

Projects fit for purpose: delivering more with less in the public sector

Sponsored by the
Project Management Institute

FOREWORD

The UK Government is undertaking an impressive and exciting range of projects, from fundamental business transformations, new schools and better railways, to the latest in medical treatment, major advances in defence systems and significant IT development projects. The challenge is significant and there is no question that in future the public sector will continue to be required to successfully deliver these projects and more for less.

In 2011 the Major Projects Authority (MPA) was set up with a Prime Ministerial mandate, confirming the Government's commitment to world class project delivery and improving project performance for the taxpayer. The MPA's mandate is to provide support for departments, and transparency and assurance for taxpayers and Ministers on the performance of the Government Major Projects Portfolio.

To improve the performance of major projects and build project delivery capability and capacity back into the public sector we are focusing on the four priorities:

- **Capability** – Continuing to build a cadre of Project Leaders across government with the ability to communicate, lead, and develop project teams for success.
- **Profession** – Ensuring that the public sector is the 'place to come' for project delivery professionals, where individuals can develop key technical and 'softer' skills.
- **Strategic prioritisation & Front end loading** – Providing high levels of support and assurance to departments in the project set up phase; ensuring policy understands delivery from the outset.
- **Challenge, assure and support** – Providing expert advice and support to Departments to assure the delivery of major projects, helping to provide transparency on the GMPP.

'Projects fit for purpose: delivering more with less in the public sector' captures the experience of Project Managers and Senior Responsible Owners who deliver public sector projects. The success factors identified neatly overlaps with the MPA priorities, and our maxim 'Right projects, done right'. We welcome this research and look forward to working closely with PMI and other institutions and academic groups to share and promulgate the lessons from all of the good work being undertaken.

Tim Banfield,

Major Projects Authority

ABOUT LONDON ECONOMICS

London Economics (LE) is one of Europe's leading specialist economics and policy consultancies. Based in London and with offices and associate offices in five other European capitals, we advise an international client base throughout Europe and beyond on economic and financial analysis, litigation support, policy development and evaluation, business strategy, and regulatory and competition policy.

Our consultants are highly-qualified economists who apply a wide range of analytical tools to tackle complex problems across the business and policy spheres.

Our approach combines the use of economic theory and sophisticated quantitative methods, including the latest insights from behavioural economics, with practical know-how ranging from commonly used market research tools to advanced experimental methods at the frontier of applied social science.

We are committed to providing customer service to world-class standards and take pride in our clients' success. For more information, please visit www.londoneconomics.co.uk.

Head Office

Somerset House, New Wing, The Strand, London, WC2R 1LA, United Kingdom

w: londoneconomics.co.uk

e: info@londoneconomics.co.uk

@LondonEconomics

t: +44 (0)20 3701 7700

f: +44 (0)20 3701 7701

CONTENTS

1 Background and Context	7
2 Communication	10
3 Leadership	12
4 Origination	14
5 Project Management	18
6 Stakeholders	22
7 Project team and resourcing	23
8 Summary	26
Annex 1 Method	30
Annex 2 List of interviews	32

TABLES & FIGURES

Tables

Table 1: Success Factors: Communication	10
Table 2: Success Factors: Knowledge Sharing	11
Table 3: Success Factors: Leadership	13
Table 4: Success Factors: Origination	14
Table 5: Success Factors: Project Management	18
Table 6: Success Factors: Stakeholders	22
Table 7: Success Factors: Team	24

Figures:

Figure 1: Most defining characteristics of complexity in projects (PMI, 2013)	8
--	----------

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

London Economics (LE) has been commissioned by the Project Management Institute (PMI) to conduct an exploratory study of success factors in public sector project and programme management in the United Kingdom. What makes projects fit for purpose in a fiscal environment that requires the public sector to deliver more with less? The study forms part of PMI's ongoing effort to understand what works in project management globally and to make these insights available to policymakers, project managers and the wider public. This research sits alongside similar research projects done elsewhere in the world including the U.S. and Canada.

The research presented here is based on a number of stakeholder interviews with project managers (PMs) and senior responsible owners (SROs). The success of projects undertaken by public sector bodies is a sensitive topic; as such, the majority of interviewees agreed to participate in this research only under the condition of anonymity.

Looking only at a sample of project and programme managers, SROs and other professionals involved in project management in the public sector necessarily presents only one side of the picture, namely that of the people in charge. Other important perspectives—staff on the project teams, external stakeholders, elected officials ultimately responsible and accountable to the public and the people affected by the programmes—are not represented in the analysis. This insiders' view of project success factors is valuable as it captures the experience of the people most involved with the problems of project management on a daily basis. However, it has to be recognised that the picture is incomplete and may suffer from biases. In particular, the reported views may represent a rationalization of the behaviour of our interviewees, which might not be optimal for ensuring project success.

Challenges of Project Management

Fixed constraints are not fixed

Project¹ management is about the delivery of a particular aim or objective within certain fixed constraints—timescale, budget, political, operational—while addressing the key risks and interdependencies. This works in many areas; however, in the public sector the major challenge that successful project management needs to overcome is that the fixed constraints are generally not fixed (or worse some may be fixed and others may not): the objectives underpinning the project may change; the budget may change; the timescales may change; what is viewed as politically acceptable may change; and what is viewed as operationally manageable may change. To describe why projects fail, one interviewee used the analogy of sailing a ship by the stars with all the stars moving. PMI research uses the term complexity (see Figure 1) to describe the ambiguity in the features of a project and the multiplicity of external influences (stakeholders, regulations, technology, etc.) that affect project success.

¹ PMI's definition of a project is "a temporary group activity designed to produce a unique product, service or result." See PMI (2014). What is Project Management? Available at: <http://bit.ly/1ffgkCU> [accessed 20 May 2014].

Figure 1:**Most defining characteristics of complexity in projects (PMI, 2013)**

Source: PMI (2013). Navigating complexity. Available at: <http://bit.ly/1m2TMKo> [accessed 20 May 2014].

Scope creep

A major issue in relation to project management success relates to scope creep, where the objective changes because additional requirements are appended. This is particularly an issue within the sphere of IT projects (the Department of Health's National Programme for IT in the NHS is a good example²), which is usually a failure at the corporate level to not fix the requirement adequately, and then not having the courage to leave one project running as specified and catching further requirements in a second project.

Project management structures

Project management has long been seen as a key to addressing this situation, and failure cannot be attributed to a lack of guidance. Project management has a long history in the UK public sector and extensive resources exist for public sector project managers³. The Projects in Controlled Environments (PRINCE) project management methodology was developed by the UK Office of Government Commerce (OGC) in the 1980s. Our interviews confirmed the methodology is widely used, either in its pure form or in slimmed down versions adapted to different environments (e.g., local government, higher education institutions). However, several respondents highlighted the limitations of the methodology, while some mentioned the use of other methodologies (Scrum, Agile) as more appropriate to the dynamic environment of public sector project management (changing constraints, etc.).

