Chapter 104
Shaping Mega–Science Projects and Practical Steps for Success

Phil Crosby
Curtin University, Australia

ABSTRACT

Too many large engineering/science projects fail in terms of budget overruns, schedule slippage, or underperformance, and this has profound implications not only for the construction and commissioning organizations, but also for the funders (public or private) and the clients or users. Successful design and delivery is therefore not only a commercial necessity but also a societal imperative. Success in complex mega-projects is not easily achieved and is interpreted differently by various stakeholders. Moreover, there is growing recognition of the importance of front-end shaping. In this chapter, the author addresses the inception, planning, and feasibility phases of complex mega-projects in some depth, based on extant and updated research of large-scale high-technology science projects. Five key success drivers are explained and, when addressed together, are shown to be especially potent. This chapter draws out subtle aspects of mega-project management shown to be crucial at the preliminary, or start-up, phase.

INTRODUCTION

Success and failure in projects is a topic frequently discussed among project management (PM) practitioners. Public funded mega-scale projects especially are scrutinised for performance by funders, users, and the popular press. While a good number of notable mega-projects are delivered within acceptable parameters of time, budget and scope, many large complex projects - especially those underpinned by, or delivering, new technology - too often fail in one or more success dimension (Hartman and Ashrafi, 2004; Ellis, 2008; MoD, 2009; Brouwer, 2011; Flyvbjerg and Budzier, 2014). Perhaps of most concern is that we don't seem to be learning. Large complex projects continue to underperform despite increased availability of systemic, disciplined PM approaches, training, and internet based resources (Archibald, 2003; Flyvbjerg, Bruzelius, & Rothengatter, 2003).

Much has been written regarding project performance, and the literature contains casework and empirical studies of tens, and sometimes hundreds, of projects in an effort to distil factors governing their success or failure (e.g. Pinto and Slevin, 1989; Müller and Turner, 2007; Ika, 2009). Flyvbjerg et al. (2003) identify a 'megaproject performance paradox' that, put simply, means that despite increasing opportunities to learn by experience, project risks remain unacknowledged or unaddressed by stakeholders, and that project performance continues to disappoint.

However, the focus of this chapter is not on causes of failure, but factors underpinning success. The objective is to bring together key findings from the author's research and casework, augmented by recent reports and lessons learned, to identify strategic activities and/or actions at the project formation phase that show strong correlation to successful project outcomes. In this chapter, mega-projects are generally defined as having hundreds of millions or even billion dollar budgets, time-frames measured in several years, and often attracting public and/or political attention. Such projects generally involve a significant information technology (IT) or software component, application of leading edge science/engineering technologies, and complexities that test traditional, rational PM methodologies.

BACKGROUND

As high-technology (high-tech) projects have grown in size, cost and risk, so has the challenge in realising success. Between the 1960's and 1980's project success emphasised delivery against the "iron triangle" (time, cost, scope). By year 2000, success criteria had expanded to include client satisfaction and stakeholder benefits. The 21st century has seen the focus broaden to embrace business success and strategic objectives (Ika, 2009).

Systematic project management emerged in the 1950s with the Program Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT), and the Critical Path Method (CPM). These methodologies continued to proliferate through the 1960s and 1970s; later becoming computerised. By 1990, PM was effectively professionalised and managed through hierarchical organisational structures, along with their attending bureaucracies, linear mode planning tools, and standardised forms of project review.

The application of skills and techniques to meet the demands of increasing complexity and the parameters by which modern project success is measured, has lagged. Whereas moderately scaled high-tech projects can be managed using traditional PM methods and tools, the reported poor performance of many mega-projects is compelling evidence that lessons are not being learned, and that advanced PM theory and practice is not being applied (Turner, 2004; Cooke-Davies, 2002; Grün, 2004; Shenhar and Dvir, 2007). An example of this is illustrated in data by Flyvbjerg et al., (2003). See Figure 1.

The topic of mega-project management, with its inherent new scale challenges, is receiving attention by researchers, with a growing awareness of the importance of front-end planning. Difficulties with dependence on early stage risk assessment amid uncertainty are examined by Flyvberg et al. (2003); Bakker, Cambre, Korlaar, & Raab (2010); and Geraldi, Lee-Kelley, & Kutsch (2010). Project shaping as a management craft is investigated by Smith and Winter (2010) who show clear links to project success, while project shaping as a competitive advantage is addressed by Miller and Lessard (2000). Blanchard (1990) and Cook-Davies (2002) each discuss the people aspects of new projects and the pivotal role of management, while work by Jani (2010) asserts that self-efficacy enables resilience in complex IT project teams. Crosby's in-depth study (2012a) reveals new attitudinal and conditional factors for shaping of complex projects specifically. Early stage critical success factors (CSF) are noted by Elenbaas (2000)

Related Content

Modification of Service Content for Evolution of Service Platform Ecosystems
Yuki Inoue, Takeshi Takenakaand Koichi Kurumatani (2020). *Journal of Business Ecosystems (pp. 1-19).*
www.irma-international.org/article/modification-of-service-content-for-evolution-of-service-platform-ecosystems/250361

A Case for Ethical and Administrative Considerations on Grade Inflation: A Review
Helen G. Hammondand Gary R. Almy (2021). *International Journal of Responsible Leadership and Ethical Decision-Making (pp. 1-16).*
www.irma-international.org/article/a-case-for-ethical-and-administrative-considerations-on-grade-inflation/308453

Is It Farcical Defending Corporate Responsibility?
Ike Valentine Iyioke (2018). *Corporate Social Responsibility for Valorization of Cultural Organizations (pp. 1-23).*
www.irma-international.org/chapter/is-it-farcical-defending-corporate-responsibility/197923

A Leadership and Ethical Analysis of the Scholar-Practitioner
Abeni El-Amin (2022). *International Journal of Responsible Leadership and Ethical Decision-Making (pp. 1-13).*
www.irma-international.org/article/a-leadership-and-ethical-analysis-of-the-scholar-practitioner/313032

A New Framework for Preparing Indonesian Graduates for Employability: A Capitals-Based Approach
Redi Anak Agung Ayu Pudyantiand Thanh Pham (2023). *Handbook of Research on Sustainable Career Ecosystems for University Students and Graduates (pp. 116-135).*
www.irma-international.org/chapter/a-new-framework-for-preparing-indonesian-graduates-for-employability/324249