

On the real value of project, program and portfolio management (PPPM) and PPPM standards¹

Vyacheslav Pozniakov

Abstract

Currently modern methods of project, program and portfolios management (PPPM) have widespread implementation in the national, as well as in a number of foreign economies. There are a lot of a vivid examples of these, which have received international acceptance and distribution. Among these are ISO 10006 [8], PMBoK Guide [9], ICB IPMA Competence Baseline [10], P2M [11], PRINCE 2 [12], etc. At the same time the problem of remaining a large number of unsuccessful projects and programs up to 50-90 percent in a number of industries still exist. The problem above is considered. Based on international and national experiences, some ways to improve the situation, including creation of widely and easily accessible systems of databases of positive and negative PPPM experiences are offered. The concepts of PPPM and PPPM' standards value and the methods for their determination are introduced. Also it is proposed to expand the system of the main processes of PPPM, recommended by most modern PPPM standards.

Keywords: Project management, unsuccessful projects, databases on completed projects, project management standards, the basic project management processes.

Introduction

Currently, PPPM are successfully used and are becoming more widespread in Russia and abroad, and there is much vivid evidence of this. As a result of notable successes, many publications and speeches affirm the legitimacy and high efficiency of applying PPPM to all types of projects, programs, portfolios, and calls for the widespread introduction of PPPM in all areas of activity and in any conditions .

At the same time, the results of PPPM are not 100 percentage positive everywhere and not always. According to a number of international studies, the proportion of unsuccessful projects, at least, in a number of modern industries, ranges from 50 to 90 percent. Experience shows that in other sectors of economies the situation is not much better.

There are no domestic statistics on this topic, but it can be assumed that in Russia the number of failed projects is even greater.

¹ How to cite this paper: Pozniakov, V. (2020). On the real value of project, program and portfolio management (PPPM) and PPPM standards; *PM World Journal*, Vol. IX, Issue VI, June.

The latter circumstance, as well as the accompanying economic and other losses, cause project participants disappointment and doubts about the potential of the PPPM, which negatively affects its further development and successful use.

This problem seems relevant for the Russian national economy, given the scale of the projects being implemented in the country (about 20% of GDP) and the increasing attention of the country's leadership at all levels to the widespread introduction of PPPM in the management of various sectors of the national economy (see “The main directions of the Government of the Russian Federation for the period until 2018”, as well as the creation at the end of 2016 the Department of Project Activities of the Russian Federation Government, etc.) .

The article considers the problem formulated above, suggests some possible solutions, including taking into account international and national experience.

The article is intended for the main stakeholders of the development and implementation of projects, participants in the training and certification of the PPPM specialists.

I. Some positive results of PPPM usage in Russia.

As it was noted above, PPPM methods are currently successfully used and are becoming widespread in Russia and abroad. In Russia, in one way or another, PPPM is used virtually in all sectors of the economy and management levels pack a systematic way, on various forms of ownership. In many cases, the application of PPPM methods is the basis for the success of the project and there is much vivid evidence of this. For example, in Russia are results of the Nizhny Novgorod engineering company AO « NIAEP " in the development and practical use of the methodology of Multi – D. It is complex system pack, a systematic way during the construction of complex engineering structures, such as nuclear power plants. It allowed, for example, in difficult conditions to build the last units of the Rostov nuclear station, to carry out the project at the level of world standards and significantly reduce the time and cost of the project. Impressive are the successes of Sberbank in the field of PPPM, which have received international recognition in the form of first places in international competitions in the field of PPPM.

The next to be mentioned could be achievements of domestic organizations that have assessed the maturity level of PPPM according to the “DELTA” system of the International Project Management Association IPMA , as well as the results of projects and programs that have won national contests “Best Project of the Year” deserve widespread attention . The latter are carried out by the Russian project management association SOVNET and are becoming increasingly popular. PPPM methods are being actively implemented in the activities of public sector organizations. This is evidenced by Russian Government documents, for example, "Main directions of activity of Russian Federation Government for the period until 2018 the year ", an

increasing number of PPPM departments in the federal public administration, regional and municipal level, as well as creating at the end of 2016 the PPPM Unit of the Russian Federation Government [1], etc. . This, in particular, is illustrated by the results of the Project Olympus competitions held for the 5th time by the Analytical Center under the Government of the Russian Federation and in 2018 together with the Russian Project Management Association SOVNET (IPMA member) .

