Understanding the nature of Project Management Capacity in Sri Lankan Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs): A Resource Based Perspective.

Abstract

Project Management (PM) capacity can be defined as PM resources and capabilities that are supporting for effective project operations. Using the Resource Based Perspective, the paper aims to explore the nature of PM capacity in NGOs and develops a framework for PM capacity in NGOs. A case study approach and qualitative methods have been applied for this study.

For this study, the literature on PM resources and Organizational capacity was reviewed and a theoretical framework was created. This theoretical framework was then explored using four case studies conducted at Local and International NGOs in Sri Lanka. The study identified three levels of PM Capacity: Team PM Capacity, Organizational PM Capacity and Collaborative Social PM Capacity, a Capacity that has not yet been identified in the literature which supports adaptation to the complex, uncertain environments in which some NGOs operate.
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1. Introduction
Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are generally considered to be non-state, non-profit-oriented groups that function in the public interest (World Bank, 2001; Schmidt and Take, 1997). Since the 1980s, NGOs have become prominent players in community, national and international development (Bagci, 2003; Malena, 1995). NGOs are particularly active in developing countries where they play prominent roles in development activities and vulnerability reduction (United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 2014). Historically, NGOs originated in the early 1800s (Nalinakumari and MacLean, 2005) and the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society was known as the first structured NGO, being established for banning slavery in the British Empire (Nalinakumari and MacLean, 2005; Nadelman, 1990).

According to Korten (1990), the evolution of NGOs has occurred over four generations. The first generation was relief and welfare-oriented and aimed for direct delivery of services to meet immediate needs during an emergency due to natural disasters or war (Bagci, 2003). The second generation was oriented for community development and involved developing the capacities of community people to better meet their own needs through self-reliant local action. The third generation moved forward to sustainable systems development. This generation looked for changes in specific policies and institutions at local, national and global levels. The final, fourth generation focused on social movements and global change. These focused on people-centred development on a global scale. Within the past three decades people’s movements have reshaped thought and action on the environment, human rights, women, peace and population. These third and fourth generations of NGOs are increasingly focusing on strategic management and collaborative networking management orientations in order to fulfil their national and global development objectives (Lewis and Kanji, 2009).
The present fourth generation of NGOs operates increasingly in a turbulent and competitive context and undertake a variety of humanitarian efforts for global social change and development (Lewis and Kanji, 2009; Lyons, 2001; Korten, 1990). They strive for stronger institutional capacities and stimulate collaborating networks in order to sustain or survive for a long period and deliver their complex of services to a vulnerable population (Weerawardena et al., 2010; Lusthaus et al., 2002).

1.1 Unique Characteristics of Projects delivered by NGOs

A substantial number of NGO activities are project-based (Strichman et al., 2008) since these are temporary interventions to fulfil community emergencies or needs. NGOs can work in country environments in which institutional capacity is limited due to emerging economy status (Dedu et al., 2011) or as a result of natural disasters (Crawford and Bryce, 2003). As a result, infrastructure may be lacking and the NGO may be required to duplicate functions provided by the state in a developed country such as access and security before project activity can take place (Hekala, 2012). NGOs deliver complex social, economic and physical interventions in which outcomes are difficult to measure. This creates challenges in monitoring and evaluating these projects using approaches developed within industries which deliver tangible outputs such as construction (Dedu et al., 2011). A related challenge that NGO projects are required to engage with a wide variety of stakeholders such as donors, host communities and beneficiaries (Easterly, 2009) who need to be formally consulted during the process. To meet the demands of these stakeholders while operating in difficult country environments may require adaptation to project systems, tools, processes and activities (Ika et al., 2012; Shleifer, 2009).
1.2 Project Management in NGO research

The first strand of research examines the factors that influence NGO project delivery and outcomes (Ika et al., 2012). NGOs are required to manage political, social, legal, technical and cultural issues in host environments (Struyk, 2007). Managing these factors may require stakeholder engagement in order to develop approaches that are sensitive to the host country (Yu and Leung, 2015). This can require the development of a management structure and project team (Khan et al., 2000) that can adapt project processes to the country context (Youker, 2003). Since NGO projects are aimed at providing long term benefits, a success factor is also the transfer of knowledge to host communities (Yalegama et al., 2016).

The second strand of research examines NGO project management tools and methodologies. Researchers have examined the extent to which traditional PM tools are used by NGOs (Golini et al., 2015) along with the need to adopt additional tools from program management (Korten, 1987). A significant amount of research has examined the adoption and limitations of the logical framework, a commonly used NGO PM tool (Khang and Moe, 2008). Newer, NGO specific methodologies have also been proposed such as the PMD Pro 1 Guide (Hermano et al., 2013). Research has also compared traditional and NGO specific PM tools (Golini and Landoni, 2014).

Finally, the evaluation of NGO project outcomes has attracted attention from researchers. Previous work has examined traditional “iron triangle” metrics such as cost and schedule (Ahsan and Gunawan, 2010). Other researchers have included additional project delivery
measures such as quality, site disputes, safety and environmental impact (Ngacho and Das, 2014). Related work also examined the reasons for failure of development projects (Ika, 2012).

While previous work has generated valuable insights into the type and effectiveness of NGO project activities, there has been little attempt to examine the project capacity of NGOs. Existing capacity development activities mainly focus on development of internal capacity of NGOs to improve organisational performance and sustainability (Bryson, 2004; Lusthaus et al., 2002; Bryson et al., 2001). Research suggests that NGO resources are important for successful delivery of projects, however, existing work focuses on examining a narrow range of explicit or tacit resources. They have focused on human resources, financial resources (Packard, 2010; Chakravarthy, 1982), organizational culture (IDRC/Universalia Model, 2005), strategic leadership (Okorley and Nkrumah, 2012; Hansberry, 2002; Fowler, 2000) networking and linkages (Andrews, 2012), and an external environment (IDRC/Universalia Model, 2005).

The aim of this research is therefore to understand the nature of PM capacity in NGOs using a Resource Based perspective. First a framework for NGO capacity was created using existing NGO and RBV research. Next, data from NGOs was collected and analysed using a multiple case study perspective. Finally, a model describing NGO PM capacity is presented and implications are discussed.

1.3 NGO Resources, Capabilities and Capacity

In strategic management, a resource can be individual tangible or intangible component and capability is the combination and coordination of different resources (Carnes et al., 2016; Grant,
Therefore, an organisational capability can be defined as a firm’s ability to deploy its resources to achieve an end result (Paradkar et al., 2015; Helfat and Lieberman, 2002). The non-profit context, literature uses the term ‘organisational capacity’ instead of ‘organizational capability’ and/or ‘organizational resources’. Capacity is an abstract term that describes a wide range of capabilities, knowledge, and resources that non-profits need to be effective (Connolly and Lukas, 2002). Organizational capacity refers to the resources, knowledge and processes employed by the organization and capacity factors include staffing, infrastructure, strategic leadership, program and process management and networks and linkages with other organizations (UNDP, 1998).