Culture and status of project management

We find evidence the culture of project management varies across different parts of government (local, central, executive agencies, non-departmental public bodies) as well as different types of projects. As a

² See National Audit Office (2011). Department of Health The National Programme for IT in the NHS: An update on the delivery of detailed care records systems. Available at: <http://bit.ly/1pcbJH2> [accessed 20 May 2014].

³ <http://bit.ly/1jpUYX1>, <http://bit.ly/1hWDh1q>

result, the status of project management as a discipline varies, which affects the role of project managers and their conception of their work. The variety of experiences persists despite the Cabinet Office's attempts to influence practices and provide guidance, notably through the Major Projects Authority (MPA) and the Major Projects Leadership Academy, run in partnership with the Saïd Oxford Business School and Deloitte. This is a welcome move but needs to extend across the whole public sector if it is to be truly successful.

Cost over-runs

The cost of project overruns is very high. The minister for the cabinet office stated: **"We know that billions of pounds were squandered in the past. Major projects were one area where countless millions were poured away."**⁴ This makes "getting it right" all the more important, especially in an era where resources are tight.

The report

On the basis of 25 interviews with project managers in public sector organisations in the UK, we categorized respondents' observations on what makes projects successful—and the lessons learned from their experience with the specific projects/programmes covered in the interviews—into six broad categories of success factors:

- communication;
- leadership;
- origination;
- project management;
- stakeholders; and
- project team and resourcing.

The next sections summarise the qualitative insights from the interviews across these six dimensions.

⁴ <https://engage.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/major-projects-authority/>

2. COMMUNICATION

Communication is seen as a central skill for project managers. Most of the interviewees conceptualised their role as **people-focused**, rather than technical, which means that good communications was often described as the most vital task for them. Communication was seen as important on all levels, namely in the leadership function (see below), communicating the vision and objectives of the project to the team and to stakeholders; but also as a day-to-day task in running the project and in response to contingencies during the project.

The emphasis placed by interviewees on communication as a crucial factor in project success echoes recent findings by Forbes⁵, PricewaterhouseCoopers LLC⁶ and Towers Watson⁷. PMI's own research⁸ found that "communications is a core competency that, when properly executed, connects every member of a project team to a common set of strategies, goals and actions. Unless these components are effectively shared by project leads and understood by stakeholders, project outcomes are jeopardized and budgets incur unnecessary risk."

In relation to crisis communications, one interviewee pointed out that a proactive approach to counter hostile media coverage was key to the project's success at certain stages. The project manager believed the project was caught in an ongoing dispute between a newspaper and the government. The performance of the system that the project was meant to establish was being called into question. The project countered by using TV to get its positive message across, and by having press releases and a local spokesperson available each time the media wanted more information.

Table 1:

Success Factors: Communication

Evidence from Interviews	
Leadership communication	"Take people on the journey. They need to understand the reasons for the change and why it is being proposed."
Communication with end users	"Communications are key with customers. If time is not invested in this upfront then 10 times as much will be needed later to redress matters." "User awareness courses were prioritized and a lot of 'hand holding' made available to users."
Crisis communication	"Logic and altruism is not always enough. There are always other agendas at play (e.g., press v government, territorial disputes between departments, contractor rivalry)."

Source: London Economics

5 Forbes Insights Strategic Initiatives (2011). Adapting Corporate Strategy to the Changing Economy. Available at: <http://onforb.es/1h8g8pz> [accessed 20 May 2014]. Nine out of ten CEOs believe that communications is critical to the success of their strategic initiatives.

6 The third global PricewaterhouseCoopers LLC (PwC) survey on the current state of project management (2012). Insights and Trends: Current Portfolio, Programme, and Project Management Practices. (available at: <http://pwc.to/1tjYJBw> [accessed 19 May 2014]) reports that effective communications is associated with a 17% increase in finishing projects within budget.

7 Tower Watson (2012). The 2011-2012 Change and Communication ROI Study Report. Available at: <http://bit.ly/1j7vavk> [accessed 19 May 2014].

Companies with 'highly-effective communications practices' are 1.7 times more likely to outperform their peers financially.

8 PMI (2013). The High Cost of Low Performance: The Essential Role of Communications. Available at <http://bit.ly/1mc8UGl> [accessed 20 May 2014].

Knowledge exchange

A different aspect of communication relates to knowledge sharing. This was seen as an important success factor for public sector project delivery, but also one that was often absent and, at times, actively impeded by the set up and the culture of the organisations our interviewees worked in.

In particular, while having experienced personnel is clearly recognised as a success factor, knowledge exchange often occurs mainly through individuals moving between or within organisations. Only one project in the sample showed clear signs of an active strategy of making external experiences available to the project team, in the form of members of the project team attending procurement conventions with other suppliers and users of eProcurement systems.

In relation to the dissemination of best practice, interviewees viewed this as an area where government has consistently failed; in part because so few efforts had been made to achieve knowledge transfer. They also felt that when central government departments were reorganised, the element of the department that had been saved was inevitably watered down or lost. One interviewee stated: "The Civil Service has never properly invested in knowledge management." However, things may be changing. Several respondents referred to the MPA as a promising initiative for disseminating best practice. The focus of the MPA on very large projects necessarily limits its relevance for local government projects, however. One interviewee in a local government project management role was not aware of the MPA. In general, the absence of a central agency that disseminates best practice in project management throughout the public sector is striking, and the impact of the MPA will be interesting to watch.

Table 2:

Success Factors: Knowledge Sharing

Evidence from Interviews	
Informal knowledge sharing	<p>"drew on her experience of managing similar programmes in other local authorities, and her experience of previously being an inspector."</p> <p>"The national nature of the programme meant that there was a cohort of contractors and specialist advisors moving around the country from project to project. They brought with them experience and learning from elsewhere."</p>
Lack of a knowledge-sharing culture	<p>"Exchange of ideas? Yeah, right."</p> <p>"Post project reviews are rarely done in higher education, so learning is not collected for future use."</p>
Formal knowledge sharing	<p>"The only area where [the Department] is taking ideas from others is from the Major Projects Authority and its Major Projects Leadership Academy."</p>

Source: London Economics

3. LEADERSHIP

Leadership was seen as essential for successful public sector project delivery by all interviewees, confirming the MPA's view: "project leadership has been identified as a key factor in major projects failing to deliver high quality outcomes on time and to budget."⁹ Leadership was seen in a broad sense by interviewees and included the roles of the project manager and the senior responsible owner, but also internal stakeholders higher up, including the political level (e.g., ministers, elected officials in local government).

