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CHAPTER 1

1.0 INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDY

1.1 Background of the study

When an organisation or an individual embarks on a project it involves carrying out a unique, finite undertaking with clearly-defined objectives, involving many inter-related tasks or activities and the contribution of a number of people working co-operatively under centralised control to produce a specified outcome or product within clearly-defined parameters of time, cost and quality. Rao (1997) defines projects as an assignment usually directed towards short term results with limited resource base and a fixed time frame.

According to the Project Management Institute, the discipline of project management is defined as the art of directing and coordinating human and material resources throughout the life of a project by using modern management techniques to achieve predetermined objectives of scope, cost, time, and quality and participation satisfaction. Project Management Institute (2004)

Project management is a vehicle of change. Unfortunately, many managers encounter problems in implementing projects. The efforts fail because they cost too much, take too long, are inadequately thought out and specified or simply don’t deliver the expected benefits. First and foremost, it has been noted that most projects are not aligned to the corporate strategy. Every project undertaken should support the organization’s business goals. Today’s lean organizations have only so much money and time to devote to project initiatives. Inappropriate projects lead to unnecessary competition for scarce resources, resulting in wasted managerial time and increased risk to overall corporate performance.
There are many challenges faced by companies globally. A study carried out by the Business Improvement Architect's annual research of project managers at Project World 2005 in Toronto, Canada indicated that 'Lack of Clarity in the Scope of the Project' was the top challenge their organization faces in managing projects. This concern is almost tied with 'Shifting Organizational Priorities'. Over the past 5 years, both these issues have consistently been identified as the top two challenges. The third challenge for respondents was 'Project Changes Not Well Managed' (43%) followed by 'A lack of Project Management Skills' (37%).

In Kenya, many project undertaken by state Corporations have been dubbed as "White Elephants" due to the fact that majority of which have stalled mid way, and those that have been completed, have been done so at an exorbitant cost. This is as a result of a change in scope of the project during the implementation process. That is, more and more ideas are incorporated into the project, resulting in higher costs and late delivery. A case in point is the Sondu Miriu Dam project that was to have one million cubic meter reservoir and a 60 megawatt hydro power station way back in 2003.

This mega project was being financed by the Japan Bank for International Cooperation together with KenGen a state corporation, Kenya even though the power station is scheduled to be operational in 2003, some of the works --like the construction of camp sites, roads, a bridge, and communication facilities have not been commissioned to date. Other examples of projects that have had exorbitant costs include the Turkwel Gorge Power Project which cost billions of shillings to the taxpayers.

Other challenges faced by state corporations include lack of Project Management Skills, Project not linked to organizational goals, Loss of control due to lack of detail in project plan, Conflict among project team members, lack of senior management support/buy-in, Project does not include all stakeholder
needs, and political interference. It is important to note that many of these corporations end up carrying out "pet projects" for political expediency, given that the managers, board members are political appointees, thus, carry out projects that suit them.

In addition, within the project management within organizations face various hurdles such as lack of Intra-functional thinking. This is whereby project members are focused on their department's need and fail to take a company-wide view. Further, when changes in the top management of the organizations take place as is frequently the case, many projects loose focus due to lack of management support.

1.2 Background of Kenya Pipeline Company

The Kenya Pipeline Company (KPC) was incorporated on 6th September 1973 under the companies act (Cap 486) and started commercial operations in 1978. The Company is a State Corporation under the Ministry of Energy with 100% government shareholding. KPC was given a mandate of constructing, operating and maintaining a multi-product pipeline and related white-oil storage facilitates. The overall objective of setting up the Company was to provide the economy with the most efficient, reliable, safe and least cost means of transporting petroleum products from Mombasa to the hinterland.

1.2.1 Vision Statement
The Company's vision is "to be a world class petroleum products distribution, handling and supply network in Africa"

1.2.2 Mission Statement
The Company's mission is "to efficiently, economically and safely transport, store and deliver petroleum products to customers, while optimising shareholder value, with utmost respect for the environment"
1.2.5 Projects At KPC

The very first project carried out at KPC involved constructing a pipeline system to transport refined petroleum products from Mombasa to Nairobi. The construction of the Pipeline Project commenced in October 1976 and was completed in December 1977 (period of 15 months). The project was successfully tested and commissioned in January 1978.

Given the success in the operations of the Mombasa-Nairobi pipeline, the Government allowed KPC in 1992 to undertake an expansion programme to extend the pipeline from Nairobi to Western Kenya towns of Nakuru, Eldoret and Kisumu. The extension of the pipeline was successfully completed and commissioned in early 1994.

KPC has constantly improved its services through continuous undertaking of various projects geared towards the enhancement of its core business. Over the past five years, KPC has undertaken major construction projects. These include the following:

Firstly, the construction of additional Jet fuel tanks at Eldoret and Kisumu to enhance storage of Jet fuel;
secondly, the construction of four (4) additional tanks at Mombasa (KOSF) to increase product storage capacity;
thirdly, the construction of an independent laboratory in Mombasa.;
fourthly, the construction of Cathodic Protection stations to enhance the pipeline integrity, and;
fifthly, the construction of Morendat Pump Station to improve the flow rates and hence meeting the petroleum demand in Western Kenya and beyond.

Given the increased demand for Petroleum Product both within Kenya and the region, there are several projects that have been planned to be undertaken at
KPC such as the extension of pipeline to Uganda, the construction of Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) storage and handling facilities in both Mombasa and Nairobi, the construction of truck loading facilities in Mombasa and the construction of a Mooring facility at Kisumu.

