KPMG

PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT SURVEY 2002

Executive summary

Introduction

This year's survey focused on the programme office and identified a number of trends, future goals and success factors in relation to the programme office and its impact on project performance. A total of 134 companies from a range of sectors, geographies and size groups participated .

This survey enables participating companies, and indeed others, to benchmark themselves against the survey findings and in so doing perhaps identify programme management improvement areas that in turn may improve return on investment and market competitiveness.

Key findings

- Over half, 56 percent, of companies surveyed had experienced a failed project within the past 12 months;

- The average cost of a failed project was just under UKP8m;

- Almost all, 98 percent, of participants with a mature programme office (PO) reported 100 percent successful project delivery. This project delivery success rate reduced to 76 percent for those with grown-up POs and to 53 percent for those with established, but immature, POs;

- Participants highlighted the importance of strong:

    - Business focus;
    - Project governance;
    - Risk management;
    - Progress reporting;
    - Supporting infrastructure;
    - Emphasis on strategic fit and benefits delivery.

- Participants emphasised the importance of having clear project objectives and strong ongoing risk and issue management during project execution;

- Participants stressed the importance of team and individual motivation and morale and therefore strong leadership;

- Learning curve and scale advantages were identified as, on average, the cost of running a mature PO was 2 percent of the value of projects managed compared to 3 percent for others;

- Successful PO's are professional business functions that have a high level of acceptance and profile with organisations;

- Participants aspirations for the future suggest a continuing drive towards increased automation and adoption of integrated PO tools.

Conclusion

Projects are one of the ubiquitous aspects of business management and, as reinforced by the survey, the investment in projects across all industry sectors, geographies and size groups is very significant.

Projects are the predominate vehicle for delivering the change and business improvement required to create competitive edge and enhance shareholder value. Therefore the importance of improving project delivery performance cannot be underestimated.

Given the strong correlation between programme office maturity and project success rates and the identified learning curve benefits, KPMG predicts that organisations may continue to invest to build professional, well equipped and executive sponsored programme offices. These POs will work with the business and fulfil the roles of catalysts, conductors and referees of change for a broadening range of business change initiatives.

Programme Management Survey
Summary of responses

Survey participation
Global participation
- 50 percent of respondents were from the United Kingdom (UK);
- 28 percent were from the Americas (US);
- 22 percent were from other countries (Rest of World):
  - 17 percent from Africa;
  - 4 percent from Europe (excluding UK);
  - 1 percent from Australia.

Industry
- 52 percent of respondents were Financial Service (FS) organisations;
- 25 percent were from Consumer Industrial Markets (CIM) organisations;
- 12 percent were from Information, Communications & Entertainment (ICE) organisations;
- 11 percent were from Infrastructure and Government (I&G) organisations.

Organisation size
- 13 percent had UKP7bn or more in annual revenues ('large');
- 33 percent had more than UKP700m but less than UKP7bn in annual revenues ('medium');
- 54 percent had less than UKP700m in annual revenues ('small').

Performance criteria
Functions provided by the PO
- 90 percent said tracking and reporting;
- 85 percent said coordination;
- 83 percent said communication;
- 76 percent said standards;
- Others specified resource management, benefit tracking, strategic alignment, idea creation, methodology training.

Most important functions
- Tracking and reporting;
- Coordination;
- Communication;
- Standards;
- Governance;
- Risk management;
- Portfolio management;
- Business requirements planning.

Most important measure of success
- 46 percent said meeting business case requirements;
- 21 percent said on-time delivery;
- 9 percent said within budget delivery;
- 24 percent gave all three measures equal weighting.

Methodology
Methodology used by PO
- 81 percent used a homegrown methodology;
- 15 percent used a Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK®) based methodology;
- 4 percent used other methodologies.

Most important elements of PO methodology
- Planning;
- Business case development;
- Risk analysis;
- Issue management;
- Business requirements definition.

Compliance with policies and methodologies
Policy and methodology compliance correlated to failed Projects
- 20 percent of failed projects occurred in POs with stringent compliance.
- 80 percent of failed projects were attributable to POs with moderate or weak compliance.

Compliance monitoring of policies and methodology
- 23 percent said stringent;
- 48 percent said moderate;
- 29 percent said weak.

Some 65 percent of organisations reported that they had no link between compliance and a review/reward system.

Use of tools
Most important tools used by PO
- MS Office Suite;
- MS Project;
- Time recording applications.

A total of 70 percent use MS Project and 34 percent use web-based tools.