There is still some debate on the nature of NGO capacity by researchers (Bryan, 2011). Some non-profit researchers consider NGO capacity as resources (Christensen and Gazley, 2008), others as capabilities (Harvey et al., 2010) and some as resources and capabilities as part of organizational capacity (Bryson, 2004; Sowa, Selden and Sandfort, 2004). This research adopts the latter view of NGO organizational capacity as organizational resources and capabilities that contribute to the effectiveness of the organizations. IDRC (1995) emphasizes the importance of organizational capacity to increase performance in a sustainable way and to achieve the organizational objectives of NGOs.

1.4 NGO PM Resources and PM Capacity

This section defines PM resources and capacity using the perspective presented in the non-profit literature. Therefore, PM resources can be defined as PM tangible or/and, intangible elements
that support effective project operations. The researcher applies two terms in this research ‘PM resources’ and ‘PM capacity’. The capabilities are subset of resources and in the non-profit literature are mostly interpreted as a ‘know-how’ resource (Bryson, 2004; Sowa et al., 2004). Therefore, the term ‘resources’ is applied to mean resources and capabilities in this study.

2 Literature Review

2.1 PM Capacity

Previous research in private sector organisations has indicated that PM capacity is a useful approach for improving performance (Jugdev, 2011). Existing research in project capacity in private and public sector organizations can be classified into an examination of the structural elements of project capacity and the practice elements of project capacity.

2.1.1 Structural Elements of Project Capacity

The organizational environment can influence the delivery of Projects. At the macro level, organizations may launch projects to deliver a planned or emergent strategy (Aubry and Hobbs, 2011). These projects therefore need to be aligned with strategy (Turner, 2016; Asrilhant et al., 2007), and this area looks at the how the degree of fit between PM and strategy is defined and measured (Martinsuo and Killen, 2014). Research has identified factors such as the top management support (Kwak et al., 2015). Research has also examined the effect of organisational culture on intra (Duffield and Whitty, 2015) and inter project knowledge flows and across organizations (Ghobadi, 2015). In addition to project actors, internal organizational configurations influence the execution of project activities (Thiry and Deguire, 2007). Projects may be required to interface with operations (Killen and Kjaer, 2012) resulting in challenges of communication and coordination (Budayan et al., 2015).
Research also examines the establishment of project specific delivery structures such as Project Management Offices or PMOs including rationale (Spelta and Albertin, 2012), characteristics (Thorn, 2003) and the adaptation of these structures over time (Aubry et al., 2008).

2.1.2 Project Capacity as a collection of Practices

Project capacity has also been viewed as a collection of company practices that are identified and assessed using tools such as maturity models (Gomes et al., 2015; Andersen and Jessen, 2003). These models generally examine for comparing project processes (Amendola et al., 2014) Szulanski, 1996) to an idealized “Best practice” (Leybourne and Kennedyn, 2015) and makes recommendations for improvement. Research has examined the identification, formulation and standardization of best practices (von Wangenheim et al., 2010) along with their contribution to project outcomes (Besner and Hobbs, 2008; Williams, 2016). Best practices can inform the development of metrics for project management (Papke-Shields et al., 2010). Since best practices imply the coordination of internal knowledge assets, this research also examines team interactions (Anantatmula, 2010) and the relationship between leadership and project outcomes (Aga et al., 2016). An emerging stream of this research examines the adoption and impact of maturity models on project practices (Bititci et al., 2015). PM capacity assessment models examine to what level PM is widely practised in organisations and its repetitive nature in bringing high probability of project success (Backlund et al., 2015; Ibbs et al., 2004).
2.2 Organisational Capacity of NGOs

In NGOs, capacity can be analysed at three levels: individual level, the organisational level and the system level (Hawkes et al., 2016; UNDP, 1998; Kotellos et al., 1998). The individual level focuses on the knowledge, skills, attitudes, accountability, beliefs, values, and motivations of employees and volunteers in NGOs (Vallejo and Wehn, 2016; UNDP, 1998). Capacity at this level refers to the individual’s capacity to function efficiently and effectively within an NGO. Capacity development in this area seeks to enhance human resources including technical, leadership and management using training and mentorship (Vallejo and Wehn, 2016; Boffin, 2002). The organisational level consists of all resources and capabilities within the control of the NGO, including the human resources at the individual level, financial resources, physical resources, information resources, technology resources and structure. Research in this domain examines challenges faced by NGOs in managing these resources and the interactions between them (Nanthagopan, 2012; Enemark and Molen, 2008).

Finally, the system level examines the interactions between NGOs and the environment in which it is embedded. At this broader level, research in this area examines the impact of the political setting, donors, funding agencies and the legal infrastructure that influence an NGO’s ability to operate in a particular environment (Enemark et al., 2008). This approach may also be of value to NGOs (Hawkes et al., 2016; Mingus, 2002) as PM capacity can aid NGOs in adapting to complex environments, like Sri Lanka, while delivering projects supporting such activities as research, initiative formulation, resource and risk management (Clarke, 1999). Therefore, this study aims to understand the nature of PM capacity in NGOs.
2.3 Project Management and RBV

In the Resource-Based View (RBV), firms are modelled as a collection of resources (Kamboj et al., 2015; Mahoney and Pandian, 1992) that are coordinated to generate rents or income (Feng et al., 2016; Penrose, 1959). RBV is a strategic perspective that relates to the competitive advantage of a given firm to the tangible or intangible resources owned or controlled by the organisation (Othman et al., 2015; Amit and Schoemaker, 1993; Wernerfelt, 1984; Rumelt, 1984).

Competitive advantage exists while organisations outperform competitors and is gained through having superior organisational resources to provide products or services which yield greater benefits to customers (Dirisu et al., 2013; Barney, 2002; Besanko et al., 2000; Porter, 1991). Organisation-particular resource characteristics make certain resources more important to organisations. Peteraf (1993) indicated that resources should be heterogeneous and not perfectly mobile. Barney (1991) indicated that resources must be valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (VRIN). Subsequently, it was reorganised so that resources must be valuable, rare, inimitable, and it requires organisational support for exploiting these resources (VRIO) in order to achieve sustained competitive advantage (Barney, 1997). Strategic resources contribute to the firm’s competitive advantage and tend to be knowledge-based (Grant, 2016; Amit and Schoemaker, 1993), and are also known as organisational capabilities (Pisano, 2016; Barney 1991).
2.4.1 PM Resource Types

PM processes are based on intangible knowledge assets; explicit (codified) and tacit knowledge assets (Delaket al., 2015; Fernie et al., 2003; DeFillippi and Arthur, 1998) also called ‘know-what’ (codified) and ‘know-how’ (tacit) (Nonaka, 1994). In practice, all knowledge is a mixture of tacit and explicit elements and these designations should be perceived as a range spectrum rather than as definitive positions (Virtanen, 2013; Crossan et al., 1999; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995). However, to understand knowledge and knowledge-based resources, it is important to understand the nature of each type (Botha et al., 2008).