1.2.6 Management of Project at KPC

The management of construction projects requires knowledge of modern management as well as an understanding of the design and construction process. Construction projects have a specific set of objectives and constraints such as a required time frame for completion. While the relevant technology, institutional arrangements or processes will differ, the management of such projects has much in common with the management of similar types of projects in other specialty or technology domains such as aerospace, pharmaceutical and energy developments. Generally, project management is distinguished from the general management of corporations by the mission-oriented nature of a project.

Projects at KPC are managed by two departments namely, Engineering and Corporate Planning. Corporate Planning Department is charged with developing the overall strategy of the company. Consequently, all projects that are proposed are carried out in line with the global strategy of the company. The role of this department is to carry out the appraisal of proposed projects through feasibility studies and thereafter source for funding either from internal sources or from loans for the project implementation. Further, Corporate Planning is charged with the responsibility of carrying out Monitoring and Evaluation of all projects undertaken by the firm.

The Engineering department is charged with design and implementation of projects. This involves developing the specifications for the given projects from
which Tender documents are produced. This forms the basis on which contractors to quote for the work and are subsequently contracted to implement the same. Once the contractors are engaged, the Engineering department is charged with supervising the implementation of the project.

1.3 Statement of the Problem
There are very few successful projects that have been undertaken by various State Corporations over the years. This has led to loss of tax payer's monies and a great loss to the economy at large. These project often dubbed as 'White Elephants', have been a great failure due to the fact that they have been poorly planned and executed. However it is note worthy that there are equally very many successful projects that have been undertaken by various state Corporations. Indeed for success to have been achieved, there are very many challenges during the course of their life cycle, which had to be surmounted for success to be achieved.

It is in this light that this research hopes to identify various factors that pose a great challenge in the successful implementation of various projects. This is the question this project seeks to answer with a hope to understand the pitfall of many a project, which can then be avoided for future project success.

1.4 Objectives of the Study
The main objectives of this study are to:-

1. To find out factors that lead to Project success and failure in State Corporations.
2. To find out about challenges in Project Implementation in State Corporations
The specific objectives of the study are: -

1. To establish the factors leading to project success in state corporations
2. To establish the factors leading to project failures in state corporations
3. To establish the challenges faced during Project Implementation
4. To establish the role of Project Managers in the management of project for the success of given projects.

1.5 Significance of the Study

1. To help state Corporations in understanding of the nature of Project Management for successful Projects
2. To develop management awareness of the pitfalls in project implementation
3. To improve organizations competence for effective Management of Projects.
4. To equip State Corporations with knowledge of factors causing project failure in a bid to avoid these pitfalls

1.6 Limitation of the Study

The study is expected to be limited by the following reasons: -

1. Given the sensitive nature of the projects in State Corporations, the respondents may not be willing to divulge information regarding projects previously undertaken.
2. Project Managers involved in previous projects may not be willing to air their views given the fact that might feel they were part of the failure to many of the projects.
3. Lack of sufficient data and documentation on projects previously undertaken.
4. Lack of sufficient time to get the required responses adequately.
Project management concerns the activities of defining, planning, implementing and successfully concluding the implementation of projects. In this review the definition of the term project, and hence of project management, are considered and significant issues in the application of project management in an organisational environment are addressed. Further factors that contribute to the success and failure of project implementation were also studied.

2.1 Project Management

"Project management was established as a popular discipline in the late 1960s and 1970s, through the creation and activity of the US and European project management societies and, crucially, through the widespread adoption in business, government and the military of the matrix form of organization. Suddenly, thousands of professionals were pitched into task-focused, project-type situations." (Morris, 1994).

Morris (1994) complained that project management was "widely misperceived as a collection of planning and control techniques", and Kerzner (1989) reinforces this with his assertion that "project management is more behavioural than quantitative". Baguley (1995) agrees that "Projects are people-centred - they need and demand, whatever their duration or outcomes, the skills and abilities of people in order to create, plan and manage the processes and activities involved."

Kliem and Ludin (1992) draw attention to the complexities of the interactions between the various components of project work and organisation, and suggest
that "perhaps the best way to see what is meant by the people side of project management is to regard a project as a system". Morris (1994), enumerates some of these components: "Before one goes very far, discussion of attitudes and commitment, of criticism or communications, leads to project organizational issues such as project leadership, team management, industrial relations, and owner-supplier contractual and organizational relationships." He further states that "people need the right environment if they are to deliver good results"

2.2 Factors In Project Success and Failure

"Projects are concerned with change and, therefore, carry with them considerable uncertainty, and with uncertainty comes risk" (Lockyer and Gordon, 1996)

The effects of these uncertainties on project outcomes have entered the public consciousness through some well-publicised, perhaps infamous, public-sector projects. Caulkin (1996) observes that, of twenty-three programmes examined by the National Audit Office - "almost all were late [the average slippage was 31 months]" and total overspend came to £700 million. Caulkin cites some examples of well-known projects that overran budget and/or schedule, including: Eurofighter - 3 years late and £1.25 billion overspent, the British library - "nearly three times dearer than it should have been, still unfinished and without a definite completion date"; the Stock Exchange Taurus project - "embarrassingly aborted"; the London Ambulance computer system, which collapsed disastrously when implemented; and the Channel tunnel, notoriously over-budget.

To balance this otherwise depressing picture, it should be observed that 'success' is not necessarily an objective or measurable term. Concorde, by budget or schedule factors, would be considered a project which clearly failed, but as a technical achievement, and as an enduring icon of national pride, it has been highly successful; so much so that British Airways were overwhelmed with
applications when they offered a strictly limited number of flights from London to New York for £10, in the spring of 1997. "When measuring project success, one must consider the objectives of all the stakeholders throughout the project life cycle and at all levels in the management hierarchy. Therefore, to believe that, with such a multitude of objectives, one can objectively measure the success of a project is somewhat an illusion." (de Wit, 1988).