Now in Russia in spite of certain difficulties in organizations of different ownership and at different management levels, there are an increasing number of planned and ongoing projects and programs, the most diverse and often very ambitious. So, the country's leadership has developed and is implementing a number of programs to overcome the current difficult economic situation. Among them are:

- Financing of infrastructure projects of the Foundation national Welfare
- Import substitution
- Development of export production
- oil and gas projects
- Restructuring of the economy
- Big infrastructure projects: the BAM, the Far East, Crimea bridge, etc.
- The development of small and medium-sized businesses
- Etc. (see website of the Government)

The crisis and the desire to get out of it generate in the private sector, in small and medium-sized businesses, a large number of ideas and projects of the most diverse content and scope.

As a consequence, considerable progress implementing PPPM in a number of publications affirms the legitimacy and effectiveness of PPPM for all types of projects, programs, portfolios, calls for widespread adoption of PPPM, or how often formulate, project methods, in management of projects, programs, portfolios in on all spheres activities and in all conditions .

II. A large number of unsuccessful projects, the value of PPPM, the basic reasons for project failures

At the same time, the results of PPPM are not always and not everywhere positive. For example, according to The Standish Group, in 2013, \$ 750 billion was spent on software development and implementation projects around the world [2]. Of these, the number of undeniably successful projects is 38 %, while the remaining projects are classified as completely failed (16%) or controversial, for example, to achieve goals (46 %). Experience shows that in other sectors of the economies the situation is not much better. So according to the founder of the Japanese Association of Project Management Professor Hiroshi Tanaka, founded on the analysis of the Japanese and international experience in project management in the last 50 years, 90% of infrastructure projects fail [3]. There are other sources of information. Among these especially note the paper by David Pells [5]. as well as studies [6,7].

There are no domestic statistics on this note topic, but it can be assumed that in Russia the number of controversial, and clearly disastrous, projects is even greater. At the same time, project participants, as a rule, argue that modern, proven methods of PPPM were used.

The latter circumstance, as well as related economic and other losses caused the project participants disappointment and doubts about the possibility PPPM, which negatively affects its further development and successful use. Therefore, the existing successes in applying PPPM and the expected increase in the number of various projects in the country raise the question of analyzing the current situation, the real value of PPPM and its most appropriate role in specific application conditions, especially in modern national conditions, and its further development.

As a first approximation, the real value of PPPM may be understood, for example, as the probability of achieving set goals, as measured by statistical or subjective, expert methods. Naturally, this definition is not the only possible and far from universal. Its advantages are comparative simplicity associated with the use of statistical methods for large volumes of PPPM statistics dates, the possibility of involvement of experts and acceptability for the purpose of article as analysis of the reasons for a significant number of wholly or partially unsuccessful projects. As can be seen in our case PPPM usefulness, at least, in a number of areas of project activity can be considered as the order of 50%, and some 10%, where 100% is a case with 100% successful projects. Naturally, for different fields of activity, the value of PPPM is different and depends on many factors, for example, on national conditions.

So, among the significant characteristics of modern Russian national conditions, we note such as:

- not always reliable functioning of the economy;
- a certain level of corruption;
- political risks;
- lack of investment activity;
- dependence on the oil market;
- insufficient development of the credit and financial and banking systems, restraining the turnover of investments and capital;
- the absence of a reliable system for providing guarantees and benefits for investors, including foreign ones;
- Not always favorable economic, legal, organizational and other necessary conditions for the development of small and medium-sized businesses;
- etc.

Taking into account national specifics of PPPM is a serious factor in ensuring the project's success. Especially, taking into account that continuously and often with a purely commercial objectives to the country come new methods and PPPM' approaches developed in other countries

and with other external and internal conditions. Advocates of these new products often are not concerned with the rationale for the effectiveness of their proposals in specific national conditions.

In general, the concept of the PPPMs value requires further development, and among the promising possible approaches are similar to those used in risk management, evaluating of projects, investment effectiveness, evaluating information, etc.

