This slide presentation is derived from a entitled: “Strategic Planning for Project Management” which was presented at the: “Conference on Governance in the Contemporary Caribbean” hosted by the Sir Arthur Lewis Institute for Social and Economic Studies” at UWI, St. Augustine in April 2001.

A modified form of this slide package was subsequently presented to the cabinet in several of the Caribbean Governments, including the Government of Trinidad and Tobago. The Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, Mr. Patrick Manning, in reviewing the presentation said that:

“Your lecture was timely and critical to the success of government’s project planning activities. This session added great value to our training workshop. Further feedback from those who participated attests not only to the excellence of the session content and delivery, but also its immediate practical usefulness”.

In this presentation at the CARICAD Conference on Human Resource Development and Managing Change, we are emphasizing on those aspects of the paper which focus on:

“Strategic Management for Organizational Effectiveness”.

In that context, we address the relationship between Strategy and Organization Structure and identify the critical differences between the organization structure for development activities as for Operational Activities. In particular we present a model for the Project Management Organization in a Caribbean Government.
The Structure Follows Strategy Thesis

- The practice of consciously matching organization design and structure to the particular needs of a strategy is a fairly recent management development.
- A landmark study by Alfred Chandler found that:
  “changes in an organization’s strategy bring about new administrative problems which, in turn, require a new or refashioned structure for the new strategy to be successfully implemented”

Attempting to carry out a new strategy with an old organizational structure is usually unwise.

Although the stress here is on matching structure to strategy, structure can and does influence, the choice of strategy.

A good strategy must be doable. When an organization’s present structure is so far out of line with the requirements of a particular strategy that the organization would have to be turned upside down to implement it, the strategy may not be doable and should not be given further consideration.

In such cases, structure shapes the choice of strategy. The point here, however, is that once a strategy is chosen, structure must be modified to fit the strategy, if an approximate fit does not already exist.

Any influences of structures on strategy should come before the point of strategy selection rather than after it.

A study of 70 large corporations revealed that structure tends to follow growth strategy of the firm – but often not until inefficiency and internal operating problems provoke a structural adjustment. The experiences of these firms followed a consistent sequential pattern: new strategy creation, emergence of new administrative problems, decline in profitability and performance, a shift to a more appropriate organizational structure, and recovery to more profitable levels and improved strategy execution.

Major Types of Organization Structures

- Functional Organizational Structure
- Geographic Organization Structure
- Decentralized Line-of-Business Type of Organizational Structure
- Strategic Business Unit Type of Organization Structure
- Matrix Organization Structure

A functional Organization structure tends to be effective in single-business firms where key activities revolve around well-defined skills and areas of specialization (Microsearch International).

A Geographic Organization is well suited for firms pursuing different strategies in different geographic markets (Nestle’ operations in Trinidad and Jamaica).

Decentralized Business Units are suited to diversified firms. The basis organizational blocks are its business units. Each business unit is operated as a stand-alone profit center (Ish Galbaransingh).

Strategic Business Units structures are a means for managing broad diversification and enforcing strategic coordination across related businesses (Ansa McAl).

Matrix Organization Structures, although complex to manage and sometimes unwieldy, allow a firm to be organized in two different strategy-supportive ways at the same time. It has a structure with two or more channels of command, two lines of budget authority, and two sources of performance and reward. (Managing within and across ministries in a Government)
Major Phases in the Strategic Planning and Development Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A systematic progression through the phases of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Programme Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Development &amp; Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Closeout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Operations Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An understanding of the phases in the Planning and Development Process as well as the interrelationships and interfaces among these phases is critical to the development of a model for improving this process.

This process is more of an iterative nature than a strictly top-down sequence. The sequence, however, clearly shows a movement from Strategic Planning to Programme Planning, Project Planning and then Implementation and Operations.

It is important, at this juncture, to emphasize that the implementation of a project generates deliverables (e.g. the construction of a health centre) which at that point will have generated little economic benefits (substantially limited to benefits derived during construction).