Just as the traditional ‘Time-Cost-Quality’ triangle has proved inadequate in defining project objectives, so these factors have been found unsatisfactory in assessing the success or failure of projects, a concept which "has remained ambiguously defined both in the project management literature and, indeed, often within the psyches of project managers" Pinto and Slevin, (1986).

"The research conducted by the authors on over 650 projects supports the following definition of success: If the project meets the technical performance specifications and/or mission to be performed, and if there is a high level of satisfaction concerning the project outcome among key people in the parent organization, key people in the client organization, key people in the project team, and key users or clientele of the project effort, the project is considered an overall success" (Baker, Murphy and Fisher, 1988).

Baker et al (1988) found that "Technical performance is integrally associated with perceived success of a project, whereas cost and schedule performance are somewhat less intimately associated with perceived success". Satisfaction of people associated with the project was also found to be more important than cost or schedule performance.

"Projects are often rated as successful because they have come in on or near budget and schedule and achieved an acceptable level of performance. These
characteristics may be used because they are the easiest to measure and they remain within the realm of the project organization. Other project organizations have begun to include the client satisfaction variable in their assessment of project success." (Pinto and Slevin, 1986).

The view that project success must be judged on the outcomes of the project within the recipient organisation, and not solely on the adequate discharge of the 'contractual' criteria of budget, performance measurement, and delivery on schedule, is widely supported across the recent literature.

Pinto and Slevin (1988) suggest three criteria for project implementation success: Technical validity - the project "works" or "does what it is purported to do"; Organizational validity - "the project compatible with the needs of the user if the final project is not used by the clients, that implementation effort is viewed as a failure"; and Organizational effectiveness - "once the new project has been given to the clients and is being used, it is contributing to an improved level of organizational effectiveness in the client's organization". Their view is that: "A project is generally considered to be successfully implemented if it comes on-schedule; on-budget; achieves basically all the goals originally set for it; and; is accepted and used by the clients for whom the project is intended.

Cleland (1994) takes a broadly similar view: he states that "Project success means that the project has met its cost, schedule, and technical performance objectives and has been integrated into the customer's organization to contribute to the customer's mission. A successful project means that the organization has been successful in positioning itself for the future; a specific strategy has been designed and implemented".
The Association for Project Management (1995) states that "Three basic sets of criteria on which the relative success or failure of the project may be judged can be identified which include: Firstly, those of the sponsoring organisation ie the owner or user, Secondly, the traditional or classic project management one of 'on time, in budget to specification', and; Lastly, the project participants' profitability"

Kerzner (1989) modified his earlier definition of project success as "the completion of a project within the constraints of time, cost, and performance" to include completion within the allocated time period; Within the budgeted cost; At the proper performance or specification level; With minimum or mutually agreed upon scope changes; Without disturbing the main work flow of the organization, and; Without changing the corporate culture."

Some writers draw attention to the changes which may occur during and after the lifetime of a project, which may have a bearing on how it is perceived and judged. Avots (1984) argues that "During the early phase of the project, schedule is of primary importance, while cost takes second place and quality third. Later in the project, cost becomes the controlling interest, with schedule taking a secondary role. After the project has been completed, schedule and cost problems are easily forgotten and quality becomes the key."

Lientz and Rea (1995) point out that to judge by "project on schedule and within budget is not as simple as it seems because the budget and schedule may have been changed many times". They ask whether the end product is in use, and go on to consider "project manager and team performance or if the project team dealt with issues early or as soon as they surfaced? Or, did they fester and get worse? Was management kept informed about the project? What signs were there of misunderstandings?".
Lientz and Rea believe that any evaluation should take a wider view of the impact a project has had, before assessing its success:

"A project can achieve its objectives and yet fail due to side effects. Take a large dam in Africa. It holds water to control flooding. It can generate power. But it may silt up. The cost of the power infrastructure may be more than that of imported oil. The lack of flooding may mean that the country has to import vast quantities of fertilizer. The side effects may outweigh the engineering success." (Lientz and Rea, 1995).

Obeng (1994) argues that "project success is and can only be defined by the stakeholders". These stakeholders may have differing requirements:

"There can be ambiguity in determining whether a project is a success or a failure. It is still not clear how to measure project success because the parties who are involved in a project perceive project success or failure differently. A project which is considered to be a success by the client might be considered a failure by top management, if the project outcome does not meet top management specifications, even though it might satisfy the client". (Belassi and Tukel, 1996).

"The project objectives are conditioned by the Client's strategic aims. Even where these appear to be obvious, for example, the profits and long term health of a company, or the implementation of Government policy, they should be reviewed to ensure that the project objectives are consistent with them." (Corrie, 1991).

"Of course, major projects have a mixture of motives, objectives and disciplines involved. However, it is essential to decide which the dominant factor is." (De Wit, 1988).
Briner, Geddes and Hastings (1990) maintain that the project manager has the responsibility for understanding and clarifying the requirements of the various stakeholders:

"The soft and less easily measured criteria of the project are often more important than the hard and easily measured criteria. It is part of the job of a project leader to 'tease out' such soft criteria in discussion with the client and end-users at the start of the project. Hard success criteria tend to relate to what is done. Soft success criteria relate more to how it is done."

"In general, most projects are viewed as a mixture of failure and success. Some things worked; some did not. The end product is often not quite right. It works but unforeseen behaviour and impacts occurred."

The study by Baker, Murphy and Fisher (1988) of “over 650 projects” found that participation by the project team in setting schedules and budgets was significantly associated with project success, whilst a lack of such participation was associated with project failure. Other factors significantly associated with failure were: lack of team spirit; lack of sense of mission; job insecurity; and lack of influence on the project manager.