An analysis of the situation with PPPM and, in particular, the reasons for unsuccessful projects could be done best by analyzing such projects. Many organizations, especially large ones, in addition to the bases of best PPPM practices, create the bases of the reasons for the failure of completed projects and take them into account in further project activities. Unfortunately there are very few open publications on the subject, for example such monographs as [4]. It may be noted further information having quite general implementation. So in 1992, due to the low efficiency of funded projects, the World Bank analyzed its projects over the previous 20 years, and similar studies for similar reasons were carried out by a number of other development organizations, individual companies.

The analysis revealed several key issues that impede success. Among them are:

- Fuzzy goal-setting, planning of necessary actions, criteria for assessing project success;
- Fuzzy wording of duties and responsibilities of managers, project participants with a large number of factors not controlled by them;
- Risks, necessary prerequisites were not given enough attention;
- Reluctance of project managers to be responsible for the influence of factors not controlled by them;
- External monitoring was considered by project managers as not desirable.

From modern studies, we provide information from the mentioned research by Professor Hiroshi Tanaka [3]. According to him, " formula of the project failure " (80 ~ 90% probability) includes:

- Not defined sponsor in the company
- The owner of the project is not defined
- There is no critical thinking
- Inconsistency of project management processes
- Pre-project planning has not been completed

The above list of reasons for the failure of projects can be continued significantly, since attention is currently increasing in these educational and normative books, for example [10].

It is obvious that the reasons given for the failure of projects are very general and do not include many important features of the implementation of specific projects. The latter can be overcome by creating, along with databases of good practice, the bases of the causes of the projects failures in specific project conditions, with the prospect of a further creation a hierarchy of national corresponding databases (for instance- Federal -Regional-municipal - corporate level with the organization access to them on acceptable terms for all interested parties). At the World Bank and many other organizations, the created databases of positive and negative experience have been actively used for a long time in the development and implementation of new own projects and projects of clients and partners.

One of the main difficulties for serious, scalable studies of the reasons for the failure of projects, especially in the national context, is that access to the necessary information is very difficult, for example, because such information is often a commercial secret. At the same time, the task of creating the hierarchical system of bases for the positive and negative experience of implementing projects in the national conditions formulated above, as well as organizing access to them for interested parties, seems real and contains the potential for great economic effect across the country, individual industries and enterprises. As noted earlier, a number of organizations, including national ones, have created and are actively using such database. However, experience shows that the information contained in them is usually closed. It can also be suggested that even when organizations have such bases and corresponding requirements for their use, their use is often not efficient enough, as evidenced by the above PPPM statistics of failed projects.

Therefore, the creation of a program of creation at the PPPM level and the widespread, possibly mandatory, use of such databases can be considered relevant. Their active use should become the same indispensable element of a management culture as, for example, determining economic, social and other indicators, ongoing projects, programs in the sectors of the economy. In conclusion of this section, we note that the use of the databases under consideration should not be fully identified with risk management. Without going into details, we note that with an obvious connection with risk management, these databases are broader in content and application. Obviously, a more detailed presentation of various aspects of the creation and effective use of the bases of positive and negative experience of PPPM requires separate consideration and relevant studies. In particular, serious attention is required to the topic of developing methods for transferring the experience of completed projects to new ones, implemented in new conditions.

Finally, one more note could be made. Despite the marked difficulties with the analysis of the reasons for failure of many projects within domestic and international PPPM practice one of these is obvious. Judging by the often published recently resonance dips messages in a variety of major projects and programs, for instance in aero and space area, one of the reasons for project failure are not enough competent performers of different levels. It is not difficult to assume that in other cases where the information on the results of the PPPM is confidential, one of the main reasons for the failure is also the lack of competence of the participants of the PPPM.

III. The value of PPPM standards

In connection with the noted difficulties with direct analysis of the reasons for the failure of many modern projects, programs and portfolios, it seems promising to carry out an analysis of existing PPPM standards.

Really. There are many definitions of the PPPM concept, for example, as a set of management processes for projects, programs, portfolios [9], etc. Without going into the analysis of existing definitions of PPPM, for the purposes of this study, we note the following. It is well known that the projects were carried out by people so long ago, as there is Humanity. Consequently, the same number of more or less formalized common approaches and methods of project management exist. To date, these methods have undergone major changes. Various schools and methodologies have emerged that offer their approaches for the practical use and training of PPPM specialists. The accumulated practical experience and various methodological approaches have found concentrated expression in modern PPPM standards, developed by international, national organizations or individual corporations. It is these PPPM standards that are the basis for practical PPPM, are used in the training of PPPM specialists. According to this a number of practical project oriented -organizations judge the degree of maturity of the latter in the field of PPPM, for example, using the “Maturity Models”. PPPM standards are used as the basis for various certification systems for PPPM specialists and organizations in the field of PPPM, for example, in the IPMA “DELTA” system. Therefore, with a high degree of certainty, it can be argued that the PPPM standards are associated with a high degree of correlation with the positive and negative aspects of the current situation in PPPM and , in particular , the real value of PPPM.

