The Appropriateness of Project Management Mechanisms Within the South African Public Sector Environment

MM Selepe
University of Limpopo, South Africa

Abstract: This paper examines the variety of project management mechanisms in order to ensure that the three spheres of government which are the National, Provincial and Local government are project oriented. It is the responsibility of the South African government to take ownership pertaining to all the projects and infrastructure development in South Africa. It is evident that all the major projects are managed by the private sector project management Consulting firms. The article will also examine the importance of Enterprise Project Management Office (EPMO) within the public sector. Despite the success rate of government projects through Public Private Partnership synergies, the paper argues that, government departments still have less contribution regarding the management of government projects. It is evident that there is no Project Management Offices (PMO) within the government departments. The paper seeks to assist the South African public sector with the integration of project management mechanisms in order to transform the traditional way of managing government project to a project oriented public sector. This paper relies on document study and published material. The paper concludes by outlining and suggesting that project management mechanisms to be adopted by the South African public sector.

Keywords: Enterprise project management office, Projects governance, Project management office, Project Management mechanisms

1. Introduction

Project management is a topic we come across in all aspects of our everyday lives. It is also a topic in history as concept of project management has been around since the beginning of time. If we define project as the act or art of assembling people and resources to systematically achieve shared goal, then it has existed since ancient history. Ancient assignments were not anomalies in history but projects delivered in a systematic way with similar characteristics to today's projects. Project management has allowed leaders to plan bold and massive projects and manage funding, materials and labour within a designated time frame (Du Plessis, 2014:4).Project management is a methodical approach to planning and guiding processes from start to finish. According to the Project Management Institute (PMI), the processes are guided through five stages which are initiation, planning, executing and controlling and closing. Commonly at the end of each phase, key stakeholders assess the project and decide to either stop or continue to the next stage, commonly known as gates. The planning, executing and controlling stages are often repeating stages occurring throughout the lifetime of the project, whereas the initiation and closing phases are commonly only done once (Du Plessis, 2014:15).

Project management is currently employed in only a few enterprises as a successful business function at the executive level. However, we believe this practice will become a standard practice in future enterprise organisational model. Executives and business unit managers in today's most forward-thinking enterprises are already taking project management disciplines beyond handling specific projects in manufacturing product development, services and information technology. The practices of project program and portfolio management are applicable to any type of enterprise, whether it is a for-profit company, a not-for-profit company or a governmental agency (Bolles *et al.*, 2007:3).

According to Van der Waldt (2007:249) project management was established as a popular discipline in the late 1960s and 1970s, through the creation and activity of the United States and European project management societies and through the widespread adoption in business, government and the military of the matrix form of organisation. The main driving force in the 1980s and 1990s was mainly in the area of computer tools and software applications. Project management is internationally recognised as a profession and in South Africa, a professional body, Project Management Institute South Africa (PMISA),

was established to ensure quality in project management practices. One of the key contributions and products of PMISA is the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK) guide which highlights nine knowledge areas of project management, namely quality management, human resource management, cost management, communication management, procurement management, scope management, integration management, risk management, and time management. Over time a wide variety of models emerged to study the processes associated with projects. A "model" is used to identify, monitor, measure and benchmark a progression of steps or methodology in a project cycle. A model could lead to an organisation's ability to implement strategies and programmes through effective, efficient, and consistent steps. Models are gaining interest as organisations and theorists strive to make sense of why some projects succeed and others not.

Since 1994, South Africa's first democratically elected Government focused primarily on the development of policy frameworks, structures and systems to give effect to the values and principles of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act 108 of 1996) and to lay the foundation for democratic governance. Considerable progress has been made in this regard as can be witnessed by a myriad of policy papers in nearly every sector of the government. But, as the new policy frameworks were operationalized, attention increasingly shifted to the most critical issue, namely service delivery. In line with international trends, the Government became increasingly aware that a significant expansion in the scope and quality of service provision was not possible with traditional delivery approaches. There is growing evidence that there is a need for a significant departure from conventional approaches and that a massive leap into a new service delivery paradigm is necessary. Increasingly this new paradigm highlights the need to further develop the Government's project management skills and applications with a view to achieving improved delivery capability (Van Der Waldt, 2007:239-240).