Figure 2 illustrates PM resource types. Explicit knowledge is codified (Cohen and Olsen, 2015; Hirai et al., 2007), and is fairly easy to identify (Delahaye, 2015; Brown and Duguid, 1998), store, and retrieve (Wellman, 2009). This is the type of knowledge managed by formal organisational systems as it exists in the form of documents and texts stored in physical and virtual databases (Botha et al., 2008). In project management, explicit knowledge resources take the form of standards, methodologies and procedures (Jugdev et al., 2011).

Tacit knowledge is context specific and hard to formalise or record as documents and is generally in the heads of individuals and teams (Gutpa, 2011). Tacit knowledge is transferred only by direct human contact, typically through face-to-face discussions (Hirai et al., 2007) and is based on interaction and involvement (Nonaka, 1994). Tacit knowledge is viewed as valuable (Wellman, 2009) as it supports innovation in organisations (Gamble and Blackwell, 2001) and can be divided into technical and cognitive dimensions. The technical dimension covers informal personal skills and crafts and could be called ‘know-how’. The cognitive dimension involves
beliefs, ideals, values, and mental models (Botha et al., 2008). In project management, tacit knowledge resources take the form of team PM skills, knowledge-sharing activities and lesson-learning sessions (Jugdev et al., 2011). Drucker (1993) highlights that effective acquisition and applications of knowledge resources contribute highly to the high performance and competitive advantage of organisations.

**Figure 2: Project Management Resources**

To date, most PM literature has focused on codified knowledge assets (Pollack and Adler, 2015). Research has also focused on how these assets are developed and shared through communities of practice (Lee et al., 2015). However, an emerging stream of research examines tacit PM resources (Kim et al., 2015) such as project team trust, values and informal knowledge-sharing processes (Judgev and Mathur, 2006; Jugdev and Thomas, 2002; Ibbs and Kwak, 2000). While some previous research refers implicitly to resources such as the critical success factor
(intangible) and the project tools (tangible), there is little research that attempts a holistic examination of the project resources in NGOs. As project management involves the use of both explicit and tacit resources, it is important to examine both in order to understand the nature of PM capacity in NGOs. The adoption of the RBV enables the examination of NGO resource profiles (tacit and explicit) that support the delivery of projects in challenging environments.

2.4.2. Levels of PM Resources

The previous section examined the types of PM resource. This section examines existing work on PM resources at two levels: Team Resources and Organisational Resources. PM team resources are defined as explicit (codified) or tacit elements within teams (Jugdev and Mathur, 2006a). Explicit PM team resources consist of codified knowledge assets for example professional certifications and written documents of PM practices (Mathur et al., 2007). Tacit PM team resources consist of items based on informal sharing of knowledge including casual conversations, mentoring, stories, brainstorming, and shadowing that address ways in which participants exchange tacit knowledge (Jugdev and Mathur, 2006a). In PM, team resources have been associated with the on-time completion of projects (PMI, 2004; Muriithi and Crawford, 2003).

Organisational PM resources have been defined as the extent to which the PM knowledge is distributed, as well as the composition of this knowledge (Mahroeian and Forozia, 2012). PM organisational resources include both explicit resources such as policies, rules and standards and tacit resources (CIC, 2003) such as norms, values, and routines (Ekinge et al., 2000). In PM, tacit organisational resources can influence the success and failure of complex projects (Verma,
Belassi et al. (2007) found a significant relationship between the presence of supportive policies for project management and new product development project success. Further, firms with project-oriented routines (Doolen et al., 2003) are associated with higher levels of technology transfer (Gopalakrishnan and Santoro, 2004). The previous research on PM resources has identified types (explicit and tacit) and levels (team and organisational) of resources. These paradigms are similar to the types and levels of capacity identified in previous research on NGOs.

3.0 Research Methods

The PM research using an RBV perspective in the private sector organisations mainly carried out by using quantitative approaches (Jugdev and Mathur, 2006a, 2006b). While this method enables the statistical evaluation of relationships, it does not allow the researcher to understand the nature of tacit PM resources in depth. More recent work has suggested the importance of using inductive methodologies to develop theory on PM capacity from the RBV perspective (Jugdev, 2012). Further, the unique characteristics of NGO projects as identified in section 1.1 indicates that these firms may have resource configurations and types that vary from private and public sector organisations examined in previous research. Since in the NGOs’ sectors, the PM resources and capacity still have not been identified, this research adopts an inductive perspective with the aim of generating theory by looking at patterns in the data (Maylor and Blackmon, 2005). It uses an exploratory multiple case study approach; using multiple sources of evidence (Hancock and Algozzine, 2015; Yin, 2009) to investigate the contemporary phenomenon of NGO PM capacity within its real-life context.
3.1. Research Setting

The setting of research, Sri Lanka, is an appropriate environment to examine NGO activities. While Sri Lanka’s voluntary sector has existed since ancient times (Orjuela, 2005; Wanigaratne, 1997), recent events have resulted in the country’s need for NGO support. Sri Lanka was the setting for a violent civil war, and numerous local NGOs were created specifically as a response to the needs caused by the conflict (Nanthagopan et al., 2015; DeVotta, 2005). Further, the country suffered heavy damage as a result of the 2004 tsunami which killed around 40,000 Sri Lankans. International NGOs funding and operations are growing at present in the country (DeVotta, 2005; Orjuela, 2005). Combined, these two events lead to an immediate increase in NGOs operating out of Sri Lanka as most international donors select to direct aid through NGOs to avoid government mismanagement of funds (DeVotta, 2005).