The function of leadership was seen as twofold:

- demonstrating ongoing commitment to the project, including engaging more actively where necessary; and
- disseminating and reinforcing the vision for the project, internally and externally.

Visibility of leadership and clarity of purpose were seen as crucial ingredients in both functions. In terms of skills, an ability to make sense of the project and formulate a vision that can be understood and communicated easily was identified as crucial. The ability to identify, engage and work with the "the right people" was also called out. The latter aspect suggests experience and knowledge (in the sense of knowing relevant people and structures), not just personal qualities (people skills) are important success factors on the leadership side.

Several respondents also highlighted the ability to take risks, adopt innovative solutions, and step in when things go wrong as important leadership qualities.

Leadership was seen as requiring a fine balance between active engagement and delegation of authority. This applies at all levels of an organisation, but was considered particularly important in the relationship between the project manager and the senior responsible owner. At the more senior level, leadership requires the alignment of the project's goals with the strategic objectives of the organisation. Here, leadership needs to empower the project manager to get on with the project. However, it is a careful balance between the SRO empowering the PM and also providing support to the PM through providing direction at key junctures. The role of SRO is thus to look to the:

- board/directors, to articulate the vision behind the project and provide justification, and to ensure board's ongoing engagement with the project; and
- PM to provide support, advice and directions.

Interviewees felt the SRO should interpret the desire of the organisation to go into a particular direction. The PM's role is purely tactical. To achieve the necessary synergy between PM and SRO, confidence is required.

The SRO's role is particularly important during the development of the specification. It was noted repeatedly that the specification needs to be sufficiently detailed, and the level of detail can be considerable (e.g., lux level, min/max temperature in a building). A close relationship between PM and SRO ensures the specification is accurate and permeates all aspects of project management.

The roles of SRO and PM were seen as complementary. The SRO needs to "make the hard decisions" and lend his/her authority to the PM where necessary. This division of labour is replicated at the next level down, in the relationship between project manager and project team. Here, the project manager needs to "give people space to contribute." There is a balance between central direction and local ownership. For the project manager, it is a question of relinquishing duties while still maintaining a shared frame of reference.

⁹ MPA Annual Report 2013.

Other respondents mentioned the importance of leadership in establishing a culture of success in the organisation (“success was encouraged and celebrated”). This was seen as more than an exercise in mood enhancement; a history of successful project delivery was said to raise the confidence of the whole organisation, making future successes more likely. One respondent noted that a key weakness in government comes from a repeated failure to recognise or reward success. “No one is interested in success,” even when the programme is delivered “under budget, early and under the resource budget.”

Table 3:

Success Factors: Leadership

Evidence from Interviews	
Vision	<p>“The project team needs to have an articulated, shared vision. Things not being done to people, but with them providing a collaborative approach to delivery.”</p> <p>“If you can’t articulate the benefits of the project in a simple way (lift conversation), ‘you have no project.’”</p> <p>“Be clear on the objectives and vision and keep revisiting and selling them to staff throughout the project. Expect to have lots of discussion throughout to get people on board and to achieve alignment.”</p> <p>“The wider project team must all buy into the project and understand its objectives. There must be no cynicism.”</p> <p>“Give a clear sense of direction built around a public value proposition that can inspire people. It is about aligning people with a common purpose.”</p> <p>“Make sure everybody understands what the project is about.”</p>
Lack of a knowledge-sharing culture	<p>“Commitment from the right people to make it work. People not systems made it happen.”</p> <p>“Support from senior management and the main board (and its parent body) was vital.”</p> <p>“Senior leadership is important. ... In this case it was important that he gave enough of his personal time to the project to demonstrate its importance to the council and his personal commitment.”</p>
Appropriate intervention	<p>“Commitment from the right people to make it work. People not systems made it happen.”</p> <p>“Support from senior management and the main board (and its parent body) was vital.”</p> <p>“Senior leadership is important. Top managers need to know when to dive down and when to stand back (the art of delegation).”</p>

Source: London Economics

4. ORIGINATION

The way projects are conceived and specified emerged as a fundamental challenge for project success. Broadly, projects that are well-specified, have a compelling rationale and broad-based support (good projects) are the ones more likely to succeed. While this is a truism, it has potentially important implications for the role of project management. In particular, the better the project is conceived, the easier the project manager's job becomes. Careful project orientation becomes a crucial success factor over the lifetime of the project. The need for accurate and realistic specifications at the outset takes on particular importance in procurement project. Some of the most high-profile failures in public sector procurement in recent years (notably the Universal Credit scheme¹⁰ and the National Programme for IT in the NHS¹¹) have been traced to inadequate initial specification of the requirement.

Why projects?

A critical consideration in the conception of a project and programme is the fundamental question: Where does regular day-to-day work end and a new or specific project begins? A mis-specified project is unlikely to be able to use project management, in the sense of an **alternative hierarchy** (see below), effectively.

The overall message from the interviews was that numerous components need to be considered before a project or programme begins. Factors that can imperil project success before the actual work begins include pressure from ministers, optimism bias, and the way the public's expectations around a project are managed. The processes for this are in place and interviewees talked about the different aspects of project origination, including defining outcomes and metrics, identifying stakeholders, building project teams and allocating funds. However, in practice, the specification of projects at the outset still seems to cause problems for project managers later on. This links to the literature on systematic optimism bias in public sector projects¹².

Table 4:

Success Factors: Origination

Evidence from Interviews	
Funding	<p>"Argue for separate resources for the project, as doing it from existing budgets and on top of day jobs is not ideal."</p> <p>Looking back with hindsight, the manager would have asked for more money. At every stage the project, was up against a tight budget and more resources upfront would have helped. In particular it would have allowed more test runs and iterations of the system before the launch.</p>
Objective	<p>"The scoping and exploration of potential risks needs to be done thoroughly up front. This tended to happen as the project went along and several risks emerged which affected the timing. These were mainly around technology issues, and the delayed introduction of lap tops on a related project which had a knock on effect."</p>

¹⁰ See the NAO's early progress report at: <http://bit.ly/1gkWUSy> [accessed 20 May 2014].

¹¹ NOA report available at: <http://bit.ly/1pcbJH2> [accessed 20 May 2014].