Turning strategy into reality is not a function in which the public service is known to excel. This deficiency has caused many political principals huge embarrassment as they often had brilliant visionary abilities and provided strong direction, yet the operationalization of their visions left much to be desired. There are various factors which can be attributed to Government's inability to deliver on the vision of executing authorities, of which the lack of adequate skills, lack of funding, high vacancy rates, inadequate systems, non-cooperation from other spheres of government and administrative red tape are often identified as the major causes. At times the lack of planning and or performance management are also identified as possible causes, but that puts the spotlight on the department itself whereas the factors mentioned previously can easily be placed at the door of a third party. When looking objectively at the prescribed planning and budgeting processes of the departments it becomes evident that the formal processes do allow for adequate discussion and consultation. Policy priorities, strategic objectives and funding options are thoroughly discussed at structures such as the Medium Term Expenditure Committee (MTEC) and the Standing Committees on Public Accounts (SCOPA). Therefore, nothing which reflects in departments' annual performance plans is enforced without budgetary consideration. Departments determine their own score sheets which should take into account issues such as vacancy levels, funding of and availability of skills, and red tape requirements. This leads to the hypothesis that service delivery inefficiency and ineffectiveness is partly due to a lack of a project management approach to delivering on objectives as well as the absence of a system that provides a consolidated projects portfolio view to enable performance management at strategic level (Modernisation Programme, 2009:4). It is important to note that this hypothesis identifies the problem: "service delivery inefficiency and ineffectiveness" and attributes it partly to the root cause: "a lack of a project management approach to achieving objectives". The lack of project based management practices is evident through a plethora of symptoms which include: poorly documented and structured initiation and prioritising of deliverables, inadequate or no planning of activities that lead to the achievement of intended deliverables and poor execution of activities, weak monitoring and controlling mechanisms and late completion of projects and little or no formal sign-off thereof (Modernisation Programme, 2009:4).

2. Public Sector Project Governance

Project governance is viewed as playing a vital role in the successful delivery of public sector projects. For the purposes of this study, project governance

is defined as those aspects of governance related to ensuring the effectiveness of projects. In essence, project governance is about helping to ensure that the right projects are done. The aim of project governance is to help public sector bodies put in place and maintain the structures and forums that are needed for effective project governance at all stages in the project lifecycle. Project governance consists of the main activities which relate to the following aspects to programme direction, project ownership and sponsorship, ensuring the effectiveness of project management functions and reporting and disclosure (including consulting with stakeholders) (Project Governance, 2007:3).

Project governance arrangements should be put in place from the inception of a project. It is important to note that the arrangements will need to vary considerably over the life of a project as it moves through its different phases. A broad framework for the project governance structure for the full life cycle should be prepared at the outset. A good starting point is to work from a project plan which shows the main project approval or authorisation points in order to identify key decisions and the actions and information needed for those points. The detailed project governance arrangement for each project phase should be worked up before the phase starts and should focus on the specific needs of the project for that phase (Project Governance, 2007:11). Broader public sector issues need to be brought within the project governance framework to be managed effectively. Although generally they are intended to ensure value for money, fairness, transparency and accountability and to provide a sound audit trail, these issues can have a significant impact on timely project delivery if they are not handled correctly. Broadly these issues will be matters of government policy objectives and public law. The value of managing these within the project governance mechanisms is that it enables scrutiny at the right level at the right time, allows any conflicts with stakeholder interests to be resolved and enables access to expert advice and best practice, such as legal, accounting, policy and financial expertise. The aim is to help the judgement of stakeholders. A number of examples include:

- Freedom of Information and data protection. There can be conflict between the interests of the stakeholders (e.g. operational and commercial sensitivities) and the wish to be as open and informative as possible;

- The need to comply with public law, including the public procurement regulations. Public law places constraints on public sector activity. An example is where a procurement following the Competitive Dialogue route under EU public procurement regulations wishes to make substantive changes post selection of the preferred bidder;

- Policy on terms and conditions of employment for transferring employees and new joiners; e.g. improving affordability should not be at the expense of employees' terms and conditions;

- There can be conflicts of interest among the stakeholders, e.g. scope and quality constraints driven by considerations of affordability, or interfaces with complementary projects;

- "Government Accounting", for regularity, probity and value for money issues;

- The vires of the public sector to undertake the proposed project.

