

# **Towards a Global Body of Project Management Knowledge**

**June 18 – 21 2000**

**Haugesund, Norway**

**Sponsored by Telenor**



<b>Document Control Information</b>	
<b>Initial Author</b>	Diana Papas
<b>Version No</b>	0.1
<b>Date</b>	17 July 2001
<b>Changes</b>	
<b>Initial Distribution List</b>	Lynn Crawford
	Alicia Aitken
	Bill Duncan

## **Table of contents**

<a href="#"><u>Introduction</u></a> .....	3
<a href="#"><u>Purpose</u></a> .....	3
<a href="#"><u>List of attendees</u></a> .....	4
<a href="#"><u>Ground rules</u></a> .....	5
<a href="#"><u>Expected deliverables</u></a> .....	6
<a href="#"><u>Observations and implications</u></a> .....	7
<a href="#"><u>Terms</u></a> .....	8
<a href="#"><u>Lessons learned</u></a> .....	10
<a href="#"><u>Where to from here?</u></a> .....	13
<a href="#"><u>Summary</u></a> .....	14
<a href="#"><u>Wrap up</u></a> .....	14
<a href="#"><u>Action plan</u></a> .....	14
<a href="#"><u>Decision taken</u></a> .....	14

## **Introduction**

The conference was convened for those:

- who are considered a global opinion leader in project management
- have made a significant contribution to the development of the project management body of knowledge
- are globally representative
- were on the initial invitation list for the 1<sup>st</sup> workshop in June 1999

The conference is sponsored by Telenor, Norway's telecommunications, media and information technology organisation.

This event was organised because it is considered to be a key international project management event. It provides the basis for discussion between those involved in project management body of knowledge guide developments with a view to international cooperation.

## **Purpose**

To progress the development of a globally accepted body of project management of knowledge.

## List of attendees

<b>Name</b>	<b>Country</b>
Adesh Jain	India
Sergey Busheyev	Ukraine
Bill Duncan	USA
Debbie O'Bray	Canada
Lynn Crawford	Australia
Terry Cooke-Davies	UK
Karlos Artto	Finland
Christophe Bredillet	France
Kevin Forsberg	USA
Diana Papas	Australia
Kristoffer Grude	Norway
Per Willy Hetland	Norway
Brian Hobbs	Canada
Lew Ireland	USA
Yukihide Kosaka	Japan
Mike Katagiri	USA
Jean-Lois Muller	France
Ralph Levene	UK
Bruce Rodrigues	South Africa
Asbjorn Rolstadas	Norway
Suhrita Sen	India
Mary-Lou Raybould	Australia
Greg Skulmoski	Canada
Rodney Turner	UK
Jaap Van Der Deijl	Netherlands
John Gulbis	Australia
Ralph Mueller	Denmark
Andrew Roberston	Australia
Mark Austin	USA
Inger Bergman	Sweden
Andreas Unger Solheim	Switzerland
Janne Mialsen	Norway
Erik Loes	Norway
Morten Dunham	Norway
Gunn Bente Johansen	Norway
Jon Erik Hogberg	Norway
Anne Stodle	Norway
Rolf Schroeder	Germany
Morten Fangel	Denmark

## **Ground rules**

The following ground rules were agreed upon:

1. Define the deliverable(s) on a regular basis
2. Basic meeting protocol, such as:
  - a. Mobile phones are silent
  - b. 1 person speaking at a time in a group scenario and give the speaker our attention and respect
  - c. timeliness
  - d. participation
  - e. shorter frequent breaks
3. Balance between individual needs and group progress. Discuss topics that matter to the individuals in great depth
4. Openness to alternative paradigms
5. Use slogans, titles or pictures to briefly express ideas
6. Listen to each other clarify ideas so we fully understand opinions and areas of interest
7. Focus the meeting on Project Management culture
8. Regular opportunities to mix up groups
9. Make some forward progress – content
10. Opportunity to get to know each other – time for social interaction
11. Park our ideas and structure workspace

## **Expected deliverables**

The following deliverables were expected:

1. List of users of body of knowledge (target groups)
2. 3 – 6 sample structures of bodies of knowledge
3. Lessons learned as a group product and guidelines for future work on structures
4. Programme of work that goes beyond the conference
5. Some time spent providing Telenor with helpful insights

## **Observations and implications**

What did you see / notice in your work groups that you found interesting?

- What challenges / issues did you have to resolve in order to complete each exercise?
  - On your own
  - As a team
  - Different perspectives

What are the implications for this group?

## Terms

### Consolidated List of Terms:

Terms	Terms
Accountants	Multiple stakeholder like the OLCI/Nordnet
Administration (Government)	Municipalities
All other people that sell services to projects	National
Artists (musicals, opera)	National - international
Authors	New industries to Project Management
Business managers / sponsors	NGO
Chief Executives	Non - Professional Part Time Project Managers
Community organizations	Non Project Management Practitioners
Companies	Organisations developing methodologies
Construction	Other Associations (accounting, industrial)
Consultants	Part time
Crisis managers	People supporting PMs in multi product organisation
Customer groups - common language of understanding	PM Consultant with diverse clientele
Customer groups for evaluation capabilities	PM software vendors / developers
Director of Project Office	PMs in a multi-product organisation
Economic Projects	Politicians
Education	Portfolio Managers
Employees	Potential Users
Expert opinion	Practitioners – PMs, Teams, Contractors
Family members	Process and Quality people
Financial director	Product development
Financiers	Professional Association
Functional Managers	Professional Bodies
	Professional full time PMs delivering projects in internal to organisation which may be contraction, or different technologies or business processes
Generic or Universal principles	
Global/regional/industry/company	Professional full time PMs delivering projects in the field
	Professional full time PMs delivering projects in the field in different stages of projects (eg product development, customer care, implementation etc)
Government	
HR - Education, Training, and Performance measurement	Professional full time PMs delivering projects in the field in different stages of projects on different types of projects) e.g.,

