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**Appendix C: AWP Project Definition Assessment Tool**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project:** | **SCORE** | **Date:** |
|  | **Description** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Disagree** | **Neutral** | **Agree** | **Strongly Agree** | **Comments/Observations** |
|  |  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |  |
| **1.0** | **Project Definition** |  |
| 1.1 | Do you have a construction sequencing plan? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2 | Do you have a construction contracting plan? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 | Do you have a procurement plan? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.4 | Have you made decisions regarding level of design for technical deliverables to support work packaging? (For example, will small bore piping have isometrics?) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Section 1.0 Total** (out of 20) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| **2.0** | **Construction Planning** |  |
| 2.1 | Has a project work packaging plan been developed? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 | Does the project work packaging plan include consideration ofcontractors’ work packaging processes? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3 | Have information flows been aligned across all parties? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.4 | Is the engineering work packaging execution sequence compatible with the sequence of construction? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.5 | Is the plan for offsite fabrication compatible with the sequence of construction? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.6 | Has material procurement been integrated with the construction plan? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project:** | **SCORE** | **Date:** |
|  | **Description** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Disagree** | **Neutral** | **Agree** | **Strongly Agree** | **Comments/Observations** |
| 2.7 | Does the materials management process and system integratewith work packaging process and systems? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.8 | Is the project risk register reflected in the construction sequence and work packaging plan? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.9 | Does the work packaging plan include considerations for sitelogistics and support services? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.10 | Have system turnover designations been added to the coding systems for all work packages (to allow future sorting by system requirements)? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Section 2.0 Total** (out of 50) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| **3.0** | **Engineering Planning** |  |
| 3.1 | Has the project been broken into distinct areas to support logical work packaging? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.2 | Is there a process in place to assure engineering understanding and acceptance of the IWP execution philosophy (for example, engineering to provide valves to isolate a piping system for testing)? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.3 | Has a data integration plan been put in place to assure compatibility between systems and minimize the need for data re-entry? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Section 3.0 Total** (out of 15) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project:** | **SCORE** | **Date:** |
|  | **Description** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Disagree** | **Neutral** | **Agree** | **Strongly Agree** | **Comments/Observations** |
| **4.0** | **Refinement of Schedule WBS** |  |
| 4.1 | Is the WBS aligned with owner, engineering, and constructionneeds and plans? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.2 | Has an IWP release plan been developed and issued? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Section 4.0 Total** (out of 10) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| **5.0** | **CWP Boundary Development** |  |
| 5.1 | Have specific work packaging requirements been written into every subcontract and major purchase order, including formatting, level of detail, and frequency? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.2 | Does the schedule reflect the work packaging plan? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.3 | Have work packaging plans included an assessment of craft availability by discipline? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.4 | Have work packaging plans included an assessment of long- lead items? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Section 5.0 Total** (out of 20) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| **6.0** | **EWP Boundary Development** |  |
| 6.1 | Has an engineering project standard that correlates to the WBS been developed to allow for revision control? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Section 6.0 Total** (out of 5) |  |  |  |  |  |  |