3.2. Case Selection

A theoretical selection approach was used in order to gather data that most likely to serve the theoretical purpose of research and its questions (Bryman, 2015; Silverman, 2000; Stake, 1995). Cases were selected using a matching strategy (Seawright and Gerring, 2008) in which the researcher selects similar cases fitting into the specified population. For this research, national and international NGOs (national NGOs operate in Sri Lanka only while international NGOs operate in multiple regions) were selected which had similar objectives and undertake similar projects but vary by geographic scope. This enabled comparison of PM capacity at multiple levels between organisations that operated in single vs multiple contexts, enabling the identification of a wider range of PM resources. The most similar setting employs a minimum of two cases (Skocpol and Somers, 1980). Eisenhardt (1989) suggested that there is no rule for the ideal number of cases; however, a number between four and ten usually works well. Therefore,
the researcher selected four cases from the NGOs to do in-depth analysis on PM resources and find similar patterns to identify the PM capacity. The cases have been reached theoretical saturation (Emmel, 2013; Eisenhardt, 1989). The NGOs are divided into two groups: governance and management. The study only considers the project management staff and each case represents seven project staff members. It includes project managers and officers. The case study does not include governance since the projects are mostly carried out by the management staff, so they are more experienced in project management. Therefore, the researcher should be able to gain much relevant information from the project staff. The case study approach is summarised in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining research question</td>
<td>How does project management capacity support the successful delivery of projects in NGOs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting cases</td>
<td>Four cases selected, based on the most similar setting theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafting instruments and protocols</td>
<td>In-depth interviews and semi-structured interviews are organised to identify the existing PM resources and confirm the PM capacities of NGOs. For the interview instruments, an open format questionnaire is used to collect data through face-to-face and Skype interviews. Archival data: The NGOs’ PM documents and tools are reviewed to verify information provided from interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse the data</td>
<td>All interviews are recorded by using audio recording aids and fully transcribed, coded and analysed. Visual mapping diagram is used to show the pattern of PM capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaching closure</td>
<td>All coding of interviews are grouped under the relevant levels and linking of PM resources and capacity is illustrated with the help of Visual Mapping strategy. The data collection is completed with data saturation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Case Study Protocol
3.3. Implementation of Exploratory Case Study

The in-depth interviews and semi-structured interviews were organised to explore the themes for the study. These techniques helped the researcher to obtain qualitative data from the project managers where they discussed PM practices in NGOs. Additionally, archival data helped verify what tangible PM resources are applied in NGOs. The researcher used open questionnaires to provide opportunities for in-depth data collection. Initially, two pretesting interviews – one participant from local NGO, and one participant from an international NGO – were conducted to understand the nature of the diversity of PM resources in NGOs. The case study coding table was prepared with the help of pretesting interviews and further helped plan and design the first stage of the in-depth interviews to explore deeply PM resources in NGOs.

After the pretesting interviews, four case studies were conducted in two stages. The first stage of interviews was done to explore PM resources and capacities. Twenty project staff members, five from each selected NGO, were interviewed. The second phase was conducted to confirm the first-phase findings. Eight senior project staff members, two from each selected NGO, were interviewed. In the first stage, an open questionnaire was used by the researcher. Although this is an in-depth interview, the researcher did not impose the predetermined questions and the participants were given opportunities to discuss whole PM practices in the NGO in order to draw deep exploration of themes. The second stage of the open questionnaire used for semi-structured interviews. This was conducted after the themes explored in each division of the first-stage interviews and aimed to confirm or modify the themes explored.
4.0. Exploratory Case Study Results

All interviews were recorded using audio recording aids and fully transcribed and coded with Excel spreadsheet. All coding of interviews has been grouped under the relevant three levels: team, organisational and collaborative social capacities. The explored elements of PM resources and key dimensions detected in four case studies in the first phase of in-depth interviews are described in the Table 5 (Annexure 1). The first column shows the explored elements and the second column explains the key dimensions based in the explored elements. The third column presents how many times specific elements were reported in the four case studies (C: Case). The reported times specified are useful to see the respondents’ ease or familiarity in recalling their PM applications. However, these numerical codes are not used to analyse the elements of PM resources. The PM resources have been classified based on the detected elements from the first and second stages of the case study results. The total number of counts of respondents is 978 times. Team PM capacity, organisational PM capacity and collaborative social PM capacity were counted 157, 578 and 243 times respectively. Five key dimensions were counted frequently (>50 codes) in the case study interviews. Those are: PM tools and techniques (146), Formal meetings for sharing knowledge (92), PM methodology, standards and process (71), PM office (59), and Project marketing (55).

4.1. Results: Overview of PM Capacities in NGOS

The case study interviews identified three types of PM capacity, namely, team, organisational and collaborative social capacities. The visual mapping diagram (Figure 3) presents a framework for PM capacities in NGOs that consists of three types: Team, Organisational and Collaborative Social.
These results suggest that PM capacities have three levels: team, organisational and collaborative social levels, where the literature identified PM resources in two levels: team and organisational levels. PM knowledge, skills and processes are evaluated in the team levels known as team PM
capacities, while those assessed in the organisational level are called organisational PM capacities. However, the organisation does not exist in isolation and NGOs interact with a number of stakeholders in order to deliver project activities. These were identified as collaborative social PM capacities, relational resources formed from interaction between the project organisation, teams and external environment stakeholders. As defined in the literature review chapter, explicit knowledge is codified and could be stored in physical or virtual databases and tacit knowledge is context specific, hard to formalise and can only be transferred through human interactions. However, in practice these explicit and tacit resources are mixed and interdependent (Evans and Easterby, 2001; Crossan et al., 1999; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995). This research confirms that NGOs have a combination of both of these resource types as part of each PM capacity (Botha et al., 2008; Inkpen and Dinur, 1998).

The study identified a new capacity called collaborative social PM capacity in the NGOs context. The NGOs operate in the turbulent environment and all work for providing better service to the vulnerable community to improve their living conditions. As therefore, the collaborative resources highly support to the NGOs for getting appropriate field level information, sharing knowledge and skills among the stakeholders, undertaking joint projects to address complex community issues emerging from turbulent natural, economic and social environment.

5. Analysis and Discussion: Three Levels of PM Capacity

This section analyses each three level of PM capacities in the RBV perspective, with regard to explicit and tacit insights. The findings of the qualitative case study are discussed below in the context of literature review.
5.1. Team PM Capacity

Team PM Capacity consists of team PM knowledge-sharing and skills development process, team PM culture and team competencies which contribute to effective and efficient team performance in an organisation. Lusthaus (1995) emphasises enhancing team individual abilities in pursuit of organisational objectives will improve organisational performance. Many researchers emphasised team works increase productivity and effective teams are more profitable to organisations (Katzenbach, 1998; McGovern, 1991; Goodman, 1986). In NGO literature, team level generic capacities were identified as important assets for NGOs to sustain in the community (Tozier de la Poterie, 2011). However, the nature of these capacities was not examined in detail. The present study confirms that many of team PM resources identified in private sector organisations are also applicable to NGOs.

In the present case study, all identified elements of team PM capacity in NGOs are highly characteristic of tacit assets. Commonly, team knowledge-sharing activities take place informally where the team acquires knowledge and skills through team interactions. Moreover, team values and competencies are highly in-built within the teams. Therefore, these are intuitive knowledge and rooted in team context, experience, practice and values (Ghosh and Scott, 2009; Cook and Brown, 1999). Therefore, these tacit PM resources are highly important to NGOs for successful delivery of projects. Hence, these tacit assets are crucial for NGO success.

The PM literature review revealed the following PM resources in the private sector organisations; Project management expertise, project management practices, informal meetings, project orientation programs, peer learning, on-the-job training, personal coaching and training
and mentoring (Ofori and Julian, 2014; Mathur et al. 2013; Rose et al., 2007; Jugdev and Mathur, 2006a; Dainty et al., 2005). However, PM researches were not revealed the team PM resources in the public and non-governmental organisations in the past.