Terms	Terms
	pharmaceutical, retail, construction, research, education)
Human Resource manager	Programme Managers
Industry	Project / people / organisation
Librarians to catalogue	Project Assurance
Management, Sponsors, Clients	Project champions
Managers of PM department	Project Directors
Project Management Practitioner	Students
Project Managers	Students - elementary school students
Project Portfolio Managers	Students - non PM students
Project Support	Students - PM students
Project team members	Superusers of Universal Framework
Promoters	Team members
Publishers	Temporary
R&D	Those involved in customer care
Regulators	Those involved in different types of projects
Researchers	Those involved in initiation of projects
Salesman	Those involved in internal improvement etc projects (internal clients)
Senior Managers	Trade Unions
Single discipline / multi discipline /	Trainers
Social Projects	Trainers of Project Management
Sociologists	Universities
Sponsors	Users of the final product
Stockholders	

The following terms were chosen to be discussed by the groups in the session available:

- Project Managers
- Chief Executive
- Internal improvement project managers (internal clients)
- Educators & Disseminators
- Project Sponsor (Owner of the Business Case)
- Someone having no clue about project management (like Mary-Lou's mum or elementary school students)
- Project portfolio / programme manager
- Non-professional project manager
- Government
- Project teams
- Those impacted by Projects - Stakeholders
- Sponsors of Project Management in the Organisation
- Certifiers

## **Lessons learned**

### **Strengths**

- Exchange and interaction between participants
- Spirit of the group
- Organisation and format of the workshop
- Team work, cooperation and creative discussion
- Dealing with the group dynamics and different thoughts
- Diverse views that lead to healthy debate
- Opportunity to work with committed and informed people
- Opportunity to reorganise the teams
- Stimulating discussion
- Discussion of the BOK structure
- Helpful and attentive facilitators, responsive to participants
- Clear context and direction in which the group is working
- Effective warm up exercise
- Good ideas on how to define expectations in the morning session
- Successful ground rules and categorising exercise
- Focus on situational approaches to project management
- Variety in work, in participation and in activities
- Positive atmosphere
- Greater awareness of global project management methodologies
- Infrastructure, technology, data entry
- Meals

## **Areas for Development**

- Ventilation in the room
- More focus in questions
- Need for a facilitator in each group
- Some time required for personal experiences to be discussed
- Electronic technology sometimes limits participation, speed of email
- Household session was too long, i.e., ground rules
- Duration of the session, more productive use of time
- Confusion surrounding how the afternoon session related to the morning session
- Vocabulary and categorising exercises unnecessary and approach to the content structure confusing
- Keeping to ground rules
- Purpose of the end product
- Noisy environment
- Schedule information was not adequate
- Restrict group size to five people
- More time required

## **Reasons**

- Support and enhance the project management profession by offering a tool for better communication
- Make it easier for those who want to contribute
- To align the current P.H. standards
- Create knowledge framework consistent with the needs of the global project management environment
- Capture ongoing development of project management body of knowledge
- Provide consistent framework for companies that work globally

## **Key words/issues**

- Embedded learning system
- Harmonisation of certification schemes
- Mutual recognition of standards
- Public domain

## Where to from here?

What	Who	When
1. Product description for costing	Jaap will write the business case. Scope as proposed by group 1.	
2. Register domain name <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create mock up of web page in Word</li> <li>• Follow up with Cambridge firm -Search software</li> </ul>	Bill Duncan	
3. Consider Business case before deciding on brand		
4. Proof of concept	Bill Duncan	
5. Standards – validation and acceptance of ideas with people in South Africa, and review and contribute work as requested	Bruce	
6. Structuring BOK and report on it. 7. Involvement in the TOOLS FOR web site	Christophe	1 year
8. Ralf will work with Christophe to structure BOK	Ralf	
9. Work with Jaap on business case 10. Will take on next venue with a few friends	Mark	
11. Will help with business case	Kristoffe	
12. Will head Asian recruitment committee – suggest sub groups	Suhrita	
13. point structure for proof of concept – Kevin f will provide existing product as starting point collect comments etc	Kevin Forsberg	
14. Will work on concept	Kolja	
15. Project Manager to coordinate this project and central contact point	Jaap	
16. Will assist Christophe with structures	Asbjorn	
17. Inger will provide quality assurance on demand (validation and testing)	Inger	
18. Project managers develop a charter and confirm		

## **Summary**

Christophe - structures

Mark – next venue

Jaap – business case

## **Wrap up**

- This meeting – structuring the global
- Don't restrict creativity by lawn mowing strategy
- We are not competitive we are complimentary (bridge across silos)
- We are not doing recipes
- It is different, available, usable, accessible
- It is a response to stake holder demand

## **Action plan**

Project Managers develop a charter and confirm schedule within a few weeks from TDA  
June 21.

## **Decision taken**

Program Manager – Lynn Crawford

Program Office – Diana Papas (temporary)

Sub Projects - venue next time is Mark

Business case – Jaap

Structures – Christophe Bredillet

Proof of concept – Bill Duncan

Lynn will prime project piece – Ralph, Jon Erik and all.