Thus , the issue of the real value of PPPM with a high degree of legitimacy can be transformed and investigated as a question of the PPPM state and real value of modern PPPM standards , in particular, the methods used in PPPM, the requirements for the respective competencies of managers. Naturally, a detailed study of the degree of legitimacy of the proposed transformation is of independent interest.

Let us briefly consider the state of the art with modern PPPM standards in relation to the objectives of the article.

That is possible to distinguish two main groups among the PPPM standards. The first one can be so -called framework PPPM standards, Those are applicable for all subjects to manage (managers, participants of the project teams, individual projects, programs, portfolios, etc.). Such PPPM standards are proposed by various professional associations in the field of PPPM. Examples of such PPPM standards have received widespread international acceptance and distribution. are ISO 10006 [8], PMBoK Guide [9], ICB IPMA Competence Baseline [10] , P 2 M [11] , , PRINCE 2 [12] , etc.

Another group of PPPM standards could be a set of national, industry and corporate PPPM standards.

Various framework International and second group's PPPM standards use different ways to standardize PPPM processes, concepts, terminology of PPPM, which is associated with different cultures PPPM and different external and internal project environment, programs, portfolios in different countries, industries, organizations. These PPPM standards, usually contain of the most general requirements for the competence of managers, terminology, methods, and descriptions of the main functions and processes PPPM, such as management:

- subject area
- time parameters
- cost and finance
- human resources
- quality
- risks
- procurement and contracts
- communications
- changes
- security
- etc.

Therefore, these PPPM standards claim to be applicable in all varieties of projects and in different countries. Unfortunately, it should be noted that there is very little scientific proof that exactly provides convincing justifications of the legality of universal applicability of these PPPM framework standards, or an indication of their limits of applicability. As a rule, these statements are based on the opinion of respected experts and the results of the individual success of the projects undertaken in specific PPPM circumstances, of course, more or less distinguished of the project to be undertaken. Moreover, the corresponding scientific basis is often practically absent.

At the same time, it is well known fact, that the more general the created PPPM standards are, then the less information they contain for application and decision-making in specific situations. The latter circumstance also indicate the need to pay attention to clarifying the real value, justifying the boundaries of the effective application of the proposed PPPM standards, especially those applying for widespread and even universal application.

Thus, the framework PPPM standards on the one hand, by definition, are general in nature, based on previous experience, external and internal conditions for the implementation of previous projects and their content (subject area). Therefore, they could not contain many competencies or requirements for them, important for the success of managing a specific project, program, or portfolio, especially related to their uniqueness. The latter is especially characteristic of many modern innovative projects, programs, and portfolios.

On the other hand, framework PPPM standards play an important role in creating the basis of a single methodological, terminological space of PPPM, including the international one. They significantly contribute to the creation and development of a common culture of PPPM, including

the development of the second group of PPPM standards - national, industry and corporate. The latter set themselves the goal of taking into account national, industry, and corporate specifics, including the specifics of specific projects, programs, and portfolios. Unfortunately, and here it remains an urgent task of convincing, including research, study boundaries effective using of proposed PPPM standards.

It should be noted that PPPM is a young discipline and many of its sections have not yet received a sufficiently serious scientific justification. There is a certain lag between the foundations of the general theory of PPPM standardization and the general theory of control. Despite the rapprochement with the developments the ICO, the marked separation occurs, for example, in a certain inconsistency in terminology PPPM used by different PPPM standards and organizations.

With respect to the two groups of PPPM standards discussed above, one conclusion, well known to PPPM experts, is obvious. Both groups of PPPM standards should be considered, applied and developed as a whole, including the goal of a possible combination of different methodologies. And this is also one of the serious problems of further development of the PPPM discipline and its standards 'part.

