

Military Programs Business Process Framework

1. Purpose: This document establishes the philosophy, policy objectives, and business process for all work performed by the Military Programs Directorate, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. I

2. References:

- a. ER 5-1-11, 17 August 2001, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Business Process.
- b. OM 10-1-1, 31 Oct 1990, Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- c. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Strategic Vision
- d. USACE Environmental Operating Principles
- e. USACE Communication Principles
- f. USACE Business Process Manual

3. Background: As the world's problems increase in complexity, the need and demand for environmentally compatible engineering solutions grows. In the face of these complex problems, the Army Corps of Engineers strives to be forward-looking and proactive. Just as the Corps focuses on the changing engineering needs of the Army and the nation so, too, does the Corps critically review its business practices in order to ensure we are prepared to manage increasingly complex challenges.

After such a critical review of its business processes, begun in the 1980's, the Corps is now moving to embrace a new business process for the delivery of quality projects and services, including the delivery of support services provided within USACE. The new business process is the Project Management Business Process (PMBP) and is to be used by all echelons for the planning, development, and management of programs and projects within the Military Programs Directorate.

Adapting to PMBP and its intensive use of teams can be both exhilarating and difficult, as we will find ourselves working closely with people with specialized skills and unique perspectives that we may never have worked with before. As Nicolo Machiavelli wrote, "there is nothing more difficult to carry out, nor more doubtful of success, nor more dangerous to handle, than to initiate a new order of things." Such may be our experience with PMBP. An additional challenge will be full integration of corporate automated information systems into the USACE Business Process. A premium will be placed on cross-functional, information-based teams that acquire and process program information in real time. A challenge for the PBMP-based teams will be the effective management of this team/information interface. Teams will need not only to

CEMP-ZA
Military Programs Business Process Framework

work seamlessly but also learn to maintain and use flexible and sophisticated automated information systems and databases.

This Military Programs business process framework presents the work, roles and responsibilities of Military programs within the context of the PMBP. The framework itself is the product of a team-based approach involving representatives from all Military Programs divisions. Development of this framework involved many dialogues and much learning about the purposes, values and missions of Military Programs as well as the ways and means of PMBP. The framework you hold in your hands represents a compilation of ideas, guidance and directions that have previously been articulated by the USACE leadership, either formally or informally, but which are now expressed within the context of PMBP.

4. Military Programs Management Philosophy and Leadership Objectives:

a. General -- Successful delivery of engineering support to the Army and to the nation is founded upon having full knowledge of what the Army and the nation need and are asking from us. Supported by this knowledge, the program – (or project-) focused team produces what the customer asks from us. To create the program – (or project-) focused team, we must assemble strong multi-disciplined Project Delivery Teams (PDT), unconstrained by geography or organizational boundaries, to best meet the customers’ needs, and the national/public interests. As the Program- (or Project-) Delivery Teams become more established and high performing, they will be empowered with more authority and responsibility. As this occurs, decision-making will be pushed down and out to the lowest feasible levels within the Corps hierarchy. It is critical that as decision making becomes more decentralized, each PDT member must have a deep understanding of the mission, values and principles upon which the Army, the Corps and the nation are founded. That knowledge is a prerequisite for team membership and responsibility.

b. Military Programs Roles in Accomplishing the Mission --

MP Roles	Objectives
Support to the Army	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the Army’s Transformation to the Interim Force and to the Objective Force. • Leverage USACE capabilities/expertise in support of military operations. • Maximize the use of environmentally responsible and sustainable methods and technologies for all work performed under CEMP leadership. • Focus all CEMP resources on building high performing PDTs that will ensure our soldiers and their families have the highest quality communities to live in, and the safest, most effective equipment possible.

