



Smart Project Administration and Management

Olav Hauge, Asplan Viak,
Project Manager NMC og StratMoS

Project Management versus Project Administration

- Common objective: The project shall achieve the envisaged results
- Project management: Efforts to achieve the results of the project
- Project administration: Efforts to strengthen the project management

Lead partner versus partner

- The Lead Partner is responsible to the Interreg programme
- The Partners are responsible to the Lead Partner
- A Sub-partner is responsible to the Partner the Sub-partner is linked to
- The Lead Partner has a major challenge in making all partners to deliver!
- First problem: Slow start
- Largest problem: The partners are giving priority to daily work in their entity

Start-up of the project

- Project Management Group/ International Steering Group
- Partner Agreement
- Work Plan
- Fact Sheets
- Communication Plan

Project Management Group/ International Steering Group

- ISG: All partners are members
- PMG: All WP leaders plus Lead Partner and Deputy Chairs are members
- Written preparations for the ISG/PMG, distributed at least 2 weeks before the meeting. Structure:
 - Background
 - Considerations
 - Draft resolution

Partner Agreement

- Agreement versus Statement:
 - Who signs?
 - Legal office involved?
 - Takes a lot of time to get all partners to sign
- Important issues:
 - In case of non-delivery and conflicts between partners
 - Contributions to cover common costs
 - Property rights to material, data and software used in the project
- Has the Agreement any real impact? The tradition is to reach consensus

Work Plan Format

- Overall Work Plan for the full project period
- Detailed work plan for each of the half year periods/phases (co-inciding with the reporting period)
- NB: All partners have to be assigned clear and specific tasks with clear specifications of the delivery and time schedule

Overall Work Plan

Overall Time Schedule for: DP3a - Rogaland																																						
		2008										2009										2010										2011						
Main Activity	Sub-activity/milestone	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	
IMG (I) and WP A (A)		I		I					A						I						A							I					A					I
1. Extract knowledge from the SWOT analysis in Stage 1																																						
	1.1 Conduct SWOT analysis																																					
2. Identify existing and potential weaknesses in the connecting transport network																																						
	2.1 Conduct regional SWOT workshop																																					
	2.2 Sum up SWOT analysis, English																																					
	2.3 Participate in transnational SWOT workshop																																					
3. Stakeholder involvement in determning critical path activities																																						
	3.1 Review cargo flows/transport chains in Stavanger																																					
	3.2 Assessments of links in the transport chains																																					
4. Potential stakeholder involvement to determine perceived barriers to the interface with maritime transport																																						
	4.1 Visit to another StratMoS partner																																					
	4.2 Sum up analysis of transport chain, English																																					

Detailed Work Plan

Detailed work plan for Phase 4: 01.10.2009 - 31.03.2010					
Main Activity	Sub-activity/milestone	Detailed description	Responsible partner	Deliverables	Deadline
3. Stakeholder involvement in determining critical path activities					
	3.1 Review cargo flows/transport chains in Stavanger	Review existing documents like port statistics, reports from NMC, IRIS etc. Describe important transport chains through the Stavanger logistics hub, based on discussions with major logistics players.	Rogaland	Memo for compiling and structuring information collected	01.12.2009
	3.2 Assessments of links in the transport chains	Assessment of the links in the transport chains described in 3.1. Clarify which factors are limiting the efficiency in the transportation chain within the logistics hub.	Rogaland	Memo documenting assessments done	30.01.2010
4. Potential stakeholder involvement to determine perceived barriers to the interface with maritime transport					
	4.1 Visit to another StratMoS partner	Prepare and conduct a visit to one of the other StratMoS partner to discuss common problems and challenges and tentative improvement measures	Rogaland	Short documentation report from the visit	01.02.2010
	4.2 Sum up analysis of transport chain, English	Summing up the analysis of the transport chains within the logistics hub in Stavanger. English version	Rogaland	Working paper	01.04.2010