However, it is the efficient operation of the project deliverables (the health Centre) in providing quality and efficient health services, which generates economic benefits. This implies that the design of an operating plan, for the use of project deliverables, must be included as an essential component of every project.

e.g. The Eric Williams Medical Sciences Complex – Mount Hope, Trinidad.

The Gov’t of Trinidad & Tobago built the Mount Hope Medical Complex, about twenty years ago, but no operating plan was ever developed and implemented. In that context, the project to date has been a failure in that it has never been able to provide economic benefits consistent with its development costs. It is not too late, however to salvage some economic benefits by implementing a well designed operating plan.

Analytical Tools which Contribute to Performance in the Planning of Programmes and Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytical tools in Integrated Planning and Development of Programmes/Projects:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hierarchy Charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Matrix Organization Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Log Frame Planning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work Breakdown Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Outlining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Tracking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Hierarchy Chart – A tool used for depicting a Programme as a set of Logically related projects.

(b) Matrix Organization Structure – An organization Structure whereby a person may report to two or more persons (vertically and laterally).

(c) Log Frame Plan – A (four by four matrix) tool used for depicting the four Logical levels of a Project (Goal, Purpose, Outputs and Activities), along the four rows of the matrix, and then defining the performance parameters at each Level (Objectively Verifiable Indicators and Means of Verification) and the associated Assumptions, in the four columns.

(d) Work Breakdown Structure – A tool for decomposing a Project into a set of logically related activities and tasks.

(e) Project Outlining – A method in writing Project Schedules, whereby different levels of the Work Breakdown Structure are depicted using different indentation levels of the activity Task Names.

(f) Project Tracking – A graphical method for presenting the actual project implementation schedule against the Baseline Implementation Schedule on the same Gantt chart.
This Hierarchy Chart depicts the Programme Plan for a Rice Development Programme in Guyana, and demonstrates the mechanism for satisfying the Necessary and Sufficient for Programme Performance.

The Programme Goal is to increase the quality and extent of sustainable income among Guyana's 22,000 rice farmers. The programme is decomposed, at the first level, into its major logical components, and then each component is further decomposed into projects, including the Irrigation Systems Project.

Note how:
(a) Different outline colors are used to denote sector responsibility (public, private or CSO) for the development and implementation of the individual projects.

(b) Different background colors are used to designate the schedule phases for implementation of the individual projects (first year, second year, third year).

(c) A responsibility matrix can be superimposed on the Hierarchy Chart. i.e. the designation of responsibility at the programme level, at the group project level and at the individual project level.

(d) You may also use this chart as a tool in estimating the preliminary programme budget and in spreading the budget across the subordinate projects.

Note how the Log Frame provides the facility for defining the Evaluation parameters, Monitoring Parameters and "Terms of Reference". Note also how the Assumptions Analysis influences the Risk Analysis and Contingency Planning.

The Log Frame also provides a tool for quantifying a preliminary budget for the project by assigning initial budgets to each of the major activities (which themselves are related to defined outputs/deliverables) and then adding the Project Overheads based on pre-defined budgeting standards.

There is a logical hierarchy of Means – Ends Relationship between the various project elements. i.e. Progress at each level is a pre-condition for moving to the higher level. Establishing clearly the means and ends, helps to design a sound and logical project.

i.e.
IF INPUTS are provided THEN ACTIVITIES can take place
IF ACTIVITIES are successfully completed THEN Planned OUTPUTS should result
IF Outputs are used as intended THEN the PURPOSE (i.e. immediate objective (effect) should be realised
IF the PURPOSE is achieved THEN it should contribute to the realization of the development objective

(i.e. the GOAL)
Example of the Objectives Column of the Log Frame - Irrigation Project

**GOAL:**
Increase extent and quality of sustainable income among rice farmers.

**PURPOSE:**
Increase irrigated acreage suitable for rice production

**OUTPUTS:**
1. Installed Irrigation Canals
2. Installed Sluice Gates
3. Installed Reservoirs and Pumps
4. Recruited and Trained Personnel
5. Developed Operating Plan

**ACTIVITIES:**
1. Conduct Start-up Activities
2. Construct Irrigation Canals
3. Procure and install Sluice Gates
4. Construct Reservoirs and Install Pumps
5. Recruit and train operating and maintenance personnel
6. Develop Operating Plan

It is important to note the difference between the Project Purpose and the Project Goal. While the Purpose seeks to increase the irrigated acreage suitable for rice production, the successful completion of this project, by itself, does not provide a basis for achieving the Project Goal. The Project Goal is achieved when a set of complementary projects, as depicted in the Hierarchy Chart, are implemented and integrated.