Returning to the situation with a large number of the project failures, we note that, of course, some of these caused by a lack of knowledge or unqualified using, in many cases proven the modern methods of PPPM, including those reflected in the PPPM standards, or simply do not desire or inexpediency, for various reasons, to use them. For example, as some researchers have noted, there are cases when participants of the projects plan its failure in advance [3]. The role of objective reasons is also significant, for example, related to the impact on the project of external factors not controlled by the participants of the PPPM, such as economic and political crises, natural disasters, etc.

At the same time, another part of project failure, even when using the most modern PPPM standards and methods PPPM is associated with the nature of the PPPM standards and methods of PPPM. For example, to the fact that they are based on past experience. The latter often determines in many respects their real value for the participants of the PPPM.

Turning to the issue of the value of PPPM standards for PPPM, we will choose for further use one general as follows.

Under the value of PPPM standards for a particular PPPM party (specialist, organizations) we mean the ability of PPPM standards to satisfy the needs of this party especially in lacking competencies (knowledge, experience, skills) to participate in a particular role in a particular project, program, portfolio.

As can be seen here we select different definition of value, rather than those discussed above for value of PPPM. One of the reasons is that the concept of PPPM is broader in scope than the concept of PPPM standard.

The topic of a detailed justification of the choice of the concept of the PPPM standards and related concepts is very wide and is beyond the scope of this study. For example, such concepts as utility value, usefulness, etc. are not considered here. At the same time, the chosen definition seems to be the most suitable for the purpose of the article as an analysis of the possible reasons for a significant number of unsuccessful projects, programs, portfolios, the role and real value of PPPM' standards, and accordingly the PPPM itself.

We only note that the common for various possible definitions of the value of PPPM standards, apparently, will be their subjective and situational nature, depending on the specific needs of the PPPM participant and on the specific situation of the project, program, portfolio.

Indeed, with the chosen formulation, the value of PPPM' standards depends on a number of factors. Among of these:

- Existing, personal competence of a PPPM participant (experience, knowledge, skills, etc.) and corporate competence (developed system of PPPM' standards, project office, etc.);
- Roles of participant (customers, investors, contractors, authorities, other interested parties);
- Management level (strategic, operational);
- The urgency of using lacking competencies;
- Perspective for reusing of lacking competencies.
- The complexity of the particular project, program, portfolio.

According to this approach to determine the value of PPPM' standards for particular projects, programs, portfolios and qualitative as well as quantitative assessment can be used. For the latter, for example, in the form of a linear combination with factor weighting and their numerical values for specific projects, programs, and portfolios. However, in both cases, expert assessments will be required for the weight factors and their numerical values for specific projects, programs, and portfolios.

Note that, as seen from the definition, it is proposed to distinguish between already existing PPPM competencies of a participants and those they lack to successfully fulfill his role in the project, program, portfolio.

We can distinguish the following main situations with the presence of necessary and lacking competencies:

1. The existing competencies are completely sufficient for a PPPM. However, this situation is rare. For almost all management levels, the phases of the project life cycle,

there is some lack of competence. It is related more or less to uniqueness of almost all projects, programs and portfolios, and to the features and dynamics of their external and internal environment. For example, company key analyst of the target market unexpectedly left the company, the competitor suddenly entered the market with a new product and the company experiences difficulties to formulate a strategy and objectives of the program of improving its products, changes in production plans. Such situations, unfortunately, lead to a fairly rapid obsolescing of PPPM standards and competencies, which, by definition, are based on previous competencies, on previous experience. Usually obsolescence occurs faster, if the PPPM standards and competencies are based on the specific experience of the past years.

2. Available competencies are sufficient, but their use is not advisable for organizational, economic or other reasons. For example, all specialists needed are engaged in more important projects, programs, and portfolios.
3. Existing competence at different management levels are not sufficient, but there are others independent organizations with these competences.
4. In view of the high degree of innovativeness of the project, the necessary competencies in principle, absent.

Because of the growing innovatory nature of many modern projects, programs, portfolios a big number PPPM cases are characterized by three recent situations. In these three situations, as a rule, customer organizations are forced to look for and attract others, not dependent on them specialists or organizations. These professionals or organizations, are able to train the customer personnel the necessary knowledge and whether to help make the necessary changes in the company management, the production processes etc. In other cases, they are able to independently conduct the necessary work, whth absent in the customer organization the competencies, including work on the production of a fundamentally new lacking competencies.