An effective project governance system can help ensure that public sector requirements are addressed fully and in good time, perhaps in the face of considerable pressures from individual stakeholders, and hence minimise the potential for delaying or disrupting the project (Project Governance, 2007:13). According to Santos and Varajo (2015:2) public administration institutions can be central (ministries), territorial (county councils, mayor halls, county school inspectorates) and of social insurance (Health Insurance House). They also include schools, hospitals, theatres, museums, public libraries, military units, police, and others; managed by local communities according to the decisions of locals elected and funded by the related administration funds. The structure of a public institution and its leading board is directly influenced by the services delivered during a certain period of time and the available funds. The total expenditure cannot exceed the organisation revenues for a certain period of time. The budget from previous years represents model patterns for the following year so as based on the experience acquired to make improvements in accordance to the structure, intensity and variation of activity volume and previous activity framing. Thus, in routine, bureaucratic activities carried out by public institutions, budgetary management on functions and traditional services proves to be useful, easy to

plan and manage, with real chances to ensure the organisation's efficiency. However, a public institution faces permanently a series of internal and external challenges, the occurrence of needs that require reorganization, changes, diversification, modernisation or adaptation and implementing projects in public organizations have become an important issue in recent years. Due to its role as keeper of our common economy, the public sector differs in its nature from financially interested owners or investors in the private sector. The most important public and private sector values differ to some extent. In public sector the most important are 'accountability', 'lawfulness', 'incorruptibility', 'expertise', 'reliability', whereas the highest ranking private sector values are 'profitability', 'accountability', 'reliability', 'effectiveness', 'expertise, 'efficiency', 'honesty' and 'innovativeness'.

2.1 E-Governance

E-Governance is the use of information and communication technology (ICT) to deliver certain services electronically. According to this approach to service delivery, government utilises internet technology to improve quality (better services), efficiency (cost effectiveness), and effectiveness (economic development). In 2000 Government established the State Information Technology Agency (SITA) to create a uniform ICT-platform for governance (Van der Waldt, 2007:247). The e-Governance cluster must be assigned to ensure that Information and Communication Technology Systems, processes and structures are best positioned and applied to improve effective and efficient service delivery. The following objectives are included in cluster:

- To assess the current IT service delivery model through an IT services work stream;

- To optimise existing filing systems and introduce uniform e-filing practices through a Registry/e-filing workstream; and

- To develop a system and implement an approach to establish and institutionalise delivery of all objectives on a project management basis.

Two work streams, namely the Projects Management Approach and the Executive Projects Dashboard, must be established. Due to the integrated nature of the work of the two streams and the interdependencies between the two it is important to combine the two work streams into a single one to manage the implementation of the Executive Dashboard, the Project Management Approach and to address the quality of the content being captured on the system (Modernisation Programme, 2009:3). According to Cats-Baril and Thompson (1995:560) the role of IT in public organizations has been the subject of numerous research efforts, including a major research program at the University of California at Irvine (Northrop *et al*., 1990). The Irvine group argued that many of the intended benefits of IT, such as better information for planning and managerial control, had not been realized. A long-term, longitudinal study found that most payoffs from computerization were in the areas of fiscal control, cost avoidance, and better interactions with the public. However, those payoffs were not immediate, and the prospects for future payoffs in these areas were mixed. Other research has focused on the control of information resources (including IT) at the state level. A national study of state governments investigated new organizational structures, planning processes, and policy formulation activities relating to the acquisition, use, and management of IT (Caudle, 1990). The study concluded that although the focus remained on IT management, public sector management was increasingly considering information itself as an important resource to be managed.

