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Abstract

This paper reports upon progress towards a doctoral study on the antecedents of project 
success in aid/emergency relief projects. We argue that there are useful project management 
(PM) approaches that may be universally applied to most, if not all, projects to contribute to 
successful PM delivery. However, when reflecting upon field-experience, some of these PM 
approaches appear to simply not function in the environment typified by project aid and 
emergency relief projects. This raises some interesting questions.

What does the literature on PM success factors take as its underlying assumptions that may not 
apply to aid projects? What are some of the more problematic issues that aid project deliverers 
face which are significantly different from delivering, for example, commercial projects in 
difficult or distressing circumstances? How can we best approach studying such projects and to 
summarise in a simple but effective universal framework, the contextual project success 
constants and methods for application in any environment, particularly the PM Framework and 
application undertaking Aid / Relief Projects. This paper also has the benefit of a PMI research 
grant.

Keywords: Project Management Success; Research Methods; Aid Projects.

Introduction - Project Management in the Aid / Relief Global Environment - Success / 
Failure

A recent series of natural disasters associated with the Earthquakes and Tsunamis that 
struck the South East Asia region starting on December 26th 2004, killing hundreds of thousands 
of people and leaving many more destitute and homeless, has triggered a surge in research 
interest in predictive and disaster response research and, to a lesser extent, how to improve 
delivery of critical aid relief projects.

Amongst a range of Institutions, the PMI responded generously with a post-disaster rebuild 
methodology (Project Management Institute, 2005). There was also a generous reaction from the 
public, as well as governments, to establish disaster relief and rebuilding funds1. With the web 
being so accessible, there are many web site locations established to help aid donors make better

1 For an abbreviated list of donors and concerned agencies refer to http://www.google.com/tsunami_relief.html
use of their funds, inform them of current crises and aid hot spots as well as provide access to communities of practice in the aid relief areas.

There has, however, been relatively limited research field research work into how to improve delivery of these kinds of projects from an effective and practical PM perspective that fully recognises the challenges and difficulties that inhibit PM best practice being applied to these aid / relief projects.

The project management (PM) profession has a long record of developing academic theory and best practice. Interested readers can refer to Morris (1994) for a thorough history of the profession. The PMI, for example, has a standard body of knowledge that has been refined several times. The current edition (PMI, 2004) has been extensively extended over previous versions. However, the PMBOK content still has limitations as pointed out by several PM profession thought leaders (Morris, Patel and Wearne, 2000; Turner, 2000; Morris, 2001; Morris, Jamieson and Shepherd, 2006). It also tends to imply that its processes and procedures can be universally applied and this has been questioned with the re-thinking PM movement (Hodgson and Cicmil, 2006; Winter, Smith, Cooke-Davies and Cicmil, 2006).

This paper will investigate the questions posed in the paper’s abstract and is structured as follows. The next section will review and summarise the interest in project types and their nature in terms of what PM techniques may be applied. This leads to a discussion on what project and PM success actually means and how it may relate to different project types. We then discuss the context of the case studies that we propose to study in late 2007 and draw upon reflection on in-field experiences to date by one of the authors. We will then discuss how research can be undertaken and justify our approach that will be undertaken during the second half of 2007. We will conclude with several propositions which will be tested over the mid 2007-2008 period.

Project Success Criteria and Factors in any environment

In her paper profiling the Competent Project Manager, Crawford (2000) addressed the major concern of the field of project management and a recurring theme of the literature as that of project success. She highlighted that there are two major strands to this concern – how success is judged (success criteria), and the factors that contribute to the success of projects (success factors).

In her paper on the Success of Projects in Different Organisational Conditions, Irya Hyvärä (2006) undertook a relevant cross industry study. She compared rankings of importance of factors and, while it is beyond the scope of our paper, we find it interesting that her comparison with four other studies found varying rankings of the importance of factors across these other surveys as well as compared to her survey. She also found that the ranking of her 10 identified factors varied across project phase. Her factors included: project mission; top management support; project schedule/plans; client consultation; personnel; technical task; client acceptance; monitoring and feedback; communication; and trouble shooting. This suggests that while the identity of success factors can be reasonably understood from the literature and there is general agreement about these factors being important, there is variation both across studies and phases as to the relative importance of these factors.
However, in the measuring success study by Ramage and Armstrong (2005), they find that the various historical methods for evaluating success encounter barriers to performance measurement. Difficulties arise in ensuring that measurement instruments guarantee reliability, validity and responsiveness. To assist in the categorisation of factors impacting on these aspects, they extend the framework developed by de Lancer and Holzer (2001) to produce a more comprehensive categorisation of influences. These may align, coincidentally, with the antecedents to Project Management Best Practice or Success necessary to be in place in the Aid / Relief Project Management research world.