Baker et al found a linear correlation between project success and the degree of goal commitment in the project team, and with the degree to which task commitment, backed-up with social commitment, was used as means of conflict resolution.
Corrie (1991) states that projects fail because “the project was badly conceived, that is, factors which might affect it are not properly considered. In addition, the “Project scope not adequately defined and agreed”, leading to projects going out of scope. Further Corries (1991) state that most “users are kept at arm's length from project development “ and as a result do not have user buy-in. Further, other causes of failure cited include “Conflicting objectives of participants not recognised, Project are badly organised, Poor communications, Amount of planning inappropriate to the scale of the project, Optimistic planning leading to underestimation of resource requirements, Contract strategy not considered until too late thus limiting options and lastly, Poor change control.”

Harrison (1992) cites some 1988 research by Duffy and Thomas on project audits to produce another list of factors in project failure which include:

Firstly, Not full-time project manager, client;
Secondly; inappropriate project organization, roles and responsibilities not clearly defined;
Thirdly; Lack of direction control and Level of planning inappropriate to scope of work;
Fourthly, Contract strategy not decided and the Scope of work not defined and understood, and;
Lastly, Poor change control and Poor risk identification and management.

Harrison uses this and other research to argue that “There is a large amount of consensus both in the UK and the USA as to the reasons for the success or failure of projects and of project management. The principal factors leading to project failure have been identified as Inadequate and inappropriate organisation structures, which lead to problems of authority, responsibility, communication and coordination. In addition, “Inadequate planning and control methodologies and systems” in project implementation. Another factor includes “the fact that the inter
group and interpersonal human problems and conflicts that arise in the flexible and complex organization of projects" are not adequately addressed. Further, "A lack of integration of the organization, the work, the people and the management systems." leading to project failure.

Harrison (1992) further states that "there is much consensus in these studies as to the reasons for the success or failure of projects and of project management. The following principal factors can be identified as being lack of Organization, Planning and control and finally human factors."

Pinto and Kharbanda (1996) states twelve ways "to ensure a project's failure. These include: "Ignoring the project environment including stakeholders; Push a new technology to market too early; Don't bother building in fallback options; When problems occur, shoot the person most visible; Let new ideas starve to death from inertia; Don't bother conducting feasibility studies; Never admit a project is a failure; Over manage project managers and their teams; Never, never conduct post-failure reviews; Never bother to understand project trade-offs; Allow political expediency and infighting to dictate crucial project decisions; Make sure the project is run by a weak leader."

Meredith and Mantel (1995) collected data "over a period of three years from a sample of over 400 project leaders in predominantly technical undertakings. Project leadership criteria included: two years of experience in managing multidisciplinary projects, leading a minimum of three other project professionals, and being formally accountable for final results." They found that problems of project control, leading to perceived failure, were differently attributed by stakeholder groups. "Project leaders" blamed poor project control on: "Customer and management changes; Technical complexities; Unrealistic project plans; Staffing problems; Inability to detect problems early"
Meredith and Mantel (1995) further state that "Managers at all levels have long lists of 'real' reasons why problems occur." The most frequently mentioned reasons for poor project performance can be classified in five categories namely, "Problems with organizing project team, Weak project leadership, Communications problems, Conflict and confusion and Insufficient upper management involvement" Most of the problems relate to the manager's inability to foster a work environment conducive to multidisciplinary teamwork, rich in professionally stimulating and interesting activities, involvement, and mutual trust."

Belassi and Tukel identify, from the literature and from their own research, "top management support" as probably the most critical factor in project success. This is because "Top management usually controls a project manager's access to resources which are supervised by functional managers. The level of support provided by the functional manager is usually determined by the level of support from top management" (Belassi and Tukel, 1996).

Morris (1994) agrees that "it is particularly important to project success that there be commitment and support at the top; without it the project is probably doomed". This requirement can be seen as a component of matrix working, which has already been explored above, and is related to the degree of authority accorded to the project manager (see, for example, Thamhain and Wilemon, 1974; Baker, Murphy and Fisher, 1988; or Cleland, 1994). Organisation structure: "having the wrong people in key positions with their roles and responsibilities being neither well defined nor understood" (Corrie, 1991) has also been identified as a key factor in project failure. Lockyer and Gordon (1996) link this factor directly to top management support, contending that "a project may suffer because of the
degree of importance assigned to it by the parent company. Should it be deemed
to be of little value there may be attempts to 'pass off' difficult employees to the
project".

Baker, Murphy and Fisher (1988) found that “excessive structure” was
significantly related to failure, and that “bureaucracy and spatial distance of the
project manager to the project” was linearly related to failure.

The importance of the feelings and attitudes of people working on a project is a
recurring theme in the literature. Morris (1994) is adamant:
"Projects demand significant effort, under difficult and even hostile conditions,
often without the benefit of high personal financial reward. Unless there is a major
commitment to making the project a success, unless the motivation of everyone
working on the project is high, and unless attitudes are supportive and positive,
the chances of success are substantially diminished."

Fortunately, according to Cleland (1994) "Most people associated with a project
are disposed to make it succeed", although even this has a down side, leading
project participants to continue their commitment “even beyond a point of unwise
cost increases or schedule delays. All too often project managers will ask for
more time and more resources to make the project succeed, even beyond
prudent justification." (Cleland, 1994).

2.3 Research Gap

From the literature studied, various challenges have been analysed that
contribute to the success and failure of projects. However, non of these were
considered in the context of Management of Project in State Corporations Which
provides a unique environment under which projects are implemented. Thus this
research hopes to identify factors that contribute to the success and failure of
projects within state corporations under their unique working environment.
CHAPTER 3
3.0 METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

3.1 The Case Study
The study was carried out at the Kenya Pipeline Company's industrial Area offices at Nairobi.

3.2 Population of the Study
The population of the state owned corporations located in Kenya, according to the Inspectorate of State Corporations, are 83 listed corporations. These public corporations have one common feature in that the leadership is appointed politically.