3. The Mechanisms of Project Management

3.1 The Drivers of Project Management Application in Government

Arguably the main driver behind the application of project management in government is to improve state institutions' ability to deliver efficient, effective and high quality services. The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa of 1996, Chapter 10, Section 195(1)(b & c), for example lay the foundation for drivers by stipulating that South Africa's Public Service must promote efficient, economic and effective use of resources and that it must be development-oriented. The Public Finance Management Act 1 of 1999 (Part 2, Section 38(b)), a further example, stipulates that accounting officers are responsible for the "effective, efficient, economical and transparent use of the resources of the department". As statutory drivers these stipulations place significant emphasis on the optimal utilisation of departmental resources by focusing on outcomes. It further focus attention

on getting things done on time (efficient), within budget (economical) and according to certain quality standards (effective). There are also increased accountability requirements on public sector institutions, leading to a greater focus on effectiveness and efficiency in the way functions are performed. Project management can support the achievement of institutional goals, as well as give greater assurance to stakeholders that resources are effectively managed. Applying a formalised project management framework, or methodology to projects can help with clarification of, and agreement to goals, identifying resources needed, ensuring accountability for results and performance, and fostering a focus on final benefits to be achieved (Van Der Waldt, 2007:250).

3.2 Project Management Office (PMO)

In the last 20 years, the public service has changed its approach to programme delivery to respond to the increasing and evolving expectations of government and the public. Known as New Public Management (NPM), this changed approach borrows heavily on private sector financial and management practice, shifting away from a traditional stewardship focus toward performance based on outcomes and efficiency. In the same way that commercial entities realize change through projects, the delivery of the key policies of Government has become project oriented (Blixt & Kirytopoulos, 2017:2).

PMO could mean Project Management Office, Program Management Office, and Portfolio Management Office depending on the level of PMO operation. The word "PMO" is used differently in different contexts. The basic difference between the type of PMOs and the level on which these PMOs operate are outlined below as follows:

- **Project Management Office** - Project Management Offices are typically setup for large projects where they help the project managers in collecting timesheets, collating status reports and financial data, tracking deliverables, coordinating issues and risks etc.

- **Program Management Office** - Program Management Offices are generally setup at Program level where there are several projects running under a program. Program Management Offices support program managers, project managers and project teams. Typical responsibilities of the Program Management Offices include collating project related data from the project teams, ensure process adherence, collating project reports from project managers and creating reports for senior executives'/project sponsors, identifying project dependencies and coordination between projects within the program.

- **Portfolio Management Office** - Portfolio Management Offices are generally setup at Department/ Business unit level to ensure the Department/ Business unit projects are aligned to overall enterprise business objectives. They facilitate business prioritization of projects. Benefit realization and value management also form part of Portfolio Management Office responsibilities. The Portfolio Management Offices support the portfolio leaders with portfolio management activities (Rathore, 2010:3).

Over the last decade, many organisations have implemented one or more Project Management Offices (PMOs) as part of organizational project management, attributing a variety of both operational and strategic roles to their PMOs while PMOs are now a prominent feature of organizational project management, the underlying logic that leads to their implementation or renewal is still not entirely understood]. PMOs typically perform a number of functions: project definition and planning; cost or benefit analysis of projects; risk management; monitoring and control; supply of experience and knowledge; support in undertaking Project Management (PM) processes and procedures; knowledge capture and dissemination; provision of specialist skills; maintenance of projects tools; standards and processes. The roles of PMOs can be segmented into three levels which are strategic; tactical; and operational. Knowledge management is one of the key functions of the PMO at all levels. At the strategic level, the role of the PMO is to guarantee that projects are aligned with the strategic objectives of the organisation, so that projects assumed are consistent with the business long-term objectives (project and team members have a direct relation to the organization's strategic operating plans, and are aligned on project process, selection, importance, and execution). Also, at this level PMO contributes to the organization strategic growth as projects assumed will contribute with value to the growth of the business and it has impact on efficient and effective knowledge management conducted so as to increase the policies, practices, and methodologies of project management with efficient knowledge

capture, knowledge sharing, knowledge transfer, and knowledge reuse mechanisms in place (Santos & Varajo, 2015:3-4).