CEMP-ZA
Military Programs Business Process Framework

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be situationally aware: Keep apprised of internal and external trends and their implications on meeting the Army’s changing infrastructure, technology, training and other needs. Communicate these to all levels.
Executive Direction and Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model Team leadership. Ensure that senior and middle level leaders embody the mission and values of the Army and the elements of the Corps PMBP in their thinking, actions, and communications. • Mobilize Team Effort -- from the newest architect and secretary to the most seasoned Corps member –to understand the MP mission and achieve that mission within the PMBP framework. • Encourage innovative strategies and appropriate risk taking to meet and exceed customer expectations. • Empower Military Programs staff to encourage initiative and leadership at every level. • Know about and meet the requirements of federal, state and local government laws and regulations
Policy and Guidance Development & Dissemination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the perspective of PMBP, the Corps Vision, & the Environmental Operating Principles, review policies, practices, and assumptions and revise or jettison them should it become clear they’re no longer relevant. • Ensure that the Corps Vision, Campaign Plans, principles and guidelines are ever-present so that everyone may learn where Military Programs is heading, what CEMP priorities are, and how each individual job fits into the overall direction.
Program Execution and Oversight	<p>Support MSCs in achieving mission success by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing policy guidance within the context of the PMBP framework; • Working with CERM-M to allocate sufficient FTEs and resources to the MSCs so they can build agile and expert Teams; • Validate/verify proper authority and funding for program implementation. • Monitoring program execution (quality, costs, schedule, sustainability, contracting requirements, accounting, etc.); • Developing MSC performance measurements

CEMP-ZA
Military Programs Business Process Framework

	that measure what our customers expect and the Corps PMBP values.
Represent USACE to External Audiences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build partnerships and collaborations both inside and outside of Military Programs and the Corps. • Expand our understanding of Army needs by listening to all constituencies both inside and outside of Military Programs. • Tell the USACE story honestly and proactively so that the Corps’ roles and expertise become known.
Support Staff Development and Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote learning and development so that functional/technical capabilities of workforce can be continuously sharpened. • Build richly diverse Program and Project Delivery Teams. • Develop a mind-set within Military Programs that embraces innovation as a way of approaching situations, not only as a technological improvement. • Plan for leadership transitions by grooming many successors. • Foster a sense of the future and a sense of opportunity within Military Programs by using details, job rotations, and other developmental tools. • Tie individual staff and managerial performance appraisals to USACE values and principles, as well as to program performance.

5. Military Programs Business Process Framework (Concept of Operations):

a. General – The Directorate of Military Programs is responsible for management and oversight of a wide range of programs and initiatives, including programs in support of the Army and other Military Services, Department of Defense agencies, other Federal and non-Federal agencies, and foreign governments. Programs include facilities design and construction execution programs, programs to provide environmental restoration or other services to clients, and technical and policy programs to develop and maintain the policies and technical guidance necessary to execute our missions.

b. Military Programs Business Process Corollaries -- Within the directorate, all programs will be managed in accordance with ER 5-1-11 and the Project Management Business process,

CEMP-ZA
Military Programs Business Process Framework

governed by the seven Business Process Imperatives. The following table provides Military Programs corollaries for each of the USACE Business Process Imperatives. All programs and initiatives for which Military Programs is responsible will be managed in accordance with these corollaries. Specific processes and procedures for each program will be detailed in Program Management Plans.

USACE Business Process Imperatives	Military Programs Corollaries
One Project, one Team, one Project Manager	One lead Program Manager for Every Program, leading the HQ Team
Plan for success and keep commitments	Every program will have a management plan, documenting roles, responsibilities, and expectations; developed in coordination with the customer.
The PDT is responsible for project success	The HQ Program Delivery Team (PgDT) is an integral part of district and MSC PDTs. Teams at all levels comprise a “team of teams”.
Measure Quality with the goals and expectations in the PMP	Measure quality and results using the goals and expectations in the Program Management Plan
Build effective communications into all activities and processes.	Open, honest, and respectful communications will be the objective of all teams. Organizational boundaries (both horizontally within HQ and vertically/externally with MSCs and customers) shall present no barrier to team communications. The Program Manager is the focal point for team communications and has the primary responsibility for keeping the MP leadership informed, and sharing information with MSC/district PDTs.
Manage all work with the PMBP, using corporate automated information systems (AIS).	HQ PgDTs will provide policy guidance and execution management using the PMBP and supporting corporate AIS; providing a model for MSCs and districts, and encouraging high AIS data quality. PgDTs and supporting AIS provide the foundation for Executive Direction and Oversight.
Use best practices and seek continuous improvement	HQ Teams will seek to improve program management processes, consistent with the evolving business process. Integration of HQ processes and functions (consistent with processes and functions of corporate customers/higher headquarters) into corporate AIS is a key goal. HQ Teams will monitor and revise processes to improve performance and quality using the Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle.

