets. Until this is done, we will continue to speculate on what went wrong on a failed project rather than assign the failure to the Project Manager. **Response: the Business Process Manual is intended to be the implementing guidance for the ER which holds the PM responsible. The processes attempt to convey this. If you have any specifics you feel would be beneficial, please provide to the BP/P2 Team.**

52. The PMBP is missing a center of gravity: Although the ER states the role of the CDR, the manual only mentions the CDR in two places - contract dispute and the COB. Believe the commander plays important roles in many more of the processes. For instance, it appears the CDR is left out of the PRB and work load acceptance processes - by commission. Leaving the CDR out is fundamentally wrong. These two processes cannot culminate until the DDPM brings the PDT's recommendations and project status to the CDR for approval.

- The DDPM is not the commander making the final decision, the DDPM is similar to the Ops Officer providing well staffed recommendations.
- The way the manual is written, it appears the CDR has little to do with the districts operations except in the budget. To go further, the manual is almost written as if to establish the DPM and PM in the old culture of "stove pipe." Again, this is wrong by the PMBP culture and must be changed if our culture is to ever change.
- Ref page 25 of 231 - the CDR, not the DPM should communicate the decisions of the Corp Board to the district. **Response: The CDR has been added into the manual into many different places. The DPM has programmatic oversight for all work although the understanding is the CDR is responsible for every action taken in a District.**

53. PMBP continues to focus on the Civil Works Program with references throughout to the Civil Works programming and execution cycles. We either need to eliminate these references and make the PMBP project generic or include similar references to the Military and HTRW programs. **Response: We have revised the manual to be more generic and are working on more detailed information for the Program-Specific document.**

54. There needs to be a reinforcement at the beginning of the manual regarding the adoption of the PMBP to ALL business processes. Numerous comments were received from Divisions that cited the absence of process that applied to their work – Real Estate, Emergency Management, Operations, Planning, etc.

Response: this is Phase I of the initiative which includes work for Military, Civil, Environmental and SFO. The others you mention will be addressed in Phase II. Additionally, these processes are intended to be the implementing guidance for ER 5-1-11 which states that all work is a project.