The case study identified ten elements of PM resources in NGO sectors. Out of these, the first six elements – casual conversations and informal meetings, brainstorming sessions, field visits, on-the-job training, job shadowing and mentoring, and success and failure stories – explain PM knowledge and skills development of team members through team knowledge-sharing and skills development activities. These activities commonly take place through team social interactions. The other four elements – team cohesion and trust, team values, team PM expertise and Team best PM practices – explain team PM culture and competencies. All these aspects overall develop team PM capacities.

The literature has discussed PM knowledge and skills development and PM competencies to the successive project operations of private sector organisations. Research in NGOs has identified the importance of management structures (Khan et al., 2000) and appropriate team skills (Youker, 2003). The findings of this case study extend previous work to identify the importance of PM team culture. Since NGOs operate in the complex uncertain environments, a PM team culture is required to ensure that member skills are coordinated to generate appropriate outcomes. The respondents’ quotations on all the identified elements of PM capacity that take place in NGOs and their importance are explained in Table 2 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Team PM Capacity</th>
<th>Some Quotes of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Casual Conversations and Informal Meetings       | “We have face-to-face informal discussions among staff members to share our project experiences.”  
“We have informal table-to-table discussions in our office place to share PM knowledge among our staff members.”                                                                                                              |
| Brainstorming Sessions                          | We regularly organise brainstorming sessions in our team level to find out solutions to project related issues.”  
“Whenever we come across problems in projects, we organise brainstorming activities to identify appropriate PM solutions.”                                                                                               |
| Field Visits                                     | “We have field visits and field-level discussions to discuss our experiences of project progress.”  
“We used to have exposure visits; all other project staff members in similar projects from other areas will visit our project site and observe our project’s progress. Mainly, we explain our project activities and technical works to them and get their suggestions on our execution of project activities.” |
| On-the-job Training                              | “We used to undergo on-the-job-training from our team manager to improve our project planning skills.”  
“Most times, I got the on-the-job training in the field level to improve my specific technical skills.”                                                                                                        |
| Job Shadowing and Mentoring                     | “When I joined as new staff in my organisation, I had a job shadowing activity to learn how to carry out participatory rural appraisal in a village.”  
“Mentoring sessions helped me to expand my project planning skills.”                                                                                                                                                |
| Success and Failure Stories                      | “Mostly foreign delegates tell us success and failure stories of their work experiences in different countries. This is very helpful for us to know what best PM practices are.”  
“Success stories of others motivated us to make our projects a success.”                                                                                                                                           |
| Team Cohesion and Trust                          | “Our team members are highly trusted by each other; this is a vital reason for our project success.”  
“Team cohesion and trust lead to achieve our project objectives.”                                                                                                                                                 |
| Team PM Values                                   | “Our team members have strong belief in PM applications which will improve their performance.”  
“We have confidence that team work will bring synergistic effects more than working alone.”                                                                                                                        |
| Team PM Expertise                                | “Our project staff well understand the project life cycle and operations and they have very good expertise in planning and implementing the projects, which make us succeed our projects.”  
“We have very experienced and competent staff for our projects. They effectively apply PM tools and techniques in project activities.”                                                                    |
| Team Best PM Practices                           | “Our team members do not strongly adhere by best practices; however, we generally follow our own NGO standards rather than global standards set by private accredited associations.”  
“We understand the PM global standards less and practising those less in our project operations. However, we understand best PM practices make our team more effective in our project operations.” |

Source: Case Study data

Table 2: Elements of Team PM Capacity
5.2. Organisational PM Capacity

Organisational PM capacity can be referred as PM resources, knowledge and processes employed by the organisations. Previous studies on NGOs emphasised that organisational-level generic capacities influence organisational performance and organisational effectiveness (Connolly and Lukas, 2002; De Vita et al., 2001; Lusthaus et al., 1999; Lusthaus, 1995). However, PM capacities in the organisational level were less discussed in the NGO PM literature (Ika, 2012). However, organisational PM resources were substantially explored by previous researchers in private sector organisations (Mahroeian and Forozia, 2012; Mathur et al., 2007) and the following resources were identified; Staff capacity-building programs, effective project coordination and leadership, shared project vision, objectives and policy, effective project communications, project organizational structure and process for sharing knowledge (Kaleshovska, 2014, Caniels and Bakens, 2012; Hurt and Thomas; 2009; Raymond and Bergeron, 2008; Jugdev and Mathur (2006a); White and Fortune, 2002). In Public sector organisations, various PM tools and techniques were identified (Milosevic, 2003; Kliem and Ludin, 1999). Further, in non-profit sector organisations, more specific PM tools and techniques; logical framework matrix and cause-and-effect diagrams (Ika and Lytvynov, 2011; Carroll and Kellow, 2011), monitoring and evaluation systems (Bornstein, 2006; Mebrahtu, 2002), staff capacity building activities (Fowler, 2013) were identified.

The case studies revealed that explicit resources are widely held in the PM organisational capacity except organisational PM culture. This means organisational PM resources will be kept as written documents and/or transferable means in forms such as audio, video and software. Therefore, organisational capacities are commonly formal and easily transferable. These
resources impart knowledge and skills more objectively while team PM resources are conveyed highly implicitly to staff. In addition, the case study discovered team PM capacities are inherent capacities to the organisation and not easily codified or transferable. However, organisational PM capacities are overt capacities which are easily codified and transferable. Subsequently, the case study findings ensure that team PM capacities (tacit resources) which generate organisational explicit PM resources and organisational PM capacities (explicit resources) facilitate generate team PM capacities. This reconfirms the findings of Cook and Brown (1999) which pointed out that each type of knowledge can be used to facilitate the acquisition of other knowledge.

Higher-level organisational PM capacities reflect that an organisation practices PM knowledge, skills, tools and techniques at a very superior level in their project operations, and organisational culture and leadership are highly supportive of greater PM practices in organisations. These capacities are highly important to execute projects well and achieve PM success. While most elements of organisational PM capacity are explicit, organisational PM culture combines explicit and tacit PM aspects (Cheyne and Loan-Clarke, 2009). This resource consists of organisational setting, well-articulated values and beliefs to the project teams by way of policies or written documents. Therefore, acquired culture belongs more to tacit resources and designed structure, and written policies of PM culture fits more with explicit resource. All these aspects overall develop organisational PM capacities.