(1) Program Managers and Program Delivery Teams -- Within Military Programs, one lead program manager will be assigned for every program. Program Managers need not be assigned to Programs Management Division and may be employed in any Military Programs organization. The Program Manager is the primary point of contact within HQUSACE for

CEMP-ZA Military Programs Business Process Framework

his/her programs, and is the leader of the Headquarters Program Delivery Team (PgDT) supporting successful program implementation. Headquarters PgDTs will be responsible to:

- Support and monitor compliance with ER 5-1-11, and manage all work using the PMBP.
- Develop a Program Delivery Team (PgDT) comprised of all required functional/technical disciplines and stakeholders, including the corporate customer/program proponent.
- Ensure development of a Program Management Plan (PgMP) for each program that fully addresses customer requirements and expectations.
- Develop, coordinate, and interpret program policy and other Command-level guidance.
- Ensure HQ responsibilities defined in PgMPs are performed in a professional and timely manner.
- Facilitate resolution of program issues requiring HQUSACE attention.
- Provide guidance and leadership to MSC/District PDTs within the framework of established policy and PgMPs.
- Facilitate open communications among PgDT members, PDT members, and between Customer, HQ, MSC, and District teams.
- Monitor performance against the quality and performance requirements documented in the PgMP, using data from corporate automated information systems.
- Inform the USACE senior leadership regarding program execution and issues.

Headquarters PgDTs will be comprised of the functional and technical experts from throughout the Headquarters that are necessary to support successful program implementation (see PROC2020 – Team Establishment). The composition of PgDTs will vary considerably depending on the nature of the program. HQ PgDTs will typically include other CEMP team members and representatives of other HQ organizations which may include CECW-E (Engineering & Construction), Counsel, Resource Management, Principal Assistant Responsible for Contracting, Public Affairs, Congressional Affairs, and others. The specific roles of Headquarters organizations as members of Program Delivery Teams are described in the Program Management Plans for each program subject to Military Programs oversight and management.

(2) Program Management Plans -- Just as Project Management Plans (PMPs) describe and define the strategy, roles and responsibilities, processes, and procedures for successful project delivery, Program Management Plans (PgMP) will describe and define the specific policies, processes, and procedures under which HQ Program Delivery Teams will operate in providing the HQ policy guidance, execution oversight, and management control for each program subject to Military Programs oversight and management. Program Management Plans will provide the framework within which MSCs and Districts will develop their strategies and PMPs for execution of the projects within the program. As such, the PgMP will focus on

CEMP-ZA

Military Programs Business Process Framework

defining the goals and expectations of the corporate customer, meaning the entity with the primary responsibility for development, justification, budgeting, and execution of the entire program.

Program Management Plans will be developed consistent with the guidance on PMP/PgMP content (REF8005G), development (PROC2000), and approval (PROC2070) contained in the USACE Business Process Manual. Each PgMP will include the specific roles and responsibilities of all organizations and stakeholders on the PgDT, both internal and external; and will include the specific policies, processes and procedures that will be used to manage the program and monitor performance. Key elements of HQ PgMPs include defining the USACE relationship with the corporate customer, describing the USACE role in support of the customer's programming and budget process (see Program Specific Processes – Military, PROC7100 series, in the Business Process Manual) defining the customer's quality and performance requirements, describing the procedures that will be used for receiving and transmitting authority and funding to MSCs/Districts, financial management procedures (REF 8014G), change/contingency management procedures, close-out processes, and any other customer requirements to be supported.

Project Management Plans developed by MSCs/Districts for specific projects within any program will comply with the policies, processes, and requirements documented in the Program Management Plan. Any PMP requirements that are in conflict with the PgMP and cannot be resolved by the MSC/District PDT will be elevated to the HQ Program Manager for resolution in coordination with the corporate customer.