Note also that Outputs are described, in the past tense, as a completed deliverable, while Activities begin with verbs signifying some action which must be undertaken to develop the deliverables. The detailed planning of a project starts with the identification and planning of the project deliverables.

The activities identified in the Log Frame are related to the Outputs, and initial budget estimates for the implementation of the activities are shown under the OVI Column.

These activities are then shown across the top row of the boxes in the Work Breakdown Structure Chart. This method provides a seamless progression from the Hierarchy Chart through the project plan.

We will now decompose the activities, shown in the Log frame, into tasks and subtasks in the Work Breakdown Structure Chart.

In the WBS Chart, we show the activities identified in the Log Frame Plan in the boxes across the top row of the chart. We then decompose these activities into subordinate tasks and sub-tasks.

There is an intimate relationship between the Work Breakdown Structure Chart and the Outline Structure of the Project Plan. In fact, Microsearch Project automatically assigns a WBS Code to each activity based on the outline structure. This WBS code reflects the relative level of decomposition of activities in the WBS Chart.

The lowest level activity identified in a WBS Chart must itself be a summary activity. One should not attempt to write a project schedule (Gantt Chart) until you have developed a proper Work Breakdown Structure Chart.

The WBS Chart could also be used as a planning tool to:
- assign the major responsibility for each level of activity
- assign budgets for each level of activity
- indicate approx. duration and schedule for implementation

One should note the relationship between the top row of boxes in the WBS Chart and the Project Outputs defined in the Log Frame.

We will now use the WBS Chart to write the Outline Structure of the Project Plan, using Microsoft Project 2000.
Note the relationship between the Hierarchical structure of activities in the Work Breakdown Structure Chart and the Outline Structure (level of indentation of activities) in the Gantt Chart. A Gantt Chart depicts a Project Schedule which comprises a set of linked activities along one or more activity paths, shown on a time scale.

Note the use of Milestones (activities with zero durations) to indicate when deliverables are completed. This provides a link back to the Outputs section of the Log Frame Plan.

All activities in the Project Schedule should have predecessor and successor activities (except the Starting Milestone and the Ending Milestone). If activity links are missing, the project schedule may give you misleading information on schedule and budget. It may also give misleading information on the critical path.

During implementation, activity slippages may not be reflected in slippages of successor activities, if the successor links are missing.

Activity bars shown in red are Critical Activities, which have no slack.
Activity bars shown in blue are non-critical activities which have slack.
Link Lines show the links between (among) Activities. Project Schedules may also be shown in Network Diagrams and Calendar Views.

Activity information, resulting from Critical Path Analysis, are calculated by Microsoft Project and presented in the Schedule Table.

The Tracking Gantt shows the actual implementation dates and costs for the implemented activities (whether partially or fully implemented) against the associated baseline schedule and budget. It is important to note that the Tracking Gantt and associated Tables provide information on Earned Value Analysis including:

(a) Percent Completed (at the activity, summary activity or project level)
(b) Forecasted Project Completion Date
(c) Budgeted Cost of Work Scheduled
(d) Budgeted Cost of Work Completed (Earned Value)
(e) Actual Costs of Work Scheduled
(f) Actual Cost of Work Completed
(g) Forecasted Cost at Project Completion

This information provides a basis for monitoring the project performance including calculation of the value of work completed by the contractor.
The Unity of Command Principle

- The Unity of Command Principle states that "no employee shall report to more than one supervisor"
- Adherence to this design principle assures unbroken lines of authority and a pyramidal shape to organization charts.
- It limits the ability of a manager to manage across organizational boundaries
- It is well suited to the operating environment

We must differentiate between the nature and extent of operating activities as compared with development activities in any environment.

