

Candidate's Declaration

I hereby solemnly declare that this dissertation is my own unaided work. It is being submitted to the Degree of Master of Science to the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

This dissertation, or any version thereof, has not been submitted before for any degree or examination to any other University.

Thus signed in Johannesburg, on the ____ day of _____ 2016

Signed by:

Abstract

Project management put the U.S. astronaut Neil Armstrong on the moon and has made possible the realisation of some of mankind's wildest dreams. Recent project management trends would indicate that the discipline has not only departed from the traditional practice of delivering projects based on an engineering design (with appended cost and schedule estimates), but that project scope, scale and complexity have drastically increased as well.

It would however transpire from the numerous and recurrent unsatisfactory outcomes of Large Infrastructure Projects (LIPs) that traditional project management has not necessarily kept pace with such new developments – especially their ever-increasing complexity. Massive costs and schedule overruns on such projects attest to the severity of this problem. Similarly, instances of substantial changes to the initial project scope will suggest that modern project management approaches would still require enhancements.

Project management is defined as *“the application of knowledge, skills, tools, and techniques to project activities in order to meet project requirements”* (PMBok Ver. 5) – Hence, to improve project delivery performance, a particular attention should be given to managing requirements throughout the project lifecycle, which constitutes the essence of System Engineering (SE).

Systems Engineering, as a discipline and as a way of thinking, is gaining popularity and acceptance in its applications to Large Infrastructure Projects (LIPs) due to the benefits emerging from its ability to manage escalating complexity, particularly in large and complex infrastructure projects such as transportation (e.g. railways, ports), energy, and water infrastructure projects. These LIPs drive economic growth, through both their construction phase (e.g., job creation) and their successful outcomes (e.g., better services).

This study has considered Systems Engineering principles and concepts for incorporation by way of enhancements into a holistic project lifecycle model that improves delivery effectiveness – which shall then result in substantially reduced cost and schedule overruns on Large Infrastructure Projects (LIPs).

Dedication

*“But it is the Spirit in a man, the breath of the Almighty,
that gives him understanding.” [Job 32:8]*

To my God-given wife and children, and

To the Project Management community across the African continent,

I humbly dedicate this work ...

Acknowledgements

This dissertation is the culmination of a research journey that was kindly supported and encouraged by the following individuals and institutions:

- My Research Supervisor, Ms Bernadette Sunjka, for the guidance and sympathetic support throughout the development of this work, the quality of which shall reflect the scope and intensity of her academic supervision;
- Transnet SOC, my previous employer, where I headed up the Project Management Centre of Excellence (PMCoE) for many years, affording one the most generous opportunity to understand the challenges around delivery of large infrastructure projects and to gather insight, information, data, and lessons-learned – all of which have not only prompted this very research, but have also ultimately sustained its successful completion;
- Transnet Centre for Systems Engineering (TCSE) at the University of Witwatersrand for their backing and support toward this research, and for affording me an open knowledge-sharing platform from which one could safely step into this fascinating world of Systems Engineering; and,
- Colleagues and friends in the industry (that are too many to mention on this page) whom, through discussing Project Management topics/issues, have assisted in enriching and crystallising one's own thoughts and insights around the effective delivery of capital and infrastructure projects.

*“My heart is not proud, O Lord, my eyes are not haughty;
I do not concern myself with great matters or things too wonderful for me.
But I have stilled and quieted my soul; like a weaned child with its mother,
like a weaned child is my soul within me. I have put my hope in the Lord,
both now and for evermore.” [Psalm 131:1-3]*

Content

Section	Description	Page
Chapter 1	Introduction	1
1.1	Problem Statement	2
1.2	Motivation	4
1.3	Research Question	5
1.4	Research Objectives	6
1.5	Significance of the Research	6
1.6	Research Method	7
1.7	Ethical Clearance	9
1.8	Scope	10
1.9	Limitations	11
1.10	Chapter Outline	12
Chapter 2	Literature Survey	14
2.1	Essence of Project Management	16
2.2	Challenges Facing Project Management	16
2.3	Implications of Project Failure	20
2.4	Inadequacies of Traditional Approaches	22
2.5	Increasing Complexity of Infrastructure Projects	26
2.6	Systems Engineering Contributions to LIPs	29
2.6.1	Systems Thinking and Project Management	30
2.6.2	Systems Engineering Concepts and Practices	35
2.6.3	Project Lifecycle Models	39
2.6.4	Four Domains of Systems Engineering	48
2.6.5	Systems of Interest in Large Infrastructure Projects	49
2.6.6	Validation and Verification	53
2.6.7	Gate Review Process	60
2.6.8	Risk Management	64
2.6.9	Stakeholder Management	68
2.6.10	Value of Systems Engineering	77
2.6.11	Construction as a Complex System	81
2.6.12	Pertinent SE Concepts from the Literature Review	82