(3) Relationship between HQ Teams and MSC/District PDTs – Headquarters PgDTs, under the leadership of a program manager, provide the policy framework, guidance, resources, and support necessary for the success of MSC and District PDTs. As such, the HQ PgDT is an integral part of MSC/District PDTs.

The HQ Program Manager will be the primary focal point for participation of the HQ on MSC/District PDTs. The responsibilities of the HQ PgDT and the specific nature of the support provided to MSC/District PDTs will be defined in the Program Management Plan. In addition to the concrete support that may be provided to MSC/District PDTs (such as provision of directive authority, funding, policy guidance), HQ PgDTs provide information and guidance to PDTs on the broader context relating to project execution, including political/policy sensitivities or other issues about which a District PDT and its local customer may not be aware (see discussion below on quality and customer expectations).

MSC/District PDTs and HQ PgDTs comprise a “team of teams” working together to meet customer requirements and expectations.

(4) Quality and Customer Expectations (REF8008G) – Consistent with ER 5-1-11, quality will be defined as meeting the customer's goals and expectations, consistent with

CEMP-ZA

Military Programs Business Process Framework

compliance with legal requirements, public policy (including Administration policy; as well as DOD, Army and USACE policy and guidance), and professional standards.

The PgDT will work with customers and other key stakeholders to determine the program requirements and expectations to be documented in the Program Management Plan. Because most Military Programs customers share USACE requirements for compliance with legal obligations, policy requirements, and professional standards; meeting customer requirements and expectations will be weighted heavily in defining quality.

USACE programs rarely serve only a single customer/stakeholder. Typically, USACE services benefit a hierarchy of customers and external stakeholders. These often include the installation level using agency and Directorate of Public Works, the agency responsible for programming and budgeting of the project (the corporate customer), their higher headquarters, USACE's higher headquarters (DA and OSD), external regulatory agencies, and Congress. Although all of these customer and stakeholders may share the goal of successful project completion, they often have conflicting priorities and expectations. A key role of USACE teams at all levels is to understand those priorities and expectations and mediate the goals and expectations that will best satisfy the hierarchy of customers and stakeholders. Teams at all levels (HQ, MSC, & District) must understand the diversity of goals and expectations of our customers and stakeholders.

Headquarters PgDTs, although aware of the expectations of local installation customers, will focus their attention primarily on meeting the expectations of the corporate customer and higher headquarters. Headquarters PgDTs and Program Managers have the primary responsibility for communicating the expectations and requirements of the corporate/headquarters level customer to MSC and District PDTs. To the extent possible, those expectations are to be documented in Program Management Plans to form a baseline set of expectations from which MSC and District PDTs can build PMPs that satisfy corporate customers, local installation customers, and external stakeholders to the maximum extent possible.

(5) Communications (REF8006G) -- A key tenet of the Business Process is that open and honest sharing of information promotes successful program execution. Informal communications shall be the primary and preferred method of day-to-day interaction between team members at all levels. The lead HQ Program Manager will be the focal point for team communications. As such, PgDT members are responsible for ensuring that the HQ Program Manager is informed of all substantive program communications. Although the authority of the formal organizational structure and chain of command will be respected, open sharing of information and ideas among team members at all levels (district, MSC, HQ, external organizations) is encouraged. Program Management Plans will include a communications plan that defines roles and responsibilities for addressing potential public affairs and/or legislative affairs issues, and that defines any specific requirements for formal communications (such as periodic updates, in-progress reviews, and senior executive review groups).

CEMP-ZA Military Programs Business Process Framework

(6) Headquarters Program Execution Management and Oversight –

A. Background/Nature of CEMP Role: Direction, oversight, and support of programs for which the Directorate of Military Programs (CEMP) is responsible is conducted principally at the working level by Headquarters Program Managers and their Program Delivery Teams. For many “mission” programs (those programs for which USACE is the statutory or Executive Agent), CEMP has primary responsibility of management and oversight of design and construction execution, fiscal management and customer satisfaction. In these cases, the role of CEMP includes directive and financial control, wherein program managers release program authority and/or funding by line item to MSC/Districts at the direction of or under the delegated authority of the program sponsor/corporate customer. CECW-E, in conjunction with CEMP, as appropriate, has responsibility for oversight of technical and quality control aspects of project execution, such as design cost targets, design quality, A-E liability issues, technical competency, and construction cost and time growth. For these programs, HQ PgDTs are integral to successful program execution as they provide authority, funding, and support throughout the life cycle of each fiscal year program. Although for most programs, USACE is not responsible for planning, programming and budgeting, there are exceptional cases, such as the Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) program, for which CEMP is responsible for cradle-to-grave planning, programming, budgeting, execution, and reporting of all FUDS program activities.

