

Re: Resource vs. Task Dependency

Source: <http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Project/microsoft.public.project/2005-02/1193.html>

From: Jan De Messemaeker (*jandemes*)

Date: 02/15/05

Date: Tue, 15 Feb 2005 18:23:37 +0100

Hi all,

It's a rare occasion so let it go on record:
I COMPLETELY agree with Steve.

:~)

--
Jan De Messemaeker
Microsoft Project Most Valuable Professional
<http://users.online.be/prom-ade/index.htm>
32-495-300 620

--
Jan De Messemaeker
Microsoft Project Most Valuable Professional
<http://users.online.be/prom-ade/index.htm>
32-495-300 620

"Steve House [MVP]" <sjhouse.remove.this@to.send.hotmail.com> schreef in bericht news:OEFK0y1EFHA.3924@TK2MSFTNGP09.phx.gbl...
> Maybe I'm just thick, but I'm still trying to grasp the advantage of a
> resource "dependency" the functions like a task dependency does. A task
> dependency is straight forward - we can't put on the rafters until the
> wall
> are in place to support them, dictated by the law of gravity not allowing
> one to park the rafters in free space and then stuff the walls in
> underneath
> them later. The predecessor task is thus controlling the time of the
> sucessor based on the dictates of the actual nature of the process itself.
> But a resource dependency is saying the that order and timing of the
> sequence is determined by the availability of the required resource and
> it's
> the first of those two factors that I'm having trouble with. Yes, Jack
> Craftsman can only work on one of either polishing fids or carving widgets
> at any given moment and he's the only resource capable of doing either
> task.
> Obviously they must be sequenced but the kicker in my mind is WHAT
> sequence?
> If the order of the sequence isn't arbitrary - the widgets are components
> of
> the fids and a fid can't be polished until its widget is fitted in place -
> then a task dependency is appropriate for sequencing them. If it is
> arbitrary - the tasks are completely independent of each other in terms of
> process logic - then leveling coupled with leveling priorities will
> accomplish the sequencing. I don't see the advantage of adding another
> dependency type that duplicates that functionality graphically.

microsoft.public.project: Re: Resource vs. Task Dependency

>
> You say one would be able to see timelines driven by task dependencies
> versus on driven by resource dependencies but I don't see how it could be
> possible that they are different. For a task to take place both task
> dependencies and resource availability must be considered. All of the
> physical requirements for the work on the task must be in place and the
> resources who will do the work must also be present - switch off
considering
> either one in the scheduling and the resulting timing of the task is
bogus.
> A task dependency is driven by the physical nature of the process that
> creates the project's deliverables, It can never be switched off or
ignored
> and still be able to sucessfully complete the project - the rafters will
> fall to the ground if we lift them in place before the supporting walls
are
> three no matter how badly I, the Project Managee, might like it to be
> otherwise and no matter how much money it would save us if we only could
> pull it off. A project plan that switches off that link and creates a
> timeline assuming it could be ignored is just simply wrong and I don't see
> any use for it. As for seeing timelines when resource dependencies are
> taken into account - isn't that exactly what you get when you view the
> pre-leveled schedule versus the post-leveled schedule? In fact, the
> Leveling Gantt view gives you both on same chart with the pre-leveled and
> post-leveled schedules distinctly colour coded.
> --
> Steve House [MVP]
> MS Project Trainer & Consultant
> Visit <http://www.mvps.org/project/faqs.htm> for the FAQs
>
>
> "JackD" <momokuri@gmail> wrote in message
> news:ux1Y3utEFHA.3596@TK2MSFTNGP12.phx.gbl...
> > If the links between tasks had some intelligence, rather than just two
end
> > points, type and lag, then there are a number of things which could be
> > done.
> > First and most obvious you could tell immediately if your project was
task
> > or resource limited. It would be trivial to have project calculate two
> > times
> > based on task vs. resource dependencies and tell you what the difference
> > was. Second, you could pinpoint areas where adding/substituting
resources
> > would affect the critical path.
> >
> > The key to this is having links which have multiple properties so that
> > they
> > can be switched on or off, can be filtered and displayed by type, etc.
> >
> > Wouldn't it be nice to have leveling improved by this sort of thing? I
> > think
> > I posted about a year ago about some other types of task dependencies
> > which
> > would improve project. Critical path scheduling got it's big break from
> > the
> > growth of cheap computing power (which made it possible to calculate
> > networks which were too complicated to do by hand). With the exception
of
> > leveling (which is many years old) Project has not taken advantage of
the
> > GHz which are now available. Microsoft has stuck with a scheduling model

microsoft.public.project: Re: Resource vs. Task Dependency

> > which is decades old. There really is room for innovation. Working on
new
> > types of dependencies is one area for improvement.
> >
> > --
> > -Jack ... For project information and macro examples visit
> > <http://masamiki.com/project>
> >
> > .
> > "Steve House [MVP]" <sjhouse.remove.this@to.send.hotmail.com> wrote in
> > message news:uUgEZntEFHA.2600@TK2MSFTNGP09.phx.gbl...
> >> A resource can't be two places at once and so out of a pair of tasks
that
> > he
> >> must do, one must follow the other. But *what* sequence? A link, to
me,
> >> indicates that there is a certain preferred order in the sequence.
> > Project
> >> can currently handle mandatory links driven by the nature of the
process
> >> itself just fine. But the order of sequencing required by resource
> >> availability is essentially arbitrary. Staggering concurrent tasks to
> >> resolve resource overloading is precisely what leveling does. Why
would
> >> adding another type of link to accomplish the same end result be
> > beneficial?
> >> What would a "resource dependency" link give you that leveling,
> >> controlled
> >> by leveling priority settings, does not?
> >>
> >> --
> >> Steve House [MVP]
> >> MS Project Trainer & Consultant
> >> Visit <http://www.mvps.org/project/faqs.htm> for the FAQs
> >>
> >>
> >> "jhn" <jhn@discussions.microsoft.com> wrote in message
> >> news:B16ED020-A5DF-45D6-A23F-6B6CD65D6DAE@microsoft.com...
> >> > Can MS-Project differentiate between a resource and a task
dependency?
> > In
> >> > MS-Project there is only 1 type of dependency but it would be nice to
> > know
> >> > if
> >> > that dependency is resource or task dependent--it would allow the
easy
> >> > update
> >> > of adding resources to crash the schedule and knowing which
> >> > dependencies
> >> > can
> >> > be redirected.
> >> >
> >> > This comes as a result of a posted question on 1/28/2005. JackD has
> >> > requested this before as well from reading his response with no
action
> > > by
> >> > Microsoft. There is a claim that this can be done (although not
> > > visually
> >> > with a link) by Steve House [MVP]--I have used the leveling engine
> > > before
> >> > and
> >> > it only seems to work on simple classroom exercise-type projects. I

microsoft.public.project: Re: Resource vs. Task Dependency

```
> > like
> >> > my
> >> > (and JackD's) solution better because management (who you ultimately
> > have
> >> > as
> >> > a sponsor) can quickly look down the column and determine which
> >> > dependencies
> >> > are real and which are resource based rather than switching between
> >> > resources
> >> > in the resource view.
> >>
> >
> >
>
```