¹² See for example Bent Flyvbjerg (2008). "Public Planning of Mega-projects: Overestimation of Demand and Underestimation of Costs." In Hugo Priemus, Bent Flyvbjerg, and Bert van Wee, eds., *Decision-Making On Mega-Projects: Cost-benefit Analysis, Planning, and Innovation*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar, 2008, pp. 120-144

<p>Objective continued</p>	<p>“Clear objectives need to be set. These must then be regularly measured and stuck to.”</p> <p>“Think about what you want to get out of the programme at the outset and make sure you and your partners issue consistent messages.”</p> <p>“The system is fundamentally a good product.”</p> <p>The focus should be on something that at the end of the day will have a real impact on the organisation and which build the organisation’s confidence.</p> <p>“Think really hard about the benefits and how to express them. Always look for non-financial benefits to supplement the financial ones and try to couch these in terms of the wider philosophy or purpose of the project (e.g., the promotion of independence). Use simple direct language and avoid management-speak.”</p> <p>Underestimating the full implications of creating a new body rather than using an existing one (even though this was the right decision)</p> <p>Clear terms of reference are needed at the start of the project. Not only for the project team, but also for the steering group/quality assurance.</p>
<p>Team building & stakeholder engagement</p>	<p>“Try and involve the project manager in the design of the project to avoid them inheriting a project that is not deliverable, or needs excessive retro-fitting”</p> <p>“A key success factor was the understanding that existed from the previous creation of the two borough shared services”</p> <p>The project manager also would have gone to the permanent secretary on day one to get them on board from the outset. This would have stopped junior officials becoming difficult at later stages. The project manager believes they resented the project because it was [] funded (the PM was surprised how territorial the civil service could be).</p> <p>“Map out the key players at the outset, share with them the problem to be solved and ask them to contribute to the solution. Success is more likely if everyone has some ‘skin in the game.’”</p> <p>“Key success factor is to write the business case with the end user/customer in mind. This includes defining metrics and what success looks like in a collaborative way. Success criteria/business case need to be realistic and have to be constantly reviewed and revised where necessary (‘if the world changes’).”</p> <p>“Benefits need to be tangible/measurable, but it’s important not to ‘underestimate the power of stories’ to communicate the vision for the project, both internally and externally.”</p>

Source: London Economics

The discussion in relation to project origination gave rise to a number of interesting conversations. One interviewee raised the fundamental question why project or programme structures should be used to deliver an outcome. The answer in the respondent's view (one of the most senior interviewees in our sample with a long track record in project management at the operational and theoretical level) is that a project structure should be used when you need to "speed up decision-making" by escaping existing management structures, i.e., by building a temporary management and decision-making process which gives the SRO the capacity to drive the project by "separating the project from permanent management hierarchies."

In short, core decision-making in the Civil Service is often slow and relies on a consensus between a number of functions, each making sure it understands and can still operate in the light of the outcome. The role of the hierarchy (i.e., the ordinary structures of the organisation) is to ensure that trusted, capable staff is allocated to the project, and to put the correct processes in place¹³.

The role of projects versus business as usual in the public sector is changing. As one interviewee explained, government failed to recognise the scale of its reform programme in the balance of what government delivers.

In short, in an environment where 90 percent of a department's work constitutes business as usual, a splattering of additional projects could be managed with organisational structures that assume projects represent exceptions to the rule. However, in the current environment, when 50 percent of a department's work is devoted to *change*, just organising this work indifferent projects and requisite processes may not be enough.

One interviewee considered that public sector organisations may not have been radical enough to restructure themselves to cope in an environment where projects are the normal way of delivering policy. In this situation, the "separation of functional hierarchies" may not be enough to cope with the degree of reform underway. The interviewee doubted that any permanent secretaries understood this issue well enough to grapple with it, and suggested that efficiency was being sacrificed at the organisation level, even where individual programmes performed well when looked at in isolation: "avoiding red gateway reviews is not the same as having a green-rated, well-functioning and efficient programme."

The responsibilities of the project and programme leadership in this view lack crucial features not addressed by narrowly focused project management approaches. In particular, the project scope and arrangements need to be defined in relation to the ordinary setup of the organisation in which the project is embedded. The key tasks for the leadership (typically the SRO) thus consist of:

- Ensuring there is enough capacity in the team¹⁴, through one of three means:
 - Using the existing team and strengthening with one or two appointments.
 - Bring in an external organisation to augment the team.
 - Write-off existing arrangements and management hierarchy and establish a temporary new organisation wholly focussed on the task at hand, such as the Olympic Delivery Agency (although this is very expensive).

¹³ The interviewee elaborated that there is a classic mismatch here between standard Civil Service practices and good PPM. In normal Civil Service structures there is an Accounting Officer – this role is accountable to Parliament for the way his department has spent its resources. As such he is meant to retain sufficient control over his Department or Agency to be able to be held to account. However, Accounting Officers are by definition very senior (e.g. Permanent Secretaries or Head of Agencies), in which case they cannot devote the time to being the SRO of an individual project, but neither can they relinquish control to an SRO. Some Departments have tried to short-cut this paradox by making the Accounting Officer only accountable for ensuring that the processes being completed by the project meet the required standard. However, this opens a new problem, returning us to a world where there is an incentive to revert to 'box-ticking' and blandly delivering the process as an outcome in itself, rather than as a means to an ends.

¹⁴ The interviewee felt that the MPA's approach to targeted training for leaders here was wrong – the need was for the broad base of staff to understand why project management methods were used and how to do it well.

- Ensuring the policy is in place.
- Ensuring the risk planning has been imaginative enough to consider all the factors which might throw the programme off schedule. “It shouldn’t just be the standard risks which go into the risk register—the risk register should reflect serious time spent thinking about it.”
- Ensuring the project has access to support services (analysis, commercial, legal, etc.), that may lie outside the core team. Particularly important were analysis to create a narrative with proven benefits (including external commercial benefits arising from out-sourcing significant proportions of project-related expenditure).
- Recognising that “expensive people bring high benefits” to a project.
- Ensuring the project fits in the overall hierarchy, and which Boards the project has and didn’t report to.
- Creating a narrative. A business case is required to demonstrate and track the value being created by the project, but it is only a useful document if the material can be distilled into a narrative and sold. **The business case has to prove; not just asserting the case for the programme¹⁵.** A key element of achieving this is **evidence and clear demonstration of benefits**. An important element in this respect is the extent of engagement with external stakeholders. Specifically, it takes a lot of his time to get this right and get stakeholders to accept the plan through offering a “sustainable relationship based on honouring commitments.”
- Retaining a focus on quality, costs and timely delivery. Care needs to be taken to balance these three constraints, but it is better to take risks on timetable to deliver quality and price.

However, the distinction between business as usual and project governance seems to be largely confined to central government. Public sector bodies more focused on delivery (as opposed to policy), which includes most of local government as well as the devolved administrations, have less difficulty integrating project management into their organisational self-perception.

¹⁵ Another topical example raised by the interviewee concerned the difficulties faced by the Department for Transport in relation to identifying and selling the benefits of HS2.

5. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Various respondents commented on the usefulness of formal project management methods, reflecting the MPA’s assessment that “a lack of appreciation and experience of critical project and programme management techniques has inhibited progress.¹⁶” However, the majority of interviewees stressed the need for flexibility, which often meant deviation from formal project management procedures, which were sometimes seen as too rigid, in particular in policy-related projects.