3.3 Enterprise Project Management Office (EPMO)

Enterprise Project Management Office (EPMO) is a centralized business function which operates at strategic level with the enterprise executives and provides enterprise wide support on governance, project portfolio management best practices, mentoring, tools and standardized processes. EPMO ensures strategic alignment between business objectives and projects executed. EPMO does not eliminate the need for Project, Program or Department level PMOs. It simply complements these traditional PMOs. While the traditional PMOs operating at the tactical and operational level focus on doing the things right. Organizations having an EPMO and traditional PMOs get the right things done the right. So the EPMO help the overall organization achieve its strategic goals and in the process also helps better support the project teams (Rathore, 2010:5).

EPMO differentiates itself from other PMOs mainly by the level on which it operates. It is mainly operating as a business function within the organisation and reporting directly to one of the CXOs, mostly CIO. With the authority that comes with being at this position the EPMO can effectively control the portfolios, programs and projects running across the enterprise. Its position is regarded close to the Portfolio Management function. Strategic alignment of business objectives with the projects, project prioritization, value management and benefit realization are some of the key responsibilities of EPMO. The EPMO is not restricted to governing only the IT programs but the sales PMO, finance PMO, marketing PMO, HR PMO functions will also be typically reporting to the EPMO. Therefore, EPMO collaborates and supports cross functional projects. This results into better synergy between the projects running under different enterprise functions.

In an organization that has global operations, the geographically dispersed PMOs will report to the centralized EPMO thereby providing much needed coordination between these multinational PMOs. In today's uncertain business environment amidst the financial crisis where organisations putting more emphasis on cost cutting, better resource utilization and trying to do more with less, EPMO have become even more relevant. Another factor leading to rise in EPMO adoption is increasing globalization. Organizations are now having global footprint and it becomes ever so important to have a centralised PMO (EPMO) at the enterprise level overseeing all the projects undertaken in the organisation (Rathore, 2010:5-6).

The EPMO is incumbent on the executives of an enterprise to recognise that portfolio, program and project management are critical business functions that are necessary to achieve the business strategies. Embedding project business management as a core competency within an enterprise first requires a business strategy that accepts project management as business management function. Once accepted, but before embarking on strategically implementing enterprise- wide project management, the enterprise must prepare an organisational business strategy to create the specific organisational structure known as an EPMO at the executive level (Bolles *et al.,* 2007:45)

The purpose of incorporating project management into strategic planning of the enterprise's overall operations is to improve the strategic planning processes by adding a project business management perspective. This addition of the EPMO organisation to the enterprise can have the following benefits:

- Adding executive level project management planning input into developing business strategies;

- Identifying and implementing the project business management processes applicable to developing the enterprise's business strategies;

- Helping to assure that the business strategies do not conflict with enterprise environmental factors applicable to the organisation;

- Helping to assure that any business strategy accomplished by project-related actions and activities will support the enterprise's vision and mission;

- Providing executives with timely and accurate oversight capability of future portfolios; and

- Enabling the maturation of the organisation's project business management strategic planning process (Bolles *et al.,* 2007:46).

3.4 Leading the Change to a Project-Based Organisation

Most future growth in organisations will result from successful development projects that generate new products, services or procedures. Such projects are also a principal way of creating organizational change, implementing change and growth strategies is usually entrusted to project managers (Graham & Englund, 2004:1).

According to Du Plessis (2014:414) the intertwined discipline of change, change management and project management evolved from very different starting points. The dominant of paradigm of change is that it can be controlled and this fits nicely with the project management idea that change is controlled, which is deeply embedded in the field of engineering. Conversely, the idea of change management comes from a behavioural point of view and is rooted in the fields of Psychology and Sociology. They regard the process and techniques related to change management as inherent to organisational development.