Operating activities are recurrent, with a narrow scope, well defined reporting structure and subject to improvement in performance as a result of a learning curve. They are more consistent with the Theory X mode of employment.

Development Activities are unique, requiring more creativity, innovation and self-discipline and much wider in scope. Because of the non-recurrent nature of activities, it requires greater planning, effort and focus. They are more consistent with the Theory Y mode of employment.

A failure to recognize the differences in the nature of Development Activities as compared with Operating Activities could result in responsibility and organizational conflicts. Development personnel should either have no or very minimal operating responsibilities.

In many organizations a failure to recognize and cater for these differences in the nature and extent of job responsibilities could impact negatively on the performance in development programmes and projects.

It is also necessary to develop different remuneration structures for development personnel, in order to attract the right calibre of persons to plan and manage large development programmes.

We have a situation here where the projects in several programmes are spread across Ministries based on their core strengths and functions.

You then have several projects (shown in a column), under a particular Ministry, each of which is managed by a project manager, who reports to (say) the Permanent Secretary.

However, the projects along a row are logically related and are part of the same programme.

In order for the Programme Manager to exert some influence and control over the development of the projects under the programme, the associated project managers must also report to the programme manager.

This implies that a project manager will report to both the Permanent Secretary and the Programme Manager.

This is called a Matrix Organization Structure and is an important organization tool in facilitating the integration of projects across organizational boundaries.

It conflicts with the Unity Command Principle
The Matrix Organization Structure

- An organization design mechanism within which an employee may report to more than one supervisors.
- It is well suited to the development organization as contrasted with the Unity of Command Principle which is suited to the Operating Organization.
- It is a strategic organizational tool in integrating projects across organizational boundaries.
- Matrix Organization structures are widely used in the private sector.

The Public Sector works within the context of strict Ministerial Boundaries and programmes are normally planned and developed entirely within a Ministry.

It will be difficult to implement a Matrix Organization Structure within a Government unless these rigid barriers are relaxed to allow for the deployment of logically-related projects across Ministries, based on the core strengths of ministries.

The current Process used in the private sector, whereby logically-related projects are allocated to departments, based on core strengths, facilitate the adoption and use of the Matrix Organization Structure.

Unless and until, the Matrix Organization Structure is adopted and used in the public sector, for managing programmes, it will be difficult to spread projects across ministries in improving the performance in implementation, and difficult to integrate projects in seeking to meet the defined programme goal.

This represents one of the fundamental differences between the development of programmes in the private sector as compared with the public sector and (maybe) one of the fundamentals reasons for the differences in performance.

Job Description of the Programme Administrator
- an internal project management consultant

In every major development environment, there is a need for a Project Management Specialist, who will provide:
- technical support to Programme and Project personnel, in adopting and using modern project management methods and software
- Reinforce the use of uniform project management standards, procedures and controls
- Give independent opinions on the performance of programmes and projects in the development of monitoring and evaluation reports.

In the example on use of the Matrix Organization Structure, we identified a position, in the top left-hand box, entitled the Programme Administrator.

The Project Management Administrator is the major Government representative in a public sector-wide Project Management Integrating Framework.

He/she has a major responsibility for:

- monitoring and Integrating all programmes across a Government in seeking to achieve national development objectives.
- Provides management and technical support to programme/project personnel in the planning, budgeting, development and implementation of projects.
- Monitors, evaluates and reports on Programme Execution performance
- Audits programme/project development to ensure compliance with defined policies, procedures, standards and controls.
- Prepares performance reports for submission to senior Government Personnel, Funding Agencies and other major stakeholders.
- Collaborates with other Programme Administrators in the Management of a Government-wide Project Management Data Base.
- Provides technical support to the Director of Planning and the Director of Projects.
- He she must also be a Specialist in the use of Project Planning Software.
In many organizations, particularly in the private sector, persons responsible for development programmes also have substantial operating responsibilities.

There is a fundamental difference between the nature and extent of development responsibilities and those in Operating responsibilities.