Value of technology tools
- 21 percent said high, very effective;
- 73 percent said okay, fairly effective;
- 6 percent said poor, not effective.

Over one third, 35 percent, of web based tool users rated their tools as highly effective. This compared to only 13 percent for non-web based tool users.

Other tools to acquire
- "What if" modelling tool;
- MS Office 2002®;
- Rational® (product suite);
- Digital dashboard/sophisticated reporting tool.

What could the PO do better with technology
- Quality management;
- Risk management;
- Issues management;
- More structure, formalised process and approach;
- Communication among team members.

Perceived value of the PO to the organisation
Senior management value perception of PO
- 43 percent reported the PO was integral to success;
- 44 percent reported the PO was beneficial to the organisation;
- 9 percent were sceptical;
- 4 percent considered the PO an overhead.

Project success factors
Major reasons for success
- Executive sponsorship;
- Thorough preparation and planning;
- Good and clear requirements;
- Quality assurance;
- "Superhuman efforts";
- Clarity of scope;
- Management of stakeholder expectations;
- Project transparency and regular reporting;
- Issues resolution;
- Common goals;
- Small controllable projects;
- Teamwork and leadership;
- Experienced and capable staff;
- Quality control.

Project failures
- 56 percent had failed projects within the past 12 months;
- Average cost of a failed project was just under UKP8m;
- Largest project failure cost UKP133m;
- Average value of PO projects managed for the year was UKP67m;
- Average number of projects managed by a PO was 83;
- Average cost to operate mature POs was 2 percent of project value managed;
- Average cost to operate less mature POs was 3 percent of project value managed.

Major reasons for failure
- Lack of sponsor involvement;
- Poor scope management;
- Poor planning;
- Over-ambitious commitment to deliver in restricted timescale;
- Resource contention;
- Poor communication between IT and the business;
- Misalignment with strategy;
- Quality of code delivered by software vendor;
- Poor change management, compliance with process and lack of understanding;
- "We know it all".

General scope
Type of projects managed by POs
- 49 percent managed all projects;
- 43 percent managed only IT projects;
- 8 percent managed only business initiatives.

POs organisational position
- 37 percent reported to an executive;
- 34 percent reported to IT;
- 10 percent reported within business unit;
- 9 percent reported to operations;
- 3 percent reported to finance;
- 7 percent reported to other areas in the organisation (dependant on the project).

POs reporting line
- 20 percent reported to the CEO or equivalent;
- 37 percent reported to the Executive Director;
- 23 percent reported to a Business Unit Director;
- 20 percent reported lower in their organisation.

PO staffing
- Organisations larger than UKP7bn had an average of 44 personnel;
- Organisations larger than UKP700m and smaller than UKP7bn had an average of 39 personnel;
- Organisations smaller than UKP700m had an average of 12 personnel.

Organisation
Number of POs
- 10 percent did not have a PO;
- 52 percent reported just one PO;
- 28 percent had between 2 to 5 POs in their organisation;
- 10 percent had more than 5 POs.

PO characteristics
- 70 percent used a single process for one or more POs;
- 19 percent used multiple processes and multiple POs;
- 2 percent used multiple processes and one PO;
- 9 percent had no PO or no process for their PO.

Programme office maturity
Maturity correlated to successful projects
- 98 percent of mature POs reported all successful projects;
- 76 percent of grown-up POs reported all successful projects;
- 53 percent of established POs reported all successful projects.

PO maturity classification
- 9 percent mature, very successful;
- 24 percent grown-up, more successes than failures;
- 41 percent established, in need of improvement;
- 26 percent immature.

Most important elements of maturity

■ Developing processes, standards , methodologies and templates;
■ Showing the "Big Picture" of all work underway;
■ Discipline and executive buy-in;
■ Profile and acceptance within the organisation and executive sponsorship;
■ Experienced project managers;
■ Right combination of skills within the PO;
■ Education:
  - 65 percent reported being trained in their discipline;
  - 48 percent had a curriculum to follow to achieve training goals;
  - PO personnel averaged 66 hours of training per year.

Years PO in operation

■ Average years in operation was just under four;
■ 22 percent were under one year old or not yet in operation;
■ Mature POs had been in operation eight or more years.

Is the PO adequately funded for the work undertaken

■ 30 percent said funding was appropriate;
■ 49 percent said funding was adequate;
■ 21 percent said funding was inadequate.

