

ANNEXURE A: PROGRAM PROJECT LIFECYCLE MANAGEMENT (PPLCM) FRAMEWORK

1. BACKGROUND

MISA operates in a programme and project-based environment in fulfilling its support mandate to respective clients (Municipalities, National department etc.) and has set a goal to comply with international standards and best practices across 'programme and project management' areas of the organisation with an objective to improve efficacy and impact of municipal infrastructure and create efficiencies. An assessment of the maturity levels in respect of Program and Project Management (PPM) which highlighted that the PPM maturity is at an average of 2,45 using the Portfolio, Program, Project Management (P3M3) assessment tool. This score of 2.45 maturity level denotes that the current state of PPM are at the level where processes are informal and have not yet been institutionalized. This consolidated maturity score was based on the findings from the self-assessment exercise utilising the P3M3™ assessment, with respect to programme management maturity for the organisation peached at an average maturity level of 2,7 whilst project management maturity was peached at an average maturity level of 2,2. A strategic decision to transform the PPM maturity levels from 2,45 to level 4 where programme and project management processes are managed, institutionalized was made followed by the approval of the Program Project Lifecycle Management (PPLCM) Framework.

The PPLCM framework presents a common approach to programme and project management within MISA which, when consistently applied though a recommended methodology can help embrace change and get the right things done right the first time. It illustrates programme and project management knowledge that is generally recognized as good practice and is specifically tailored for MISA's purposes and is aligned with Infrastructure Delivery Management System (IDMS) and Project Management Institute's Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK® Guide), 6th Edition. This framework narrative is written in the format of a reference model or guideline and defines programme project management terminology and common vocabulary for a shared language within MISA. It also provides linkages to related initiatives, tools, resources or other existing standard business practices and policies. The Framework is organised into the following (excluding set-up):

- Four Portfolio Management Phases
- Three Programme Management Phases, and
- Five Project Management Phases.

It also includes step-by-step activities in relation to Portfolio, Programme & Project Management (PPM) processes that are applicable and/or can be customised to work

and scope carried out in the MISA Support Service ('mandate') including ready-to-use tools, templates and checklists associated with the illustrated phases and processes. These developments encouraged an increased recognition of project management as a strategic business tool and enabler of change and prompted greater focus on the development of internal project management capacity and skills within MISA wherein an Enterprise Management Office ('EPMO') was also established to help build 'programme & project management' ("PPM') capacity to create and sustain transformational change and achieve projectisation objectives by driving the implementation of the frameworks, methodologies, tools, learning etc. In the context of MISA, the levels of the framework are defined as follows;

- Portfolio Management (PfM) viewed as a corporate, strategic level process for coordinating successful delivery across a Local Government's entire set of programmes or projects (as per the infrastructure delivery support mandate) which provides a structured method of decision-making that enables MISA to select and run the optimal set of Programmes and Projects. In particular it considers alignment with the State of the Nation Address (SONA) Ministerial Directives, Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) and Cabinet Lekgotla targets and other COGTA's policies/objectives and overall achievability based on MISA capacity and capability to deliver.
- Programme Management (PgM) is an action of carrying out coordinated organisation, direction, and implementation of a dossier of projects and transformation activities to achieve outcomes and realise benefits of strategic importance whilst also aligns three critical organisational elements: 1) corporate strategic plan, 2) delivery mechanisms for change and 3) business as usual environment.
- Project Management defined as practice of initiating, planning, executing, controlling, and closing work of a team to achieve a specific KPIs/goals and meet a specific-success-criteria at the specific time.

In the main, MISA desires to manage its programmes and projects keeping a strong alignment with its strategic goals and objectives, therefore the PPLCM approach is embedded in Strategic project management principles to align key corporate processes of strategic planning, KPI setting, and project management and prioritization provide direction for determining the financing resources and budgets allocations for MISA programmes and projects. The broader PPLCM function through (1)Phased Methodology with Gates (Stages) (2)Supporting Capabilities and (3)Building Blocks (Governance, Tools, Processes & Competency).