They conclude that their study provides confirmation that two distinct categories of influences, namely rational / scientific and political / cultural, exist. They further, and most importantly, state that it is not possible to fully understand rational / scientific factors without consideration of political / cultural factors. It is interesting that these points have not been studied in detail to any great extent in research in the primary project management area to date.

**Project Success / Failure**

What is project success? How do we define project success and design performance measures that allow us to recognise the degree of success attained? There has been a great deal written over the years about project success, project management success and performance management to deliver success. A number of papers relating to critical success factors emerged during the late 1980’s—for example see (Pinto and Slevin, 1987) and de Wit (1988) who viewed success as being judged by the degree to which project objectives have been met. These views centred on success of project management delivery processes and also acknowledged that project success is also a matter of the project stakeholder’s perception of the value (in their terms) of what was delivered.

A study of the “Criteria of Project Success: an exploratory re-examination” (Lim and Mohamed, 1999) where they look at projects where some stakeholders perceive success and others do not on the same project. Whilst they also define criteria and factors leading to success as similar to Crawford (2000), they do look further into the perspectives of project success and break it down into macro and micro views of project success. They cite examples of projects which were successful for some but not for others. We have, in Australia, significant examples of these projects. The Sydney Opera house is generally acknowledged to have been a project management failure but a roaring project success. It was delivered grossly over time and over cost budgets and yet it placed Sydney on the map and had many other longer term benefits. More recently, however, the Redevelopment of the international event venue, the Melbourne Cricket Ground (MCG) for the staging of the Commonwealth Games, International Cricket and Australian Football is viewed as a project management success and, interestingly, a project success, both at the same time. The MCG Project is quite significant and rare at the same time in that is perceived as a success by all the key stakeholders and more but also satisfies project success at a micro and macro view as explored in the exploration by Lim and Mohamed (1999).

An earlier paper on determining critical success/failure factors in projects (Belassi and Tukel, 1996) sensibly works to group critical success factors according to; those related to the
project, those related to the project manager and the team members, those related to the organisation and those related to the external environment. They further cite that factors which relate to the project include the “urgency” of a project. They identify that “projects which start after natural disasters are typical examples and that in these situations, not enough time is allocated for planning and scheduling projects”. They further identify that in relation to factors related to external environment, a number of environmental factors such as political, economic, and social, as well as factors related to the advances in technology or even factors related to nature affect project performance. They do not, however, cortically review these aspects into heir study. These aspects as well as the previously cited ones do have a major impact on aid projects. We will be critically reviewing these in the environment of aid projects but necessarily first need to conclude on critical success criteria and factors in any project environment. This is the focus of our research overall.

Sheena et al. (2001: p717) associated four (4) dimensions of success with a timeframe of expected results. Dimension 1 has a short term goal of project efficiency (meeting cost time goals). Dimension 2 has a medium term goal of customer success (meeting technical specifications, functional performance solving customer’s problem that triggered the project right through to matching intangible and tangible Nuggets (2006) outcomes). Dimension 3 has a long term goal of business success (commercial success and gaining increased market share that for aid projects could be generating confidence, satisfaction and also influence). Finally, Dimension 4 has a very long term goal of preparing for the future (developing new tools, techniques, products, markets etc).