The literature in NGOs, highly focused on more specific PM tools and techniques and staff capacity building programs as organisational capacities, however, the case study revealed more
elements of organisational capacity such as PM information system, formal meetings for sharing knowledge, effective project communications system and technology and defined organisational PM culture as crucial elements for project success of NGOs. The resources identified in the case study are more similar to the resources identified in private sectors since the NGOs currently like private sectors operate high complexity of projects for rebuilding vulnerable communities. The respondents’ quotations on all the identified elements of PM capacity that take place in NGOs and their importance are summarised in Table 3 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Organisational PM Capacity</th>
<th>Some Quotes of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Effective PM Office | “The PMO provide technical support and other all support to field. Usually, PMO staff visit the fields and give necessary advice.”  
“The PMO is a centre of coordination and support for us. The PMO gives all necessary support to the project staff for successful project delivery.” |
| PM Methodology, Standards and Processes | “We have a program guideline manual to implement our projects, which is specifically developed to effectively execute our projects.”  
“We mostly use the PM methodologies designed by our organisation and those specially designed for NGOs for global practice, for example, the Sphere Handbook for Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response.” |
| PM Tools and Techniques | “In the needs identification stage, we use PM tools such as Venn diagram, resource mapping, problem tree analysis, needs prioritisation list, objective tree analysis, seasonal calendar, and stakeholder mapping and PM techniques as participatory rural appraisal (PRA), rapid rural appraisal (RRA), and participatory network analysis (PNA).”  
“In the planning stage, we use PM tools such as Logical Framework Matrix (LFM), action plan, Gantt chart, and monthly and weekly work plans and PM techniques such as results based management and rights based approach.” |
| PM Information System | “We don’t have very extensive applications of PMIS in our projects since it is hard to practise.”  
“We use PM software which is designed by our organisation to track our project progress in some cases.” |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism | “We use appropriate M & E mechanisms in our organisation to meet the requirements of stakeholders sufficiently.”  
“We have mid-, end- and post-evaluation plans and also conduct field-level assessments, desk-based assessments, and pocket-based assessments to evaluate progress and outcomes of our projects.” |
| Staff Capacity-building Programs | “We usually get training in project planning, proposal writing, monitoring and application of PM tools and techniques, which help us for performing our operations.”  
“I had no experience in NGOs project work when I joined this NGO as monitoring and evaluation officer. After capacity building training was provided to me, I became confident holding meetings with communities, donors and project teams to monitor and evaluate project activities.” |
| Formal Meetings for Sharing Knowledge | “We conduct monthly meetings, milestone meetings and senior management meetings which help us to report our project progress and get suggestions from other team members.”  
“Project review meetings where we discuss the ongoing issues of projects; usually we have weekly and monthly review meetings.” |
| Effective Project Communications System and Technology | “We do telephone, e-mail, and Skype communications among our staff members and those are effective for communicating our information.”  
“We do have a network sharing system. This means we have shared folders within our organisation. Any staff can access all information within our organisation from anywhere and can share their experiences through emails.” |
| Defined Organisational PM Culture | “Organisational culture should promote results-based management, transparency and accountability; which will induce effective team work in organisations.”  
“Organisational culture will influence team members’ performance, and give appropriate direction for everyone to lead the projects to a success.” |
| Supportive Organisational Leadership to PM | “Project-centred visionary leadership and values are the most important factors to project success.”  
“Actually, we are in the top management, we call it senior management. We provide technical support and M & E support to the project teams.” |

Table 3: Elements of Organisational PM Capacity  
Source: Case Study data
5.3. Collaborative Social PM Capacities

Team and organisational PM capacities were discussed in terms of explicit and tacit resources and exist within the organisational level. Team PM capacity consists of highly tacit resources and organisational PM capacity comprises of highly explicit resources. Collaborative social PM capacities combines both types of resources as it comprises of formal/ know-what (explicit) and informal/ know-how (tacit) elements. It differs from both team and organisational capacity as it is a systemic level capacity that can support both team and organisational resources with new knowledge from external sources. The collaborations are founded in trusted relationships and vital for project success (Tansley and Newell, 2007). Bjork et al (2011) emphasises the networking activities improves the project performance in organisations. Burn (2004) highlights receiving information from the external setting promotes organisations getting new knowledge and achieving competitive advantage. Collaborative social PM capacity has been revealed as a new capacity to the existing literature and these are most important to NGOs successful operations.

Since NGOs are non-profit mission-driven organisations, unlike private sector organisations, they face limits on how they can direct their resources and they are formally accountable to their stakeholders. These stakeholders are heterogeneous and have different needs and objectives (Reed et al., 2006). Also, in developing countries such as Sri Lanka, institutions (government/regulations) may not be very strong (DeVotta, 2005). As a result, the environments in which these organisations operate are characterised by a high degree of uncertainty with little access to detailed reliable data to support project design and delivery. One respondent stated:
“The developing countries like Sri Lanka; collaborative social PM capacity is a very important asset for NGOs as knowledge gap is a big issue for us.” (CPC 2)

Therefore, focusing only on the internal team and organisational capacities – such as informal (tacit) team values, mentoring and story-telling – or formal (explicit) processes – such as methodologies, processes and tools – may not be able to support the required adaption to host community requirements. These, collaborative social capacities can enable NGOs to configure team and organisational resources appropriately in the host environment. Further, the case study identified that collaborative social PM capacities could be seen in two types as formal collaborative social PM capacities and informal collaborative social PM capacities. Subsequently, both capacities were explored as crucial for NGOs to attain new ideas for successfully implementing projects for improving community benefits. Liu and Liu (2008) say organisations relying only on within-the-boundary are not adequate to meet competitive forces. Hence, absorbing external knowledge is indispensable for survival of organisations (Liu and Liu, 2008; Grant, 1996).

Formal collaborative social capacity refers to the capacity of the organisation to formally receive knowledge and advisory recommendations from external networking sources. The case study identified knowledge transfer takes place in NGOs with external bodies through formal means such as project advisory from government bodies, project advisory from donors, NGOs intra and consortium meetings, official information releases and joint project formal interactions. Informal collaborative social capacity refers to the capacity of the organisation for getting knowledge from informal external interactions. The case study explored that informal knowledge transfer takes place with external bodies such as joint project informal interactions, networking relations
with stakeholders, beneficiary integration in projects, project marketing, and community of practice through online social networks. One respondent commented on the importance of informal collaborative capacity as quoted below.