IV. Function and process of lacking competencies and resources management.

Determining the real situation with the availability of the necessary and most important, the lack of competencies, as well as the lack of resources and the adoption of appropriate decisions, is currently becoming one of the most important functions of project, program, and portfolio managers. This function is especially important for managers of the highest strategic level.

This function can be formulated as management of lacking competencies and resources. It consists of identifying the lacking competencies and resources at all phases of the project life cycle and levels of PPPM and the organization measures aimed to eliminate this situation.

The corresponding function and the process of **“of identifying the lacking competencies and resources at all phases of the project lifecycle and levels of PPPM and the organizational measures aimed to eliminate this situation”**, may be added to s the list of basic functions and

PPPM processes, listed above under description of framework PPPM standards . Unfortunately, at present time these functions and processes are not explicitly specified in the PPPM standards.

Note the main arguments in favor of introducing a new basic function and process. Adding to the framework and other PPPM standards , extends the scope of applicability of these and largely increases the validity of these, especially the framework PPPM standards, on the legitimacy of wide application in the different varieties of projects , programs, portfolios and different countries . The increase in validity occurs due to the fact that the possibility of the entire set of PPPM standards, discussed above, increases due to possibility to provide a more complete set of competencies and resources necessary for PPPM, taking into account the specific needs of the participants of the PPPM and the characteristics of specific projects, programs, portfolios .

Thereby increase the fullness of the possible PPPM standards with regard to a variety of projects, programs and portfolios , and hence the real value of the PPPM and PPPM standards, as it creates an opportunity to reduce the number of unsuccessful projects .

Obviously, the need to perform this function, and the process is the matter of common sense, is evident and implemented by PPPM participants, especially practitioners. For instance, in connection with the need to attract in order contract various specialized organizations, under the planned training of PPPM stuff , preparation of work, etc. At the same time the importance and role of these function and the process remained in the shadows, and they are clearly not considered as one of most important functions and processes of PPPM. But experience shows that at present, in many cases, especially in innovative projects, programs, portfolios, failure of projects is associated with the ineffective implementation of these functions and processes. Really diverse causes of failure of projects, programs, and portfolios, as a rule, are associated with the incompetent implementation functions and processes named “managing the lacking competencies and resources”.

As an additional argument, we can cite the fact that, by influencing the entire PPPM process, the function and process of managing lacking competencies and resources are very close to such a fundamental process as determining the goal of a project, program, or portfolio. Indeed, just as determining the purpose of a project, program, or portfolio in their early phases then largely determines the content of other management functions, the management of lacking competencies and resources also has a significant impact on the early and subsequent phases.

Therefore, it seems that the attitude to the considered function and process as secondary one, not worthy of inclusion in the PPPM standards, does not correspond to the modern nature of most projects, programs and portfolios. These function and process should be included in the main functions and processes of the PPPM, recommended by the PPPM standards as a function and process of **“managing lacking competencies and resources”**.

This issue is of great importance for the training and certification of PPPM specialists.

As noted earlier, PPPM is a young discipline. Naturally, the function and the process of “**managing the lacking competencies and resources**” require a clear design of their place and role among the other functions and processes of the PPPM, communication with them, as well as ways to develop their own methods. A more detailed study of these issues is a topic for separate consideration.

The basic implementation scheme of the function and process of “managing the lacking competencies and resources” can be as follows. At the concept phase, when choosing and justifying the goals, the necessary and lacking competencies of the PPPM participants and resources should be determined. It seems that this function and process should play a large role in the early phases of projects, programs, portfolios in managing their value, in determining the cost of complex contracts for services of external third-party organizations. At the further development of the project, program, portfolio, in particular, the above-mentioned basic functions and processes must begin with a clarification required and lacking competencies and other resources and. It seems not correct in the present conditions to consider the function and the process only as belonging to the content for example, by labeled earlier as part of PPPM standard functions of cost and financial management, human resources, procurement and contracts. The innovative nature of many modern projects, their complexity and scale make these functions and processes key, deserving of an independent place and methodology in project management. Improper performance of these functions and processes, especially in the early phases and change management using the methodology of Agile and other approaches, as well as databases in a particular organization and the sector and sectors of the economy must be regarded as highly dangerous risk. We note once again the large role that can play, the widespread creation and active use in individual organizations and industries of databases on the positive and especially currently negative experience of PPPM. On their basis, effective corporate and industry PPPM standards can be created and function, projects, programs, portfolios can be developed and implemented, and personnel training be carried out.