3.3 Research Design
Since the management systems in the state corporations are almost the same, it was the feeling of the researcher that a case study of Kenya Pipeline Company would give enough to be generalized with all the other public corporations. Therefore this was a case study of Kenya Pipeline Company.

3.4 Data Collection
Being a survey on the opinions of the Kenya Pipeline employees working involved in projects in the company. A semi-structured questionnaire was used to gather primary data. The respondents to the study are employees at all levels and cadres of Kenya Pipeline Company involved in various project within the company. The questionnaire comprised both open and closed ended questions. Ordinal scale was used to rate the different variables.
3.5 Data Analysis

The data analysis sought to establish challenges of Project Management in Kenya Pipeline Company. Before analysing responses, the completed questionnaires were edited for errors. The data was then coded to enable the responses to be grouped into categories. Descriptive statistics was used to summarize the data. Frequencies, percentages and proportions charts were also be used. Tables were used to bring out the factors in order of importance.
4.1 Project Planning, Appraisal and Design

In the analysis of Project Planning, Appraisal and Design of various projects undertaken in state corporations, the following observations were made:

4.1.1 Project Identification

*Chart 1: Thorough Pre-feasibility Studies*

To a large extent, 50% of the respondents indicated that thorough Pre-feasibility studies are conducted whereas 10% indicated that they are carried out to a medium extent.
4.1.2 Purposes and Goals

Chart 2: Purposes and Goals

Only 40% of the respondents indicated that the purposes and goals are defined during the project Identification whereas 30% and 10% indicated that to a medium and small extent respectively are the purposes and goals defined.

4.1.3 Organisation Mission and Vision

Chart 3: Organization Mission and Vision

Source: Researcher (2006)
30% of the respondents indicated that always and to a large extent are the organization mission and vision put into consideration during problem identification. 20% on the other hand indicated that to both a small and medium extent is this taken into consideration.

4.1.4 Political Expediency

Chart 4: Political Expediency

To a large extent, 30% of the respondents indicated that political expediency plays a major role in project identification, whereas 20% to a small and medium extent indicated that is plays a role in project identification.
4.1.5 Stakeholder Involvement

Chart 5: Stakeholder Involvement

Over 50% of the respondents indicated that stakeholders are involved in the project identification to a small extent, whereas 30% to a large extent, 10% to both a small extent and not at all respectively.

Thus, many projects face many challenges due to low stakeholder buy-in into the projects undertaken, which results in failure of many projects.
4.1.6 Feasibility Analysis and Appraisal

Chart 6: Feasibility Analysis and Appraisal

Source: Researcher (2006)

40% of the respondents indicated that to a small and medium extent reliable assumptions are used in carrying out feasibility studies. Further, 40% of the respondents indicated that feasibility studies are actually carried out to both a small and medium extent. In addition, 40% of the respondents indicated that effective appraisals are carried out to a medium extent. Concerning on-site assessment, 30% of the respondents indicated that it is carried out to a medium extent, whereas 60% of the respondents indicated that contingency planning is factored in to a medium extent as part of the feasibility analysis of a given project.

On average, these results indicate that feasibility analyses on most projects are carried out to a medium extent. Consequently, it can be concluded that majority of the projects have feasibility studies carried out beforehand.
Over 50% of the respondents indicated that preliminary designs are implemented to a large extent whereas, 30% indicated that designs are based on the initial objectives. However, 40% of the respondents indicated that the designs are reviewed to a small extent, whereas only 30% indicated that activities are defined to a large extent. With regard to bottlenecks in project design, 40% of the respondents indicated that they are always identified as part of the project design.

From this analysis, it can be concluded that most project are designed well and all the critical factors are taken into consideration.
In the analysis of challenges experienced in Project Selection, it was noted that 50% of the respondents indicated that the selection criteria for given projects posed a challenge to a medium extent, whereas, 55.5% indicated that project selection lacked prioritization to a large extent. 44.4% of the respondents indicated that project selection always had political influence, and 40% indicated that selected project faced delays in approval.

In addition, 40% of the respondents indicated that most projects had insufficient finances and inadequate budgets to a large extent. It was also noted by 40% of the respondents that many of the projects had cost inflation to a large extent thus posing a great challenge.

Further, to a large extent, 50% of the respondents indicated that there were many project variations, whereas 40% indicated that most projects faced legal hurdles to a large extent. In addition, 30% of the respondents indicated that
projects carried out were in line with national development objectives to a small extent.

4.1.9 Project Implementation

Analysis of Project Implementation indicated that over 78% of the respondents indicated that tasks are scheduled to a medium extent in most project carried out. Further, to a small extent, over 40% indicated that the use of tools such as Critical Path Methodology (CPM) and Program Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT) are used during project implementation. In addition over 30% to a medium extent indicated that they had management support during project implementation. To a small extent 40% and 50% indicated that they had sufficient tools and solving problem techniques during project implementation respectively.

Over 30% to a small extent indicated that project inspection was carried out during implementation. In addition, 40% indicated that they had insufficient manpower to a medium extent, while carrying out the various projects. To a large extent, 40% of the respondents pointed out that budgets were monitored during project implementation. However, 30% indicated that project completion reports
were made to a large extent and 40% indicated that contractors completed the work on schedule to a small extent.