- Project management aims to systematically and methodically manage change in an organisation from techno-structural perspective.

- Change management aims to facilitate the same changes but from people perspective, supporting different levels of social system of the organisation through this process of transition.

In some organisations and some types of projects, projects, project and change specialist work very closely together to realise change. In other organisations they try to work together without successfully collaborating. Sometimes there is even a rift between project and change specialist. At structural level, often project and change management roles are specified in the organisational structure. However, change management is sometimes seen as a capability or competency that can be sourced via involvement of human resources, organisational development or even line management. Change managers should be involved in a project right from the beginning, Change managers can contribute process thinking during planning phases and this will help facilitate change that is done with or by people rather than to people. However, when organisations view change management as an independent skill it is seen as a core competency for project managers (Du Plessis, 2014:415).

3.5 Power and Political Behaviour

Power and political behaviour in organisations is complex and dynamic. It is also unavoidable in a project environment as stakeholders are greatly diverse and have different backgrounds, norms, needs and expectations. There is a need to be able to use power skillfully and politically to manage projects successfully, as a lack of emphasis on project politics and an inappropriate use of power will lead to chaotic project management. Power and politics are still some of the least discussed subject matters in project management and project managers and leaders need to know about it and learn how it works. It is impossible to break away from power and politics in any organisation. Political strategies and political tactics apply to everyone in every situation. Project managers have to be particularly conscious of all the possible stakeholders differing power bases and interest (Du Plessis, 2014:348-349). Project managers need to be aware that, in the public sector, they are operating in a milieu in the sense that project outcomes have political consequences and also in the sense of departmental and inter-department politics. Politics can be viewed as either the activities or affairs engaged in by government or the intrigue and maneuvering in a group. In politically-charged circumstances, effective project management requires the exercise of political skills as well as the skills of problem solving and participation. Project managers need to be sensitive to the power and influence of key individuals in the institution and to how the pattern of influence is affected by the project and changing circumstances. Project managers have to market ideas and concepts to indifferent or hostile colleagues, to channel information in order to change perceptions and to undertake a number of lobbying activities to obtain resources needed for the project (Kinipe *et al.*, 2002:213).

3.6 Developing the Project Management Information System

When determining the proper components of project management information system (PMIS), first evaluate whom it will serve. Upper managers need the information on all projects regarding progress, problems, resources usage, costs and project goals. This information helps them judge the portfolio of projects. They need to review projects at each milestone and produce a go or no-go decision. Project managers and department managers need to see

each project schedule, priority and use of resources to determine the most efficient use across the organisation. Project team members need to see schedules, task lists, specifications and the like so they know what needs to be done next. The PMIS should do the following:

- Answer questions of the major stakeholder;

- Facilitate communication between team members, between team members and other stakeholders, between all project managers and between project managers and upper managers;

- Help in "What if?" analyses to answer questions about project staffing, proposed staffing changes, and total allocation of resources; and

- Help organisational learning by helping the members of the organisation to learn about the project.

Developing a useful information system across projects is critical to successful of a project-based organisation because people need to be able to do each of the following:

- Respond quickly to opportunities and threats;

- Get needed information efficiently;

- Avoid duplication of efforts;

- Get help on current project by considering information on similar past or present projects; and

- Provide individual schedules, along with information on who is waiting for output, to support on time delivery (Graham & Englund, 2004: 168-169).

3.7 Developing and Supporting Core Teams for Project Success

Successful projects are completed by project teams, not upper managers. But the background work of upper management teams often leads to project team success. Project teams represent the cornerstone of the post bureaucratic organisation. They confer benefits but also have costs (Graham & Englund, 2004:109). For the upper management team to develop a core team process:

- Require that each project have a core team;

- Define core team membership as an important position in the organisation;

- Commitment to the core team members should be full time or at least a large percentage of each member's time;

- Support core team involvement in defining the project goal and completing the project plan. Core team members should be heavily involved in in the project start-up meeting;

- Resist moving core team members once they are assigned;

- Motivate, evaluate and reward core team membership;

- Support regular core team meeting.

