

Project Categories & Life Cycle Models:



Report on the 2003 IPMA Survey

Russell D. Archibald

And

Vladimir I. Voropaev

Presentation Outline

1. The IPMA 2003 Survey and Its Results
2. Conclusions from the Survey
3. Classifying Projects
4. Project Life Cycle Models for Categories
5. Conclusions
6. Recommended Further Actions

1. The IPMA 2003 Survey & Results

- Questionnaire posted in English & Spanish at www.ipmaglobalsurvey.com
- Publicized at Moscow Congress & by email to hundreds of IPMA/PMI officers & members worldwide
- Linked via PMI research web page
- Questionnaire completed on-line

2003 Survey Results

□ 29 responses from 10 countries:

- Brazil 8
- Canada 1
- Colombia 4
- Egypt 1
- Germany 2
- Great Britain 1
- Lithuania 1
- Mexico 3
- Russia 1
- USA 7

Why So Few Responses?

- Low recognition of importance of having an agreed project classification system

- Questionnaire was:
 - Too long and time consuming (1 to 2 hours)
 - Poorly designed, sometimes ambiguous
 - Available only in 2 languages

- Little or no inducement for people to respond

2. Conclusions from the Survey

Project Categories:

- Is it desirable & useful to have an agreed project category list?
 - Yes: 25 No: 1 No reply: 3

- Aware of other categorization methods in use?
 - Yes: 8 No: 17 No reply: 4

- Would list be useful to select methodologies?
 - Yes: 23 No: 2 No reply: 4

2. Conclusions from Survey (cont'd)

Project Life Cycle Models

- Is it desirable & useful to have an agreed list of life cycle models for each project category:
 - Yes: 22 No: 1 No reply: 6

- Aware of other life cycle models in use:
 - Yes: 4 No: 16 No reply: 9

3. Classifying Projects

- Survey intended to test validity of proposed method of classification:
 - Based first on the end results produced by the project
 - Secondly also related to the end results
 - Then using other factors:
 - Project size, complexity, customer identity, customer involvement, level & type of risk, major versus minor, other

Validity of Proposed Categories

- Because of small number of responses, no conclusions can be drawn regarding the validity of this approach
- Of the responses received:
 - Very few said a category listed was “never” used
 - Most indicated the proposed categories were “widely used” or “used by some”
 - 8 said other categories were used; follow up is required to identify those

Subordinate Classification Factors

- Because the number of responses was so small no conclusions can be reached regarding the use of:
 - Project size, complexity, customer identity, customer involvement, level & type of risk, major versus minor, or other factors

Proposed Major Project Categories

1. Aerospace/Defense
2. Business & Organizational Change Projects
3. Communication Systems Projects
4. Event Projects
5. Facilities Projects
6. Information Systems
7. International Development
8. Media & Entertainment
9. Product/Service Development
10. Research & Dev.

Other Major Categories May Be Required

- See Table 1 in the paper
- Further breakdown is obviously required
- A few examples follow

Sub-Categories Are Required

One example:

2. **Business & Organization Change Projects:**
 1. Acquisition/merger
 2. Management process improvement
 3. New business venture
 4. Organization re-structuring
 5. Legal proceeding
 6. Other: ?

Example:

Category 5. Facilities Projects

Subcategories:

- Facility decommissioning
- Facility demolition
- Facility maintenance & modification
- Facility design/procure/construct
 - 1.Civil 2.Energy 3.Environmental 4.Industrial 5.Commercial 6.Residential
 - 7.Other:
- Other: ?

4. Project Life Cycle Models for Specific Categories

- Survey intended to identify the types of life cycle models that are now in use
- So few responses do not allow any conclusions to be drawn in this respect
- Time does not allow further discussion on this topic

5. Conclusions

Need for and Uses of a Common, Agreed System

- Developing a globally agreed system for classifying projects is urgently needed and will have many practical uses, including:
 - Selecting best PM methodologies
 - Developing and using best life cycle models
 - Tailoring education and training curricula
 - Developing specialized software applications
 - Certification of project managers and PM specialists

5. Conclusions (Cont'd)

Application of “One-Size-Fits-All” PM Methods Causes Many Project Failures

- “Best practices” must be identified for each agreed project category
- In the absence of agreed categories, the wrong PM methods are applied
- This is a root cause for many project failures

5. Conclusions (Cont'd)

Development of a Global Project Classification Method Is a Major, Multinational Project

- Achieving the goal of an agreed method requires the planning and execution of a multinational research project.

6. Recommended Further Actions

1. Document the need for and uses of a globally agreed project classification method
2. Develop an agreed, practical, world-wide classification method reflecting current practice but enabling continued advancement in the state of the art of PM across all boundaries
3. Identify the major life cycle models in use today and relate them to the agreed project list.
4. Form a multinational team of practitioners and researchers to carry out this project.

Multi-National Team Required

Ideally:

- One team leader in each country
- Involve all PM practitioners, universities, researchers, agencies, consultants, vendors
- Project sponsor:
 - Steering group representing the major professional associations involved in project management from a cross section of industries
- The authors will participate and assist in attracting team members

How Do We Make This Happen?

- Meet tonight:
 - When?
 - Where?
- Contact us:
 - russell_archibald@yahoo.com
 - voropaev@sovnet.ru
- Your ideas and involvement are most welcome!
- Thank you for listening