At the other end of the spectrum, the CEMP role may be limited to general program oversight, analysis, and support for MSC/District issue resolution when necessary. This approach is generally applicable to reimbursable, interagency or international programs for which funds and authority are provided by the customer directly to the executing USACE organization (i.e., not directed through HQUSACE). For these programs, the CEMP role is focused on monitoring the progress of execution and obligation of funds, assuring customer satisfaction, and analysis to ensure corporate visibility of the magnitude and nature of reimbursable programs, and assure customer satisfaction. The overview and analysis responsibility will be exercised through heavy reliance on automated information systems (AIS), such as the project management AIS, CEFMS, FUDSMIS, and others.

For all programs subject to CEMP oversight, Program Managers and their supporting PgDTs have a responsibility for keeping the Director of Military Programs and the senior executive leadership informed regarding program status and key issues. This ongoing information sharing promotes sound decision making at all levels and assists the USACE command and senior leadership in exercising their executive direction and leadership responsibilities.

Because of the diversity of CEMP programs, this document will not attempt to define the CEMP processes, procedures, and performance metrics that apply to programs and initiatives subject to CEMP management and oversight. As discussed above, these specifics are defined in individual Program Management Plans maintained for each program. In addition, a Program Integration and Execution Management Plan being developed by CEMP-MP will provide details on program integration, execution management and Executive oversight (including performance measures,

CEMP-ZA Military Programs Business Process Framework

rating criteria, use of corporate automated information systems, etc...) in the Directorate of Military Programs. General procedures for Executive Oversight are summarized in subparagraph (6) B. below.

B. Executive Oversight: Selected programs, primarily those “mission” or direct funded programs directed to USACE in its role as a DOD construction agent, are subject to executive level oversight by the Director of Military Programs to ensure efficient and effective execution in accordance with statutory requirements and customer expectations. Executive direction and oversight is conducted by measuring performance against selected metrics relating to statutory and customer expectations for timeliness of execution (financial and physical), cost effectiveness, and quality. These Command Management Review (CMR) indicators are published annually in the Consolidated Command Guidance. A listing of the CMR indicators for CEMP/CECW-E, including details pertaining to their definition, calculation and rating criteria will be included in the Program Integration and Execution Management Plan being developed by CEMP-MP. A key performance measure is construction contract award of projects in the planned annual fiscal year program. MSCs annually provide CEMP with a forecasted schedule for construction awards of the annual program. Success in meeting or exceeding the forecast is a key measure of success, particularly for projects in the annual military construction (MILCON) programs.

Performance review and feedback to MSCs is conducted via the following forums :

- **Directorate Management Review (DMR):** This is a quarterly video teleconference held by the Director, MP with the Commanders of all MSCs and their senior staff to review and discuss program execution status and issues and selected CMR indicators. Presentation format is included in the Program Integration and Execution Management Plan.
- **Command Management Review (CMR):** Quarterly review held by the Chief of Engineers to review selected CMR indicators from all HQ Directorates and discuss issues. Attended by all HQ senior leader and MSC Commanders.
- **Executive Steering Board (ESB):** The ESB is comprised of the senior leadership of CEMP and CECW-E and customer representatives from Army Chief of Staff for Installation Management (ACSIM), U.S. Air Force, MEDCOM and other DoD agencies. The primary purpose of the ESB is proactive management and control of program execution with particular emphasis on programming, program release and impediments to execution of future year programs. Data elements being monitored (e.g. program and project release schedules, project program amounts, current working estimates (CWE), design start, RTA, etc.) are drawn from the AIS.
- **MSC Line Item Review (LIR):** The MSC LIR is a semi-annually review of the status of design and construction execution on all programs and projects subject to the DMR. The

CEMP-ZA Military Programs Business Process Framework

MSC LIR held in the first part of the FY helps to establish the official ‘locked-in’ Program Execution Forecast of awards. Individual program or MSC line item reviews may be held at the discretion of the PgDT, in coordination with the customer(s) and MSC(s). Details regarding the MSC LIR and procedures for the annual execution forecast of awards are included in the Program Integration and Execution Management Plan (CEMP-MP).