While it is not unreasonable for a project manager or programme manager to have a limited extent of operating responsibilities, these should be the exception and not the rule.

In many such situations the operating responsibilities are given priority over the development responsibilities (since the manager may always be operating in a firefighting mode whereby his focus is on managing day to day problems) resulting in relatively low allocation of effort to the development responsibilities and, by extension, poor project planning.

We have examined the Unity of Command Principle and the Matrix Organization Structure and pointed out that the Unity of Command Principle is more suited to the operating Organization. We also recommended that development personnel should work within a Matrix Organization Structure. We further pointed out the conflict between these two organization structures.

In that context, the resolution of this organizational conflict, within the context of a well-defined project management organization is critical to good performance in development programmes.

In many Governments, the remuneration scales are somewhat lower than in the private sector, and the career path is somewhat slower. In particular, the decision-making structure in the public sector is longer, more centralized and with less room for exercising initiative and innovation.

In particular, the extent of authority given to ministers of Government, who may make arbitrary decisions, despite or in site of the professional advice given by technocrats (when such advice is sought) sometimes leads to frustration and a lack of self actualization on the part of the professional employees.

This results in a constant migration of the best professionals from the public sector to the private sector.

In that context, the public sector has long served as a training ground for persons who ultimately move to the private sector. This continuous brain drain coupled with the difficulty in attracting, keeping and motivating qualified persons in the public sector is a major constraint to economic performance in development programmes.

In some countries, the Governments are reluctant to train their public sector personnel in project management, since it accelerates the migration of the best employees to other countries. A remuneration/career path structure should be developed for development personnel which is closer to that in the private sector, as the basis for achieving a continuous level of economic improvement in development programmes.
Limited Effort in Developing Operating Plans

Failure to develop operating plans to ensure that programme deliverables are operated efficiently, in a manner consistent with economic objectives.

This is one of the fundamental reasons why the deliverables from major programmes do not generate the economic values envisioned. (e.g. Mt. Hope Medical Complex).

It is also a major reason why the economic use of programme deliverables may dissipate within a relatively short period.

Of all the weaknesses identified in this report, this one is the most common and perhaps the most compelling. Strategic Planners and Programme Managers must recognize that programmes, when implemented, generate deliverables. These might take the form of a finished hospital, trained personnel, an implemented system or the development of some institutional capacity.

While some limited economic benefits may be derived during implementation, it is in the effective and efficient use of the programme deliverables, over some reasonable economic life, that the major economic benefits are derived.

In fact the feasibility analysis was based on some quantification of the present value of the economic benefits that are likely to be derived over some future period, after programme implementation.

This can only be achieved if a properly operating plan, for efficient operation of the programme deliverables, are included in the programme plan, at the level of each of the subordinate projects.

If this is not done (as in the case of the Eric Williams Medical Sciences Complex in Trinidad) the potential value of the programme deliverables may dissipate quite quickly, in a manner inconsistent with the assumptions used establishing the economic Feasibility of the Programme. Unfortunately, in many programmes, there is no attempt to develop operating plans for programme deliverables.

Limited Collaboration with the Private Sector and Civil Society Organizations

No formal framework for effectively collaborating with the private sector and civil society organizations in seeking to achieve common national development goals, particular in social development and social mitigation programmes as well as in community development programmes.

This is based on the general recognition that the private sector or social sector may more efficiently develop and manage some types of national or community-based projects, than the public sector.

The three main sectors of the economy, which contribute to national development are the public sector, private sector and Civil Society Organizations.

Each of these sectors have core capacities and competencies which complement each other. Governments have recognized that in many human and social development programmes, there are some types of projects which are more efficiently developed and implemented by the private sector or the social sector.

In particular, the Civil Society Organizations (including the churches) have access to community-based capacity (foot soldiers) which no Government can easily replicate. The effective and efficient harnessing of this capacity (through the development and operation of Social Action Units) in the implementation of activities at the community, family or individual levels can be the most critical key success factor in generating performance in these programmes.