A common mistake in implementing project management is ignoring the process of developing core teams. Core team process implementation requires a long-run view of projects; often only upper managers have this view (Graham & Englund, 2004:113)

Teams develop around achieving a long-term goal and for a team to develop successfully there some key features needed which are the right people with the right combination of skills needed to be identified. Trust needs to be built; and roles, responsibilities and membership need to be identified. When teams are developed, most of them go through five predicable stages of development which are forming, storming, norming, performing and adjourning. At the norming stage newly formed teams start by milling around in confusion because of the high degree of uncertainty regarding their roles and relationships. The storming stage is when the teams progress to confronting possible issues and interact with other team members to understand their roles. The third stage is norming and team members have organised themselves to be able to work together and meet project objectives. Performing is the productive stage of team development when team members are openly operating and effectively and willing to set each other up to win. Adjourning stage is when project time lines are temporary and all project teams have adjourned when the project comes to an end (Du Plessis, 2014:302-305.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

The paper has demonstrated that the integration of Project Management mechanisms within the public sector which is the borrowed concept from the private sector will refine and enhance project management. The utilisation of project management mechanisms in government will results in a new implementation "tool-kit" for public service managers and service providers. From this article it should, however, be clear that the incorporation of project management mechanisms into the public sector will yield efficiency and effectiveness benefits for government departments. The concept of a Project Management office (PMO) at an enterprise level (EPMO) is relatively new but large organizations having global footprint are adopting Enterprise Project Management Office (PMO). Therefore, the public sector must also benchmark on the best practices of the private sector. The popularity and adoption of EPMO will increase as globalization increases. The emphasis is on effectiveness and efficiency within the public sector. Moving from what has been the traditional approach of having program and project level PMOs to an EPMO level is a logical step in enhancing project management within the public sector. The adoption of project management mechanisms by the public sector will enable the public sector to be project oriented and gradually refrain from utilising the services of the private sector project management companies. Despite significant investment since 1994, most of the public sector projects have failed to meet delivery expectations, and the lack of significant project management experience in the South African Public Service has been identified as a contributing factor. The South African Government has sought to address these gaps and improve future outcomes by engaging the services of private sector to increase project management competency in the South African Public Service. However, according to the above exposition outlined in this article it is evident that the South African public sector must incorporate and implement project management mechanisms in its current structures.

References

Blixt, C. & Kirytopoulos, K. 2017. Challenges and competencies for project management in the Australian public service'. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 30(3): 286-300.

Bolles, D.L. & Hubbard, D.G. 2007. The Power of Enterprise-Wide Project Management. New York: UNISA Press.

Cats-Baril, W. & Thompson, R. 1995. Managing Information Technology Projects in the Public Sector. *Public Administration Review*, 55(6): 559-566. Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/3110347. Accessed 27 November 2018.

Du Plessis, Y. 2014. Project Management: A behavioural Perspective, Principles, Practices and Cases. 2nd ed. Cape Town: Pearson.

Graham, R.J. & Englund, R.L. 2004. Creating an environment for Successful Projects. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

HM Treasury. 2007. Project Governance: A guide note for public sector projects. Norwich. Crown. Available at: http://www.Hm-treasury.gov.uk. Accessed 29 November 2018.

Knipe, A., Van der Waldt, G., Burger, D. & Nell, K. 2002. Project Management Success. Cape Town: Pearson.

Rathore, A. 2010. The growing importance of EPMO (Enterprise Project Management Office) in today's organizations. Available at: http://www.wipro.com/insights. Accessed 29 November 2018.

Santosa, B. & Varajão, J. 2015. PMO as a key ingredient of public sector projects' success: Available at: www.sciencedirect.com. Accessed 29 November 2018.

South Africa. 2009. *Western Cape Provincial Government*. Modernisation Programme: Project Management Approach: Government Printers: Pretoria.

Van der Waldt, G. 2007. Project management: A new service delivery paradigm. *Koers*, 72(2):239-260.