4.1.10 Project Evaluation

In the analysis of Project Evaluation, it was noted that by 30% of the respondents that Evaluation Objective and Procedures were always clear. In addition it was noted by 30% of the respondents that both background information and previous evaluation reports were used to a medium extent in the course of evaluating a project. Further, to a large extent 30% indicated that an evaluation time table is used whereas 50% to a large extent indicated that evaluation reports were produced. However, 40% indicated that evaluation of project received management to a small extent and 50% indicated that post failure reviews were not carried out.
Analysis of the characteristics of Project Managers showed the following: 50% of the respondents indicated that project managers carried out project administration to a medium extent whereas only 30% indicated that they got involved in individual tasks to a large extent. However, 30% noted that project managers did not resolve issues to a small extent and 50% indicated that Project Managers were willing to listen to complaints. It was further noted by 44% of the respondents that Project Managers focused on specific tools to a small extent and 50% indicated that they are more concerned with the percentage of completion of projects to a small extent.
In the analysis of the characteristics of Project Managers, it was noted by 40% of the respondents that milestones of given projects were recognized to small extent. In addition, 40% of the respondents indicated that to a large extent, Project Managers were inclined to micro-manage given projects. In addition, to a large extent, 40% indicated that changes to schedule were made by majority of the Project managers.

Further, to a large extent, 50% of the respondents indicated that Project Managers were Status Oriented and 40% indicated that they had general project plans. Further, it was pointed out that 30% of the respondents noted that no thorough analysis is carried out by project managers to a large extent.
In the analysis of the Project Planning the following observations were made:

30% of the respondents indicated that project scope in various projects is inappropriate to a small and medium extent. In addition, 40% indicated that projects have inadequate planning to a small extent. Further, 30% pointed out that underestimation of resources required for given projects is carried out to a large extent. In addition, inadequate participation and a lack of involvement of users during project planning is carried out to a medium extent.
Analysis of challenges faced in the Project Organization indicated the following: To a medium extent, 40% indicated that project organizations were formed for given projects. However, 40% to medium and 50% large extent, indicated that lack of integration and undefined responsibilities were a major challenge respectively. In addition, 50% indicated that inappropriate project roles were prevalent to a medium extent. Further, it was pointed out that 40% to a large extent indicated that projects were badly organized.
Analysis of Project Directing noted the following:-

To a small extent, 50% of the respondents indicated that inadequate coordination in directing projects, whereas, 30% indicated that there is lack of direction control. In addition, 40% indicated there is inadequate and poor communication to a large extent whereas, 30% indicated that there is lack of influence in the directing of given projects.
An analysis of Project Staffing indicated the following challenges in the management of projects:

33.3% of the respondents indicated that there is no full time project manager to a small extent, whereas, 22.2% indicated that there are no full time project managers to a large extent. Further analysis showed that 44.4% indicated that there is lack of integration among project staff to a medium extent. In addition, 33.3% indicated that no inter-group conflicts existed among project teams whereas, 44.4% indicated that lack of team spirit existed to a large extent. Further, 33.3% of project staff indicated that they suffered from job insecurity to a large extent.
An analysis of the various factors that characterize project management resulted in the following:

To a large extent, 55% of the respondents indicated that Project Missions existed. 33.3% indicated that projects received top management support always and had a project plan. In addition it was noted by 44.4% that client consultation took place to a small extent in given projects whereas 33.3% indicated that projects had sufficient personnel to a small extent.

Further, it was noted by 44.4% of the respondents that challenges were faced in carrying out technical tasks to a small extent, whereas, 44.4% indicated that projects carried out had client acceptance to a large extent.

In addition, to a medium extent, 44.4% indicated that monitoring and feedback on given projects regularly takes place, and over 25% indicated that communication is not carried out to a large extent. Further, 33.3% indicated that troubleshooting is carried out in given projects to a large extent.
4.3.5 Project Controlling

An analysis of challenges faced in Project Controlling indicated the following:-

To a medium and large extent 37.5% of the respondents indicated that inadequate control of given projects posed a major challenge. Further, to a large extent, 50% of the respondents indicated that inadequate management systems were in place for the control of projects. In addition, 25% indicated that there was always poor change control during the introduction of new projects.

To a medium extent, it was noted by 37.5% of the respondents that most projects had poor risk identification, whereas 55.5% noted that budget and schedules as tools for control of projects were used to a small extent.

Source: Researcher (2006)
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents an analytical discussion of the findings in the preceding chapter. Results pertaining to the objectives of the study are comprehensively discussed and the various challenges of project management in state corporations are explored further.

5.2 Project Planning Appraisal and Design
Finding from this study have shown that thorough Pre-feasibility studies are conducted carried out with clear purposes and goals set out. However the organization mission and vision are not always put into consideration during problem identification and in addition not all external factors that influence the actual projects to be undertaken are considered to a large extent. However, the study findings indicated that political expediency plays a major role in project identification carried out by state corporations.

With regard to stakeholder involvement, the study findings indicated that stakeholders are involved in the project identification to a small extent, whereas and thus, many projects face many challenges due to low stakeholder buy-in into the projects undertaken, which results in failure of many projects.

Further, it was noted that reliable assumptions are used in carrying out feasibility studies. However, on-site assessment of given projects is not carried out to a great extent. In addition it was noted that contingency planning is factored in to a medium extent as part of the feasibility analysis of a given project. It can be
concluded that majority of the projects have feasibility studies carried out beforehand.

With regard to project design, findings indicated that preliminary designs are implemented to a large extent based on the initial objectives of the projects. However it was noted that the preliminary designs are reviewed to a small extent, resulting in many challenges and bottlenecks during project implementation.

5.3 Project Selection and Approval

Findings from this study have shown that the selection criteria for given projects posed a challenge resulting in prioritization of projects to a large extent. Further, it was noted that project selection always had political influence, and resulting in delays in approving projects and the failure of many projects selected project s

In addition, the study indicated that most projects had insufficient finances and inadequate budgets to a large extent. This explains why there are many stalled projects carried out by state corporations. In addition, findings indicated that many of the projects had inflated costs which explain why many projects face great challenges during implementation resulting in failure. Further, findings from the study indicated that many projects face legal hurdles to a large extent during selection and approval as a result of vested interest during tendering.