These include Programmes such as:
- Poverty Reduction Programme
- HIV/AIDS Intervention Programme
- Disaster Management Programme
- Violence Reduction Programme
- Social Safety net for economically marginalized persons.

There is no formal framework for collaboration among these three sector in the planning, management and operation of major national development programmes.
Managing projects across a government requires the design of a Project Management Organization which provides for the development of programmes and projects within a ministry, across several ministries and across the three major sectors in the economy.

It must provide the flexibility to provide for decentralized planning and development of individual projects, centralized planning of cross-ministry programmes, and centralized monitoring of cross-sectoral programmes.

This is not easy to accomplish, because of the way ministries operate, and the extent to which decisions are driven by subjective factors including political expediency.

In addition, the Project Management Organization must provide for the implementation, use and monitoring of uniform project management policies, procedures, standards and controls across all ministries in a Government.

To accomplish this we recommend:

- The establishment of an Inter-Ministerial Secretariat (IMS) in the Office of the Prime Minister to facilitate direct ministerial intervention in the planning and management of major programmes.
- The establishment of the position of Programme Administrator, an internal project management consultant, with the IMS.
- The establishment of the positions of Director of Planning and Director of Projects.
- The establishment of Programme Implementation Units with cross-ministerial responsibility.

This recommendation is the most difficult to implement. It will require a change in the way development personnel are recruited, hired, managed and promoted. It may even require that development personnel are initially hired on three-year contracts (in order to pay salaries different from those in the civil service scales) with renewal of contract, on good performance, and the ultimate granting of tenure (in a manner similar to that used at UWI).

It will also require a change in organizational structure, organization culture and work ethic to ensure that the right cadre of people are mobilized and used in improving project management performance in the public sector.

The adoption and use of the Matrix Organization Structure will facilitate vertical and horizontal reporting relationships to facilitate integration of programmes/projects across organizational boundaries.

It is inconceivable that programme managers, with salaries of (say) US$1,500 per month could be managing consultants earning fees of US$15,000 per month. Not only does this create the opportunity for conflicts, since the consultants are unlikely to show much respect for these programme managers, but it also creates opportunities for conspiracies between the programme manager and the consultants/contractors, to augment the take home pay of the programme managers. We recommend the use of a performance incentive system.
Establish the position of Programme Administrator within the Inter-Ministerial Secretariat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establish the position of Programme Administrator with major responsibility for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Acting as the counterpart to the consultants in implementing all the components of the proposed Project Management Institutional Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developing, communicating, implementing and enforcing common standards and procedures across all ministries in the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing professional and technical support to all project personnel across the Government, in improving standards in project management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A job description of the Programme Administrator is shown in slide 44.

Finding the right person to fill this position, however, will be somewhat difficult.

He/she should have a business degree (preferably a graduate degree) in Management with some specialization in Strategic Planning and Project Management.

He/she should also have a good computer background, with the ability to work at a macro planning level (using modeling and decision-support software) as well as at the detailed micro-level in using project management software, office productivity software and operating systems software.

He/she should have substantial experience working in both the public and private sector and be able to communicate effectively at the ministerial level as well as at the technical or operational levels.

This person should have good communication skills, dispute resolution skills, delegation skills and be able to work well at an individual level or as part of larger teams.

If such is person is not readily available on the open market, a Government should consider hiring a consultant to fill this position for a limited time (say one year) while an understudy is trained by the consultant to fill the position.

Many programme managers and project managers are qualified in diverse fields and have gained valuable experienced in their current working environment.

In many cases, however, they have received little formal training in project management.

A fundamental strategy in improving the quality of effort and productivity of these persons is to establish a central Technical Support Services Facility through which these persons will receive technical support in the use of project management methods and software, programme planning, project planning, project feasibility analysis, project monitoring and in the use of Microsoft Project 2000.

This facility may be created within the Ministry of Planning or the Ministry of Finance. Alternatively, this facility may be created within the proposed Inter-Ministerial Secretariat.

This proper use of the facility could significantly reinforce the adoption and use of uniform project management policies, procedures, standards and controls as well as improve the performance of project management personnel across a Government.