“From my personal experience, I could say that informal knowledge sharing is the most important and gives more knowledge to us than formal collaborative capacity. Sometimes, formal sources don’t give all knowledge and skills to us and people fail to impart their knowledge to others. But, informal interactions make our works more effective. For example, having informal discussions with stakeholders, community discussions and community of practice give more skills to me to develop my personal competency.” *(CPC4)*

Further, the case study reveals that both capacities are vital exclusively for local NGOs which function in developing countries like Sri Lanka because people who work in these NGOs comparably have fewer or lower PM competencies compared with people who work in international NGOs. Therefore, absorbing knowledge from experts promotes performance of team members. At the same time, the collaborative means promotes team members’ successive project operations through knowledge transfer not only between the NGOs but also among the stakeholders, such as community, donors and government agencies. The literature more focused on team and organisational resources. However, the case study newly identified the collaborative social PM capacity to the existing PM literature. NGOs are required to manage political, social, legal, technical and cultural issues in host environments (Struyk, 2007). Managing these factors may require stakeholder engagement in order to develop approaches that are sensitive to the host country (Yu and Leung 2015). All the identified elements of collaborative social PM capacity are explained with the quotations of respondents in Table 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Elements of Collaborative Social PM Capacity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Some Quotes of Respondents</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project Advisory from Government Bodies       | “In government agent review meetings of NGO projects, we get useful suggestions and ideas from government staff for our projects.”  
|                                                | “In some projects, we work with government authorities, especially in disaster management, education and health; we need to adhere to government advisory and policy.” |
| Project Advisory from Donors                  | “Donors visit every three months and review the progress of projects and will give their expert advisory to the project staff.”  
|                                                | “Donors’ advisory makes our projects more effective and sustainable.” |
| NGOs’ Intra and Consortium Meetings            | “At district level, we do have consortium meetings. A consortium, in a sense, is a group of NGOs registered under one umbrella. In this meeting, every NGO presents their challenges, opportunities and plans.”  
|                                                | “NGO sector-wise meetings inform each NGO’s projects and progress to other NGOs.” |
| Official Information Releases                  | “Government releases the NGOs’ project information on their own websites, which help us to see the information of all NGOs and what they are involved in.”  
|                                                | “We distribute news letters to our stakeholders and receive news letters from other NGOs in which every NGO explains their projects.” |
| Joint Projects Formal Interactions             | “We do have formal meetings with our partner organisations where we discuss our projects’ progress, issues and solutions.”  
|                                                | “Joint formal meetings are very useful to share project views among staff.” |
| Joint Projects Informal Interactions           | “Joint field visits where we both (our organisation and partner organisation) will visit the field and will have discussions.”  
|                                                | “In some cases, we visit other countries and observe their project mechanisms. I have visited Cambodia and learnt their system for livelihood projects. This gave me very good experience to work locally.” |
| Networking Relations with Stakeholders         | “We have informal meetings with grassroot level organisations and attend the events organised by them, where we share our project information between us.”  
|                                                | “Networking relationships with beneficiaries and other NGOs support us to implement our projects very successfully.” |
| Beneficiary Integration in Projects            | “Making beneficiaries implement the projects and we do only the observation and advice. For example, we established a livelihoods co-operative society and allowed the community to run it. In this project, the community will implement the project and we will give necessary advice, ideas and trainings to them.”  
|                                                | “This is the most important capacity for NGOs to take all the knowledge and skills from outside of the organisations. Mainly, community knowledge and skills are the most important capacity that we need to use.” |
| Project Marketing                             | “We conduct project inauguration meetings with the stakeholders. In this meeting, we disclose all information on the project and planned activities; and there, stakeholders share their views over projects.”  
|                                                | “We organise awareness programs and displays about projects to community people to get their views on our projects. These greatly help us to amend our projects to meet community requirements.” |
| Community of Practice through Online Social Networks | “On-line social networking gives more new ideas on project practices. It gives more confidence to the project staff to get ideas from similar practices from the professionals of other organisations and from other countries.”  
|                                                | “On-line social networks sometimes help to solve our technical issues in projects.” |

Source: Case Study data

**Table 4: Elements of Collaborative Social PM Capacity**
6. Conclusion and Implications

The RBV has been increasingly applied to explain the activities of firms as it forms an adaptable framework for building theories (Kogut and Zander 2003). This research has identified the resources that underpin PM capacity in NGOs and has highlighted the importance of intangible resources. This is important as in uncertain environments where NGOs operate, explicit resources such as maturity models have less value than resources that are built via actors (Grant 1996) in interaction with the environment (Jones and Khanna 2006).

A new PM capacity, Collaborative Social PM capacity has been identified in this study. This can enable NGOs to adapt to external environment by acquiring external knowledge via a network of relationships to develop other internal PM capacities. For NGOs, these capacities will be critical to get the knowledge, skills, tools and techniques from the other NGOs or stakeholders and collaborative works with other NGOs can improve the effective delivery of community projects. Future research can examine this capacity in additional detail, as it suggests that organizations, both public and private can engage stakeholders to manage external uncertainty. This extends research from examining approaches to proactively manage stakeholders to a wider range of network based engagement strategies that deliver mutual benefit. For managers, there is a need to examine how stakeholders can extend the organizations’ sensing and scanning capabilities to support the adaptations necessary to operate in uncertain environments.

The research has also identified the value of the RBV as an appropriate method to analyse PM capacity in NGOs. While in the PM literature, tangible assets are increasingly discussed and
promoted as a source of competitive advantage and PM intangibles assets have not been focussed (Jugdev, 2011). The PM models do not emphasize organisational processes and practices and typically lack a connection between operations management and strategy. Few PM models have been empirically tested and many are based on codified best practices that may need to be adapted in the environments in which NGOs operate (Jugdev, 2011). This research has been able to identify the resources that enable NGOs to meet the complex challenges of stakeholders in difficult environments.

Past research has highlighted that even though organisations are deeply concerned about developing traditional organisational capacities, such as building organisational systems and structures, human resource development, financial resource development and leadership capacity development (Wachira, 2008; Bryson, 2004), NGOs’ projects have a high failure rate in terms of meeting quality, timeliness and being on budget to eradicate poverty and vulnerability (Ika, 2012; Dedu et al., 2011). Therefore, this study finding help organisations to understand the nature of PM capacities in NGOs and how can these be developed for NGOs’ project to succeed. The study reveals that three levels of PM capacity exist in NGOs. Those are team capacity, organisational capacity, and collaborative social capacity. This expands on the common conceptualization of two levels of resources (team and organizational) in existing work. PM practitioners and NGOs not only need to work to develop the first two levels, but also need to formally develop collaborative social capacity. Improvements in how projects are delivered by NGOs will enable them to meet their stakeholders’ needs and their stated objectives effectively such as quality specifications, budget and time schedules and improving specific conditions in
community. These concepts can be incorporated into the design of future tools including maturity models that can help NGOs improve project performance.