Section	Description	Page
2.7	Analysis of Project Life-Cycle Models and SE Concepts	83
2.7.1	Comparison with the PMBoK	84
2.7.2	Comparison with the [Dutch] PWW Model	86
2.7.3	Comparison with the IPA Model	88
2.7.4	Findings of the NETLIPSE Report	90
2.8	Key Theoretical Concepts for Further Investigations	94
Chapter 3	Research Methodology	95
3.1	Research Framework	95
3.2	Research Question	96
3.3	Collection of Qualitative and Quantitative Data	97
3.3.1	Research Instrument	98
3.3.2	Research Data	98
3.3.3	Selection of Research Instruments	100
3.3.4	Questionnaire and Interview Design	101
3.4	Data Organisation	109
3.5	Analytical Methods	110
3.5.1	Analysis of Quantitative Data	110
3.5.2	Analysis of Qualitative Data	111
3.5.3	Analysis of Delphi Responses	112
3.5.4	Validity and Reliability in Qualitative Data	113
3.6	Analytic Results	114
3.7	Research Question Conclusion	114
3.8	Recapitulation and Way Forward	114
Chapter 4	Data Analysis and Results	115
4.1	Review of a Typical Infrastructure Delivery Organisation	116
4.2	Survey Approach and Analysis	118
4.2.1	Survey Validity and Reliability	118
4.2.2	Survey Respondent Profile	119
4.2.3	Survey Analysis	122
4.2.4	Survey Results Synopsis	123
4.3	Statistical Correlation Analysis	134
4.4	Structured Interviews Analysis	143

Section	Description	Page
4.4.1	Structured Interview Respondents	145
4.4.2	Thematic Analysis of Interviews	146
4.4.3	Structured Interview Outcomes	148
4.5	Delphi Panel	161
Chapter 5	Model Development	163
5.1	Essential Elements of a SE-based Lifecycle Model	163
5.2	Project Lifecycle Model Building	167
5.2.1	Project-System Boundaries	167
5.2.2	Project Lifecycle Span	168
5.2.3	Requirements Management	168
5.2.4	Project Lifecycle Methodology and Tailoring	169
5.2.5	Project Lifecycle Methodology Deployment	170
5.2.6	Conceptual SE-based Project Lifecycle Model	171
5.2.7	SE-based Project Lifecycle Methodology	175
5.3	Systems Engineering Roles in Project Management	176
Chapter 6	Model Validation	179
6.1	Validation by Project Literature	179
6.2	Validation by Delphi Technique	183
6.3	Concluded Corroboration	186
Chapter 7	Discussions	188
7.1	Achievement of Research Objectives	188
7.1.1	Exploring Common Methodologies and SE Applications to LIPs	188
7.1.2	Comparing Common Methodologies to Project Lifecycle Model	189
7.1.3	Developing a Theoretical Project Lifecycle Model	189
7.2	Systems Engineering Roles in Project Management	189
7.3	Practical Implications	190
Chapter 8	Proposed Future Developments	192
8.1	Empirical Corroboration	192
8.2	Realisation System as a Complex System	193

Section	Description	Page
8.3	Realisation System as a Viable System	193
8.4	SE Supplement to PM Body of Knowledge	194
Chapter 9	Conclusions and Recommendations	195
9.1	Study Conclusions	195
9.2	Proposed Future Developments	198
9.3	Recommendations to the Project Management Industry	199

List of Figures

- 1.1 Dissertation Structure: Three (3) Main Parts and Nine (9) Chapters
- 2.1 Structure of Literature Survey and Substance of Each Sections
- 2.2 Project Success Failure Grid
- 2.3 Project Failure Rate
- 2.4 Standish Findings on Project Outcomes Comparison by Year
- 2.5 Reasons for Budget Overruns on Infrastructure Projects in Africa
- 2.6 Summary of SSM as a Seven-Stage Process
- 2.7 INCOSE System Lifecycle Processes
- 2.8 Generic Project Lifecycle Structure
- 2.9 Front-End-Loading Arrangement
- 2.10 Front-End-Loading Phases
- 2.11 Lifecycle Gateway and Issues
- 2.12 SE-Based Project Lifecycle Model
- 2.13 The Vee-Model Structure
- 2.14 Integrated Vee-Model
- 2.15 Vee Model Representation
- 2.16 Systems Engineering Domains
- 2.17 Systems come in 3's – Realisation-, Solution-, Context-Systems
- 2.18 Systems-of-Interest covering Seven Systems
- 2.19 Verification & Validation as per V-Model
- 2.20 Verification & Validation during Production Process
- 2.21 Extract of GR Analytics
- 2.22 Lifecycle Risk Management Requirements at "MaxCoal"
- 2.23 Risk Management Process as per Vee Model
- 2.24 Essence of Wicked Problems
- 2.25 Late Change Drive Project Costs