C. Use of Corporate Automated Information Systems (AIS): Maximum use will be made of approved corporate automated project and financial management information systems for data collection to support HQ management, control and oversight of program execution. HQ reliance will be on design and construction data in PROMIS and the Resident Management System (RMS) as reported through the web based PPDS until the P2 AIS is deployed and implemented USACE-wide¹. The continued use of and/or development of ‘home grown automated systems’ will not be supported. Headquarters Command Inspections and MSCs management of District/Lab/Center will enforce this prohibition and ensure that the approved AISs are being fully utilized.

Data calls to FOAs that require the manual collection of data to meet continuing MSC, HQ or higher authority information and management requirements will be terminated. These current and future information requirements will be thoroughly evaluated for necessity by the appropriate AIS configuration management boards and, if accepted, will be programmed into the standard AIS and become one of the ‘tools’ for management control.

All data drawn from the Corps AIS to support HQ management, control and/or oversight of program execution is expected to be accurate and timely. Significant decisions by HQ, Department of the Army, DoD and customers regarding USACE performance, funding and manpower allocations, etc. will be made based on data drawn from the AISs. MSCs are expected to ensure the highest degree of data quality and timeliness of reporting. Program and project managers at all levels are expected to support data quality and timeliness through periodic checks on data quality.

Except for FUDSMIS (see footnote), the Program Integration and Business Process Branch (CEMP-MP) is designated as the POC for continuing and new information requirements to support HQ management control. CEMP-MP will act as CEMP liaison to other HQ Directorates

¹ FUDS Management Information System (FUDSMIS): The FUDSMIS is a standing management information system used by DoD, HQDA, HQUSACE, MSCs, and Districts to manage and execute the Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) Program. The system allows all program managers the ability to track and report FUDS property, project, and phase data in support of the DoD Restoration Management Information System (RMIS), PPBES process, as well as the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) Annual Report to Congress and Environmental Liability Reports. In addition to RMIS, DoD has mandated that the FUDSMIS be integrated with DoD's Native American Environmental Tracking System (NAETS). Unlike PROMIS or P2, FUDSMIS is not a tool for project management, resource planning, and workload management. However, the FUDSMIS will be linked with P2 to support those PMBP functional requirements.

CEMP-ZA
Military Programs Business Process Framework

and Offices and AIS Configuration Management Boards for the modification of current and/or development of new information requirements.

(7) Process Improvements – In addition to defining and managing the quality of the services and products we provide to our customers, the USACE Business Process challenges us to use best practices and seek continuous improvement. To meet the challenge of continuous improvement, we must periodically evaluate our processes, assess our success in meeting customer expectations, compare our performance to other organizations performing similar functions, and change our processes to achieve improvements. This is by definition a quality management process corresponding to the “Plan-Do-Check-Act” cycle that is the foundation of USACE quality management practices (REF8008G). Pending adoption of a formalized system for organizational quality management at HQUSACE, all team members have a responsibility to implement the “Plan-Do-Check-Act” process for their work, and to make recommendations for improvements. The USACE Business Process will be used to conduct evaluations of current processes, make recommendations, and implement process improvements.

6. Conclusion: This document has defined a framework or concept of operations for the Directorate of Military Programs, within the context of the Project Management Business Process. This framework is intended to 1) form the foundation for development of program management plans and headquarters processes and practices for all work under the management and oversight of the Directorate of Military Programs, and 2) facilitate understanding of fundamental Military Programs objectives and operational concepts to all involved in the work of the directorate.



CARL A. STROCK
Major General, USA
Director of Military Programs