The developed framework was informed by the gap analysis which allowed MISA to compare critical aspects of current PPM practices (AS-IS) against desired state (TO-BE), whilst benchmarking current practices against best practices to assist in

identifying specific deficiencies or shortcomings that need to be overcome. Table 1 below provides an overview of some of the deficiencies that were identified and defined the desired state across the phases of the PPLCM framework. The desired state provides a base of determining the gap to be closed, segregated into portfolio management, program management, project management in order to achieve the PPM maturity level of 4,

TABLE 1: OVERVIEW ON THE CURRENT STATE AND DESIRED STATE ACROSS PORTFOLIO, PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT LEVELS

	Portfolio Definition and Selection				Portfolio Monitoring and Optimisation							
	Current		Desired		Current				Desired			
Portfolio Management	Programmes and projects are approved on the basis of who shouts loudest, quality of sector diagnostics or political mandates. No formal and standardised process followed when allocating projects or targets to individual provinces.		A standardised process for establishing portfolio management within MISA setting, so the appropriate capabilities and infrastructure is established that will support an effective prioritization and selection decision-making process and portfolio delivery function. This will ensure: •The right projects and programmes are selected to achieve the strategic outcomes and priorities set by MISA Strategic Plan. •Resources are deployed where the organisation needs them most.		Once programmes and projects are approved, changes on the internal and external political and policy environment can invalidate projects or programmes, therefore Management need consistent information on which to judge the impact of such changes.				•Programmes and projects are monitored against key outcomes (as per APP KPIs) •Ongoing successful delivery of programmes and projects to meet MISA Mandate. Assessment of MISA programmes and projects' priorities within the portfolio management process that assimilates information about the capacity and capability of the organisation to determine what is achievable within these constraints.			
Program Management	Program Set-up		Program Definition (Initiation and Set-Up)		Program Delivery		Program Closure		Monitoring and Controlling			
	Current	Desired	Current	Desired	Current	Desired	Current	Desired	Current		Desired	
	Programmes stipulated within Annual Performance Plans (APP) are not further defined according to either Infrastructure Delivery Management System (IDMS)/ Managing Successful Programs (MSP) or Project Management Institute (PMI) processes/methodologies. Programme Definition Documents, Programme Mandate or IPMP (as per IDMS) are not developed	Programme definition processes are documented, standardised, and integrated to some extend with corporate processes. Establish Programme Charter or IPMP	Some of start-up documents in place; APP, Programme Brief, Terms of Reference (ToR), Memorandum of approval and minutes of meetings, however no standardized programme start up process. Non-standardised process followed from developing APP to procuring suppliers to execute the programme targets as stipulated in the APP.	Documented Programme establishment & set up processes which are standardised and integrated to some extend with corporate processes. Guideline for programme authorization process & templates are in place and institutionalised.	Programme components are not authorized and implemented according to either IDMS, MSP or PMI processes/methodologies. Programme Implementation Plan or IPIP are not developed consistently Non-standardised process followed from developing APP to procuring suppliers to execute the programme targets as stipulated in the APP.	Set-up benefits management guidelines. Develop measurements defining when and how benefits will be measured. Develop baseline measures from which improvements will be calculated. Determine what resources are needed to carry out the review work	Processes are not usually documented. Managers close out programmes based on personal preferences and there is little, if any, guidance or supporting documentation.	Programme Close out Management processes are documented, standardised and integrated to some extend with corporate processes.	Program life cycle methodology is non-existent.		Component Authorization and Planning, Component Oversight and Integration and Component Transition and Closure process are documented, standardised, and integrated to some extend to corporate processes.	
Project Management	Project Set-up		Project Initiation		Planning		Execution		Monitoring and Controlling		Project Hand-over/Close-out	
	Current	Desired	Current	Desired	Current	Desired	Current	Desired	Current	Desired	Current	Desired
	No standardised start-up process except for current procurement process. No consistent application of start-up activities i.e. various projects follow different steps when starting up a project. Use Terms of Reference (ToR) and Memorandums of approval and minutes of meetings for requesting project approval mostly. Very few projects with business cases.	Defined project start-up process including best practice components and ensure consistent application across all projects. Ensure that projects have a Project Charter with defined roles and responsibilities including project governance that is detailed. Project objectives are clear and link to overall organizational strategic objectives.	There is no formal project initiation process in place. Current documents used are very high level and do not contain sufficient information on the project. The Memorandum of Approval and Terms of Reference (ToR) are used during the initiation stage of the project	Project initiation process taking into consideration the components of the Project Initiation Document (PID) and the required documentation. Ensure that a set of mandatory documents are in place for project approval before official start date e.g., Mandate, Business Case, Initial Risk Management etc. Use of the PID template as a guide for development of a PID and adoption of the PID mandatory.	Most projects do not have a formal Project Management Plan (PMP) in place (different projects use different templates), PIPs in existence are done in Microsoft Word/or Excel and sometimes Microsoft Project and only highlight activities at a high-level provided. No detailed project planning and levels of planning in place, planning is high-level and plans not refined to various levels of projects and knowledge areas. No planning tools applied and accessible to project managers.	Standardized templates for PMP and trained project managers on preparing and updating project management plans. Documented detailed planning processes integrated to some extent to corporate processes. Investigate feasibility and application of a planning tool including necessary training. Establish a process for examining and capturing risks and issues. Quality Management policy for projects developed for	Most projects do not have a formal PIP in place (different projects use different templates). Managers implement projects based on personal preferences and there is minimal guidance or supporting documentation. PIP resides with the service provider therefore there is limited day-to-day monitoring of projects internally.	Standardized templates for PIPs and trained project managers on preparing and updating project plans. Established levels of control for projects: Project Committee control and Project Manager controls as well as in the levels of reporting. Defined and documented process to confirm tolerances for the project and escalation procedures.	Projects do not have Project Controls Specifications or Manuals, main focus of the controls is mainly around the financial aspects of the project. Minimal evidence of minutes of meetings in place. No change control process place and sometimes a change control template in place for financial changes only. No Issue log in place for most	Adoption of methodology, tools and templates, definition of KPI's (tracking against the project specific performance metrics). Introduce reporting tools e.g. standardized progress report template, dashboards, EVM, etc. Changes have to be treated as a	No documented process for handing over projects to operational functions to ensure that they are maintained.	Standardized approach for handing over project closure which across all projects.