A critical review of project histories stretching over several decades of one of the author’s past projects (ranging in size from multi-million dollar IT delivery projects to very large and complex construction projects) costing hundreds of millions of dollars resulted in key success factors. These relate to PM processes being adequately carried out which led to a positive project outcome including extensive front-end planning and project definition work flowing through to effective project delivery such as:

1. A clear mission/vision and agreed goals with agreed success criteria and clear understanding of desired and expected values driving the project culture;
2. Key stakeholder/key resource understanding of the goals/objectives with a clear and agreed statement of outcomes defined;
3. Project plan and programme/method of work being resolved and agreed by all key parties, including provision of adequate reserves and contingencies;
4. The feasibility of that plan (in terms of resources, contingencies, risks and outcomes) being resolved and signed off by all key players;
5. Adequate resources being committed for the project based upon detail derived from an achievable project plan;
6. Clearly stated and understood PM capacity, experience and staff/senior manager's support including project governance, dispute resolution procedures to engender trust behaviours;
7. Adequate communication and project tools;
8. Project competencies and PM skills, adequate and agreed organisation structure; and
9. Integrity, effective communication, commitment, support, team approach, mentoring, and learning.
10. **External Influences such as political or cultural awareness and capability.**

Others have conducted rigorous research on a wide range of project types and found similar results. Terry Cook-Davies’ work for example (Cooke-Davies, 2001;2002) widely supports our field experience highlighted above. He describes 12 ‘real success factors’ as follows (Cooke-Davies, 2002: p186-189). For on-time performance they are:

1. Adequacy of company-wide education on the concepts of risk management.
2. Maturity of an organisation’s processes for assigning ownership of risks.
3. Adequacy with which a visible risk registers is maintained.
4. Adequacy of an up-to-date risk management plan.
5. Adequacy of documentation of organisational responsibilities on the project.
6. Keep project (or project stage duration) as far below 3 years as possible (1 year is better).

Those that correlate to on-cost performance are:

7. Allow changes to scope only through a mature scope change control process.
8. Maintain the integrity of the performance measurement baseline.

In terms of individual projects he identified a ninth factor:

9. The existence of an effective benefits delivery and management process that involves the mutual co-operation of project management and line management functions.

His work also considered how projects fit into programs that allow us to better understand project success in its broader context rather than an individual project:

10. Portfolio and programme management practices that allow the enterprise to resource fully a suite of projects that are thoughtfully and dynamically matched to the corporate strategy and business objectives.

11. A suite of project, programme and portfolio metrics that provides direct ‘line of sight’ feedback on current project performance, and anticipated future success, so that project, portfolio and corporate decisions can be aligned. Since corporations are increasingly recognizing the need for ‘upstream’ measures of ‘downstream’ financial success through the adoption of reporting against such devices as the ‘balanced scorecard’.

12. An effective means of ‘learning from experience’ on projects, that combines explicit knowledge with tacit knowledge in a way that encourages people to learn and to embed that learning into continuous improvement of project management processes and practices.

With all of the above papers, it becomes clear that success needs to be investigated from the perspective of active project team stakeholders as well as from that of their client/benefit recipients and in the theoretical and empirical/practical review of critical success criteria and factors on any project and then, in particular, on aid / emergency relief projects. Success at the same time is, overall, seen as a collaborative achievement involving joint-team action to identify problems and solutions to these problems and taking action to effectively deliver action, while learning from the process and fine tuning strategy and tactics employed in a constructive and reflective way. This leads to viewing project work that leads to successful outcomes as a process of problem solving, action research and learning that triggers a cycle of continuous improvement in PM practice.
But most critically it is defined by the need to define criteria and factors leading to success on any projects and then how that is to be effectively applied to aid / emergency projects.

The Project Process - Projects, Problem Solving, Action Research and Learning

The alignment and commonality of core processes between projects, problem-solving, action research and learning has been undertaken in Australia in the context of capacity building projects involving Australian indigenous communities (McIntyre, 2002). McIntyre’s paper has a very relevant approach to its research and program/project development is very relevant to our study. McIntyre’s approach was utilisation of an adapted version of a Community of Practice (COP) involving Participatory Action Research\(^3\) (PAR) with communities. McIntyre (2002: p57) suggests that other communities could benefit from the process that was developed for her project and that “Learning by doing” (through PAR) builds ‘spiritual wellbeing’. She also makes the point that PAR is potentially empowering if the participants who learn by the doing own the process. She stresses the need for empowerment, i.e. “helping people to achieve greater confidence and power in the following areas: resources, relationships, information and decision making”– all of which are also key to project management success.