From an academic perspective, Collaborative Social capacity can be explored further to identify if it is present in differing industries and contexts. This capacity may be valuable in helping organizations other than NGOs adapt to complex, uncertain environments such as high technology which is characterized by rapid change. Further empirical study is needed to examine the relationship between these PM capacities and the project success of NGOs and need further more investigation on collaborative social PM capacities which are revealed as new capacity to the existing literature.
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### Annexure 1:

#### Table 5: Detecting Elements of PM resources and Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detected Elements across the data set</th>
<th>Key Dimensions</th>
<th>No of counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Informal meetings</td>
<td>Informal Meetings</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills and Experience Sharing meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience sharing discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson-learning sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Discussions with colleagues</td>
<td>Casual Conversations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do brainstorming sessions to discuss important issues</td>
<td>Brainstorming Sessions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We organise sessions to generate new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do brainstorming sessions to find out better solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field level discussions</td>
<td>Field Level Discussions &amp; Review Visits</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field level meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review visits and discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review visits and observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do personal coaching sessions</td>
<td>Personal Coaching</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We got personal coacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did on job training in the field level</td>
<td>On-the job training</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On job training we use to share our skills to junior staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadowing through observations</td>
<td>Job shadowing &amp; Mentoring</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadowing through meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring sessions and expert guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases discussions</td>
<td>Case Studies &amp; Success Stories</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study writings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success story-telling and presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing people under one program team changing their mind set under one common goal</td>
<td>Team Cohesion and Trust</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some staffs are not willing to work together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people are facing difficulties to adopt team culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Transparency</td>
<td>Team Values</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following team norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working for the team objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team work and team commitment are more important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have very committed team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting members suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the resources at maximum level by doing proper planning and controlling.</td>
<td>Deeper understanding of project Lifecycle and operations</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of project life cycle and operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We got very experienced and competent staff</td>
<td>PM Expertise</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management experience is good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong PM skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good PM practices</td>
<td>Best PM Practices</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have improved in all stages of our process</td>
<td>Synthesise new knowledge in PM</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We design new tools for PM practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing tailor-made software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We got project office</td>
<td>PM Office &amp; Structure</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project organisation , Matrix, Functional, effective structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Plan, Work break down structure, Gantt Chart, budget, Logic frame, Check List, LFM, Venn diagram, Resource Mapping, Problem tree analysis, objective tree analysis, Network Analysis, Seasonal Calendar, Risk Mapping, Service delivery analysis, Step by step guide, Social Mapping, Income circle, Structural/Architectural design, implementation plan, PM Software, Stakeholder mapping, Analysis software, Indicators, BOQs, Village development plan, Needs prioritisation list, Operational Plan, Work plan, Monthly and weekly plans, Staff monthly targets, Risk planning</td>
<td>PM Tools &amp; Techniques</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory needs identification, Vulnerable capacity assessment, Right based approach, Data collection, PRA (Participatory Rural Appraisal), Observations, Interviews, Questionnaires, Results based management, Results Based Reporting, Base Line survey, End Line Survey, Secondary data, RRA (Rapid rural appraisal), PNA (Participatory Network Analysis), Bottom Up Approach, Tailor-Made Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Information System (PMIS), Knowledge management system, Executive Decision tools, Data base management</td>
<td>PM Information System</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process and Impact Monitoring plan, Sustainability Plan, Evaluation plan, Field reports, Complaint mechanism, Standard manual for M &amp; E, M&amp;E framework, Internal and external audit, suggestion box from community, Review visits, indicators, Mid evaluation plan, End evaluation plan, Post evaluation plan, Field level assessment, Desk based assessments, Pocket based assessments</td>
<td>Project M &amp; E Mechanism</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training, Short courses, Online courses, PM certifications, Formal PM courses, capacity-building trainings, Foreign workshops</td>
<td>Staff Capacity-building programs</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction programs, Superior staff inform to the junior staff, Diary, Wall hanger, Meetings, Handbooks, staff meetings, workshops, Project orientation programs</td>
<td>Shared project vision, objectives and policy</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Meetings, Formal Meetings, Reporting, Annual program review, Displays in boards, Technical Meetings, Online documents, Open documents, project meetings, staff meetings, Review meetings, Planning meetings, Integration meetings, Regular meetings, Team planning, Field level discussions, Field level reports, M&amp;E Co-group meetings, Milestone meetings, Project Team meetings, Annual Reports, Meeting minutes</td>
<td>Formal Meetings for sharing knowledge</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Related Skills</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate channel, Telephone, Email, Skype, Online, TELE conference, Facebook, Network-sharing system</td>
<td>Effective project communication</td>
<td>17 13 03 04 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job design, Selection of team, Motivation system, Rewarding system, Career path</td>
<td>Right team selection, Team motivation &amp; Career path</td>
<td>14 03 05 05 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation culture promotes project works and its transparency</td>
<td>Supportive organisational Culture to PM</td>
<td>07 02 04 00 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor guidance, project manager guidance, conducting project review meetings, conducting financial review meetings, Monthly meetings (Bottle neck), Management level meetings, Technical Support, Planning support, Report writing, proposal development, Advisory in implementation, M &amp;E support</td>
<td>Supportive Organisational Leadership to PM</td>
<td>02 13 01 23 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support, Project Approval, Policy &amp; Guidance, Government advocacy, Meetings, GA review, Government policy</td>
<td>Project Advisory from Government Bodies</td>
<td>06 03 02 05 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support, Guidance, Field level discussions, Project review discussions, Planning and implementing support</td>
<td>Project Advisory from Donors</td>
<td>01 02 03 05 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular meetings, Intra forum, Cluster meetings, Peer review meetings, Partners meetings, Consortium meetings, Coordination meetings, Sectoral meetings</td>
<td>Intra and Consortium meetings</td>
<td>07 01 01 07 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community advocacy</td>
<td>Community Advocacy</td>
<td>01 00 01 00 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines, Publications, Websites, Social media, Meetings, Leaflets, ministry level meetings, Broachers, final reports, Regional Manual, Reports, Government websites, Letters</td>
<td>Official Information releases</td>
<td>08 05 04 13 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint planning, Joint implementation, Participatory monitoring, Regular meetings, Group Discussions, informal meetings, Lesson-learning sessions, Outsourcing programs, Technical support, Inter-exposure visits, Joint field visits, Peer group discussions</td>
<td>Joint project Interactions</td>
<td>08 09 07 13 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face discussions, telephone, email, video conferences and meetings, Informal interactions, informal meetings, experience sharing meetings, Stakeholders informal meetings, CBOs Meetings, Focus group discussions</td>
<td>Networking with stakeholders</td>
<td>10 10 05 07 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Technical, Decision-making, Implementing, Experience sharing, Meetings, Review meetings, CBOs meetings, Producer group discussions, community level meetings, Complaint Box</td>
<td>Beneficiary integration in projects</td>
<td>03 04 06 08 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inauguration programs, Propaganda programs, Meetings, Awareness programs, Home Visits, Exhibitions, Theater Program, Stakeholders meetings, community meetings, stakeholders meetings, Notice board, Direct interviews,</td>
<td>Project Marketing</td>
<td>14 17 10 14 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook, Community discussions, Twitter, Google, Internal Websites, Project review with partners, Discussions with beneficiary, informal meetings, Delegates/Expatriates sharing their experiences, Delegates Visits and discussions, Exposure visits to other countries, International Forums, Regional conferences</td>
<td>Community of practice</td>
<td>02 08 06 07 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>