Many responses highlighted the importance of particular aspects of project management, such as the importance of risk registers and project timetables; the identification and continuous engagement of stakeholders; and the merit of piloting. Such statements emphasized the idiosyncratic nature of projects, with different emphasis placed on the individual elements dependents on the project’s circumstances.

One interviewee commented on the fact that being a formally qualified project manager was unusual in his field of work (higher education). Moreover, he gained his project management qualification while working at an accounting firm before he came into the public sector. According to the interviewee, some people are intuitively good at project management and can learn on the job—e.g., defining critical paths, deliverables and outcomes—as they often are bright people with organized minds. But even then they tend to lack the soft skills of how to manage the inevitable resistance and guide people through change. Not having professional managers often means that project management is not valued, which encourages an amateurish approach. The same interviewee was concerned that organisations in his sector often tried to undertake project management “on the cheap” and overloaded people as a result: “Typically a project manager is nominated who does not have the skills and they are expected to do it on top of their day job.” A project manager, in his view, should have up to 50 percent of their time made available to do the job but this rarely happens. In fact project management is one of the first things that is pared back to meet budget constraints on projects. The net result is delays, overruns and suboptimal projects.

However, the overall message from respondents was that project management methods on their own are insufficient. The crucial contribution of communication and stakeholder management was often raised in this context.

Table 5:
Success Factors: Project management

Evidence from Interviews	
Uses of project management methodologies	<p>“An appropriate (tailored) methodology is a crucial success factor.”</p> <p>“Successful projects are those where risk is managed and risk is a standing board agenda item. Risk registers often concentrate on the impacts, but the most important part is the mitigation. Risk registers need to be updated continuously to reflect developments in the project.”</p>

¹⁶ MPA Annual Report 2013

Uses of project
management
methodologies
continued

“Change is inevitable during a project, it needs to be managed: how change is accommodated needs to be firmly established at the outset, including formal procedures for scoping and signing off changes to the original specification.”

“Different project management tools are used as appropriate, e.g. PMI, PRINCE2 (for control) MSP for Managing Change and Benefit realisation and some agile techniques were appropriate.”

“Don’t be afraid to re-scope the project and plans as things progress and to issue revised requests (RFPs) to partners.”

“You should expect and plan for any new system to ‘go down’ when first launched. This always seems to happen until the glitches are sorted and the system is able to cope with the surge of interest.”

“Always have a contingency plan.”

“Try to surface issues and matters outside your control early, so that they can be planned for.”

“Agile methods fit better with the complex cross-cutting projects that predominate in local government.” By contrast, traditional project management approaches are, in her opinion, slow and outdated.

“PRINCE2 style project planning only works if the project is simple and straightforward, with clear outputs and one person responsible for each element. It is less appropriate in complex, transformative projects where the outputs are not clear at the outset. Here, what is needed is a project charter, a high-level road map and a way of responding to opportunities as they develop.”

PRINCE2 is accepted practice at [] and the chairman was keen that the project should use best practice. A version of PRINCE2 was therefore used to inform the project management, but a pure PRINCE2 approach was felt to be too IT and business focussed for this kind of project in an HE environment, hence the need for tailoring. The elements that were kept were: a project mandate, a PID, a communications plan. However there was no GANT chart, risk register or highlight report (one was initially used but then dropped). Terms of Reference were used instead of a Project Brief.

“Strong managers kept all parts of the team informed and made sure the right resources were deployed in the right places. Unknown if they had formal PM skills; ‘they did a good impersonation of formal PM skills.’”

“Project management was carried out in line with []’s project management guidelines which are based on PRINCE2. Differences from PRINCE2 include no colour coding or flagging of risks.”

<p>Uses of project management methodologies continued</p>	<p>“You can undertake some training into how to deliver a process, and you can undertake that process, but it does not mean that you can convert this into successful process into successful delivery. Converting the process into successful delivery requires you to be able to differentiate between undertaking the process as a means of ‘ticking the box’ and undertaking the process to meet the intent of project management of getting all parts of your organisation, and other stakeholders to work towards delivering your objective, and making them want to deliver this objective because they understand how they and the organisation will benefit from delivery. ‘People and their capability and engagement is what delivers success.’”</p> <p>“The project used the organisation’s bespoke project management processes and controls, which are comparable to PRINCE2 but not as comprehensive (‘PRINCE light’).”</p>
<p>Shortcomings of PM methodologies</p>	<p>“Project management methodologies are not to be followed slavishly; board meetings, steering groups, etc. often miss the point if they are not focused on the bigger picture. “</p> <p>“The project did not fully comply with ‘the [] approach to projects’ as this approach is still ponderous and not sufficiently nimble. Rather it focused on the following, which are the key tools for project management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A clear statement of purpose at the outset, and set out in the initiation document ○ A benefits statement, setting out financial and other benefits and how they will be measured ○ Milestones for deliverables ○ A list of key stakeholders and identification of which of these could ‘scupper’ the project (‘the scupperers’ list’) ○ A communication plan ○ A list of risks and possible mitigations.” <p>likes to keep PM documentation to a minimum and is attracted to the ‘PID on page’ approach that has seen used by PA Consulting.</p> <p>The wider corporate management and elected members were not involved and allowed [] to ‘get on with it’. There were no formal reporting requirements to the CMT or elected members, although [] kept them informed of progress.</p> <p>“Making sure that the process was open (even though this led to heated meetings and consultations at times).”</p> <p>“This flexibility within clearly defined costs was a critical success factor.”</p>

Shortcomings of PM methodologies

“Survival of the [] system, and its ability to meet its long term objectives depended critically on quick and sensitive adaptation in response to these changes.”

“Project management of policy (as opposed to projects) is difficult. A project management framework to introduce [a new policy/strategy] is too rigid and does not take account of the very different stakeholder engagement needed for different sectors, and the way in which Ministers like to be involved (and when): some Ministers are hands off, others like to get involved in detailed drafting. Codifying policy making does not work as it is more of a craft.”

They took what they needed out of PM guidelines (had to deal with a finite budget and tight deadlines). But “societal/political considerations are not hard-wired into the PM toolkit. Policy is different, more people focused.”

“Strict adherence to PM methods fails to recognize the inherent complexities of the process, which PM skills struggle to cope with, with the end result that the rigid application of PM techniques becomes an objective in and of itself and therefore a burden rather than an aid.”

“The Bill was in constant flux, making it incredibly hard to manage from a PM perspective.”

“I am not a fan of PRINCE2. It is too technical, especially as in my experience projects are about the people, not the process. If you don't get the buy-in you won't deliver the outcome. The problem with PRINCE2 is that it is a pseudo-science, it makes you think that if you follow the process you'll deliver the outcome. In reality if you follow the process you won't necessarily get outcome if you don't get the buy-in and win hearts and minds.”