Reflect, learn, research, plan, act, monitor, evaluate, reflect cycle

There is quite a degree of alignment /synergy/serendipity in the process of a research project, the process of the Project Monitoring and Evaluation PM practice of Aid Projects (Action and Reflection) and the Action Research process and other change related process projects. Action research is a process that starts with planning, then flows through to taking the planned actions, deeply reflecting upon the results of that action, consciously learning from that learning and then repeating the cycle (Kemmis and McTaggart, 1988; Greenwood and Levin, 1998; McKay and Marshall, 2001; Smith and O'Neal, 2003; Coghlan and Brannick, 2005).

Project Synergies / Different Backgrounds - PMBOK , Logframe, Project Monitoring / Evaluation and Results Based Management

The PMBOK’s formulation was geared to responding to highly visible and tangible projects such as those found in the construction, aerospace and shipbuilding industries. Interest in appropriate PM practices and approaches has also been focussed on project types for many years (Turner and Cochrane, 1993; Shenhar and Dvir, 1996; Shenhar and Dvir, 2004). There appears to be an appreciation that management of some projects, particularly those with difficult to define sub-goals (beyond the obvious highest level goal) requires managing complementarities (Pettigrew and Whittington, 2003; Whittington and Pettigrew, 2003) - achieving high levels of flexibility while maintaining structure. Managing projects in a particularly chaotic environment appears to best characterise the experience of one of the authors in delivering aid projects in post-disaster situations.

The gap that the above thought leaders have identified in PM practice as it is currently evolving in the commercial PM world is mirrored by observations in the field of how aid projects function

\(^3\) PAR is a form of action research where the research actively takes part as a participant rather than being a bystander or advisor to others taking action (Action research will be discussed later).
and a growing body of literature that is critical of PM techniques being applied in what may be viewed as inappropriate situations. This suggests that there are a range of project planning and performance measurement approaches better suited for ambiguous or poorly defined aid or social service delivery projects (Sigsgaard, 2002; Earle, 2003; Ramage and Armstrong, 2005).

Project Monitoring and Evaluation

Aid agencies are required to conform to stringent project reporting requirements in order to satisfy the wide range of stakeholders. Project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) information systems (IS), frequently a requirement for funding, are believed to inform the reporting process (Shenhar and Levy, 1997; Crawford and Bryce, 2003). The logical framework approach (LFA) is another tool widely used throughout the aid industry for project design and appraisal (Baccarini, 1999), and although much of the literature also promotes the use of the LFA for the purposes of M&E, it has proved inadequate (Earle, 2003).

The nature of the research question that interests us is firstly Project Monitoring and Evaluation (P.M. & E.) as a process which is used extensively in the aid world and also has the potential to be brought to bear effectively on a whole range of projects previously submitted to the PMBOK (product development/phases/management). What is outstanding about this form of project delivery is it gives a lot more power to learn and drive to those at the working community level yet it is still able to be planned and managed effectively. The further point of interest here is the point of Action Research and involving not just project management experts in Project Management Research. This can then be extended to action learning workshops and even Action Science (Greenwood and Levin, 1998).

Project Logframe

It becomes clear that there are different types of projects with very different needs and demands upon them and very different characteristics and, yet, professional bodies continue to assume a ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach is appropriate—the PMI with the PMBOK (PMI, 2004), or in many of the aid projects the logical framework approach (Logframe) that stresses an hierarchical cascade of identified objectives linked to assumptions in terms of goal, purpose, outputs and inputs presented in a how-why chain (Baccarini, 1999) or variations on this theme that take into account means of verification and a time dimension (Crawford and Bryce, 2003).

Results Based Management

Results Based Management, also referred to as Performance Management, is best defined as a broad management strategy aimed at achieving important changes in the way project agencies operate, with improving performance on projects (achieving better results) as the central orientation in a comprehensive report by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Working Party on Aid Evaluation. The development co-operation (or donor) agencies whose experiences are reviewed include USAID, DFID, AusAID, CIDA, Danida, the UNDP and the World Bank. Results based management with performance measurement is the process an organization follows to objectively measure how well it’s stated objectives are being met.
This document also addresses how to enable the effective incorporation of Logframe and Risk Management into Results Based Management whilst, at the same time, keeping a critical eye to their limitations. It concludes by pointing out that the challenge is to balance project performance monitoring needs at all LogFrame hierarchy levels, without overburdening the monitoring system or having it displace evaluation or implementation activities. The related factor here is also that most NGO/Aid agencies are typically under resourced and under trained in project management or measurement of any critical form.