					<p>Inadequate setting up of project controls, currently procurement process in place mainly focussing on controlling financial aspects of projects.</p> <p>No Quality Management framework existing. No quality process documented, sometimes customer's quality expectation documented on ToR for infrastructure projects and skills development projects.</p> <p>Stakeholder identification and engagement across project environment not consistent.</p> <p>No joint planning between branches characterised by a dominant "silo" culture. No process for identifying, registering and monitoring risks.</p> <p>No formal process for registering and handling issues, assessing impact of issues.</p> <p>No consistency in the file structures and the indexing of files is inconsistent.</p>	<p>implementation in all projects.</p> <p>Ensure project assurance arrangements are in place.</p> <p>Ensure that stakeholder identification is done for each project, consultation, and identification of desired relationship.</p> <p>Communication Policy for the organisation to take into account the project environment.</p> <p>Sourcing Strategies, Procurement Management, Cost Management, Quality Management, Resource Management, Communication Management, Risk Management, Stakeholder Management processes are documented, standardised and integrated to some extent with corporate processes.</p>			<p>projects to track change requests. Most projects are not broken down into manageable sections (stages) making it difficult to spot the problems early.</p> <p>End stage assessments are not conducted thus constrain ability to make decisions on whether the work should continue or not.</p> <p>Project life cycle methodology is non-existent.</p>	<p>type of project issue, claim or variation and handled using the applicable contractual mechanism.</p> <p>Formally define project stages when developing stage plan.</p> <p>Ensure there is a phased handover of deliverables during each project stage.</p> <p>The Project Committee (referred to as Gate Authorisation Committee-GAC) to review and approve End Stage Reports established.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

2. OVERVIEW OF PROGRESS

The implementation and institutionalisation of the PPLCM framework has not taken-off as expected and is characterised by delays, due to a plethora of issues including capacity of the EPMO (human capital and financial), change management etc. In the main, progress made thus far includes the following:

- Defined processes and procedures for programme and projects set up, initiation, planning, implementation, closing and post project evaluation.
- Application of the defined processes and procedures for programme and project management gradually taking-off.
- Use and application of the PPLCM framework templates commenced, however not fully integrated by all yet.
- EPMO capacitated with leadership position (Chief Director) filled.
- Defined governance procedures in place for set up, initiation, planning and implementation of programmes and projects.
- Established Gate Authorisation Committee (GAC) for providing the governance and assurance function.
- Training in PPM practices and principles has commenced.
- Electronic Document Management System (EDMS) Sharepoint tool and Municipal Infrastructure Performance Management Information System (MIPMIS), Ms Project tools considered, and use commenced.
- Total organisation involvement (all persons involved directly or indirectly in programmes and project activities are aware of PPLCM framework) with support and buy-in at top and senior management.

AM