- 2.26 Cost and Schedule Overruns Correlated with SE Effort
- 2.27 SE Effort to Cost Overruns by Honour and Gruhl
- 3.1 Data Analysis Framework
- 3.2 Overall Design Of a Survey Project
- 3.3 Proposed Five (5) Scale Likert Continuum
- 4.1 Data and Result Analysis: Chapter Outline
- 4.2 Mid-Year records showing Budget & Forecast Accuracy at “LogisTop”
- 4.3 Pie Chart: Industry of Capital Projects
- 4.4 Pie Chart: Entity’s PM Operating Model
- 4.5 Pie Chart: Capital Delivery Structure
- 4.6 Pie Chart: Value of Biggest Project in Portfolio
- 4.7 Pie Chart: Number of Projects in Portfolio
- 4.8 Bar Chart: Lifecycle Methodology
- 4.9 Bar Chart: Principles & Concepts of Methodology
- 4.10 Bar Chart: Project Delivery Process
- 4.11 Bar Chart: Readiness to Improve Project Delivery
- 4.12 Pie Chart: Organisation Sector
- 4.13 Project Lifecycle Correlation Map
- 4.14 The Six Precursor Nodes of Project Lifecycle Infrastructure
- 5.1 SE-based Project Lifecycle Model Building Process
- 5.2 Proposed SE-Based Project Lifecycle Model
- 5.3 Verification-Tailoring-Validation Triangle [VTVT]
- 5.4 SE-based ORS Process Flow
- 5.5 Four (4) Components of Project Delivery Infrastructure
- 5.6 Project Delivery Streams: Business, Technical and Integration
- 6.1 Reasons for Project Failure

List of Tables

- 2.1 Generic Life-cycle Stages, Purposes, and Decision Gate Options
- 2.2 Comparison between SE Elements and PMBoK 5th Ed
- 2.3 Comparison between SE Elements and the [Dutch] PWW Model
- 2.4 Comparison between SE Elements and the IPA Model
- 2.5 Mapping NETLIPSE Findings against ISO 15288:2008

- 3.1 Summary of Data Collection
- 3.2 Qualitative Analysis as per Delphi Round

- 4.1 Survey Scoring on Precursor Elements of Lifecycle Infrastructure
- 4.2 Interview and Delphi Panel Members and Professional Background

- 5.1 Indicative aspects of SE Roles

- 6.1 Extent of Application of Proposed SE Elements in Lifecycle Management Methodologies
- 6.2 Lifecycle Elements and Corresponding Causes of Project Failure they Mitigate/Alleviate [Part I]
- 6.3 Lifecycle Elements and Corresponding Causes of Project Failure they Mitigate/Alleviate [Part II]
- 6.4 Summary of the Delphi Round Testing “Scale of Relevance” of the 13 Identified SE Elements to Proposed Model

List of Symbols

Symbols are not reflected in the body of this dissertation as no equation is included therein, other than those in-built in Excel spreadsheets used to analyse survey responses.

Nomenclature / List of Acronyms

Capex	Capital Expenditure
CASoS	Complex Adaptive System-of-Systems
CLIOS	Complex, Large-scale, Integrated, and Open Systems
DoD	Department of Defence [USA]
DP	Deployment Package
EC	European Commission
ELLP	East London Line Project [UK]
EPCM	Engineering Procurement and Construction Management
EU	European Union
FEL	Front End Loading
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GR	Gate Review
H&S	Health and Safety
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
INCOSE	International Council on Systems Engineering
IPA	International Project Analysts
ISO	International Standard Organisation
ITS	Intelligent Transportation System
LIP	Large Infrastructure Project
MCMA	Mexico City Metropolitan Area
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NETLIPSE	NETwork for the dissemination of knowledge on the management and organisation of Large Infrastructure ProjectS in Europe
NPV	Net Present Value
ORP	Operational Readiness Plan
ORS	Owner Requirements Specification
PESTLE	Political, Economic, Social, Technological, Legal, and Environmental [Analysis]
PICC	Presidential Infrastructure Coordinating Committee
PIR	Post Implementation Review
PLD	Problem-Literature-Data
PLM	Project Lifecycle Methodology
PM	Project Management

PMBok	Project Management Body of Knowledge
PMI	Project Management Institute
PWW	[Dutch] Public Works and Water Management
ROI	Return on Investment
RSA	Republic of South Africa
SA	System Analysis
SE	Systems Engineering
SEBoK	Systems Engineering Body of Knowledge
SECoE	Systems Engineering Centre of Excellence
SEH v3	Systems Engineering Handbook version 3
SE in CES	[Dutch] Guideline for SE within the Civil Engineering Sector
SE for ITS	Manual on Systems Engineering for Intelligent Transportation Systems
SE for PWW	[Dutch] Guideline Systems Engineering for Public Works and Water Management
SIPs	Strategic Infrastructure Projects
SM	Stakeholder Management
SME	Subject Matter Expert
SMT	Systems Measurement Triangle
SoI	Systems-of-Interest
SoS	System-of-Systems
SoSE	System-of-Systems Engineering
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
SSM	Soft Systems Methodology
ST	Systems Thinking
STD DEV	Standard Deviation
S-TEAM	Systems Techniques-, Engineering-, Approaches-, and Methodologies
SWOT	Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats [Analysis]
TA	Thematic Analysis
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States
US DoS	United States Department of State
USA	United States of America
USAF	United States Air Force [USA]

V	Vee [for V Model]
V&V	Verification and Validation
VSM	Viable Systems Model
VTVT	Verification-Tailoring-Validation Triangle
YTD	Year-to-Date