Very relevant to all this is the Evaluation Journal of Australasia titled “Measuring Success” (Ramage & Armstrong 2006) They look at the Balanced Scorecard methodology which analyses an organisation’s overall performance from four perspectives: communities, learning and growth, internal processes and financial. This alignment and similar process leads to papers such as “An Adapted Version of a Community of Practice Approach to Evaluation Owned by Indigenous Stakeholders” (in Australia) (McIntyre, 2002). Her work also explains how she helps other facilitate the setting up of COP’s to use PAR as an iterative means to assess its value and impact on improving governance, guiding and designing future development. This approach to problem solving and research and improving governance and management is owned by the participants and supports existing initiatives and priorities i.e. good project management.

**Mission and Cultural Awareness**

However, the Measuring success study finds that the various historical methods for evaluating success encounter barriers to performance measurement. Difficulties arise in ensuring measurement instruments guarantee reliability, validity and responsiveness. To assist in the categorisation of factors impacting on these aspects they extend the framework developed by de Lancer Julnes and Holzer (2001) to produce a more comprehensive categorisation of influences. These may align coincidentally with the antecedents to Project Management Best Practice or Success necessary to be in place in the Aid / Relief Project Management research world.

Their research extended to the rational / scientific and political / cultural influence in both implementation and use. They implemented surveys and within certain limitations found the results indicate that with both political / cultural and rational scientific influences present that performance management was still seen as successful by a clear majority of participants from all levels of organisation and community.

The above literature, our experience on projects in Australia and the PMBOK (PMI, 2004) does strongly support stakeholder engagement for both external groups as well as project team and supply chain stakeholders, but there is an underlying assumption that remains tacit. This is the cultural dimension of stakeholder engagement whether in decision making or communication about progress, impact and other matters of interest. This is a relatively new area of study for the PM profession with a growing interest at the margins of the PM community that is gaining attention. The cultural factors, organisational and cross-national, have been understood from models of cultural traits developed in the general management literature (Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv and Sanders, 1990; Hofstede, 1991; Trompenaars, 1993; Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 2004; Trompenaars and Prud'homme, 2004). These factors relate to an individual’s or group’s norms and behaviour being influenced along 5 dimensions. These are: power distance
(respect for and understanding of the sources of authority); Uncertainty avoidance (propensity to rely on rules regulations and to interpret these more or less literally); Individualism (degree of focus on the individual to the collective interest); Gender (adherence to a more macho or more feminine set of values); and Time Orientation (focus on long term or short term and seeing time as fixed (as in years months days etc) or seasonal).

**Top Down, Bottom Up – Learning Driving Projects**

The PMBOK stresses the need for deciding what a project should deliver and how to plan to deliver that objective with a predominance for consider scopes project using a work breakdown structure (WBS) approach (PMI, 2004). However, we see a tension between generally taking a top down and bottom up approach when defining the scope of a project. The bottom up approach essentially relies on a large number of well understood and well identified components that can be grouped into assemblies and these configured into subsystems, and thence into systems. A project becomes the summation of these systems that delivers a need. The point here is that the scope of delivery moves beyond delivery of ‘things’ to include ‘services’ i.e. knowledge of how to most effectively use the ‘thing’ delivered and how to ensure that maintenance of performance standards are optimised on these highly customised project deliverables (Hobday, 2000).

It is interesting to contrast the above tangible projects with how PM and planning for control is handled in other industries where different paradigms prevail, for example in the areas where creative PM teams craft an emergent strategy (Mintzberg, 1987) through action learning rather than developing rigidly complete specification in a set design to address a particularly well defined position.