Maturity correlated to where in the organisation the PO Reports

■ 58 percent of mature POs reported to the CEO.
■ 30 percent of immature POs reported to the CEO.

Training and certification
PO staff background

■ 77 percent had an IT background;
■ 58 percent had a general business background;
■ 48 percent had a background in operations;
■ 37 percent had a finance background.

Personnel experience within the PO

■ 13 percent had 0-2 years of programme/project experience;
■ 27 percent had 2-5 years of experience;
■ 40 percent had 5-10 years of experience;
■ 11 percent had 10-20 years of experience;
■ 9 percent had over 20 years of experience.

PMI® certification within the PO

■ 2 percent reported all personnel within the PO were certified;
■ 4 percent reported most personnel were certified;
■ 21 percent reported some personnel certified;
■ 73 percent said no personnel were certified.

Only 39 percent of respondents valued PMI® certification.

Other valuable processes and professional organisations

■ Prince2;
■ Association of Project Managers;
■ IPMA;
■ IEEE;
■ Six Sigma;
■ Various Consultancies;
■ Gartner;
■ CMM-SEI;
■ American Society for Quality;
■ ASTD;
■ CITI Project Discipline;
■ SAICA.

Portfolio management and reporting

Some 74 percent reported they prepare portfolio management reports. Only 44 percent compared project performance to established metrics.

Needed reporting improvements

■ Reporting is cumbersome, project centric and not executive friendly;
■ Not enough integrated data for project management;
■ Not enough exception reporting for project problems;
■ Need more sophisticated financial reporting (budget vs. actual);
■ Need readily available, on line project performance data for business sponsors.

Some 70 percent reported they had a formal, periodic portfolio management process. All of of these reported they made go/hold/cancel decisions during their portfolio management process.

Responsibility for go/hold/cancel decisions

■ 51 percent said the executive committee;
■ 37 percent said the business unit leadership;
■ 12 percent said the CEO or equivalent.

Criteria used to make portfolio decisions

■ 79 percent used strategic alignment as a criteria;
■ 74 percent used commercial value as a criteria;
■ 48 percent used portfolio balance as a criteria;
■ 31 percent used an internal model;
■ 19 percent used social value as a criteria;
■ 9 percent had no formal criteria.

Improvement areas now and future
Ways to be more successful managing projects for the organisation

■ Achieve greater global co-ordination over project activity;
■ Increase the emphasis on portfolio and investment management;
■ Increase the status and capability of the PO;
■ Achieve widespread buy-in to the PO;
■ Disseminate and use common standards and processes;
■ Increase the use of tools;
■ Streamline reporting and make greater use of performance metrics.

Geography, size and industry comparisons

Comparison tables have been included only if a material difference has been identified.

A material difference has been defined as a difference of 10 percentage points or more for a particular variable across the different geographies, industries or size groups.

Geography

Performance criteria
Most important measure of success

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
Meeting business case requirements	46%	59%	30%	46%
On-time delivery	24%	15%	23%	21%
Within budget delivery	13%	3%	7%	9%
Equal weighting to all three measures	17%	23%	40%	24%

Methodology
Methodology used by PO

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
Homegrown methodology	93%	64%	81%	81%
PMI based methodology	2%	31%	19%	15%
Other methodology	5%	5%	0%	4%

Compliance with policies and methodologies
Compliance monitoring

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
Stringent compliance	30%	21%	11%	23%
Moderate compliance	50%	35%	57%	48%
Weak compliance	20%	44%	32%	29%

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
Had link between compliance and a risk/reward system	31%	35%	43%	35%

Use of tools
Value of technology tools

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
High, very effective	25%	15%	21%	21%
Ok, fairly effective	71%	82%	69%	73%
Poor, not effective	4%	3%	10%	6%

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
Use web based tools	28%	43%	33%	34%

Perceived value of the PO to the organisation
Senior management value perception of PO

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
Integral to success	48%	31%	46%	43%
Beneficial to the organisation	43%	50%	36%	44%
Sceptical	7%	8%	14%	9%
Overhead	2%	11%	4%	4%

Project failures

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
Total project value managed	£102m	£37m	£24m	£67m
Average number of projects managed	121	46	43	83
Had failed projects within the last 12 months	61%	43%	60%	56%
Average failed project cost	£13.2m	£3.9m	£1.9m	£7.8m

The largest cost of failure of all participants was from the UK (£133m).