A Government can realize an immediate improvement in performance in planning and development, by establishing a centralized Technical Support Services Facility, to provide support to programme/project personnel and in enforcing uniform standards in the formulation, analysis, planning, budgeting and preparation of project proposals and subsequently in the management, monitoring and evaluation of programme/projects.
Establish a Cross-Sectoral Monitoring and Evaluation Facility

Establish a cross-sectoral Monitoring and Evaluation Facility to coordinate, integrate, monitor and report on logically-related projects and programmes across the public, private and social sectors with a view to improving economic performance in national development programmes.

(this is based on the fundamental premise that in national development programmes, some projects are more efficiently planned and implemented by the private or social sectors).

As discussed in a previous slide, this cross-sectoral Monitoring and Evaluation Facility will extend the reach of its organizational influence across three sectors, with the clear objective of integrating and monitoring logically related projects across these sectors, in a manner consistent with the achievement of defined national goals.

A good example of this type of cross-sectoral programme is Disaster Management, in which Government will provide policy and strategic direction as well as major communication and infrastructure mitigation services particularly in disaster warning and disaster recovery.

The private sector must play a critical role in disaster management in terms of construction standards and quality, and in disaster mitigation in terms of community-based facilities.

The social sector (CSO's) however, have a critical role to play in disaster response, since they are positioned to respond at the community, family, or individual levels immediately after a disaster. The role and capacity of these Civil Society Organizations should be harnessed as an integral part of the design, development, implementation and operation of a Disaster Management Programme.

It is not inconceivable that this cross-sectoral Monitoring and Evaluation Facility could be efficiently established as a private company (with shareholding by representatives of the three major sectors and by project management consultants), with its revenues based on some percentage (say 4%) of the budgets for the programmes which it provides professional services.

This chart describes our conceptual Project Management framework. We have project implementation units established in various ministries, with a centralized Project Monitoring Facility in the Ministry of Finance and a centralized Programme Evaluation Facility in the Ministry of Planning, all under the control of a Government-wide Programme Administrator. This position may be established as the head of an Inter-Ministerial Secretariat.

This Project Management Organization will use a Government-wide Project Management Information System using a closed Data Communications Platform, within the context of Government-wide uniform Project Management policies, procedures, standards and controls.

This organization structure can be used effectively, with minor variations, in both a public sector and a private sector environment.

It must be understood that none of the Monitoring Facility, Evaluation Facility or the Programme Administrator Function could be practically employed without the data communications platform, project management information system and the use of a uniform Standards and Procedures Manual.
This chart identifies all the major components of a proposed Project Management Institutional Framework with the goal of improving the economic performance of development programmes.

As discussed under Hierarchy Charts, we must make a judgment as to whether each of the defined components is necessary for achievement of programme goal, and whether the components, taken together, are sufficient for achievement of programme goal.

Note the inclusion of a “Change Management Component” and a “Quality Management Component”.

Also note that we have separated Project Monitoring and Programme Evaluation since they should be housed under different ministerial functions.

The Project Management Information System will include, the project management data base, the Financial Management Interface System and the Project Planning Software Tool.

This chart summarizes our recommendations for development of an Integrated Project Management Institutional Framework.

We have made a bold attempt to present a diagnostic analysis of the Planning and Development processes, systems and performance in Caribbean Governments, as presented in the Situation Analysis section of this package.

In that context, we have presented a comprehensive set of recommendations for improving the performance in development programmes.

These recommendations are put within the context of a model on an Integrated Project Management Institutional Framework.

While some aspects of this model have been successfully implemented in several public and private sector organizations, the full model is yet to be properly tested through implementation in any Caribbean Government.

We have proposed that on-going research should be conducted on:
- The Development of a Standards and Procedures Manual for use in Caribbean Governments
- The development of a software-based Monitoring and Evaluation System suitable for use across the public, private and social sectors.
- The design of a Project Management Organization Structure suitable for adoption and use, centrally within the Ministries of Planning and Finance, and decentrally across all the line Ministries in the Government.

Time for Action

It’s a tough road to travel but a good day to start

Thank You