Using Africa as a case study, Muriithi and Crawford (2003) explore the applicability of project management approaches, as represented in the most widely distributed and accepted knowledge and practice guides (PMBOK Guide, APMBoK (4th edition) and Australian National Competency Standards for Project Management) to projects in developing and emerging economies. Issues identified by them include: the need to cope with political and community demands on project resources; recognition that economic rationality and efficiency, assumed as a basis for many project management tools and techniques does not reflect local realities; and that use of such tools and techniques will not enhance project success if they run counter to cultural and work values. They have tested the findings from analysis of secondary data, against case studies of application in projects in East Africa and drawn final conclusions and implications for project management of international development projects.

The tools and techniques of PM themselves will not deliver successful projects if they run counter to the cultural and work values. They concluded that in Africa there is a particular need to cope with political and community demands on the project’s resources. Muriithi and Crawford (2003) conclude that there is urgent need for empirical work to: formalise a project management framework for Africa (or developing countries and aid projects in general in that context), confirm which tools and techniques of the present project management orthodoxy work, which ones do not and why, and articulate an effective indigenous approach to project management in differing cultural backgrounds.
Research Approaches

One of the authors, a project manager for over 36 years who heads a consultancy in Melbourne with experience in managing over 3 AU$ billion of projects in IT, construction and Telco projects, was commissioned by one NGO to undertake a review of the Tsunami relief effort (confidential report uncited here) and the evidence that he gathered on that assignment, plus other consulting assignments since, suggest that current ‘best practice’ PM processes can be applied to these projects, but that there are numerous antecedents to application of PM practices that need to be better understood. PM practice antecedents are the underlying assumptions that project managers take for granted when managing projects. These are the conditions and contexts that make PM practices effective in given contexts.

The proposed research project is focussed on improving our understanding of how to manage aid relief projects through coping with the chaos and extreme turbulence associated with such projects while maintaining a structured PM approach. Its need is based upon direct observation by the author and presenter while undertaking a (confidential and thus uncited) report commissioned by a non-government organisation (NGO), Care Australia, into the scope of the PM task and performance for post-Tsunami disaster relief and reconstruction in Indonesia. He then undertook several further missions for a range of agencies over the following two years with direct filed observation and feedback from many aid workers ‘on the ground’.

Research methods

The entire research follows a staged model, recognising that the steps are not necessarily sequential and that the model should be cyclic, thus relevant for continuous quality improvement processes and particular for further research as follows:

Stage 1 Observation and Literature Review leading to Problem Clarification
Stage 2 Proposition Formulation leading to the definition research Concepts, Construct and Model
Stage 3 Development of Project Success Criteria and a List of ‘theorized’ Critical Project Success/Failure factors, gathered from the Literature Review - plan phase.
Stage 4 Conduct semi-structured pilot study interviews at the three identified levels: with project personnel supervising projects in the field (level 1) their board level project sponsors (level 2) and those that work on the ground with supervising project managers (level 3) - research action phase
Stage 5 Further refinement of Final Project Critical factors of Success/Failure, project management tools and techniques and Project Success Criteria reflection and analysis stage 1 - 3 phase and with possible survey review of findings for verification.
Stage 6 Validation workshop (qualitative research) of Project Practitioners to validate/ prove/ confirm/ add to the Critical factors reflection and analysis stage 2 phase.
Stage 7 Further in-depth interviews (semi-structured) using a Soft Systems Methodology SSM / Action Research (AR) to study the drivers and impediments to using best identified practice project management tools and techniques that are relevant for these type of projects – research action phase.
Stage 8  Data analysis feedback and proposal of actions for improvement from stage 7 based on critical factors from stage 6 and proposal of how (models, processes, templates etc) to ameliorate problems identified in stage 8 of this study relating to antecedents of the PM best practice that need to be addressed - reflection and analysis.

Stage 9  Interpretations and Conclusions
Stage 10  Presentation and thesis write up and defence.

Progress and Discussion

Work is presently in overlap between Stages 4 / 5. Solid progress has been achieved to date and there is more than sufficient material to work with coming from all the research outlined above and so far. The key focus is on their core clarification, simplification, integration leading to reliable and agreed set of constants for project management theory and application verification leading through the following stages as set out in the preceding pages.

A progress report and conclusions to date will be outlined at the presentation and a further action learning workshop may be run at the PmoZ 2007 Conference further to all of the above.
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