General scope
Type of projects managed by POs

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
All projects	60%	24%	53%	49%
Only IT projects	36%	54%	47%	43%
Only business initiatives	4%	22%	0%	8%

POs organisational position

Reported to	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
An executive	35%	41%	37%	37%
IT	31%	38%	37%	34%
Business unit	13%	5%	10%	10%
Operations	8%	10%	9%	9%
Finance	3%	3%	7%	3%
Other areas (dependent on the project)	10%	3%	0%	7%

Organisation
Number of POs in the organisation

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
None	12%	11%	7%	10%
One	46%	54%	63%	52%
Two to five	30%	30%	20%	28%
Over five	12%	5%	10%	10%

PO Characteristics

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
Single process, single or multiple POs	75%	57%	73%	70%
Multiple processes, multiple POs	16%	27%	17%	19%
Single PO with multiple processes	1%	5%	0%	2%
No process or no PO	8%	11%	10%	9%

Programme office maturity
PO maturity classification

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
Mature, very successful	9%	11%	7%	9%
Grown up, more successes than failures	29%	20%	21%	24%
Established, in need of improvement	36%	40%	52%	41%
Immature	26%	29%	20%	26%

Is the PO adequately funded for the work undertaken

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
Appropriate funding	35%	24%	24%	30%
Adequate funding	50%	42%	55%	49%
Poor funding	15%	34%	21%	21%

Training and certification
PO training/education

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
Reported being trained in their discipline	61%	78%	57%	65%
Had a curriculum to follow to achieve training goals	49%	57%	33%	48%
Average hours of training per year	56	66	90	66

PO staff background

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
IT background	76%	78%	77%	77%
General business background	57%	57%	60%	58%
Operations background	46%	49%	50%	48%
Finance background	36%	43%	30%	37%

PMI® certification within the PO

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
All PMI certified	1%	3%	3%	2%
Most PMI certified	1%	8%	3%	4%
Some PMI certified	13%	38%	17%	21%
None PMI certified	85%	51%	77%	73%

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
Valued PMI® certification	15%	70%	53%	39%

Personnel experience within the PO
(years of programme/ project experience)

Years	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
0-2	13%	20%	7%	13%
2-5	21%	17%	52%	27%
5-10	39%	46%	34%	40%
10-20	15%	11%	3%	11%
Over 20	12%	6%	4%	9%

Portfolio management and reporting

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
Had portfolio management reports	78%	59%	83%	74%
Formal portfolio management process	54%	38%	30%	70%

Responsibility for go/hold/cancel decisions

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
Executive committee	58%	39%	54%	51%
Business unit leadership	34%	45%	32%	37%
CEO or equivalent	8%	16%	14%	12%

Portfolio decision making criteria

	UK	US	Rest of World	Average
Strategic alignment	82%	68%	87%	79%
Commercial value	88%	43%	80%	74%
Portfolio balance	52%	41%	47%	48%
Internal model	36%	27%	27%	31%
Social value	22%	14%	17%	19%
No formal criteria	6%	16%	7%	9%

Industry
Performance criteria
Most important measure of success

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
Meeting business case requirements	56%	39%	7%	44%	46%
On-time delivery	23%	15%	21%	31%	21%
Within budget delivery	6%	12%	22%	6%	9%
Equal weighting to all three measures	15%	34%	50%	19%	24%

Methodology
Methodology used by PO

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
Homegrown methodology	86%	76%	81%	73%	81%
PMI based methodology	12%	18%	13%	20%	15%
Other methodology	2%	6%	6%	7%	4%

Compliance with policies and methodologies
Compliance monitoring

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
Stringent compliance	30%	10%	19%	21%	23%
Moderate compliance	43%	69%	31%	43%	48%
Weak compliance	27%	21%	50%	36%	29%

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
Had link between compliance and a risk/reward system	33%	52%	19%	27%	35%

Use of tools
Value of technology tools

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
High, very effective	16%	25%	21%	33%	21%
Ok, fairly effective	79%	72%	71%	53%	73%
Poor, not effective	5%	3%	8%	14%	6%

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
Use web based tools	24%	39%	44%	53%	34%

Perceived value of the PO to the organisation
Senior management value perception of PO

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
Integral to success	45%	42%	25%	53%	43%
Beneficial to the organisation	45%	48%	44%	27%	44%
Sceptical	7%	6%	25%	7%	9%
Overhead	3%	4%	6%	13%	4%

Project failures

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
Total project value managed (UKP)	86m	36m	59m	62m	67m
Average number of projects managed	121	36	55	38	83
Had failed projects within the last 12 months	59%	52%	63%	47%	56%
Average failed project cost (UKP)	10.8m	2.5m	3.5m	0.8m	7.8m

The largest cost of failure of all participants was from FS (£133m).

