

## Re: Predecessors!

**Source:** <http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Project/microsoft.public.project/2004-08/1295.html>

---

**From:** JulieD ([JulieD\\_at\\_hctsReMoVeThIs.net.au](mailto:JulieD_at_hctsReMoVeThIs.net.au))

**Date:** 08/30/04

Date: Mon, 30 Aug 2004 15:26:56 +0800

Hi Steve

good example ... but i seriously think you need to get out more :)

Cheers

JulieD

"Steve House" <[sjhouse.remove.this@to.send.hotmail.com](mailto:sjhouse.remove.this@to.send.hotmail.com)> wrote in message news:eJLu%23kUjEHA.1764@TK2MSFTNGP10.phx.gbl...

> *LOL Ain't it the truth! Last night I dreamt about that problem (have to stop with the pizza and salami just before bedtime) trying to figure out where linking the summary tasks might have a clear advantage and I came up with one. Imagine a project with 3 phases A, B, and C. The three phases are*

> *such that all of A needs to be completed before B starts and all of B completed before C starts. A & C have several, say 5, subtasks under them that are linked within the phase FS. BUT phase B consists of 10 1 day tasks*

> *that are completely arbitrary in the order in which they're done. Thus links to sequence them are superfluous and in fact in the scenario I'm developing they would be a negative. There is no predefined order of tasks*

> *in B and no single task can be identified as the "first task" or the "last task" (yes I could put milestones in as subtasks as well and have one as a predecessor to all 10 activities and another as a successor to all 10 but that results in a spaghetti bowl of links). I assign resource Barney to all*

> *the tasks in B. Resource leveling sequences out the tasks in B to set its duration. But how best to model its relationship to phases A & C? This is*

> *one case where I think I'd use a link from Summary A to B and another link from B to summary C. One reason is that it does indeed preserve the arbitrary nature of the task sequencing in B as part of the model. We don't*

> *care at all which subtask is done first, we 'll leave that to the resource(s) to decide for themselves. At that matters to us from a scheduling standpoint is how long it will take them to get all 10 done.*

If

Re: Predecessors!

microsoft.public.project: Re: Predecessors!

> we now acquire additional resource Fred who is also capable of doing those  
B  
> subtasks, we can substitute him for Barney on half of those tasks and when  
> we re-level the duration of phase B and the start of phase C automatically  
> adjusts without us having to worry about WHICH B level subtask each  
resource  
> is on or how we should rearrange the links. B gets done sooner so C can  
> start earlier and that's all we need to deal with.  
> --  
> Steve House [MVP]  
> MS Project Trainer/Consultant  
> Visit <http://www.mvps.org/project/faqs.htm> for the FAQs  
>  
>  
> "Mark Durrenberger" <durrenm@yahoo.com> wrote in message  
> news:e2JdylSjEHA.2932@TK2MSFTNGP10.phx.gbl...  
> > "It depends" is the classic consultant answer :-)  
> >  
> > Mark  
> >  
> >  
> > ---  
> > \_\_\_\_\_  
> > Mark Durrenberger, PMP  
> > Principal, Oak Associates, Inc, www.oakinc.com  
> > "Advancing the Theory and Practice of Project Management"  
> > \_\_\_\_\_  
> >  
> > The nicest thing about NOT planning is that failure  
> > comes as a complete surprise and is not preceded by  
> > a period of worry and depression.  
> >  
> > - Sir John Harvey-Jones  
> > "Steve House" <sjhouse.remove.this@to.send.hotmail.com> wrote in message  
> > news:OvcBRFGjEHA.1776@TK2MSFTNGP15.phx.gbl...  
> > > Some people will argue to never link summary tasks while others will  
say  
> > > it's ok. I'd say, it depends <grin> - how's that for precise and  
> > > definitive?). If Summary task A with all it's subtasks must be  
finished  
> > in  
> > > it's entirety before any part of Summary task B begins AND if you know  
> for  
> > > sure which subtask in A will be the last one done and can identify the  
> one  
> > > task in B that will always be first, then you can link from the last  
sub  
> > in  
> > > A to the first sub in B. If A and B have several parallel chains of  
> tasks  
> > > in each and you don't necessarily know in advance which task in A will

Re: Predecessors!

> end  
>>> being the last one or which in B will end up being the first one, you  
>> could  
>>> link the two summaries. I've seem perfectly workable project plans  
> using  
>>> both methods, indeed, even using both methods in different parts of  
the  
>> same  
>>> plan. The bottom line is what gives you the most readily understood  
>>> schedule that serves as a valid predictive model of the project work  
>> itself.  
>>>  
>>> --  
>>> Steve House [MVP]  
>>> MS Project Trainer/Consultant  
>>> Visit <http://www.mvps.org/project/faqs.htm> for the FAQs  
>>>  
>>> "ak" <ak@discussions.microsoft.com> wrote in message  
>>> news:9E64AEB9-9820-409B-BBB3-CAE8052F7D96@microsoft.com...  
>>>> Hello,  
>>>> My question is: Is it preferable to use summary tasks as  
predecessor,  
>> and  
>>>> if not why?  
>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>>  
>  
>  
>