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**AWP Project Integration Flowcharts | Overview**

The AWP Project Integration Flowcharts (PIFs) are tools that illustrate how the key functions and activities of AWP can be integrated into a traditional project delivery model in order to maximize the benefits of AWP execution. The PIFs are an elaboration of the recommended AWP execution model detailed in Stages I, II, and III. (See Volume 1.) This elaboration translates the recommended model into one that depicts in detail the execution processes carried out by the project’s stakeholders or functional groups: owner, project management, construction management, engineering contractor, supply chain management, and construction contractor. Note that the presentation of the PIF charts is not meant to imply hierarchy in terms of contractual relations among stakeholder groups. While the PIFs also identify key process functions, project organizations may have a different assignment of roles than those assumed in the charts. If necessary, users must map functions in the charts to the specific context of their project or organization.

For each execution task or process, a PIF charts identifies key predecessors and successors, and identifies organizational positions. (See also section 3.3 below.) As a project progresses from early phases of studies and planning through the detailed engineering phase and on into construction execution and completion, these tools provide a reference for quickly checking whether necessary tasks have been completed and a look-ahead for ensuring that remaining critical items are addressed. (NOTE: Interactive versions of the PIF charts are hosted on the COAA website; the interactive versions provide more detail about each activity, as well as links to job/role descriptions per task. Find them at www.coaa.ab.ca.)3

These flowcharts depict a typical example of the integration and relative timing of an AWP project. However, tasks can be shuffled from one party to another, or the timing can be changed relative to other tasks if such changes better suit the abilities of the parties involved and the needs of the project. What is important is to have the tasks that are identified in the flowcharts completed in order to support succeeding tasks and the overall AWP execution effort.

The tasks are also categorized into three levels of integration: 1) standard project procedures; 2) application of AWP; and 3) integration of AWP and standard procedure. Tasks identified as standard project procedures are already a part of standard project execution and require little or no modifications to fulfill the requirements of AWP. Although these tasks do not require significant modification to support AWP, they are critical components of AWP and should not be overlooked in the planning and execution of an AWP project.

The second category of integration, application of AWP, is associated with new tasks required for AWP execution. These tasks are unique to AWP and are not typically associated with traditionally executed projects. They are perhaps the easiest of the tasks in any of the three categories of integration because they do not require modifications to existing policies or practices; this category simply involves the

implementation of new tasks into the work process. Assessing activities at this level can also provide useful input for estimating the additional resources required to support AWP.

Tasks classified under the integration of AWP and standard procedure category are the ones that will require the most attention and effort to implement. These are tasks that are part of a traditionally executed project, but may require considerable effort to integrate into current standard work practices. With respect to the implementation of AWP in traditional execution plans, these tasks should be addressed first, since they represent the majority of the changes required to successfully perform AWP.

These tasks have been divided into three categories according the level of integration of AWP into traditional procedures. This division is not intended to indicate the importance of any of the categories. Each task identified in the flowcharts supports AWP, and all are individually important to the overall process.

The integration flowcharts are described below in more detail per stakeholder. However, users should bear in mind that the tasks identified can be moved from one responsible party to another, or may be a component of another larger task that is a part of the project execution plan being implemented. It should also be noted that, while separation of project phases is ideal, on many projects, it is likely that the beginning of a project phase may overlap with the end of the preceding phases. In these cases, it is still imperative that the AWP activities associated with the overlapping phase be completed prior to commencing activities for the follow-on phase.