General scope
Type of projects managed by POs

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
All projects	61%	27%	50%	33%	49%
Only IT projects	34%	58%	44%	53%	43%
Only business initiatives	5%	15%	6%	14%	8%

POs organisational position

Reported to	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
An executive	41%	34%	24%	38%	37%
IT	28%	50%	41%	25%	34%
Business unit	7%	13%	12%	19%	10%
Operations	9%	0%	23%	13%	9%
Finance	5%	0%	0%	5%	3%
Other areas (dependent on the project)	10%	3%	0%	0%	7%

POs reporting line

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
CEO or equivalent	17%	22%	29%	29%	20%
Executive director	48%	22%	18%	36%	37%
Unit director	21%	31%	29%	7%	23%
Lower in their organisation	14%	25%	24%	28%	20%

PO staffing

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
Average number of personnel	32	19	15	15	25

Organisation
Number of POs in the organisation

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
None	10%	15%	6%	7%	10%
One	47%	61%	50%	60%	52%
Two to five	31%	21%	25%	27%	28%
Over five	12%	3%	19%	6%	10%

PO characteristics

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
Single process, single or multiple POs	76%	76%	44%	53%	70%
Multiple processes, multiple POs	19%	12%	44%	13%	19%
Single PO with multiple processes	1%	0%	0%	13%	2%
No process or no PO	4%	12%	12%	21%	9%

Programme office maturity

PO maturity classification

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
Mature, very successful	9%	13%	7%	7%	9%
Grown up, more successes than failures	26%	28%	20%	13%	24%
Established, in need of improvement	38%	41%	33%	60%	41%
Immature	27%	18%	40%	20%	26%

Years PO in operation

CIM had an average of just under five years in operation. All other industries had an average of just under four years in operation.

Is the PO adequately funded for the work undertaken

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
Appropriate funding	33%	26%	25%	31%	30%
Adequate funding	55%	52%	25%	46%	49%
Poor funding	12%	22%	50%	23%	21%

Training and certification

PO training/education

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
Reported being trained in their discipline	63%	76%	44%	73%	65%
Had a curriculum to follow to achieve training goals	47%	45%	38%	67%	48%
Average hours of training per year	60	74	86	60	66

PO staff background

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
IT background	79%	73%	81%	73%	77%
General business background	64%	36%	81%	47%	58%
Operations background	47%	45%	44%	60%	48%
Finance background	39%	24%	50%	40%	37%

PMI® certification within the PO

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
All PMI certified	1%	6%	0%	0%	2%
Most PMI certified	1%	3%	6%	13%	4%
Some PMI certified	16%	30%	38%	7%	21%
None PMI certified	82%	61%	56%	80%	73%

Personnel experience within the PO (years of programme/ project experience)

Years	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
0-2	12%	16%	7%	21%	13%
2-5	28%	31%	20%	21%	27%
5-10	35%	41%	67%	29%	40%
10-20	11%	6%	6%	29%	11%
Over 20	14%	6%	0%	0%	9%

Portfolio management and reporting

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
Had portfolio Management reports	77%	61%	94%	67%	74%
Formal portfolio Management process	74%	70%	63%	60%	70%

Responsibility for go/hold/cancel decisions

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
Executive committee	60%	47%	38%	39%	51%
Business unit Leadership	31%	39%	38%	56%	37%
CEO or equivalent	9%	14%	24%	5%	12%

Portfolio decision making criteria

	FS	CIM	ICE	I&G	Average
Strategic alignment	80%	85%	63%	80%	79%
Commercial value	80%	79%	69%	40%	74%
Portfolio balance	54%	39%	38%	47%	48%
Internal model	37%	27%	31%	13%	31%
Social value	17%	15%	13%	40%	19%
No formal criteria	7%	6%	19%	13%	9%

The largest cost of failure of all participants (£133m) was from a medium size organisation.