Note that possibility a particular organization to implement the function and process of "management lacking competence and resources", as well as other PPPM processes may require creation a certain PPPM system, including the development of corporate PPPM standards, the creation of specialized departments such as project office, databases on the positive and negative experience of PPPM, etc.

Creating the latter requires considerable effort and finances. Therefore, in specific cases, it is necessary to take into account organizational, economic (cost, urgency, reusability) and other aspects of the feasibility of creating complex PPPM systems, especially in small and medium-sized organizations. This circumstance once again emphasizes the relevance of creating the previously formulated hierarchical system of bases of projects experience with the organization of access to it by interested parties.

Note that the leading role in the professional performance of formulated above functions and PPPM process, as well as in the development of corresponding methods should play organizations units associated with PPPM (project offices , etc..), As well as independent consulting company PPPM , specializing in maintenance of one or more sectors of the economy, professional associations of PPPM experts and others .

Conclusions

Professional use of modern PPPM methods in many cases significantly increases its effectiveness and allows achieving high results,

However, existing methods as a whole require further development and adaptation to modern conditions. This is evidenced by a large number of unsuccessful projects, especially in innovative industries. According to a number of studies, currently the rate of project failures is from 50 to 90 percent. One of the ways to improve the situation may be to create hierarchical database systems of project experience (for example, federal-regional-municipal, industry-corporate level) with access to them on conditions acceptable to interested parties,

Some methodological development of PPPM is advisable. In particular, the introduction of the concepts of the PPPM and PPPM standards' value and the development of methods for their determination, as well as the introduction of new functions and the process of “**managing lacking competencies and resources**” into the PPPM standards are offered.

Literature

1. Polterovich Victor "Federal Development Agency: it is necessary for the development and implementation of successful strategies." Problems of management theory and practice, Lenand (Moscow), No. 3, 2018
2. <http://iosrjournals.org/iosr-jce/papers/Vol16-issue2/Version-2/F0162122940.pdf>.
3. Hiroshi Tanaka. Reflection on corporate project management success-lessons learned from the 40 years in global PM. International project management conference, Russia, Ulyanovsk, 2018,
4. Peter W . Morris. The Anatomy of Major Projects (John Wiley & Sons , 1987)
5. David L. Pells. Six Fresh Eggs, Vol. VIII, Issue VIII – September 2019 by www.peworldjournal.com. Second Edition

6. Viacheslav Pozniakov. Project, Program, Portfolio Management: Real value, standards. International Journal, “Problems of Theory and Practice of control”. Russia, Moscow, 2019, #2.
7. Viatcheslav Poznyakov. Project Management and Senior Managers: A Russian Perspective, PM WORLD TODAY VIEWPOINT FEBRUARY, 2008
8. <https://cloud.mail.ru/public/2HZL/Rz9RJ6Joj> ISO 10006: 2003 “Quality management systems. Guidelines for managing project quality
9. PMBOK Guide. 5th Edition. Project Guidebook, PMI, 2006.
10. ICB IPMA Competence Baseline, Version 3.0, IPMA 2006
11. P2M. Program and Project Management for Innovation of Enterprise, PMCC, 2002.
12. PRINCE2, OGC UK, 2001.

About the Author



Dr. Viacheslav Pozniakov

Moscow, Russia



Viacheslav Pozniakov is professor of Moscow Civil Engineering University. He holds a Doctor of Science from the University of Dnepropetrovsk (currently Dnepr). He was previously Head of the Department for Computer-aided Management Systems at Moscow Civil Engineering University. He has been a visiting professor to the University of London and Leipzig High Engineering School. In different periods of time he headed a department in the World Bank, Moscow construction industry, consulting companies, Ukraine Academy of Science, space industry. He has practical experience in International development projects, construction, IT, transport, space and etc.

Professor Pozniakov has published a number of books and articles on information technology, systems development, project management and management in general, risk management, contracting, project preparation and evaluation. He is one of the founders and Vice-president of the Russian Project Management Association (SOVNET), first International assessor of IPMA, and *PM World Today* International Editorial Advisor. Professor Pozniakov can be contacted at: vpozniakov@gmail.ru.