5.4 Project Implementation

Findings from the study indicated the use of project management tools such as Critical Path Methodology (CPM) and Programme Evaluation and Review
Technique (PERT) are used to a small extent during implementation. Consequently, the scheduling of tasks poses a great challenge during project implementation. In addition, it was pointed out that most projects undertaken did not receive full management support during project implementation which posed a great challenge during implementation. Further, it was noted that very little inspection is carried out during project implementation and as a result, the projects are not carried out to the expected standards required. In addition, it was noted that most projects face a challenge of insufficient manpower and working within approved budgets. Findings further show that contractors completed the work on schedule to a small extent.

5.5 Project Evaluation

In the analysis of Project Evaluation, findings indicated that evaluation objectives and procedures were always clear. However, it was noted that background information and previous evaluation reports are rarely used as a basis for evaluation resulting in low standards of project evaluations. Further, findings indicated that evaluation reports were rarely produced and as a result, historical information or data not available for reference. Further, it was noted that that post failure reviews were not carried out in many project and thus many project managers lack the knowledge of experiences learnt from other projects. Thus, it can be concluded that many state corporations do not benefit from lessons learnt from other failed projects and end up repeating the same mistakes done.

5.6 Project Managers

Findings from the study indicated that Project Managers are involved in Project Administration primarily focusing on individual tasks within the project. However, given the lack of autonomy, many Project Managers find it difficult to make
decisions and thus many issues remain not unresolved over long periods of time. Further it was noted that most Project Managers are unwilling to listen to complaints and are more concerned with the percentage of completion of projects. This greatly inhibits the progress of many projects resulting in delays.

In the analysis of the characteristics of Project Managers, it was noted that majority of the Project Managers were inclined to micro-manage given projects. This results in lack of delegation and delays in project completions. Findings further indicate that Project Managers are more concerned with the status of given projects without looking into the various challenges faced by the project managers.

5.7 Management of Projects

5.7.1 Planning

Findings from the study indicated that project scope in various projects is inappropriate and have inadequate planning. This is characterized by underestimation of resources required for given projects and inadequate participation and lack of involvement of users during project planning. This results in poorly planned projects by state corporations.

5.7.3 Project Organisation

Findings from the study indicated that project organizations are formed during the initiation of given projects. However there is lack of integration and undefined responsibilities among the various people involved in the given project. This results in poor coordination of projects thus posing a major challenge. In addition it was noted that inappropriate project roles were prevalent in various projects resulting in badly organized projects. Further, it is important to have sufficient consultation with the clients during the implementation of given projects and good
communication. This will ensure that proper coordination of activities is carried out resulting in successful project implementation.

5.7.4 Project Directing
Findings from the study show that there is inadequate coordination in directing projects and to a small extend lack of direction control. In addition findings show that there is inadequate and poor communication to a large extent resulting in major challenges experienced during the implementation of various projects.

5.7.5 Project Staffing
Findings from the study showed that majority of the projects carried out in state corporations indicate that there are no full time project resulting in lack of integration and team spirit among project staff. Consequently, management of projects become very challenging given that decision making becomes difficult resulting in delays during the implementation of given projects.

5.7.6 Project Controlling
From the study, respondents indicated that inadequate control of given projects posed a major challenge. Thus many project stall due to lack of direct control of the project by the project managers due to external influences. Consequently, Project managers have to be empowered to make decisions and have control over the management of given project in order to complete projects in time and on budget.

5.8 Conclusion
From this analysis, the following conclusions can be drawn:
Firstly, most projects are designed well and all the critical factors are taken into consideration. However, it is noted that not all projects are adequately planned. Consequently, in identifying given projects it is important to have thorough feasibility studies to be carried out so as to justify the project. Clear goals need to
be defined and the involvement of all stakeholders from the onset is very important.

Secondly, in as much as State Corporations cannot be fully divorced from political influence with regard to the decisions on which projects are to be implemented, in order to ensure success of the same, it is important that professional project managers are contracted and empowered to make decisions over the project. They need to be autonomous to make decisions and have control over the project implementation. This is especially with regard to project staffing, control, directing and management of budget and cost control. In addition, state corporations should form project organizations with a permanent Project manager on site. This will ensure that there is a dedicated team involved in a given project resulting in consistency and team work among project staff. In most cases, you find that the project organization is normally changed in the middle of a project resulting in confusion and delays as project teams have to adapt to new changes.

Thirdly, one important aspect that was noted is that majority of the projects exceed initial budget. Cost inflation is a common issue due to various during the life of a project. It is important that during the planning of a given project, sufficient financial resources need to be budgeted for and committed to avoid stalling the project mid-way. One way to avoid cost escalation during the life of a project is to carry out procurement of goods and services prudently and cost effectively before embarking on a given project. This will ensure minimal expenditure on non-budgeted items during the course of project implementation.

Further, it is important that past projects need to be reviewed to understand the major pitfalls and challenges before embarking on new projects. This ensures that lessons learnt can be used for planning purposed on new projects.
Fourthly, with regard to Project Evaluation, it can be pointed out that very few projects are adequately evaluated. Thus very little documented institutional knowledge that is relevant for future projects is kept and as a result, problems faced in past projects are continuously experienced.

Lastly, Project managers that are recruited need to be Project Management professionals. In addition, soft skills such as being a team player, good communication and interpersonal skills need to characterize such an individual given that project management work needs an all rounded individual. This will guarantee the success of any future projects.

5.9 Recommendations

From the above study, the following recommendations can be made:

Firstly, Project Management in State Corporations needs to be strengthened through development of professional Project Manager within these institutions. The use of project management tools needs to be incorporated in all projects that are to be implemented. This will ensure that projects will be managed to international standards and can guarantee the number of successful projects.