Size

Performance criteria
Most important measure of success

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
Meeting business case requirements	65%	51%	38%	46%
On-time delivery	18%	13%	28%	21%
Within budget delivery	12%	9%	8%	9%
Equal weighting to all three measures	5%	27%	26%	24%

Methodology
Methodology used by PO

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
Homegrown methodology	80%	80%	82%	81%
PMI based methodology	7%	18%	15%	15%
Other methodology	13%	2%	3%	4%

Compliance with policies and methodologies
Compliance monitoring

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
Stringent compliance	31%	26%	20%	23%
Moderate compliance	56%	49%	45%	48%
Weak compliance	13%	25%	35%	29%

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
Had link between compliance and a risk/reward system	53%	29%	35%	35%

Use of tools
Value of technology tools

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
High, very effective	25%	20%	21%	21%
Ok, fairly effective	69%	78%	72%	73%
Poor, not effective	6%	2%	7%	6%

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
Use web based tools	65%	33%	26%	34%

Perceived value of the PO to the organisation
Senior management value perception of PO

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
Integral to success	44%	39%	45%	43%
Beneficial to the organisation	44%	52%	38%	44%
Sceptical	6%	2%	14%	9%
Overhead	6%	7%	3%	4%

Project failures

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
Total project value managed (UKP)	205m	65m	29m	67m
Average number of projects managed	337	82	30	83
Had failed projects within the last 12 months	47%	60%	56%	56%
Average failed project cost (UKP)	10.4m	18.1m	1.9m	7.8m

General scope
POs organisational position

Reported to	Large	Medium	Small	Average
An executive	47%	23%	43%	37%
IT	35%	42%	29%	34%
Business unit	12%	10%	9%	10%
Operations	0%	13%	9%	9%
Finance	0%	4%	5%	3%
Other areas (dependent on the project)	6%	8%	5%	7%

POs reporting line

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
CEO or equivalent	24%	18%	21%	20%
Executive director	35%	44%	32%	37%
Unit director	23%	16%	28%	23%
Lower in their organisation	18%	22%	19%	20%

PO staffing

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
Average number of personnel	44	39	12	25

Organisation
Number of POs in the organisation

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
None	6%	13%	10%	10%
One	35%	49%	58%	52%
Two to five	47%	20%	28%	28%
Over five	12%	18%	4%	10%

PO characteristics

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
Single Process, single or multiple POs	71%	69%	69%	70%
Multiple processes, Multiple POs	18%	18%	21%	19%
Single PO with multiple processes	0%	2%	3%	2%
No process or no PO	11%	11%	7%	9%

Programme office maturity
PO maturity classification

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
Mature, very successful	20%	14%	4%	9%
Grown up, more successes than failures	20%	23%	27%	24%
Established, in need of improvement	40%	43%	39%	41%
Immature	20%	20%	30%	26%

Years PO in operation

Large organisations had an average of just under three years in operation
compared to just under four year for medium and small organisations.

Is the PO adequately funded for the work undertaken

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
Appropriate funding	38%	33%	26%	30%
Adequate funding	31%	55%	50%	49%
Poor funding	31%	12%	24%	21%

Training and certification
PO training/education

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
Had a curriculum to follow to achieve training goals	41%	56%	44%	48%

PO staff background

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
IT background	88%	82%	71%	77%
General business background	47%	58%	60%	58%
Operations background	29%	56%	47%	48%
Finance background	35%	40%	35%	37%

PMI® certification within the PO

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
All PMI certified	0%	7%	0%	2%
Most PMI certified	6%	2%	4%	4%
Some PMI certified	41%	27%	13%	21%
None PMI certified	53%	64%	83%	73%

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
Valued PMI® certification	47%	40%	36%	39%

Personnel experience within the PO (years of programme/ project experience)

Years	Large	Medium	Small	Average
0-2	19%	5%	17%	13%
2-5	19%	22%	32%	27%
5-10	50%	46%	33%	40%
10-20	6%	17%	9%	11%
Over 20	6%	10%	9%	9%

Portfolio management and reporting

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
Had portfolio Management reports	59%	73%	78%	74%

Responsibility for go/hold/cancel decisions

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
Executive committee	48%	56%	49%	51%
Business unit leadership	43%	30%	39%	37%
CEO or equivalent	9%	14%	12%	12%

Portfolio decision making criteria

	Large	Medium	Small	Average
Strategic alignment	82%	80%	78%	79%
Commercial value	53%	71%	81%	74%
Portfolio Balance	59%	38%	51%	48%
Internal Model	41%	40%	24%	31%
Social Value	12%	18%	21%	19%
No Formal Criteria	0%	18%	6%	9%

KPMG

No: 203 - 587

For more information please contact KPMG's Information Risk Management team on:

irm@kpmg.co.uk
020 7311 8952

Survey Programme Management	October 2002
Designed and produced by	Name of team
No: 203 - 587	