“Having a complete set of paperwork is irrelevant if it has no traction. Indeed, a complete set of paperwork is more likely to demonstrate 'covering one's back' rather than indicating the project is being well managed. In general, Eisenhower's famous quote “plans are worthless, but planning is everything” is seen as applying. PM is not about the process, it is about building corporate agreement on the objective, a corporate understanding of the risks to delivery of that objective, and a corporate response to those risks which is understood and agreed by all the key parties, such that delivery can be achieved, even in the face of change across the system.”

“The plan did not have a risk register or comply with PRINCE2 requirements. [] has its own version of PRINCE2 light which project managers are expected to use for normal projects but this programme was seen as exceptional and outside normal procedures.”

6. STAKEHOLDERS

Many interviewees saw stakeholder support as a crucial success factor and consequently saw stakeholder engagement as one of their key tasks. Some interviewees described extremely detailed and resource-intensive processes for stakeholder involvement, ranging from surveys and consultations to various layers of consultative and advisory bodies. The benefits of engaged stakeholders were praised in glowing terms by many respondents and often seen as a result of the engagement strategy adopted by the project. Stakeholder engagement was also seen as having practical benefits, in making more information accessible to the project team. The importance of a positive vision for the project was emphasised, which raises the question of a potentially enhanced role for project management in projects that do not enjoy widespread stakeholder support.

Table 6:

Success Factors: Stakeholders

Evidence from Interviews	
<p>Importance of stakeholder engagement</p>	<p>“Stakeholders need to be identified at the start, sometimes unexpected groups of stakeholders emerge (advocates for local plants, artefacts to be put in buildings, etc.). Often stakeholders only start to engage late in a project/ when something is happening.” Stakeholder management is challenging: often stakeholders are highly emotionally invested in certain issues and unshackled from budgetary reality. Collaborative approach is needed.”</p> <p>“Political influence and stakeholders needs to be managed.”</p> <p>“The buy-in of stakeholders is crucial.”</p> <p>“Engagement of all stakeholders is vital, and the painstaking consultation that took place was time well spent.”</p>
<p>Shortcomings of PM methodologies</p>	<p>“Head teachers and other stakeholders can be reinvigorated by a successful project. It is important to share the success with them and to let them have their ‘glory moment’</p> <p>“Strong lines of communication with stakeholders—from the executive team level through to front-line teams delivering the services, in HQ and across the UK and overseas network— gave the team access to timely information about developments which could potentially impact on the effectiveness of the system, either through effects on operational aspects or on usefulness of reporting outputs or on dissemination opportunities”</p> <p>“The biggest risk [programme] faces to its capacity to make savings is rejection of its reforms by the [], a militant and historically recalcitrant union who have fought hard to maintain high levels of employment, national pay bargaining, public sector pension entitlements, and antediluvian working practices. The whole programme in some ways can be seen as a risk mitigation strategy in itself, forcing the [] to ‘play ball’ to benchmarking as a quid pro quo of preventing competition and out-sourcing.”</p>

7. PROJECT TEAM AND RESOURCING

A final set of success factors relates to the project team—from leadership down. Adequately experienced and resourced project management is crucial to success, as are sufficient junior resources to support project manager. Apart from that, crucial success factors are:

- the right team setup; and
- a culture within the team that is conducive to success.

Skills, knowledge and experience were seen as central factors for project success. Team composition is important at the start of the project, but, in reality, SRO/PM have little scope to build the team from scratch, they have to work with the people who are available. The task is not so much picking the right team, but building and shaping the team while the project goes on. A problem identified in this regard was the sheer scale of some public sector projects: national programmes can strip the market of specialist skills and create shortages locally, or increase the price for those skills.

In addition, the level of engagement by senior staff was highlighted as an important issue. As one interviewee pointed out, it is rare for SROs to be allocated to a project full time. Projects are normally conducted where the SRO carries out this role as one among his other tasks, in some cases being little more than a chair of the programme board can be problematic. The interviewee thought the best SROs must be independent, have the capacity to challenge and lead proactively. “Success and failure often depend on whether the SRO is proactive or passive, from the start to the conclusion.”

Various examples were raised in which a lack of engagement by either the project manager or the SRO caused problems and had to be rectified.

“The first project manager was an external contractor appointed by [] but did not fully understand the scope of the project and skewed her efforts too much to satisfying the needs of [] and the [] staff to be transferred. She lived on the [] and struggled to make it around the boroughs for regular meetings. She also exhibited avoidance behaviour. The net result was a lack of progress and poor communications resulting in a crisis for the project. She took up post in February and was sacked two months later.”

“[] then provided an experienced in-house project manager who understood both the project and local government (e.g., how budgets worked, how to navigate through the approval process) and had previous experience of creating the initial shared service between [] and []. The new post holder started in [], and although [] and [] were initially upset, they were quickly won over.”

A contentious point for many interviewees was the role of project management in the civil service career structure, namely the need to rotate staff during the project lifetime, which creates artificial disruptions. One interviewee pointed out he had been the SRO for a programme for the full five years of its duration; while he accepted it was possible to change SROs occasionally at the completion of key milestones, he felt that the regular rotation of staff through the SRO role, particularly when they came with new opinions in relation to key decisions, was disruptive to projects and resulted in poor outcomes. He also felt uncomfortable with joint or deputy SROs, as this “fundamentally weakened the single point of accountability.” While he agreed it could work, the whole point of the SRO is to represent the organisation that will derive the benefit from the project, with the power to force through decisions quickly, requiring the SRO to have authority and support from the top of the office. Having authority is key.

In this context, another interviewee discussed how project management has become a proxy for governance. This creates a cycle of short-term bursts of activity and a focus on short-term milestones to the exclusion of everything else. This wider point mirrors the argument that business-as-usual management structures can make it difficult to know where decisions should be taken, highlighting the problem of operating projects in parallel to other arrangements covering the same ground.

Another interviewee added that “good staff do not get transferred to project management jobs. This is a role the civil service gives to weaker staff to keep them away from ‘important’ work, normally involving working closely with Ministers.” This point was recently echoed by John Manzoni, the head of the MPA, who described it as “unbelievable” that there was no career path in the civil service for people wishing to specialise in project delivery¹⁷.

Table 7:
Success Factors: Team

Evidence from Interviews	
Team setup	<p>“It is possible to avoid using costly external consultants or to at least minimize their input. They should not be allowed to take control of the process.”</p> <p>“The potential for these types of changes was foreseen in the development phase, due to the experience brought to the project design by the economics team leader from previous monitoring and evaluation projects.”</p> <p>Continuity of project leadership: “From project conception in 2005 through January 2014 the project was directed by the same person and carried out by the same contractor, resulting in accumulation of a deep and detailed knowledge of all aspects of the system, technical, organisational and strategic. Moreover, both within the contractor, and within the team, there was long term continuity of staff working on the project. This enabled innovative and cost effective solutions to be identified quickly in response to changes.”</p>

¹⁷ “Whitehall chief criticises civil service on project delivery”, Financial Times, 5 June 2014.

<p>Team setup continued</p>	<p>“Continuity of executive team leadership: From project conception through to 2012 the project and its director had strong support from the executive team, manifested both in continued financial support and in renewed articulation of a central role of [the project] in successive versions of the strategic vision for the organisation. This provided a supportive context in which [the project] could adapt creatively to changing circumstances, rather than being threatened by them.”</p> <p>“Ensure right people on steering group, have mix of doers as well as more strategic people.”</p> <p>“Get the best technical people you can. We had the top [] officer in London on the project staff and this gave us confidence that the project was feasible and could be delivered. Create a direct line to these people so that you are kept informed of progress and issues as they arise.”</p> <p>“Stable and sustained new senior leadership team drive this forward after spectacularly bad performance by previous directors who demonstrated no momentum or ability, for which they were rewarded with a regional director post.”</p>
<p>Team culture</p>	<p>“Allow people to contribute equally and to challenge the project if necessary. Make sure they are happy in their roles.”</p> <p>“One successful project can raise the confidence of the whole organisation and lead on to other successes.”</p> <p>“Develop a ‘high challenge, high support, high expectation’ culture (this is the Ofsted approach) and set of expectations with partners.”</p> <p>“The project team were all pulling in the same direction and confident in each other’s ability.”</p> <p>“The project was ‘only as strong as its weakest link’ and the main aim of management was to ensure that all the parties were aligned and stayed aligned.”</p> <p>“People deliver the project. The project team needs to consist of people who can articulate the vision for the project and work on their own initiative to achieve it.”</p> <p>“Projects typically grow organically. The SRO needs to be picked first and interviews the PM, who then interviews individual team members. Job descriptions are less important than finding like-minded people/individuals who can work together. “</p> <p>“Staff need to be empowered, PM has to push decision-making down as far as possible. It is important that people are allowed to make mistakes, then manage the recovery. The PM alone can’t make all the decisions.”</p>

8. SUMMARY

London Economics (LE) was commissioned by the Project Management Institute to identify success factors in public sector project and programme management in the United Kingdom.

On the basis of these 25 interviews, we categorized respondents' observations on what makes projects successful—and the lessons learned from their experience with the specific projects and programmes covered in the interviews—into the six broad categories of success factors:

- communication;
- leadership;
- origination;
- project management;
- stakeholders; and
- project team and resourcing.

Notable absences from the list are project domain, budget (largely absent, although our examples includes projects with budgets in a range from a few ten thousand pounds to a hundred million pounds), and complexity (number and type of stakeholders, contentious subject matter, scope change, etc. See Figure 1). In part, this is likely because the experience of the project managers we interviewed typically did not extend to projects in many different domains.

The following success factors were identified in the interviews:

- **Good communication** permeates good project delivery. It is concentrated at the leadership level, but includes the whole organisation as well as external stakeholders. Clarity of vision and the ability to communicate the reason for the project and its objectives are a core requirement in any project. Communication needs to be timely, clear, sufficiently (but not excessively) detailed, use appropriate (non-technical) language and appropriate settings or media¹⁸.
- **Building and maintaining knowledge about best practice** in project delivery, and communicating this knowledge to the project team contributes to project success, but remains a challenge for many public sector organisations. Initiatives like the MPA began to address this.
- **Leadership**, both in terms of active management, setting the culture on the project team, and communicating effectively internally and externally is central. The three pillars of leadership relate to formulating, articulating and communicating the vision for the project; building support for the project's aims and the approach taken within the organisation and among external stakeholders; and being prepared to act decisively in support of the project's objectives, while allowing the project team to advance the day-to-day work without inappropriate interference.

18 PMI (2013). The High Cost of Low Performance: The Essential Role of Communications. Available at <http://bit.ly/1mc8UGl> [accessed 20 May 2014].

- A fundamental determinant for the success of a project is **how well it is conceived at the outset**. This issue is complex, and raises questions relating to the structure of public sector bodies and the way policy is conceptualised and delivered (the demarcation line between business as usual and the need for changes outside an organisation's normal structures). Sufficient funding, a compelling, well-defined objective, and the groundwork necessary to get the needed support from internal and external stakeholders are all crucial success factors at the origination stage.
- **Standard project management methods** are seen as necessary, but not sufficient for project success. The interviews revealed a degree of skepticism toward some project management tools, which are often seen as rigid, geared toward standardised, technical projects and insufficiently responsive to the demands of policy delivery, which is seen as people centric. Softer skills such as stakeholder engagement and communication, which project managers see as their core competencies, don't receive sufficient space standard methodologies. Many interviewees reported using adapted versions of standard methodologies; while some mentioned agile approaches to project management methods as additional tools particularly suited to the dynamic landscape in which public sector projects take place.
- **Stakeholder engagement** was seen as crucial for project success, and many examples show that a great deal of effort is invested here. This raises the question whether projects with supportive stakeholders are inherently more likely to succeed, which in turn has implications for the relative importance of different success factors depending on a project's objectives. (Does process and project management become more crucial when stakeholders are indifferent or hostile?)
- Finally, project success is affected by the makeup of the **project team** and the **culture** in which it operates. Project management skills are sometimes undervalued in the public sector, which can lead to challenges. Technical skills in the team are indispensable, but good working relationships are often seen as at least important. The difference between good and bad project managers is substantial. An area of concern is the tendency in many public sector organisations to move successful individuals out of project management roles quickly, thereby jeopardizing continuity and expertise. However, strategic replacement of project staff can be necessary. More delivery-focused organisations (including most local government) have a stronger sense of the importance of project management as a skill set.

Conclusion

The study shows that the projects with the highest probability of success are those where these success factors are most closely aligned with goals. The best performing projects are, put simply, those which have stable teams that work together and **communicate well** with a **committed, stable leadership** that advocates for their team, all of whom are working towards **clearly defined aims, targets and timescales**, set out clearly at the beginning.

Leaders should anchor the project, disseminating and reinforcing the vision for the project to stakeholders, internally and externally. They should also demonstrate their ongoing commitment and engage more actively where necessary. Project leaders need to have the right balance of responsibility and trust, with the SROs not trying to be project managers but still supporting them, without undue interference.

Their team should feel both empowered and enabled, through excellent communication and knowledge transfer, but also through proper resourcing and appropriate training.

Crucially all of this should sit upon a firm foundation. The project should clearly defined from an early stage with the best possible project team established and held together as much as possible, throughout the duration of the project.

In short, establishing sure-footed leadership who trusts their project team's abilities, all working toward clearly-defined goals with effective communication is the best way to ensure project success.

Their team should feel both empowered and enabled, through excellent communication and knowledge transfer, but also through proper resourcing and appropriate training.

Crucially all of this should sit upon a firm foundation. The project should clearly defined from an early stage with the best possible project team established and held together as much as possible, throughout the duration of the project.

In short, establishing a sure-footed leadership who trusts their project team's abilities, all working toward clearly-defined goals with effective communication is the best way to ensure project success.



ANNEX 1 METHOD

Twenty-five interviews were conducted with individuals in project management functions, namely project managers and project sponsor/senior responsible owners (SROs) in public sector organisations, including:

- central government, including government departments and executive agencies (9 interviews);
- devolved administration (Wales): 2 interviews;
- local government: 8 interviews;
- others, including public university system and non-departmental public bodies (6 interviews).

Further details on the individual interviews are shown in Annex 2. Note that interviews were given under the condition of anonymity, so that all personally identifying information has been removed. In addition to the 25 interviews summarised throughout the report, a small number of informal interviews were conducted with other project managers and academics. These interviews were used to formulate our approach, sense-check the interview guide and gather feedback on individual points of interest.

Academic and professional literature was reviewed at an early stage to inform the development of the topic guide and to validate the analytical framework. This included PMI's own research¹⁹ as well as survey publications, notably:

Chantal C. Cantarelli, Bent Flybjerg, Eric J. E. Molin, and Bert van Wee (2010). "Cost overruns in large-scale transportation infrastructure projects: explanations and their theoretical embeddedness." *European Journal of Transport and Infrastructure Research*, 10 (1): 5-18. Available at: http://www.ejtir.tbm.tudelft.nl/issues/2010_01 [accessed 12 December 2013].

Cooke-Davies, T. (2002). 'The "real" success factors on projects'. *International Journal of Project Management*, 20, 185–190.

Dvir, D., Lipovetsky, S., Shenhar, A. and Tishler, A. (1998). 'In search of project classification: a non-universal approach to project success factors'. *Research Policy*, 27, 915–935.

ESP Solutions Group (2009). *Project Management Success Factors*.

Mott MacDonald (2002). 'Review of Large Public Procurement in the UK' Report to HM Treasury

Prabhakar, G. P. (2008). 'What is Project Success: A Literature Review'. *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 3, No. 9.

Interviews were conducted between December 2013 and April 2014. Five interviews were conducted face to face, the rest over the phone. Interview length varied between 40 and 90 minutes.

¹⁹ Available at the PMI 'Knowledge Center' at <http://bit.ly/1tjtZRk> [accessed 20 May 2014].

Interviews were semi-structured and designed to elicit information on the following topics:

- Project characteristics
 - Background (project domain, project origination, budget, timelines, scope change, project goals, success metrics, award/tender process, etc.)
 - Risks (project risk register, risk mitigation strategies/measures)
 - Outcomes (expenditure, quality, impacts)
- External factors
 - External stakeholders (contractors, third-party)
 - Other external factors (economic/fiscal environment, societal/political environment)
- Internal factors
 - Organisation (profile, management structure, internal stakeholders, knowledge and experience, institutional memory, relationship with other organisations, management style, stability, leadership)
 - Project team (profile: Size, makeup, characteristics: experience with projects in general/in the same domain/of comparable size/complexity; formal PM qualifications; technical qualifications in the project domain, management approach: level of leadership involvement; PM framework, individual leadership style)

In the light of the variety of perspectives and experiences of the interviewees, a comparative approach to the analysis based on standardised reporting of interview results was found to be inappropriate. Instead, a qualitative approach emerged in which responses views were grouped into themes, each one illustrated by relevant quotes:

- communication;
- leadership;
- origination;
- project management;
- stakeholders; and
- project team and resourcing.

The terminology used in this report was developed in the course of the interview process and does not necessarily correspond to project management terminology used elsewhere. All interpretations of interviewee's responses and all conclusions are LE's.

ANNEX 2 LIST OF INTERVIEWS

Role	PM qualification	Organisation
Head of Transformation		Local government
Consultant and specialist change manager (PM)		Central government
Director of Strategic Programme Office	PRINCE2, MSP	Public university system
Head of Education Finance (PM)		Local government
Chief Economist		Central government
PM		Central government
Director of Economics		Central government
PM	Prior PRINCE2 and Agile experience	Public university system
Human Resources Director		Non-departmental public body
Director (SRO)		Central government
PM		Local government
Director of Finance and Estates project sponsor and project champion combined	PRINCE2 qualified	Public university system
PM		Central government
Services Improvement Manager (PM)		Local government
Director of services	PRINCE2	Local government
Procurement	'PRINCE light'	Public university system
PM	PM was hard embedded and driven by Deloitte team	Central government
PM		Welsh government
Director of Housing and Community Services,	'PRINCE light'	Local government
Head of Procurement and Shared Services	PRINCE2	Non-departmental public body
Director of Industrial Strategy		Central government
Director of Children's Services		Local government
PM		Central government
Director Communities Division		Welsh government
Head of Investment		Local government

Change driver					Programme/project type					Size
Ministerial initiative	Legal	Operational business change	Other	Policy development /delivery	property/ construction	IT	Other acquisition	Other multifaceted		
		■		■					£1m, 4 years	
		■						■	£60k, 1 year	
		■		■					no budget above normal operations, 6 months	
					■				£33m, 5 years	
■				■					N/A	
		■		■					£650k per year	
		■		■					£332k, 2 years	
		■				■			£143,880, 2 years	
		■			■					
		■		■						
			■	■					No separate budget. 1 year	
■								■		
	■			■					£850k, 2 years	
		■						■	£1.5m , annually	
		■				■			£500,000 over four years.	
■										
		■			■					
									£50k in time costs, 6 months	
		■				■			£1.2m, 3.5 years	
		■		■					'several hundred thousand pounds', 1 year	
		■			■				£100m, 4 years	
		■		■						
		■		■						
■					■				No separate budget. 1 year	



Beijing | Bengaluru | Brussels | Buenos Aires | Dubai | Lelystad | Mumbai | New Delhi
Philadelphia | Porto Alegre | Rio de Janeiro | Shenzhen | Singapore | Washington, DC

PMI.org

Project Management Institute
Global Operations Center
14 Campus Blvd
Newtown Square, PA 19073-3299 USA
Tel: +1 610 356 4600 | Fax: +1 610 356 4647
Email: customercare@pmi.org

©2014 Project Management Institute. All rights reserved. "PMI", the PMI logo, "Making project management indispensable for business results" and "Pulse of the Profession" are marks of Project Management Institute, Inc. For a comprehensive list of PMI marks, contact the PMI legal department.



*Making project management
indispensable for business results.®*