Fact Sheets

- The Interreg Secretariat has prepared a set of very good Fact Sheets
- Even so, there is often a project specific need for concrete clarifications and specific procedures, for instance with additional guidelines or fact sheets:
 - Organisation and responsibilities in the ISG and PMG
 - Financial procedures and rules
 - Use of common costs
 - Hiring of external expertise and consultants, and distribution of costs
 - Designguide

Communication Plan

- A sketch of the Communication Plan should be prepared as part of the application
- Outline given by the Interreg Secretariatet
- Two-way communication
- Concrete and specific tasks and measures
- Detailed budget
- Covered by collected funds for common costs

During the implementation of the project

- Support to the WP leaders
- Get all partners involved
- Partners not delivering, partners withdrawing
- Cooperation with other projects
- Reporting to the Interreg Programme

Support to the WP leaders

- The Lead Partner's most important "instrument"
- Detailed work plan
- PMG four times a year (one combined with ISG), written preparation
- Additional telephone calls and meetings

Get all partners involved

- Very concrete and specific work plans, assigning specific tasks to all partners
- Request presentation at WP meetings and workshop/conferences
- Visit partners who have difficulties in delivering

Partners not delivering, partners withdrawing

- There is a risk of some partners withdrawing when the partnership is large
- Should detect lack of interest or capacity problems at an early stage:
 - Motivate so that they start delivering
 - If withdrawing, avoid use of funds and claims
- Close cooperation with WP leaders:
 - Review and revise tasks and budget
 - Find a substitute who takes over the tasks and the budget
 - Find existing partner or new partner to take over

Cooperation with other projects

- This is the most important and easiest way of dissemination and to absorb ideas and knowledge from others!
- Select a limited number of other projects to cooperate with closely: :
 - Project where partners are involved
 - Projects with similar topics
 - Common workshops and conferences
- The main obstacle: Not allocated earmarked resources (money and time)

Reporting to the Interreg Programme

- Partners are reporting to the Lead Partner who is making a consolidated report
- Form 10A is felt to be too detailed and with aspects the partners do not have background to answer. Freedom for Lead Partner to make a simpler form.
- Challenge: Reports come from each partner, but the reporting to the Interreg programme shall be as per work package
- Great challenge: To get the financial reports in time
- Greatest challenge: To fill in the indicators

Indicators

INDICATORS AS PER MARCH 2010

Row no.	Output/ Result/ Impact	Priority/ Programme Indicator description	Description	Unit	Base -line	Project target	Reached	Assumed documentation	Actual documentation
1	14.2 i Compulsory indicators – each of the indicators must be established for the project								
2	Raising awareness/ dissemination								
3	Output	Transnational dissemination outputs	Exhibitions	Number	0	10	5	Exhibitions participated in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual NSRP conf. 2008 and 2009 • StratMoS International Conference in Hull Nov. 2009 • Interreg Conf. Gothenburg May 2009 • IIUM Polish Logistical Congress
4	Output		Own events	Number	0	40	95	WP/DP meetings, workshops, conferences etc., including also questionnaires	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IMG: 3 • WPA: 2 • WPB: 5 • WPC: 30 • WPD: 5 • DP1: 10 • DP2:10 • DP3: 20 • DP4: 30 • DP5: 5
5	Output		External events	Number	0	10	12	Conferences, working meetings with Dryport, NS FRITS etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NMC/StratMoS conf. in Amsterdam • Kirkenesdagene • Barents Conference, Hammerfest 2008 and 2009 • Dryport workshop • TransBaltic conference • Murmansk International Economic Forum • Northern Dimension Conference in St. Petersburg • Annual Meeting Northern Sea Route 2008 and 2009 • Feeder Conference, Hamburg • International Inland Terminal Conference, Amsterdam



Indicators, cont.

- Indicators done in the last minute
- Regret in arrears:
 - Targets too optimistic
 - Indicators difficult to measure
 - Indicators are not relevant
- BUT: Important to be conscious of what the project shall achieve
- Sets focus on what shall be prioritised in the project, awareness about what can be achieved and what can not be achieved
- **NB: It is this the project will be measured by!**
- **NB: It is this the Interreg programme will be measured by!**

Thank you for your attention!

Comments?