Secondly, external interference in projects needs to be minimized through de-linking projects from political influence. This will ensure that project are planned to meet national and not individual goals.

Thirdly, in planning for projects, it is imperative that thorough feasibility studies are carried out and an adequate budget given for specific projects. In organizations that run several projects simultaneously, a project organization needs to be set up for ease of coordination, communication and general planning of the implementation schedules.
Fourthly, projects to be implemented need support from all stakeholders of the project. These include the management of the institution, the beneficiaries and various clients. This will ensure that the project does not stall midway due to both internal and external conflict of interest. It is mandatory that stakeholder buy-in into the project be obtained in the early stages of project identification. This will ensure that the project is carried out to its successful completion.
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This Questionnaire seeks to find out challenges faced in Project Management, that result in the success or failure of many projects. All the information given will be treated with confidentiality and will be used solely for the purposes of carrying out this research.

NAME: ____________________________

COMPANY: _________________________

DEPARTMENT: _____________________

DESIGNATION: ____________________

PROJECT PLANNING APPRAISAL AND DESIGN

Qn. 1 To what extent are the following factors implemented or experienced in Project Planning, Appraisal and Design?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>To a medium extent</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identification

1 Thorough pre-feasibility studies
2 Clear and explicit purposes and goals defined
3 Projects in line with organisation Mission and Vision
4 Allow political expediency and infighting to dictate crucial project decisions
5 Involve all stakeholders in Project Identification

Feasibility Analysis and Appraisal

1 Reliable assumptions and supporting documents
2 Comprehensive feasibility studies
3 Effective Appraisal criteria
4 Appraisers continuously make on-site assessment
5 Contingency Planning

Design

1 Extensive preliminary design
2 Project design often reflect initial objectives
3 Project manager involved in reviewing project plans and designs
4 Project activities, functions, tasks, components clearly defined
5 Potential problems or bottlenecks to successful implementation identified
PROJECT SELECTION AND APPROVAL
Qn.2 To what extent do the following challenges experienced in Project Selection and Approval?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Selection</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Effective appraisal and selection criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Delays in making decisions for approving project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Influenced from political circles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lack of prioritising projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Insufficient financial resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inadequate budgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cost inflation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Variations during implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Procurement Bottlenecks Legal Hurdles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Linkage with national development programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION
Qn.3 To what extent are the following factors implemented or experience during in Project Execution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Implementation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work activities and project tasks scheduled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use of CPM and PERT analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fully management support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sufficient tools and Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Formal problem solving or trouble shooting procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Thorough Inspection of projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sufficient man power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Monitoring budget performance and cash flows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Project completion reports prepared and reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Contractor working within schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT EVALUATION
Qn.4 To what extent do are the following factors implemented in Project Evaluation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Evaluation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clear Evaluation objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Formal evaluation procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adequate background information on projects for evaluation purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of previous project evaluation reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluation time table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Formal evaluation reports prepared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Evaluation have adequate administrative and management support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Conduct post-failure reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROJECT MANAGERS

**Qn 5.** To what extent do the following characterise the manner in which project managers handle various projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Be over concerned with project administration and neglect project management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not get involved in individual tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Let issues drift and remain unresolved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unwilling to listen to suggestions for change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Over focused on specific project management tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Obsessed with percentage complete for tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Measure milestones by presence and not quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Attempt to micromanage the project and not delegate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Make too many changes to the schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Be status-oriented and not issue-oriented at project meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Develop an overly general project plan without detailed tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Address issues without thorough analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qn 6.** To what extent are the following challenges experienced in the management of various projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>To a medium extent</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROJECT PLANNING

1. Project scope not adequately defined and agreed
2. Amount of planning inappropriate to the scale of the project
3. Underestimation of resource requirements
4. Participation by the project team in setting schedules and budgets
5. Users not involved in Project Development

#### PROJECT ORGANISATION

1. Inappropriate project organization
2. A lack of integration of the organization
3. Project responsibilities not clearly defined
4. Inappropriate project roles
5. Project badly organised

#### PROJECT DIRECTING

1. Inadequate coordination
2. Lack of direction control
3. Inadequate communication
4. Lack of influence on the project manager
5. Poor communications
### PROJECT STAFFING

1. Not full-time project manager  
2. A lack of integration the people  
3. The inter-group and interpersonal human problems and conflicts  
4. Lack of team spirit among project staff  
5. Job insecurity among project staff

### PROJECT CONTROLLING

1. Inadequate control methodologies  
2. Inadequate project management systems  
3. Poor change control  
4. Poor risk identification  
5. Project within Budget and Schedule

Qn.7 To what extent do the following characterise Projects Management within the organisation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Mission</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>To a medium extent</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Top Management Support</td>
<td>Initial clearly defined goals and general directions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Project Schedule/Plan</td>
<td>Willingness of top management to provide the necessary resources and authority/power for project success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Client Consultation</td>
<td>A detailed specification of individual actions steps for project implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personnel</td>
<td>Communication, consultation and active listening to all impacted parties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Technical Tasks</td>
<td>Recruitment, selection and training of the necessary personnel for the project team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Client Acceptance</td>
<td>Availability of the required technology and expertise to accomplish the specific technical action steps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Monitoring and Feedback</td>
<td>The act of 'selling' the final project to its ultimate intended users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Communication</td>
<td>Timely provision of comprehensive control information at each stage in the implementation process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Troubleshooting</td>
<td>The provision of an appropriate network and necessary data to all key actors in the project implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Communication</td>
<td>Ability to handle unexpected crises and deviations from plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE END