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Summary

In recent years funding aid operations has dramatically increased, along with the concern about the real impact of its initiatives. Despite considerable amount of money have been invested world widely and a great number of projects already implemented changes have been considered inconsistent. As a result, major donors are pressuring Non governmental organizations (NGO) to evidence their achievements and legitimate their cause. There are several factors which distinguish the NGO as unique within project management environments, such as the social accountability claimed and the nature of the impact aimed. Therefore, traditional project management practices might not be suitable in the case of NGO’s project. This study analysed project methods most applied for NGO’s project and discussed about it accountability challenges related to project management. Willing to further understand how in practice NGO managers are dealing with those challenges, a case study was developed with a NGO that works with environmental issues. As a result, it was evidenced that practical methodologies are applied to embrace the organization own needs. It was apparent that project management methods were adapted to the institutional purpose, even though adjustments might not be completely in accordance with internal procedures. Project management tools are assumed as a semi structure basis and can be adjusted if the work is justified. A flexible approach relies on the trust and expertise of the organization staff. As a conclusion, it was evidenced that NGO’s projects carry particular aspects and expectations over project accountability and management methodologies must be adapted and complementary methodological approaches are being developed.
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I) Introduction

In recent years funding aid operations have dramatically increased, along with the concern about the real impact of its initiatives (Crawford & Bruce 2003). Throughout the 90’s a wide-range of efforts has been taken to support the blossoming non-profit sector and a considerable amount of money has been invested world widely. Such investment is expressed in figures by some scholars, who also suggest an increasing investment trend in a near future (Siegel & Yancey 2002; Gray, Bebbington & Collison 2006; Faber & McCarthy 2001).

Despite the large amount of investment made and a great number of projects already implemented, changes to address global alarming issues have been considered inconsistent or even wholly inefficient (Jepson 2005). As a result, major donors are pressuring Non governmental organizations (NGO) to evidence their achievements and legitimate their cause. For instance, during international debates, such as the one promoted by the United Nations (2007), it has been alarming that NGO’s reputation is falling along with the society trust on their work capability. There is a growing critique regarding the managerial competence of NGOs and it is increasing the claim to evidence their expertise on providing significant impacts. Indeed, it is apparent the call for accountability and professional management, which would assess work done; demonstrate its value and provide useful information for sponsors and general public (SustainAbility 2003; Ebrahim, 2003; The Earth Watch Institute 2006).

There are several factors which distinguish the aid industry as unique within project management environments, such as the social accountability claimed and the nature of the impact aimed (Crawford & Bruce 2003). Project goals are frequently concerned with social transformations, which are different from projects that are focused on time, cost and standardized quality procedures. NGO’s projects are looking for change community perception, legal acceptability, social and environmental impacts, hence, project performance measurement is not straight forward and can be notionally complex (The Earth Watch Institute 2006). For this reason, standard project management practices might be not suitable in NGO’s project context and an adapted set of managerial skills might be required (Crawford & Pollack 2004).

A wide number of project management methods seem to be customized for NGO needs and they are already in use. The most applied one is the Logical Frame Work (LFW), which is a methodology for
projects planning and appraisal and, indeed, it might be a requirement for funding from many international fund agencies (The Earth Watch Institute 2006). Along with its recognition, it is raising the discussion about the LFW limitations, especially on the eyes of project management methodology. The system is focused on processes evaluation, rather than impacts that could finally legitimate NGO activities. Moreover, it might poorly distinguish NGO special needs and it implies a complex monitoring and evaluation process to be implemented. Consequently, it seems that once the project is granted, the initial planning might not be followed, which could reflect on project results and blur the organizational capability to express impacts. Indeed, managers might be enquired about the organizational work legitimacy, as well as the impact accountability of projects. Provided that, this empirical study was carried willing to further understand how in practice NGO managers are dealing with challenges related to project implementation and the accountability of NGO’s projects (Gasper 2000; Crawford & Bruce 2003).

In order to forward the analysis a research question is presented along with the objective that better specify the research in purpose. Following, this document is presented in five chapters. The theoretical framework (chapter 1) presents concepts of NGO and particular aspects related to NGO work as well as project management methodologies applied. Additionally, some challenges that manager might face on such context are exploited, in order to better understand the research in question. The second chapter presents the research methodology that guided the study and then the third chapter presents findings gathered during the field research. The fourth chapter discuss the data gathered, related to work in practice, and contrast it with the background presented on the first chapter. The discussion is guided by research objectives willing to answer the research in question. Finally, the last chapter reaches the conclusion and emphasizes contributions of this study on the understanding of the question in analysis.

II) Research purpose

With that said, this study is proposing to further understand how in practice NGO managers address the transition between projects initial phases, while actions are still in theory, to the implementation phase, whether activities are actually carried out. It is also aiming to improve understanding on how such unpredictable behaviour impacts on project and organizational results and the manner that it addresses the accountability claim.
The study is surrounded on the Swedish context and an NGO, based at Stockholm that develops its work through projects, was analysed. Finding and discussion are based on a deep analysis and description of the organizational processes, as a case study, looking for aspects that might contribute to improve the knowledge of project management in practice.

II.a) Research question

The intended research question is: How does a NGO manage the transition between project phases and how it addresses projects efficiency in respect to organizational accountability?

**Objective 1:** To understand the project methodology applied and how it addresses the transition between project life cycle phases;

**Objective 2:** To understand how the project procedures deals with challenges such as strategy indeed deployed; results consistency; and monitoring system uncertainties;

**Objective 3:** To analyse how the monitoring and evaluation system addresses organizational needs for results and external claiming for project impacts;

II.b) Research scope and underlying assumptions

The scope of this research is limited to understand the issues faced by the literature research and answer the research question and related objectives. The motivation to carry the research on is a result of work on project management of environmental NGOs experienced by the researcher, whether similar challenges were faced in really. For this reason, this study is focus on the management of NGOs related to environmental issues. Analysis is based upon data obtained from the secondary resources and information provided by the responsible for planning, monitoring and evaluation of projects of the studied organization.

***
CHAPTER 1 – THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter, it will be presented the theoretical framework, which will later be used as foundation for the analysis of the empirical data collected. Topics are firstly related to contextualize the third sector and states distinguishing factors. Secondly, it presents one of the most significant management challenges faced nowadays by the sector, the claim for transparent and reliable accountability and the complex context within project’s are involved. Subsequently, factors that distinguish NGO projects are presented which justifies the need for a customized project management methodology. Thus, the rationale of projects management methodologies that guides the implementation of project for environmental NGO is introduced and the most used method is further explained and evaluated. Finally, an overview of the project management challenges raised by this theoretical review is presented, willing to sustain the development of the empirical study.

Although wider number types of NGO might be touched upon study, the kind of organizations that will be focused here are those concerned with environmental and nature conservation issues.
1.1 Third Sector and Non Governmental Concept

Philanthropic, voluntary, non governmental organization (NGO) and foundations are examples of organizations that are intermediary placed on the universe called ‘Third Sector’. Such a kind of organization is described as business located between the private (for profit) and the public (interest of society), once it is neither profit oriented nor governmental agencies. The term third sector was originally created as alternative to contest disadvantages from profit maximization of private sector and highly bureaucratic organization of public sector. By creating the hybrid sector, the advantage would be combined by the flexibility and efficiency originally from private organizations with the sense of equity from the public sector (Anheier & Seibel 1990).

Therefore, it is important to state that sectoral boundaries are not clear and constant. For this reason, a concept is not unique as well. Some international agencies state their own concept as can be seen by United Nations definition:

‘... any non-profit, voluntary citizens’ group which is organized on a local, national or international level. Task-orientated and driven by people with a common interest, NGOs perform a variety of services and humanitarian functions, bring citizens’ concerns to Governments, monitor policies and encourage political participation at the community level. They provide analysis and expertise, serve as early warning mechanisms and help monitor and implement international agreements. Some are organized around specific issues, such as human rights, the environment or health’. (The United Nations 2003 cited by Gray, Bebbington & Collison 2006, pp 324)

This tentative effort might also be lacking on provide a clear picture of the term as well. In order to deal with it, some authors suggest that there is a common concern that is part of the third sector and this could effectively differentiate the sector. In the literature it might be found several suggestions of criteria as following presented. (Anheier & Seibel 1990; Salamon & Anheier 1997; Gray, Bebbington & Collison 2006).

1.2 Third sector distinguishing factors

Anheier & Seibel (1990) identify three major set of criteria that distinguish the third sector. The first criterion would be the institutional classification as for profit or public organizations. This division has a main drawback as it does not include some non profit types as cooperatives and must be
complemented. Secondly, it is the motivation that mediates between special and general issues, combined with the nonprofits organizational rationale that is characterized by lower degree of rationality and formality as more emphasis is given on solidarity and direct exchanges. Thirdly, the institutional function focuses on compensate failure of the first two sectors on mitigate unsolved problems affecting the society. Therefore, this last criterion raises the concern that some scholars highlight as very important on the eyes of third sector role that ‘is to fill in the spaces in a healthy democracy and not to substitute for government (Gray, Bebbington & Collison 2006, pp 322). Indeed, it is essential to be aware and do not overlap competencies of sectors and disrupt even more the already blurred purpose of NGOs.

Being aware that concept is not unique, it is also convenient to know that it can be influenced by the development of political and social science and in particular by countries regulations. For instance, in USA the term is often used to qualify tax exemption organizations that are not applicable for some other countries. Some countries call similar non profit organizations as Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs), which share in common characteristic of not having owners who receive profits in terms of dividends or capital earning. Indeed, NGOs may earn profits with the strict condition that it must be applied to further develop the organizational purpose and the earnings must remain in the organization (Anheier & Seibel 1990, pp. 22-29).

In a similar vein, Edwards (2000) (cited by Gray, Bebbington & Collison, p.326) goes beyond, and add to the concept that a significant proportion of the income must come from voluntary contributions (voluntary donations or governments grants). Government grants have been historically awarding and still nowadays are the greatest provider of NGOs incomes (SustainAbility, 2003). Edwards (2000) also suggests that NGOs are governed by a board of trustees rather than elected representatives, functions that are voluntarily assumed. The contribution of voluntary work on conduct or manage the organizations, such as in the form of a voluntary board of directors or even part of the organization staff, benefits NGOs and influences their lower cost if compared with public organizations (Anheier & Seibel 1990, pp.22-29; Lewis 2000, p.37).

Considering the above presented criteria, a wide range of organizations can be included under NGO term. Large and bureaucratic organizations with multi-million dollar budgets as well as small, informal local initiatives are types of non profit organization. Likewise, some NGOs are engaged in long-term community development work and others provide short-term emergency relief. Furthermore, it is a field with a vast diversity of working areas such as education establishments,
religious organizations, trade unions, recreational clubs, community self-help initiatives, research centres, and charitable societies. The table 1 presented below provides an outlook of the relative size of the NGO sector. The action area is presented on the purpose column, followed by the number of organizations in action in 2001 and 2002. Figures refer to organizations working on North America (Gray, Bebbington & Collison, p.326).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture and recreation</td>
<td>5,511</td>
<td>5,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td>4,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>18,985</td>
<td>19,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>3,935</td>
<td>3,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social development</td>
<td>9,944</td>
<td>10,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>3,077</td>
<td>3,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development, infrastructure</td>
<td>25,013</td>
<td>24,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, policy and advocacy</td>
<td>10,039</td>
<td>10,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>4,387</td>
<td>4,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>5,048</td>
<td>5,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91,263</td>
<td>91,176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up, it seems unlikely that a unique definition of the third sector can be settled. It also seems necessary to be aware of the diverse types of organizations included on the third sector does not constitute a homogeneous grouping. NGO context must be addressed as particular, thus, it requires a mix of management capabilities and particular knowledge to conduct the management actions (Lundström, & Wijkström 1995; Lewis 2000).

1.3 The increase of Accountability Concern

The increasing visibility of NGOs induced the call for organizations accountability that was demanded by corporations, governments and civil society. In response to that, The United Nations (2007) held a debate about such worldwide concern, stressing that the non profits credibility, legitimacy and accountability are being challenged. Hence, a special apprehension is claimed to the effectiveness of the organizations work, in order to prove organizations capability to make a difference.
Indeed, some scholars suggest frameworks to approach NGO accountability, as a specific regime for the third sector, which also focus on guaranteeing organization's impact towards their mission (Jordan & Van Tuijl 2006; Gray, Bebbington & Collison 2006, p.326; Jepson 2005, p.521; Nicholls 2005). An example of an approach is the one suggested by Jepson (2005) that distinguishes accountability between rational and moral:

- **Rational accountability**: “views organizations as structures in which responsibilities and authorities are clearly defined and ordered and accountability is the means by which individuals and organizations report to a recognised authority and are held responsible for their actions”;

- **Moral accountability**: “is akin to (...) terms internal accountability and is about an NGO’s responsibility to its mission, values, to the social values and public constituencies that it was formed to advocate and represent”.

For instance, the rational accountability is similar to the system already used by commercial organizations and the moral accountability is specific for the third sector, enhancing the idea to develop trust and confidence on the work advocated. Therefore, both types are complementary and necessary to be implemented by NGOs.

Corroborating with Jepson’s approach, The SustainAbility (2003), facing the eminent and potential growth of partnership between NGOs and business, proposes four drivers to guideline more efficient NGO’s accountability approach, being:

1. **Morality** (accountability is right in principle);
2. **Performance** (accountability improves effectiveness);
3. **Political space** (accountability increases credibility and thus influence); and
4. **Wider democratization** (accountability of NGOs strengthens democracy in the general political environment).

Thus, the proposal emphasizes that accountability should go beyond meeting basic moral and legal norms, but managers should be aware that the eloquent speech for transparency should not cause reactive and unwise actions. Accountability if indiscreetly employed might threat organizations’ flexibility and independency. Thus, it is suggested that the accountability model should combine a
“minimum transparency plus a level of accountability commensurate with stakeholders” (Gray, Bebbington & Collison, 2006)

The third sector should not be trapped by applying accountability approach of the private sector. The enormous difference in size and potential influence of organizations might define the status of accountability that should be processed (Jepson 2005; Ebrahim 2003). Gray, Bebbington & Collison (2006, p.326) present a ratio, which compares revenues of both sectors, private and nonprofit. Data published by the American Enterprise Institute (AEI), of 11 corporations, which are amongst the AEI trustees, were combined and compared with the same figure for the 93 American NGOs (American Enterprise Institute n.d.). Corporations, in which are included known names as Exxon Mobil and Dow Chemicals, have combined annual revenues of $496,177 million and the same figure of the 93 NGOs is $4,182 million. As a result, the ratio is about 118:1. In spite of the questionably of the findings (age of the data, selectivity and the countries covered), it might sustain the author’s claim that it is not appropriate to apply uncritically accountability regimes from private-sector to the NGO sector.

In addition, the delicate discussion about sufficient regulation and control, which would protect NGO legitimacy, and the adequate regulation that would allow the organization’s flexibility, is also influenced by multiples accountability systems related to all stakeholders involved. Therefore, accountability for NGO has to be built through inter and intraorganizational relationships once NGO’s activities involve several stakeholders (Ebrahim 2003; The SustainAbility 2003 and Jepson 2005), as following further explained.

1.3.1 Interorganizations relationship

Inter organizational relationship happens between two or more organizations, in which one is accountable to the other for the execution of some duty promise. In order to express this external relationship, Ebrahim (2003) proposes to divide the NGO’s organizational environment into three main groups, being: (1) funders, (2) sector regulators, defined the country legislation or the policies accorded between NGOS and funders; and (3) clients and communities, such as project beneficiaries (directly involved in a project and indirectly affected), as shown by the diagram bellow.
The three groups are related by arrows, which expresses the relationship intensity between the parties. Solid arrows mean strong relationship in that direction. Dashed arrows relate to a weaker relationship in that direction. For instance, funders have a strong relation over NGOs, since to them remain the power of providing resources. The Keystone Institute (2006) goes beyond and suggests that organizations may be leaded to adapt their approach in order to fulfil donor’s expectations instead of pursuing the cause of their existence, their mission. This fact is more evident, when funders themselves are over regulated and such highly bureaucratic standard cascades their partners. A similar approach may be seen by the NGOs and Sector Regulations, in which NGOs subversive react to what is being requested since there is a constant apprehension of the abuse of power of regularity oversight. The relationship between NGOs and their client can also be tricky. In fact, NGOs might exercise the power over the beneficiaries once the relations tend to be asymmetric as a result of resource allocations. The challenge here would be to develop actions congruent with what is interesting for both actors. (Ebrahim, 2003)

As a result, accountability has to deal with how one actor manages the unequal distribution of power. More specifically, when there are in place actors that are meant to be beneficed from other’s work and they have weak political and economic voice. The power of control stands on the hands of those that possess the strong relationship and such a power might mislead the accomplishment purpose of the organizations involved. Indeed, organizational actors, such as NGOs, funders, clients must develop a
reciprocated sense of responsibility that is collectively generated rather than unidirectionally imposed (Gray, Bebbington & Collison 2006). Therefore, there is a claim of a shared vision, a greater alignment among parties, such that a traditional authority and control relationship breaks down and progresses into collaborative behaviour for outcomes (Keystone 2006; Ebrahim 2003).

The Keystone Institute (2006) released a survey to explore the accountability view of NGOs, donors and beneficiaries. It took into account the opinion of 404 organizations of 20 countries, representing perspectives from all continents. The survey findings interestingly combine academic point of view, previously mentioned, with practitioner’s perspective, as can be seen by findings presented bellow:

1) **Power issue**: This issue was found across the organization’s networking. While donors generally assign a high value to downward accountability, in practice the ways in which they manage their grants do not support it. Most reporting formats do not enable learning and improvement, hence, the system just encourages top down donations and passive recipients of aids. The same approach is reflected on the relationship between NGO’s and project benefited actors;

2) **Lack of accountability for results**: Accountability to ‘beneficiaries’ should imply accountability for results, in which beneficiary voice influenced defining and measuring an organization’s success. However, it was noticed the lack of performance criteria that would evaluate whether or not an organization is actually legitimating its actions, whether might be uneven the relation between resources applied and the impact achieved. It was clammed that systems in use stress the allocations of resources instead the effectiveness of actions;

3) **Management tools**: The planning, strategy process and reporting systems, rather than enhancing the dialogue and relationships among stakeholders, they might act as reporting ‘heavy workload’, which tend to produce large amounts of data for donors that are not directly useful for learning and improving attainment of intended outcomes.

Given that NGO’s accountability relations must be carefully understood and well addressed in order to fulfil the expectations of the parts involved. An accountable behaviour must be pursued inside the organization, considering internal staff, stakeholders affected, finances and the civil society.
1.3.2 Intraorganizations relationship

An aspect that directly influences internal accountability is the organizations governance. The term governance is generally used to mean how an organization processes and structures are used to achieve its goals (Jepson 2005). The key purpose of governance is to ensure that an organization’s assets are managed and developed in a manner that will maximise delivery on its mission. The concepts of governance and accountability are interlinked and both start up the process of legitimacy management, which must be structured to legitimate the role of NGOs.

1.4 NGO Project Distinguishing Factors

The difference of third sector organizations and other two sectors organizations were already mentioned. The sector uniqueness reflects on a distinctive management challenges such as extra effort in monitoring organizational performance, managing multiple accountabilities, keep consistency between voluntarism and professionalism and foundation toward organization’s mission (Lewis 2000, p.34).

As well, several are the factors that distinguish projects from the aid industry as unique in the project management environments (Crawford & Bryce 2003). Firstly, such a kind of projects frequently is related to social transformation, or some similar goal, which is not really clear or measurable. Actually, these projects act more like a mean to achieve a result, then a result for itself. Secondly, normally there are a vast amount of stakeholders directly involved on the project, each one with specific accountability needs. Finally, very often the issues addressed by the project are cross cultural or national, project actors might be geographically separated, which raises the propensity of emerging unpredictable socio-political implication.

Stressing project differences, Crawford & Pollack (2004) suggests classify project as soft and hard. Projects in which project objectives, and methods to achieve them, are well understood through the project team and life are defined as hard nature projects. Therefore, goals and methods are well defined and do not need to be further questioned. In this case, project managers’ challenge is to keep track of the project execution and define the most efficiently way to reach the defined goal. Methods are implemented to quantify and control execution and by doing so the project efficiency is pursued. In contrast, the project problematic of soft nature projects cannot be easily defined and isolated;
hence, it is unlikely that there will be one best way to look for a solution. Instead, there will be some possibilities for actions that may be differently evaluated by the project actors. As an example, soft projects problematic includes community perception, safety, awareness, legal acceptability and environmental and political legal impact can be struggled by a vast diversity of approaches. Project goals are less clear and the way how to accomplish the goal might be regularly questioned. Consequently, project manager’s challenges tend to emphasize more on negotiation, communication and debate. (Crawford et al. 2003; Crawford & Pollack 2004)

As a conclusion, it is unlikely that standardized project management methodologies, such as guidelines proposed by the Project Management Institute (PMI) or Association for Project Management (APM) bodies of knowledge, should be equally applied for both hard and soft types of project. Some researches claim that the cause of failure of some projects is due to the lack of recognition of the project nature difference. Furthermore, the successful implementation of project management methodologies on NGO projects requires a process grounded on professional experience, knowhow of the problematic addressed and adapted project management methodology (Crawford et al. 2003). Given that, the following sections will explain project management methodologies rationales mostly applied on NGO’s projects, using as an example methods used on conservation projects.

1.5 Project Management Methodologies

Project management methodologies applied on conservation projects follow principles of management in practice combined with adaptive management (The Earth Watch Institute 2006). Management system in practice might be exemplified by the World Wildlife Foundation’s (WWF) ‘Guideline to Plan and Manage Conservation Project and Program’. The standard was developed to assist conservations practitioners and is broadly applied. The guideline targets project and programme and considers that most projects follow lifecycle as the proposed order (Figure 2). (The World Wildlife Foundation 2007).
Phase 1 – Define basic parameters, in which are included the working team, the project scope and results desired. It is taking into consideration the project context, by evaluating threats and opportunities and the conservation target to be addressed. Key stakeholders are also identified and defined in this phase;

Phase 2 – Design proposed interventions by determining action plans (goals, objectives and activities), monitoring plan (progress evaluation); operational plan (means to implement the action plan). At the end, the work must be compiled and results of the phase one - define - and phase 2 - design – will build the strategic plan;

Phase 3 – Implement actions by developing and executing detailed workplans and budgets;

Phase 4 – Analyse regularly data collected, matching them with what was proposed on the first two phases. In case that it is necessary, Adapt workplans and budgets;

Phase 5 – Share lessons learned and formal products with key stakeholders, yet it is required to conduce audits and promote the learning curve.
An underlying principle additional to the presented method is that management of natural resources might be an experimental experience, so it might be necessary to incorporate research finding into the project actions during its implementation (The Earth Watch Institute 2003). Therefore, the concept of adaptive management states such a need and highlights that conservation projects are highly enhanced by assuming an adaptive principle. For this reason, it is highly recommended to consider constant adjustment of projects during its execution. (Salafsky & Margoluis 1999; Crawford et al. 2003).

1.5.1 Performance measurement analysis

The Earth Watch Institute published a Review of the Conservation Performance Measures, aiming to identify methodologies already used by practitioners and further develop performance measures to evaluate impacts and outcomes of conservation efforts. The study evaluated several planning and appraisal methodologies and systems that are applied by corporations and non profit organizations and confirmed the accountability lack already mentioned by The Keystone Institute (2006) study. Amongst other findings, the study identified that measurement system tends to focus on activities and the quality of the processes, thus it is limited in direct significance to the addressed conservations problem. Practitioners tend to base performance systems on the assumption that appropriate processes will result in greater and better conservation achievements, hence projects express results in terms of outputs instead of impacts. Consequently, the performance measurement lay on indirect indicators; it is focused on processes and indirect measures related to project objectives, instead of project impact.

Given that, organisations should employ customized performance systems combining organizational and stakeholders needs with best practices of management already in use (Salafsky & Margoluis 1999; The Earth Watch Institute 2006). In the case of the aid industry, the most used planning and appraisal methodology for projects is de Logical Framework (LFW) (Crawford & Bryce 2003). For instance, The United Nations System, the German GTZ (Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit/ International Cooperation Enterprise for Sustainable Development), The Canadian Cida (International Development Agency), The American USAID (United States Agency for International Development, The Swedish Sida (International Development Cooperation Agency) and the Norwegian Norad (Agency for Development Cooperation) publically encourage the usage of LFW method to their counterparts (The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency 2004). By this matter, some NGO might not
apply the LFW over all projects, but once they must apply in the case of those agencies, the rationale turn to be assumed by the organizations. For this reason, a further explanation and evaluation of LFW method will be following presented.

1.5.2 Logical framework

The Logical Framework is a tool that assists on the planning and appraisal phases of a project, based on: a) a context evaluation; b) a primarily analysis of the stakeholders and; c) an analysis of cause and effect logic of a problem. Additionally, while the method is being developed, it requires a high degree of consensus about actions feasible and valuable among the stakeholders (Gasper 2000). The main method outcome is a matrix, where is presented on a vertical axis the hierarch of objectives and project assumptions and on a horizontal axis the means to monitor the project progress (Crawford & Bryce 2003; Gasper 2000).

1.5.2.1 Description of the method

The horizontal rationale can be divided into three main parts 1) objective or goal; 2) indicators and means of verification; and 3) assumptions. The first column defines desired objectives of the project. The two second requires nominating verifiable indicators for each level in the logic to facilitate assessment towards the goal, together with the mean of verification, for each indicator, expressed on the third column. The last column defines the preconditions that the related goal of the row need to be achieved. It also can be presented a risk evaluation and the needed mitigation action. Each part must be related in cascade to the previous one. (Dale 2003; Gasper 2000).

The objective hierarch is presented by the vertical axis that is based on the cause and effect logic. The rationale is based on statements, aimed objectives, which are defined starting at the top of the first column and cascade to the following levels of achievement. The strategy is the development by first enquiry how to reach the impact and the answer will define outcomes. Subsequently, it is enquired the means to achieve outcomes and the outputs are defined with the response. Finally, activities are defined by questioning how to achieve the desired outputs. At the end, it is suggested to challenge the matrix on the opposite way, by questioning if the defined activities are necessary and sufficient to meet the outcomes and so on until the main goal (bottom-up). The logical intention is to align the
actions planned and the performance measurements with the main project goal. The Figure 3 bellow expresses the matrix and its rationales. (Crawford & Bryce 2003).

**Figure 3 - Example of Logical Framework Matrix**
Adapted from (Crawford & Bryce 2004, The Earth Watch Institute 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 1</th>
<th>Part 2</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal/ Impact</strong></td>
<td><strong>Performance Indicators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source/ Means of Verification</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sustainable development outcome expected at the end of the project. All outcomes contribute to this.</td>
<td>Measures the extent to which contribution to the goal has been made</td>
<td>How data on goal achievement is to be collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes/ Effect</strong></td>
<td><strong>Effective Indicator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expected result of the producing the planned outputs</td>
<td>Measure the extent to which the outcomes have been met</td>
<td>How data on objective achievement is to be collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Output Indicator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The direct measurable results of the carried activities</td>
<td>Milestones throughout life-of-project against which progress of project can be monitored</td>
<td>How data on progress is to be collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Process Indicator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks carried on to implement the project and deliver the identified outputs.</td>
<td>Activity schedule to monitor project progress (actual vs. planned)</td>
<td>How activity implementation is to be reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inputs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial, managerial and technical resources required to carry activities</td>
<td>Budget to monitor deployment of resources throughout life-of-project</td>
<td>How data on inputs are to be accounted for and reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LFW structure produces monitoring and evaluation indicators on each level of significance. Indicators on the three lowest rows (inputs, activities and outputs) allow measurement of project efficiency, the monitoring of the ongoing processes, thus, purpose of capture and analyse data is related to internal assessment of allocated resources. At such level, the monitoring concern is over the project manager responsibility, who monitor the expenditure of human, financial and time resources, and the internal efficiency of the project. Upper rows, which have assigned indicators of outcome and goals, attempt to measure the effectiveness of the strategy and the evaluation is a periodic process. The purpose of the evaluation is concerned with the worthiness and appropriateness of the goal to address the problem and to capture the learning. It is related to the effectiveness of the project and is responsibility of higher level of the organizations and stakeholders, usually sponsors and financers. Therefore, different stakeholders lay down different weight over the monitoring and evaluation.
system, which produces data for a distinguishing need or purpose, as exemplified by the Figure 4. (Crawford & Bryce 2003).

**Figure 4 - Relationship between elements of LFW’s monitoring and evaluations system**
Adapted from (Crawford & Bryce 2003)

1.5.2.2 **Limitations of the method**

According to some scholars (Gasper 1999; Crawford & Bryce 2003; Dale 2003) field experience has proven that the LFW method seems to be less straightforward than anticipated and some adaptations are needed. The discussion about LFW’s limitations is based on the conclusion that beyond the design phase, after the project is financed, the method is complex to be implemented and it might be completely abandoned, influencing project control and performance (Crawford & Bryce 2003).

Therefore, the literature presents five major drawbacks:

**Oversimplification:** Despite the method encourages logical and pragmatic thinking about a target purpose, problems addressed are embedded in a complex context and the lack of knowledge in advance or full control of the environment implies consider assumption to forward a planning. The matrix might result in an oversimplification of the reality and might lock the desired intended effects. Unforeseen routes and unintended impacts should have a great impact on the planning, they should be carefully considered and incorporated on the monitoring and evaluations phase, therefore the preview matrix has to be adapted (Gasper 2000).

**Inexplicit of causality rationale:** The condition of “causality rationale” during the planning phase might lead to a mismatch between the impact measurement, attractive to sponsors, with assumptions of the project team who is focused on process performance and lately on outcomes (Shaw 2001 cited by Crawford & Bryce 2003, pp. 367). Indeed, while project designers are developing the planning, they
define actions that are **necessary** to be carried on in order to address a problem, but they might consider that those actions might **not be sufficient** to fully solve the problem in case. In this phase, one strategy (route) was defined, considering that the pool of inputs, activities and outputs, once being executed could promote the achievement of the desired project goal. It seems evident that the result matrix does not express such a thought as it only evaluates the project thought level indicators, which might induce to divergent conclusions about the project process and successful result. Furthermore, even if a process is successfully implemented, evaluating the matrix lower levels, the project might not achieve the impact desired on the upper level of the matrix, which might emphasize the divergence between expectations toward the project and its outputs (Crawford & Bryce 2003).

**Rigidity to adjust**: The result matrix might be difficult to be adjusted. The assignment of performance indicators to all action levels is appealing for monitoring system, but it is challenging when it is necessary to match actions planned and actual progress. Additionally, the idea of representing different aspects of a problem on a single matrix might pack together issues that relates to a miscellaneous universe of stakeholders, which can also be a great deal to adjust the common document (Gasper 2000).

**Static Tools**: The matrix is based on a ‘snapshot’ of a reality and does not consider time dimension on the monitoring system. According to Crawford & Bryce (2003) the method is absent on time dimension, so, it is ineffective for project management during the project life, especially for control and monitoring purposes. It is lacking on activities monitoring and schedules tasks along project timeline which helps to smooth the transition between the planning, implementation and evaluation phases.

**Accountability by Reporting** – Most conservation project evaluations tend to be specific on reporting requirements. Although, there is a claim that good projects should have clearly defined objectives that can be reported against (The Earth Watch Institute 2006), there is also a great concern about the evaluation focus only on donors priorities, which might drift away NGOs from the local level groups (The SustentAbility 2003). Therefore, the reporting demand should also respect the attendance of various groups with distinguishing expectations and need and not solely imply on reporting stated in terms of ‘the project's' objective towards legal obligations(Gasper 2000).
1.6 Findings from the Theoretical Review

The foundation for NGO successful management is a combination between accountability and project effective performance. Accountability is promoted through transparency and project performance is promoted by responsive project management (Crawford & Bryce 2003). By the analysis of accountability and management aspects based on the presented theoretical framework, it is possible to list some aspects that might have contrasting viewpoints and challenge the management of projects, such as:

Monitoring and Control: Rigidity vs. Flexibility: The claim for accountability may tend to an overload of data and also justification of activities carried by organizations. Indeed, NGOs sponsors are been stressed by their own financers, being themselves over regulated and cascading such obligation towards the whole network partners. However, the universe of organizations types is immense and accountability systems must be adjusted in accordance with the size, type and influence of each organization, including the up and downwards accountability needs. Therefore, accountability standards should be well balanced and adapted for each organization needs and situation, in order to fulfil their accountability purpose. (Gray, Bebbington & Collison 2006; SustainAbility 2003)

Results consistency: Results vs. Resource allocation: Reliable impact resulted from NGO actions are usually not precise. It is due to the project soft nature which states the vagueness results characteristic. For this reason, methods of measurement are focused on processes, since direct measures (such as impact) is costly, time consuming and often provide inconclusive assessments. Therefore, project implementation is monitored by resource allocation progress and activities completion, issues very much stressed by legal authorities and project financers, but at the end might not guarantee the former project intended objective.

Strategy deployment: Intended vs. Realized. Organizations might have multiples processes of strategy development that are not mutually exclusive (Johnson 2008). The challenge faced is to combine the intended strategy, perhaps the initial LFW planning, with the real strategies implemented, that is highly influenced by context processes. The most used method for planning and appraisal LFW is lacking on operationalise projects implementations and needs adjustments. For this reason, it can be completely abandoned after the planning phase which might increase even more the discrepancy between intended and realized planning and the gap between the design and the implementation phases of the project.
Provided that, it seems that once project financing is granted, project initial planning might not be consistently followed, which could finally reflect on the project results and blurred the organization capability to express impacts. With that said, this study is proposing to further understand how in practice NGO manager address the transition between projects initial phases, while actions are still in theory, to the implementation phase, whether activities are actually carried on. It is also aiming to improve understanding on how such behaviour impacts on project and organizational results and the manner that it addresses the accountability claim.
CHAPTER 2 – RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The systematically investigation of an issue, aiming to increase the knowledge is called research (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill 2003). It must be developed based on logical relationships and not based on beliefs; hence it would allow a better understanding of the issue, which in hereby case, the implementation of non profit projects. Therefore, to investigate the gap already stated an empirical study was carried on, based on the management practice of a well stabilised organization. In this chapter, components of the research methodology will be presented such as the research philosophy, approach, design and the data collection and analysis methods. Additionally, ethical aspects related to the data collection and analysis will be also mentioned.
2.1 Research Methodology for Business and Management Studies

Saunders suggests that based on the theory managers would be able to generate ideas and afterwards relate them to the practice. Problems could be better understood and solved by the interaction between theory and practice. This is the meaning of research for business and management studies, which engages both worlds of theory and practice in order to improve the business performance. Moreover, the main purpose is not only the need to provide findings and advanced knowledge but to address unique and practical business and managerial problems (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill 2003).

The balance between theory and practice has been discussed by business research scholars. For instance, an approach that divides research accordingly to the production of knowledge is suggested by the work of Gibbons et al (1994), cited by Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2003, p. 4). He proposes two modes of research as following explained:

**Mode 1** – the knowledge creation emphasizes questions that are set and solved by academics interests, looking for fundamental rather than practical interests;

**Model 2** – the knowledge creation emphasizes the world of practice, in which the collaboration between the two areas is clearly highlighted.

Other example is the approach suggested by Timm (1994), which distinguishes research in applied and basic. On one hand, basic research seeks to further human knowledge about our world that might be related to the model 1 proposed by Gibbon. On the other hand, applied research is problem-oriented and seeks to solve specific problems by providing information that will facilitate an appropriate decision, which can be related to Gibbon’s second model.

The study hereby combines both theoretical and practical worlds, hence it relies on the applied research approach. For instance, this study is willing to understand a unique phenomenon, investigate how organizations address the gap between project phases and how it may reflect on the project accountability. Therefore, the theoretical review provided advanced knowledge about the problem whereas the practical field generated insights and instigated solution to managerial problem.
2.1.1 Qualitative research

According to Travers, (2001, p. 6) quantitative and qualitative researches are based on fundamental assumptions and this choice commits the way of understanding and developing the research. Travers also highlights the influence of the researcher’s assumptions into the study, which reflects on the choice of the research methodology and further in the data analysis (Travers 2001, p. 9). Providing this the hereby study has as underlying aim to investigate the reality, get a closer look behind appearances of organization and to discover real mechanisms which explain the management behaviour of NGOs. This approach is defined by Silverman (1997, p. 6) and Bryman & Bell (2003) as the domain of qualitative studies. Therefore, data collected were focused on daily activities, basing the investigation on meanings expressed through words, which would contribute to address managerial problems.

2.1.2 Type of research

Type of research can also be distinguished either as primary research, which focuses on primary data collection, or secondary research. Primary data must be obtained firsthand from no published information sources, while secondary data is searched through publications looking for answers to questions (Timm 1994, p. 8).

By crossing the type of research, related to data collection, with the research applicability, Timm (1994) suggests that is possible to define the purpose of the data collection and expected results generated by them, as shown in the figure bellow (figure 5).

![Figure 5 - Types of Research](Adapted from Timm (1994, p. 8))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Collect Data to Further General Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Search Publications to Gain Further Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up, the empirical study hereby developed is situated within the business and management studies, since it is focused on the management of non governmental organizations. The proposed
research design is to take advantage of the theory, enhance the knowledge about specific issues, in order to better understand the research in question. One of the expected results is to generate insights to seek problem solutions and for this reason a primary research is carried on the practitioners’ field. The idea is to gain understanding about how issues were handed in practice, willing to contribute on the development of similar NGO projects.

2.2  Research Process

2.2.1  Theoretical Framework

The research process began with readings in the field of project management for non governmental organization. Other similar terms were also considered, such as aid industry, non profits, third sector, foundation, charity and NGO. Search was conducted through online databases such as EBSCO, Elsevier, Science Direct, Esmerald and Blackwell Synergy, from where not many articles were available. Meanwhile, search on the official webpage of well recognized non profits and international fund agencies were visited, specifically on subjects as ‘institutional development and institutional capability’, from where some open publications were gathered. As a search filter factors that would distinguish the management of corporations, public organizations and non profit organizations were considered. Afterwards, the research area was focused on projects implementation of organizations working on the third sector, using as a background idea projects related to environment of nature conservation. Therefore, search was developed on keywords as project management methodologies; conservation projects; non profit accountability; soft projects; management project aid industry.

In order to select reliable material, the search was focus on academic journals such as Project Management Journal, International Journal of Project Management, Nonprofit Management & Leadership, Public Administration and Development or sources that were previously referenced by articles. Years of publication were also filtered, depending on the aspect searched. For instance, the definition of third sector is not new and year of publication was not considered relevant. Other subjects were searched on documents from the year 2005 onwards. After the process of searching and reading, additional sources were looked at to clarify specific aspects or complement the written report in development.

Additionally, while the literature review was being processed, informal discussions were held with practitioners on the non profit field and some material was gathered as result of such contacts.


2.3 Research theory

2.3.1 Research philosophy

Some scholars defend that the way which empirical study is approached must be defined in accordance with a research philosophy (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill 2003). The research approach and later on the data collection method are highly influenced by such philosophy definition. As Travers (2001, p. 6) states, the choice between quantitative or qualitative research also influence the research approach. Hence, the research methodology developed is built through a process of narrowing down from the philosophy, approach and type of research developed.

Citing Chua’s infers that research philosophy might be classified into three ‘lenses’ (Citing Chua 1986 cited by Trauth, 2001, p. 153). The first lens is called positivist studies, which are premised on the existence of earlier fixed relationships within fact. As a result, the phenomenon can be ended up as a ‘law’ of generalisation. Such study assumes the role of a researcher as an objective analyst, who will emphasize on a highly structured methodology to facilitate further replication. This philosophy relies on quantitative and statistics analysis and considers as assumption that the researcher does not affect the result of the research. The second lens is the interpretive studies, which assumes situations as being created and associate to people own subjective meanings and their interaction with the world around them. The intent of this study is to seek to understand the subjective reality in context and understand motives and intentions. The last lens is the critical studies or realism, which is based on the idea that people not only are likely to share interpretations of their social context, but also there is a reality which is independent of people. In other words, there is a large context that affect people behaviour without their necessarily awareness and, probably, it will affect the way of problems are faced and handled. Thus, while developing realism studies, it is considered that people themselves are not the object of the study, but is crucial to understand the context in which they are in operation (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill 2003; Citing Chua 1986 cited by Trauth, 2001, p. 153).

It is assumed by the hereby study that management of NGO projects is influenced by standard methodologies that can be suggested either by financers and regulation agencies or by the internal policies and procedures. Good examples of it are the Logical Framework Method, accounting regulations and project management standardized methods, as Project Management Institute body of knowledge (PMBok). Such frameworks certainly guide the approach of managers towards the management of a project. Moreover, the cultural aspects of non governmental organization also
influence social, environmental and ethical behaviour of managers while facing managerial problems, since some of these aspects might confront the mission of the organization. Therefore, these aspects must be considered while a research is being developed. Given that it seems that despite the research question is related to structured management methodologies it is highly influenced by a large context, which will affect the approach towards a problem solution. For this reason, the research philosophy adapted would lie on the **realism** philosophy and as a consequence, an **inductive** approach would be the recommended. The features of an inductive study are better explored on the following sections.

### 2.3.2 Research approach

The **inductive** approach suggests that collected data instigate the theory development. The complexity of the specific research question will be analysed as unique, hence, based on the data analysis, the research findings will be developed. According to Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2003) the inductive approach emphasizes:

- Gaining meanings human attach to events;
- Close understanding of the research context;
- Collections of qualitative data;
- Flexible structure to permit adjustment of research emphasis;
- Less concern with the need to generalise;

Moreover, concerning the data sample, Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2003) also emphasizes that studies with a small sample of subjects might be more appropriated in research using inductive approach, once it is not seeking for rigid replicable methodology, but is looking for evidences and understanding of an exceptional event. This reason emphasizes the appropriateness of the inductive approach to the hereby developed study.

### 2.3.3 Research design - Strategy

Defined the philosophy and the approach, the next step would be moving on to research design. It is the framework for collecting and analysing data. Following the realism research philosophy and inductive approach, the research design as called by Bryman & Bell (2003), or research strategy as called by Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2003) would induce the adoption of Case Study, Experiment,
Survey, Archival Analysis or Ground Theory strategies. In order to base the decision of the strategy to be chosen, Yin (1989, p. 17) agrees that the boundaries between strategies might not be clear, for this reason, the author suggests three conditions to base such decision, such as “(a) type of research question posed; (b) the extent of control an investigator has over actual behaviour events, and (c) the degree of focus on contemporary as opposed to historical events”. The three conditions are summarized on the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Form of Research Question</th>
<th>Requires Control Over Behavioural Events</th>
<th>Focus on Contemporary Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>How, why</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Who, what, where, how many and how much</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival analysis</td>
<td>Who, what, where, how many and how much</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes/ no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study History</td>
<td>How, why</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How, why</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research hereby presented followed Yin’s (1989) proposal to define the research strategy. Firstly, the research question is aiming to analyse ‘How does a NGO manage the transition between project phases and how it addresses projects efficiency in respect to organizational accountability?’, which does not suit on the meaning of archival analysis and survey strategies, the first two strategies presented on the table. Secondly, it is not expecting to manipulate or control behaviours and later analyse effects, as a laboratory experiment seeks, thus, experiment is also not an appropriate strategy. Finally, this study is focused on problem faced nowadays by the research centre, it is a contemporary event and history strategy would not be appropriated. Therefore, a suitable strategy would be a case study analysis.

Case studies are recommended in situations where there is a need to understand complex situations and it allows to investigate situations on the real life events. Organizational and managerial processes can be considered into such description (Yin 1989, p. 14), which embraces the proposal of this study. Moreover, it is aiming to understand a complex and particular phenomenon within its practical context and draw some conclusion about it (Druckman 2005, p. 163). Corroborating with such aim, according to Yin (1989) a case study design generates deeper and detailed examination of the question.
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on a single organization, while it is aiming to generate insights that would guide research findings. The same perspective is given by Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2003), who defines case study as the strategy applied that involves empirical investigation of a particular (...) phenomenon within its real life context using multiple source of evidence. Finally, the strategy decision could also be defined considering if the predominant approach is qualitative or quantitative. Bryman & Bell (2003, p. 55) recommend that a research following inductive approach and qualitative predominant approach could be designed as a case study. However, the central point is not generalising finding, but to develop pattern from the data and generate theory out of the finding (Bryman & Bell 2003, p. 54). Therefore, the hereby study followed an applied qualitative research, based on the realism philosophy, considering an inductive approach and assuming case study as a research design.

2.3.3.1 Components of the research design

Silverman (1997, p. 29) suggests, in order to obtain reliable results that it is crucial to strategically plan a case study. For instance, he proposes five components, which would be mandatory in any case study. At the end, these components would end up as a protocol that would drive the case study application and later conduct to the final research findings and results. The components are the following:

State: (1st) the study question and;
     (2nd) the preposition or research purpose;
Define: (3rd) the unit of analysis (management processes);
     (4th) the logic linking the data collected with preposition; and
     (5th) the criteria for interpreting finding (data analysis).

Corroborating with such proposal it was planned this case study. The first and second components were already presented in the introduction of this document. The three last ones are following being introduced.

2.3.4 Targeted organization and unit of analysis
The sample target group followed three particular characteristics: First, it had to be a Scandinavian non profit organization at least with an office in Sweden. Second, the work performed needed to be related to environmental issues. Third, actions must be implemented through projects. A list of non profit organizations were retrieved from the site ‘Sweden.se’ that is administrated by The Swedish Institute. There were retrieved 13 environment organizations operating in Sweden. From the list 6 organizations were targeted as potential. The criterion for such prioritisation was the analysis of the spectrum of their work, selecting organizations that had broader range of work in geographic region, assuming that organization with bigger range or work might be better administratively organized (Appendix I – List of environmental NGO working in Sweden). Representatives for the 6 organizations were contacted by e-mail, available on the official website. The only one which had replied the enquiry was the Stockholm Environmental Institute – SEI.

The SEI is a research institute that operates on more than 5 countries. It works towards environmental concern and implements its action through research projects. The institute head office is settled in Stockholm, SEI. The research institute is a non profit organization (SEI n.d.a). Hsu, & Yet (1996) emphasizes that research institutes are facing similar challenges concerning to accountability and performance results, as it is referred on literature review chapter. For instance, Hsu, & Yet (1996) adds that sponsors are concerned about the performance in meeting long-term the research needs. Issues of accountability and performance measurement with respect to mission and goals are also been claimed. Finally, considering this brief analysis the SEI research institute fulfilled the needs of the herein case study and its internal managerial procedures were targeted as the unit of analysis.

2.3.4.1 Research institute description

Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI) holds as mission:

‘[to] support decision-making and induce change towards sustainable development around the world by providing integrative knowledge that bridges science and policy in the field of environment and development’. (SEI n.d.a)

The institute was established in 1989, as initiative of Swedish government. Today, the organization financial sources are a matching among several sectors, as presented by the diagram.

*Figure 6 - SEI financial sources (2007)*
Adapted from SEI (2007, p.23)
The institute develops its activities through six research centres located in Sweden, Estonia, the United Kingdom (York and Oxford), the United States and Thailand. All centres share a common commitment to policy-relevant research, and to the goal that SEI should make a difference in the global quest for a more equitable and sustainable planet (SEI n.d.a). Nevertheless, each centre operates with significant autonomy while participating in an organised matrix matter toward six SEI research programmes. These are the programme carried on by the organizations today:

1) Atmospheric Environment;
2) Climate and Energy;
3) Future Sustainability;
4) Policy and Institutions;
5) Risk, Livelihoods and Vulnerability;
6) Water Resources and Sanitation.

Activities within SEI's programmes are undertaken by projects. Projects cut across the SEI programmes and address different aspects in a holistic way, combining understanding of several areas of knowledge to seek for impacting solutions to accomplish SEI's mission (SEI, n.d.a).

In the year 2007, it was invested 130 million Swedish crowns is research, as it is shown broke down by geographic by the following chart (Figure 7) (SEI, n.d.a).
One of SEI’s main research approaches is to develop key new ideas, through applied research and robust methodologies and models, with the aim of provide facts to decision making. Additionally, SEI assumes as a role keeping issues that are not at the top of political agenda alive. Action undertaken must consider highly relevant collaborative approach while developing its activities. Partners in regions and places, where research is being developed, are involved and local knowledge and values are also considered and incorporated (SEI, n.d.a). The proposition to involve stakeholders on a bottom up approach is a key feature of the institution’s activities (SEI 2007, p. 4). It is also stated the awareness about enhance and develop local partner’s capabilities while projects are being implemented. Moreover, the multi disciplinary nature of the research, develop through team work and with extreme concern about professionalism of the result obtained is also very clear and presented.

**The Stockholm Centre**

The Stockholm Centre is the head office for SEI and addresses the administration, including the Directors, Finance department, library and communications. The centre expertise includes biotechnology, energy resources, atmospheric environments, climate change, ozone layer protection, risk and vulnerability studies, institutions and policy analysis, water resource analysis and ecological
Sanitation (SEI, n.d.a). In the last 2 years the main 10 programmes have been undertaken by the responsibility of this Centre, carried through almost 100 projects by about 50 staff.

1) Consumer CO\(_2\) emission quotas in Sweden: an initial scoping study;
2) Environmental policy integration and multi-level governance;
3) Evaluation of the Swedish local nature conservation initiative;
4) Green blue water initiative;
5) Green water credits;
6) Links between the social and environmental pillars of sustainable development;
7) Phnom Penh water relations;
8) Policy instruments for Chinese sustainable future: EPI and SEA for energy and transport sectors;
9) Sector climate targets for Sweden;
10) Strategic environmental assessment of GMS power development strategies

As a resume, it seems evident that the institute is very committed to scientific and reliable research to support the improvement of public policies, the accomplishment of their mission. For that reason it was considered a good sample for the study hereby proposed.

**Sample Description**

The interviewee is the Deputy Director of SEI that also works as Professor in Political Science, especially Public Administration, at Umeå University. As a Deputy Director for SEI-Stockholm, relies on her the overall responsibility for SEI’s research and process of planning, executing and evaluation of SEI’s projects. Additional interviews with the Finance and Communications responsible were considered to be carried on, however, interviews with the deputy director sufficiently provided the information needed to develop the hereby.

**2.4 Data Collection**

Research design decision led to the choice of the research method, which is tools that will help to collect evidences for the study (Bryman & Bell 2003). Nevertheless, a good approach to a case study is combining tools and not simply relying on a sole approach. Such care would raise the reliability of the research proposed. Another important aspect to consider, is that qualitative research seeks to offer descriptions of a reality; hence, evidences must be gathered considering the reliability and validity of data (Silverman 1997, p. 5). Consequently, a combination of tools to collect data might raise the acceptance on the work done.
Therefore, research evidences were sought on institutional documents and by a semi structured interview. A complementary interview with the same interviewee was carried after data analysis to confirm data understanding and seek complementary information. Institutional documents provided preliminary information about the organization and its processes. Also, specific details gathered on these documents were confirmed with the information from other sources. It was used as a criteria to analyse documents the Silverman’s proposal (1997, pp. 86; 87), in which any kind of document which might contribute to understand the institute or the research proposal was reviewed. Nevertheless, the analysis was carried on, in accordance with the documents availability.

Semi structured methodology was chosen once it combines structured interviews with a loose pattern of agreement with the interviewee and produces qualitative data (Bryman & Bell 2003). The intended research proposal was presented in advance and complementary questions were asked personally. Despite Bryman & Bell (2003) enlighten that respondents typically prefer to use closed questions, an opened questions interview was carried on. It is justified once respondents can answer in their own term and spontaneity and might release additional data. Considering that, two semi structured interviews were performed face to face, to allow good interaction between the two participants and better in depth exploration of the issue. It also helped to raise confidence while the interview was taken. The two interviews were recorded and fully transcribed.

In order to assure good results on the data collection, some scholars (Yin 1989, p. 28; Timm 1994, p. 73) emphasize the need to structure and plan an interview in advance. Such effort was not underestimated since it could jeopardize the quality of the data collected. Interview guidelines are presented on Appendix II and III.

2.4.1 Interview questions

The first interview was carried at the SEI Swedish centre. The researcher introduced herself and briefly resumed its academic and professional background. The research purpose, question and main objectives were read and aspects related to the right to release data were agreed. From that time on, open questions were enquired and the interviewee was freely answering it, by this means it allowed the respondent to openly dissert about the issue. Researcher interventions were specific, clarifying aspects already referred or guiding to better exploit key points. Such approach was decided in
according to Bryman & Bell (2003) proposition that open-ended questions lead to answers that reflect opinion, attitude and explanations. Therefore, a set of questions derived from the study literature review, was on the hands of the researcher to guide the meeting (Silverman 1997, p. 89). Many of the questions from the guideline (Appendix II - First interview structure) were not asked once it had already been freely answered.

After the analysis of the data, a second face to face meeting was carried at Umeä. The purpose of second meeting was slightly different from the first, as the aim was to clarify specific information or better understand unambiguous aspects mentioned on the research report. It was concerned about the reliability of data reported, confirming understandings to be as fair as possible. For this reason, it was also handled differently, as questions were more structured and punctual, and answers were more direct responded (Appendix II – Second interview structure)

2.5 Analysing data

The strategy to analyse data can be 'based on theoretical preposition or a descriptive framework', as it is proposed by Silverman (1997, p. 125). He also suggests a rationale, in which that the first step is to define central categories and the second is to locate through the data collected information about each related category. Therefore, ‘[...] pieces of information from the same case may be related to some theoretical proposition’ (Silverman 1997, p. 33). Given that, the study had focused the data analysis on the description of project management process and the transitions between project phases, being that the first category. The second category was concerned to specific management challenges pointed out on the theoretical analysis. Finally, the third category was related to the monitoring and evaluation process and how it is connected with the organization strategy. The analysis was conducted seeking for data related to the categories within the interview transcript or at institutional documents. Once the data was categorized in those areas and the organization process well understood, the research question and research objectives were answered and presented in the discussion section. Though, the data analysis categories guided to the conclusion of the study.

2.6 Research quality and limitations

The quality of a research can be evaluated by different aspects such as the rigour and potential of the researcher, the degree of achieving according to the proposal and the quality of measurements, this
last one for quantitative research. Therefore, these aspects can be evaluated through the analysis of the reliability, validity and generalibility (Bryman & Bell 2003, p. 287; Yin 1989, p. 40).

2.6.1 **Reliability, Validity, Generalisability**

The research reliability is concerned with the question of whether the results of a study are repeatable. Reliability evaluates the degree in which same findings might be obtained if a research is developed once again (Silverman 1997, p.203). The goal is to minimize the influence and bias in the study (Yin 1989, p. 45). Some scholars define reliability as a particular concern of quantitative researches (Bryman & Bell 2003, p.33). Therefore, in this case study, in which the analysis is qualitative and subjective, particular care was taken to have more reliable results. For instance, the interview process was planned and structured in advance and the audio recorded was completely transcribed, as suggested by Silverman (1997, p.5). Additionally, any doubt and possible blurred aspects were corrected and certified with the responsible for the organization studied. Moreover, in order to draw conclusion, different sources of evidences were analysed and combined rather than just rely on verbal reports such as interviews Silverman (1997, p.101).

Validity is ‘concerned with the integrity of conclusions that are generated by a research’. It evaluates whether what is concluded relates to reality. (Bryman & Bell 2003, p.33). The main concern here is also the subjective judgement on collecting data and its analysis. Validity might be evaluated by two types, internal and external validity (Yin 1989, p. 42).

Internal validity is related to the match between the theoretical ideas and the research findings, in other words, the cause relation among conditions that led to findings. In as much as, internal validity might not be a concern in studies whether cause and effect relations are not being proved, such as the study developed in this thesis.

External validity refers to the degree that findings can be generalized beyond the immediate study. Scholars infer that external validity and generalizability are questionable in case study, once findings will be based on a single example and small sample (Bryman & Bell 2003, p.55; Silverman 1997, p.214). However, it is also emphasized the intentions of a case study, which is dealing to stress in detail a single case, thus, expecting generalizability might be conflicting and even inappropriate. The hereby study is looking to contribute with provocative ideas that might further be instigated by new studies,
which finally might rely on exploit a specific issue. Therefore it is not meant to be generalized (Yin 1989, p. 40-45). Despite of that, these quality aspects should not be ignored (Bryman & Bell 2003, p.55; Silverman 1997, p.201) and self evaluation concerning validity and reliability were carefully considered during the whole research process.

2.6.2 Researcher bias

Research scholars suggest that a good research work, valid and reliable, must suffer minimum researcher personal values influence on conducing results. For instance, “values reflect either personal beliefs or the feeling of the researcher” which might influence the research conduct since the choice of the area, the formulation of the research purpose, the data collection, analysis and the research findings (Brian & Bell 2001, p. 27; 83;194). Thus, it is important to be aware that in this study there is a real possibility of researcher induction, once either the area of study, the question and purpose were base on work experience, gained before this study began. The topic was defined due to personal experiences of years of work in practice and the final question was guided by literature that better instigated the researcher interest. Therefore, it positively influenced on the conduction the study, once the vocabulary used by the interviewee was easily followed, as much as some managerial aspects related to the NGO context discussed during the interview.

In order to reduce or even avoid the researcher bias, the research method and content analysis were carefully defined, willing that, despite the application of method could also suffer the influence of the researcher bias, it also could, at least, regulate such tempt toward the quality of results.

2.7 Ethical considerations

Access to data and institutional information was vital to develop this study and therefore ethical aspects were involved (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill 2003). Since the very beginning, the approach to the institution was supported by research proposal, which explained the research question, objective and information needed to accomplish it. The formal agreement on being part of the study was received through e-mail contact.

Data gathered, which were not freely posted on the SEI website, either by institutional documents or audio recorded interview were collected with the consent of the institution. However, despite
previous consent allowed the study to move on, the ethical concerns are often not clear as it seemed and may rise while the research process is developed (Schweigert 1994, p.26). In that, it was agreed that the final draft of the study, specially the part which relates to the organization, will be submitted to analysis in order to certify finding.

Additionally, before beginning each interview the objective of the research was reviewed with the interviewee and the consent to record, mention her name and position within the organisation was obtained. The consent to mention that the case study was developed in the research institute was also given by the Deputy Director of the organization. By this means, the important ethical issue raised by Bryman & Bell (2003, p. 543), such as lack of informed consent, was handed in this study.
CHAPTER 3 – EMPIRICAL STUDY - FINDINGS

In this chapter will be described the project management methodology at SEI to support further on discussion. Data presented was available on website or gathered by interviews and two internal documents. The first document is the ‘Project Manual’ that is part of the organization procedures and its use was authorized for the purpose of this study. The other document named ‘Stakeholders engagement and work of SEI – an empirical study’, although it was still not ready for distribution, a draft version was provided and its use was also authorized. At the end, some accountability aspects related to project will also be presented, which refers to financial monitoring system, the quality assurance and the external stakeholder’s accountability.
3.1 **SEI Project Management Rationales**

SEI accomplishes its actions throughout projects implementation. Projects are considered the “main process through which SEI performs its business” (SEI 2007, p. 3), and connect SEI strategic goals into actions. While a business plan defines the strategic guidelines and identifies SEI’s business goals, internal procedures, such as SEI Project Manual, formalise the relationships between the project management methodology and SEI’s business plan.

There are some indication that SEI works with two complementary rationales, which guideline SEI projects and activities. One emphasizes a standard idea of what a “good project” should content. It acts as a basis for a portfolio analysis, which contributes to the management of the research institute as an organization. This method relies on the SEI Project Manual and the financial monitoring and evaluation system. The other method relies on the research methodology process and it is focused on the content of the research and the consequent quality results. This complementary rational was made necessary due to the nature of the actions taken, since soft aspects highly implicate on the institute results. Despite this second rationale is based on the working paper that is still an internal discussion, the document is based on real cases within SEI projects and might well represent the novel trend towards research methodology development.

SEI applies its own project management methodology, but as the institute run projects in partnership with SIDA, some projects have to apply the LFW integrally. Moreover, SEI project information published on the organization website shows the practice of LFW on the development of projects (SEI n.d.b), which indicates that the LFW rationale also is part of management of projects at SEI. However, it is important to emphasize that SEI does not apply the Logical Framework approach, but adapts some aspects of the approach in its own methodology.

3.2 **First Rationale – Project Management Manual**

SEI’s Project Manual sets a common framework for the management of projects within the organization, independently of size or type. Also, it standardizes terminology and defines roles and project responsibilities, besides defining internal process for each project phase.
3.2.1.1  Project concepts

Project is defined as “a temporary organization created to achieve specific objectives” (SEI 2007, p. 3). A project ceases to exist when the project objectives have been achieved or terminated (SEI 2007, p. 3). Any idea to become a project must define project objectives as well as the resources assigned during the time necessary to implement the project. It must be presented by time and budget. Purpose and justification are also part of this initial concept as well as responsibilities must be assigned such as project leader, organization, client, funding and steering committee. The research methodology is also part of the project structure, as the main section, that looks for assuring the quality of outcomes. Therefore, usually projects contain the following headings:

1. Objective: Purpose, justification and specific objectives;
2. Resources: Time plan and budget;
3. Methodology: Research processes;
4. Responsibilities: Project leader, organization, client, financer and steering committee.

3.2.1.2  Organizational management structure

SEI portfolio of projects is managed inside complex organization structure that will be following described.

Functions
Projects might involve internal staffs from different research areas that are named as research groups. These are specialized groups organized around research topics and they are assumed as the main organization group for SEI researchers. The main objective of a research group is to promote a professional development and involvement of its staff on new project ideas and projects in activity.

Due to the cross national range of SEI performance, projects are linked to programs which are related to one strategic research topic. Programmes might include staff from more than one centre, hence, programmes are usually cross centre. A programme is managed by program director who guidelines the qualitative performance of the strategic research topic.
Steering committees are also part of the structure and are aiming to provide an overall management and strategic project directions. Steering committees are usually settled in case of big and complex projects and might be internal or external, which involves external stakeholders as well. As part of an internal steering committee it must be included the project leader, the research director and the program director. Besides those, the external committee also count with representatives from project partners. Once they are established, SEI steering committees assume a decisive power over the implementation of project towards the alignment with SEI’s strategic business plan. Additionally, they accumulates the responsibility to monitor implementation in relations to content, budget and time schedule.

Assisted by the already described functions, Project Leaders are responsible to direct a project to achieve the objective on the time and budget designated. Moreover, they develop and maintain updated a project plan, coordinate activities among project team members and report project activities through status and final project reports.

Organizational structure

SEI applies as a management manner a matrix, since the institute is multi project driven and geographically distributed, as shown below (Figure 8).
Lines, on the diagram above, represent the connections between roles, placing that project leader are not only part of project but part of a research group. For instance, there is a dual objective alignment, which must be followed by project leaders, being them the project objective and research topic guideline. Doted lines express the link between steering committees and projects, and also emphasize the overall responsibility of steering committees.

Additionally, the institute has departments dealing with ongoing activities which are not expressed on the above figure, by which project activities are also influenced, such as the finance, communication and administrative departments. Those areas are considered support areas that play an internal controlling role.

### 3.2.2 Project life cycle

The project lifecycle at SEI is separated in six phases. The diagram (Figure 9) bellow also provides a schematic view of each phase and its expected outputs.

![Figure 9 - SEI Project Life Cycle and Main outcomes](image-url)
The first phase is the project concept, during which the project idea is formulated as **Project Concept**. The main output of this phase, a project concept document, must provide the justification for the project idea and its importance to contribute to organization’s strategic plan and research plan. It also must provide a short background; objectives; define internal capacity to carry the project and budgeted resources. In order to be approved, the concept is evaluated regarding the quality and relevance to the organization, besides the financial viability or economic potential to be financed.

Once approved the idea, the following phase would be the **development phase**. The development output is a proposal, which contains the methodology, the detailed budget and expresses communication aspects. Additionally, an internal steering committee is assigned, which already assumes the quality responsibility of the project by guiding the research methodology development.

The third step regards the **funding decision and contract negotiation**. In such a phase, internal projects must follow the organization hierarchy of approvals and external projects move to the negotiation stage, which involves more intensively the finance and administrative departments. Projects just are allowed to move on, once a formal agreement is settled down, and the relation between SEI and the client or sponsor is clearly regulated. However, different interests and expectation always lay over projects results, and many of them can happen quite often be unrealistic considering what a project can deliver with the resources allocated. Therefore, it is tried to manage distinguishing expectations over a project and the false illusion that a sponsor, community actor or even a project team might have. The approach assumed is to try to be as realistic as possible; negotiating explicitly project objectives with the funder and clearly defining what is believed that can be done and mostly try to “manage the natural tendency to promise as much as is possible so you make sure you get the funding”. Indeed, it seems that their method is based on developing as close and transparent relationship as possible pursuing objectives in common during the whole project lifecycle.

Following the **implementation** phase is initiated. The project working plan is developed and project leader coordinate its execution. The leader also maintains superiors and committees informed about the project performance. Some standard forms of project reporting are suggested by the internal manual as the project and deviation reports, but they are not obligatory. The institute does not suggest a blueprint, which would indicate the working plan content and categories; therefore, each project plan has its own structure. Moreover, performance indicators are not a standardized
obligation, relying mainly on finance measurement as presented on the section 3.2.3 – (Financial monitoring and evaluation) following presented.

The completion phase is led by the elaboration of the project final report, which must be internally approved and submitted and approved by the client or sponsor.

Finally the project reached the evaluation phase, when are analysed project deliverables, financial results, additional outreaches and spin-offs of the whole project lifecycle. Additionally, it is highly recommended that lessons learned and best practices examples should be communicated among SEI staff. As a result, learning turned out to be an important into SEI project process. It is considered as an intrinsic process while developing a research project. Learning is assumed since the project beginning and is also expected that such learning is being gathered from team member at project level or with different researches types at same organization. Such sharing information is stimulated by top managers, as well as internal training for specific issues related to building internal human capacity.

3.2.3 Financial monitoring and evaluation

Project finance must be drawn considering a scheme, which must detail each person involvement (hours planned per person), hourly rates (cost price and sales price), overhead and other expenditures such as subcontracting, travel, and other expenses. The budgeting must be supervised by the finance department and should be broken down in accordance with the reporting requirement of each project sponsor. Providing that, the finance department monitors the financial progress of each project on a monthly basis. The monitoring analysis is based on time reports and resource allocations per projects. In case that any divergence the Project Leader is directly informed and in case of more relevant discrepancies the Centre Director is also notified. Besides this system, the information is available on the financial internal system, which can freely be accessed by all project leaders. Therefore there is not other reporting routine to support decisions taken, unless it is specifically built.

Annually a financial report of the organization is released to the board of directors and the organization is audited by external officers.
3.2.4 Quality assurance monitoring and evaluation

Quality assurance is pursued through a “well – defined research methodology” (SEI 2007, p. 11). It is believed that research methodology and the careful definition of the research content are the best tactic to assure quality of results. On this manner, SEI is deeply building internal capacity focused on the engagement of stakeholder and the work of SEI was developed, which will be further presented in the section 3.3 (Second Rationale – The Research Methodology for SEI Projects). It is important to remind that the institute does not use project performance indicators beyond the financial indicators presented at the last section.

To develop the research method it is suggested that a person must be designated to its specific purpose, who also would assume the project monitoring. This person is usually the project leader, supervised by the research director, depending on the seniority level of the researcher.

As mentioned on the interview with the Deputy Director, there is constant concern about SEI project evaluation and the institute impact. For this reason, it is planned for the year 2009 an external evaluation looking at all SEI activities. The evaluation will be attained to two main purposes, assess the quality of research (method and the accomplishment of the proposed objective) and outreach of the organization (communication matters of the actions).

3.2.5 External accountability

External accountability is addressed by external auditing, publications and the recently initiated communication strategy. Auditing is carried in accordance with each sponsor agreement, besides the annual external auditing of the organizations as a whole. Publications are considered one of the main research results and publishing is highly recommended within the staff. Furthermore, a resumed version of annual report, which catches a glimpse of the work and the accomplishments of some chosen program per year, is released to the general public.

External communication is recently being tackled, on the basis of projects results; by informing research projects results to the big media and strategic groups. The proposal is to bring SEI message across and inform about the results of the issues taken cared by SEI. Through this strategy differentiate target groups that are being fed back with proper and specific data. This approach also
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aims to better reach groups that are able to make significant difference and greater impact on actions. As stated on the interview, despite the organizations always had worked on such manner, the recent systematic way seems to show up satisfactory results.

The steering committee and a research methodology engaging stakeholders are used as mechanisms to address projects accountability. Regular meetings are willing to induce a healthy interorganizations relationship, as the one proposed by Ebrahim (2003), and disclosure the project to public. The participatory approach towards research methodology build into all project phases is also considered as tool to address external accountability, as better explained in the following section.
3.3 **Second Rationale – Research Methodology for SEI Projects**

The quality of the research can be highly influenced by a project context and the research process design. Not occasionally, stakeholder needs and their engagement into the cause influence the project context and, for this reason, the institute assumed it as a new approach towards research methodology. It is assumed that good stakeholders involvement do not just happen and it must be well designed and developed. To support such development a working paper was developed and it claims to guideline the participatory approach of SEI projects. In fact, it is justified also as SEI mission “Induce change towards sustainable development [...] providing integrative knowledge that bridges science and policy in the field of environment and development” (SEI, n.d), which states an underlying trend towards stakeholder’s involvement. Based upon the mission statement together with the idealism toward stakeholders’ involvement, SEI recommends that better impacts are achieved through real stakeholder’s participation, specially those types of participation that goes beyond the project development phase and engage actor not only willing to attain a mandatory claim. Indeed, the challenge lies in involving stakeholders to persuade problems solutions along the whole project process and beyond the project boundaries.

According to this approach, actor participation would increase the democracy towards the research process, develop social capital and create a sense of ownership over issues and processes. There is an internal notion that stakeholder directly impacted upon the targeted problem, shall be involved during the whole process, in order to legitimate it. Furthermore legitimated project results can be better used to argument to government and policy makers and it is being highly recommended by the UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). Participatory process might be more regarded to make the institute research approach grounded on reality and might be politically more impacting.

Within the context of SEI projects, there is a range of actions working with stakeholders and there are also differences between participatory approaches. Nevertheless, a common point is the need of a clear outcome and purpose of the stakeholders’ engagement process. Participatory processes must possess a clear outcome, but it also should not assume as all outcomes before the research indeed began. Outcomes should be incorporated as the stakeholder participation moves on, due to the learning encouragement and feedback ideal. As a result, more than just define as new method, it implies assuming a flexible approach which must be considered into all project phases and might implicate on the management style of projects. A culture of flexibility has to be considered part of the research methodology and the project management process.
Concerning the management of projects, a flexible approach brings up consequences towards the SEI financial expenditure and performance monitoring. Participatory actions usually spend more time and need more financial investment. The extra workload and investment must be incorporated on projects and organizational budgeting. Also, SEI itself is working to solve “unbounded problems”, which might not have only one strategy to pursue a solution. Involving more actors might increase the amount of strategy possibilities, due to the variety of expectation lie into project results. Indeed, the monitoring progress might rely on ambiguous aspects by itself, even if it is not comparing strategies choices. Establish performance indicators in such uncertain context can be complex, and monitoring progress might rely on the research process rather than in performance indicators. At the end, much attention is given to the process and on relevant process outcomes.

As a conclusion, it seems that the institute is deeming to gather better and sustainable results by investing on a flexible participatory learning process together with a ‘semi-structured’ project management methodology.
CHAPTER 4 – EMPIRICAL STUDY – ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS

Based on the theoretical framework and the findings gathered during the empirical study, in this chapter aspects related to the research in question will be discussed, in a way that led to elucidate this study question. For this reason, the set of research objectives will guide the discussion willing that it enables to compare the theoretical methods with the practical approach encountered and base the final conclusion of the thesis work.
4.1 Data Analysis and Discussion

As already mentioned, one of the aspects that could influence on the effectiveness of NGO’s projects is the transition between project phases and how it could impact on the project results. This study aims to improve the understanding of how such transition flows in work in practice, with a close concern to this consequences on project outcomes and so the effectiveness of NGO’s projects. Moreover, it deems to understand how managers are addressing challenges already identified as findings of the theoretical framework. In that, the discussion will be guided by the objectives of this research.

4.1.1 Objective 1: To understand the project methodology applied and how it addresses the transition between project life cycle phases;

The management methodology applied by SEI shows similarities to the approach to plan and manage conservation projects suggested by The World Wildlife Foundation (2007). SEI Projects seems to be managed by distinguished phases as it follows a life cycle. Taking the standard suggested by WWF as a theoretical base and comparing with SEI method (diagrams bellow Figures 10 and 11) some similarities can be noticed. To develop this analysis, it was considered as initial phased, those that happen before the project implementation, that are antecedent the development of activities in practice.
It seems that the first two phases pursue a common purpose, in spite of the different terminology. For instance, the ‘Define’ phase of WWF is called the ‘Concept’ phase from SEI and the ‘Design’ phase is called ‘Development’.

Apart from the first two phases, it seems that there are some differences in the concept of the following phases. SEI better distinguishes the funding decision and contract negotiation phase, stepping it as a phase apart (the third phase that is called ‘Funding Decision and Contract Negotiation’). Such distinction is not shown so clear on the standard format of WWF. In fact, such aspect seems mixed with implementation action, being fund raising one along all activities included on the implementation phase.

It seems that WWF ‘Implement’ phase is detached from the ‘Adapt’ phase, giving the impression that during the project implementation actions are executed as planned, having no need to be adjusted. Adaption, in WWF method, would come after, in the following phase, when data is collected, analysed and plans are adapted afterwards. Inasmuch as adaption is not mentioned on SEI lifecycle. It might be because SEI considers it as an inner assumption of the whole life cycle, so there is no need to be distinguished. The final two phases are quite similar as well, giving the WWF method more emphasis on the ‘Share’ knowledge proposal, which is just cited on the last phase of the project ‘Evaluation’ of SEI method.

Both methods, by being presented in cyclical diagram, might suggest that changing phase’s moves on a logical and clear flow, as one phase just begins after the previous is completed. However, the analysis of the interview might not suggest quite conclusive evidence, as in practice there are some projects without specific phases, as phases might run in parallel.

Moreover, SEI proposes complementary rationales to manage project which would guide as a principle the whole life cycle. Hence, initial phases such as concept, development and implementation might be carried at same time. For instance, the first action might be carried during implementation when defining the project concept could be done in partnership with stakeholders. Nevertheless, there is a framework for project lifecycle, but it is focused on the main expected outcomes from each phase, rather than accomplishing activities defined on workplans. Project plans
are considered living documents and they are adjusted as research findings come out, or in result of the interaction with stakeholders. Indeed, there is a constant process of designing, implementing and evaluation and not a clear transition between phases.

Some scholars suggest that projects on complex and changing context might need a slightly different approach toward project management methodologies (Andersen 2008; Remington & Pollack 2007). They advocate that project work can be executed in different ways, especially when it is not feasible to divide the project into neat phases. In fact, each person might have different expectations towards each project phase. According to Andersen (2008), unclear project changing phases are mostly seen in projects that deal with uncertainties issues and a lot of stakeholders’ involvement. Remington & Pollack (2007) would also include on this scheme projects with goals that are no easy to predict or are constantly being defined, such as milestones or moving tasks, as the following action would be planned based on previous phase and so on. Hence, project initial phases would define the approach toward the project development rather than draw a plan that should be strictly followed. The implementation would be mostly decided by itself. Though, such vague and uncertain context seems to suite on the case of the NGO projects and the organization analysed by this study.

At SEI, project development and implementation should follow the project manual framework, but there are some projects that implement a different process in reality. The research centre develops a wide range of projects and there is not a planning blue print that fits to all the projects types at same time. Project development and implementation processes are developed in accordance to each case faced. For instance, some projects require a lot of discussion and thinking between the development and implementation phases, specially, when there are many unsolved issues faced before the planning phase. Also, there are projects following methodologies already applied; and there is a better understanding of what it is being expected and actions are clearer. In such cases, there are more evidences and background to develop a planning and the transition between phases (development and implementation) is better distinguished. Hence, only after the development is completed the following phase is initiated. In other projects, the transition between development and implementation phases is gradual, as a consequence of the research process that considers what is being discovered into the process. Therefore, managers learn along the project development and strategize the project implementation. As a result, the project plan is seen as a necessary tool to provide a base for budgeting, but there is no need to be strictly followed.
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Projects, especially those in areas that were not exploited yet, have a quite loose framework for implementation, once structure is defined while projects move on. Therefore, it seems that SEI project management methodology applies a methodology with semi structured plans, a flexible approach that defines project boundaries (budget, responsibilities and deadlines), scope and guidelines toward actions. Additionally, the stakeholder engagement proposal encourages a deeper project context understanding, common project goals definition and flexible approach towards project implementation, therefore, project goals and strategies might be constantly planned and the transition between phases has to be considered gradual.

4.1.2 Objective 2: To understand how the project procedure deals with challenges such as strategy indeed deployed; results consistency; and monitoring system uncertainties;

Strategy deployed: Planned vs. applied
As stated by the deputy director, it seems assumed at SEI that strategies are a result of a collective thinking process and must have the freedom to be adjusted considering projects boundaries. It is quite often that strategy initially intended is not fully applied, due a numerous internal and external factors. In fact, it seems assumed that such divergence is “rather a rule than an exception”, as it is part of the research nature to understand, learn and improve. In fact, it is also possible to end up a project with different strategic directions, if learning along the process evidenced a different need. These adjustments are considered as part of the process and it is considered acceptable.

However, the fact that discrepancies are not discouraged does not mean that it is mistreated. Project planning and research methodologies structures are deployed in order to schedule actions and decrease the level of uncertainties. Especially, projects that are part of bigger programs, which are taken in partnerships with other SEI centres or external stakeholder, must well define a planning structure. Planning process promotes a longer thinking over intended actions and usually provides a more accurate completion time and prediction of resources. It also helps to estimate expectations over project outcomes, as planning methods lead the analysis of project feasibility and support negotiation terms. Furthermore, it bases discussion and exchange of expectations with project stakeholders which after all carries the common definition of project objective and strategy assumptions. Despite all that justification about the planning need, changes during the project progress are not discouraged, but they must be based on a proper justification. Once a project plan is
changed, the procedure is quite simple, as just is documented on the annual or final reports, or gained superior hierarchies acknowledgment, if changes extrapolate certain project boundaries.

Planning corrections are done on the implementation plan of the project, which is considered a living document. Usually, projects that have more than one year duration are re-planned annually, in the occasion of the annual evaluation and report. Plans might be adjusted in accordance with the work done on the previous year and outcomes gathered, being even possible to relocate resources within the budget limit. Therefore, it happens by projects individually over the Project Leader responsibility, and there is not a review moment defined by the organization to such re-plan. Despite the manual states changes reporting by deviation and changing reports in practice it is not applicable.

**Results consistency: results vs. resource allocation**

SEI system is based on the assumption that appropriate research methodology will result in greater and better project achievements. Following the tendency of environmental projects, presented by Salafsky & Margoluis (1999) and The Earth Watch Institute (2006), SEI projects results are expressed in terms of outputs instead of impacts. The institute monitors project progress through financial indicators and project reports, which focus on the processes instead of the impact of its actions. Nevertheless, it seems that the ‘operations’ accountability, as suggested by Crawford & Bryce (2003), is conducted to accomplish regulation need, specially sponsors agreements. A point that might be improved on this process is that it is not providing feedback in order to improve projects development, since none internal reporting returns to project leaders.

The ‘strategic’ evaluation, also part of Crawford & Bryce (2003) proposal, which relies on verify project impacts, is assessed by reporting to board of directors, or participating of “stakeholder’s moment” evaluation meeting. On the eyes of SEI, it seems evident that a better relationship with stakeholder is part of the future agenda and, by doing so, it is expected that consistent results might be accomplished. It also seems that is part of the future agenda submit all organization projects to an external evaluation, which would be focused on the consistency of projects and organizational results. Given that, it seems that the institute reality confirms the results of the The Keystone Institute (2006) survey, as results consistency is big concern, but it focused on processes results and stakeholders relationship.
Accountability: rigidity vs. flexibility:
It seems that SEI allows a flexible approach towards projects development. It might be evidenced by the semi structured plans and the possibility of constant project re-schedules actions. Project teams have the freedom to evaluate project progress and adapt strategies even though it was not part of the initial plan. Also, accountability standards are balanced in accordance with each funding requirements and this responsibility is mainly assumed by the financial department. By this means, the rational type of accountability suggested by Jepson (2005) on (section 4) seems to be satisfactory. The moral accountability appears to be addressed by applying the stakeholders’ participatory approach.

As proposed by The SustainAbility (2003) NGO accountability needs can be focused on four drives. By such approach, it seems that SEI faces an outstanding position on dealing with drives ‘3- police space’, considering the influence that SEI research results are influencing public polices and ‘4- wider democratization’ driver, if indeed assumed in practice the stakeholder engagement approach. However, accountability could also be seen as driver to improve the project ‘2- performance’ and help the internal users. Feed back with helpful information might assist the development of new project, or even it serves as baseline for internal benchmarking what could be a future opportunity to be exploited. The first driver, ‘1-morality’ was already mentioned and seems evident the focus on justify SEI actions into accomplish regulatory needs.

Additional to the preview analysis, it is necessary to remind that participatory work raises the need to work with uncertainty rather than block the project on controlling process, outputs and results. Therefore, ideal accountability (as suggested by Gray, Bebbington & Collison 2006; the Keystone Institute 2006 and Ebrahim 2003) would be influenced by a trustful relationship between partners, respecting differences and power relations between actors that are indeed subjective aspects to be evaluated as well. Hence, the organization faces a trick position that is built trust over transparency of the organizations involved, based on a flexible accountable approach.

4.1.3 Objective 3: To analyse how the monitoring and evaluation system addresses organizational needs for results and external claiming for project impacts;

The monitoring process of the project individually is carried by each project leader and there is not a common framework for the project planning and the monitoring process. Project progress indicators
are financial and support monitoring process of each project individual, on regards of time and project budget expenditure. The monitoring process is conducted by an annual review meeting, during which every staff reports progress and makes the plan for the next year. Big projects (with many stakeholders involved) carry also a ‘stakeholder’s moment’, which is project follow up meeting. Otherwise, ordinary projects are constantly followed by the project leader and the external process is carried by an annual report to the funding agency, in accordance to each project request. Depending on the project relevance, this document might also be analysed by the research director and, sometimes, by the steering committee.

SEI considers evaluation as a process that looks at the content of the project, the results of project as a whole. There is not a standardized institutional evaluation method or performance indicators. The evaluation relies on the analysis and expertise of team members or staff from the institute. The evaluation process is carried during the annual meeting or during the elaboration of half way or annual reports of project and organization, when project leaders report projects progresses and outcomes. Evaluation processes might also be built on the project design, in case of large programmes, and moments of self evaluations are also planed with stakeholders. Smaller projects carry self evaluation moments with the project team.

The evaluation of non financial outcomes, soft aspect of the project, is not systematically structured. Information might be gathered during the project implementation, on moments such stakeholder meetings or even through oral reports, which might be considered as a feedback. In fact, it is important to stress that SEI assumes quality assurance as a consequence of research methodology and much attention is invested on its development as it is the guideline towards the project results and the project worthiness.

Evaluation of the portfolio of projects for the institute mission accomplishment is mainly assembled on annual follow up meeting, when project progresses and accomplishments are communicated. Projects alignment with organizational objectives, or with the initial project purpose, is managed by project leader. They play a strategic role, since relies on them the responsibility to track the linkage between projects and the organizational business objectives.

Additionally, there is a complete annual report, an internal document, in which centre directors and cross centre programs report progress to the board of directors. In this document all new research
project, important finding, conferences arranged, speeches, publications and statistics are mentioned. Also, projects are briefly cited as well as its achievement of the year.
CHAPTER 5 – CONCLUSION

According to Crawford & Bryce (2003), the foundation of NGO successful management is a combination between accountability and project effective performance. Accountability can be promoted through transparency and project performance by responsive project management. Project management methodologies are applied deeming to improve project implementation and its efficiency. However, some scholars question the application of standardized project management methods in the case of NGO projects (Crawford & Bryce 2003; Jepson 2005; Remington & Pollack 2007), since there are distinguishing factors that must be carefully considered on applying those methods in real cases. As a consequence, project management methodologies must be adapted to project managed by NGO and its peculiar necessities.

Aiming to contribute to the understanding of this difference, this study deeply analysed the most commonly applied project management methodology for NGO’s projects, surrounded by the third sector context and its accountability challenges. As a result of the theoretical analysis, three relevant aspects seem worthy to be emphasized here. (1) It seems that project success might not be only considered based on the evaluation of planning and reporting documents, neither by the analysis of project process, but rather through close relationships between parties enhancing the quality of partnership and project common results. As clearly stated by The Key Stone Accountability (2006), by this matter, the evaluation ambiguity is not diminished but it is believed that it will better guarantee sustainable and future project impacts. (2) NGO’s projects are highly influenced by the difference between the intended strategy and the realized strategy as project plans are greatly modified during the project implementation. Therefore, managers cannot simply attain to project plans and ignore emerging strategies that highly reflects on project evaluation and results. (3) Accountability model suitable for NGO must combine a level of transparency with a level of accountability that is adequate to stakeholders. A challenge relies over managers to define a balance between these two points.

The analysis of the procedures in practice evidenced different practical techniques and methodologies applied to embrace the organizational own needs. It was apparent that project management methods were adapted to the institutional research purpose, even though those adjustments might not be completely in accordance with internal procedures. The gradual transition between project phases might be a point that confirms the discrepancy between project methodology in paper and the work done in practice. On going actions respect the flow of the work in development and research findings are defining the project work plan. Also, project management tools are assumed as a semi structure
basis and can be easily changed if it is justified, so, despite there is a project method, it does not need to be strictly followed. This flexible approach relies on the trust and expertise of the organization staff and much responsibility is loaded over project leaders and research groups. Moreover, SEI assumes two complementary rationales as methodological guidelines, being one of them mainly based on participatory approach. With this said, it might be evident that the research institute project management strategy is investing on a trustful relationship with both internal research staff and external actors, as a fundament to guarantee a project sustainable impact.

The analysis also allowed to state that NGO projects and traditional project management methods might be based on different philosophies. Therefore, NGO projects are based on the interpretivist philosophy, which emphasizes learning, exploration and negotiation, while traditional project management methodologies are based on realist and positivist philosophies, which emphasize efficiency of delivery, control and objectivity, as better presented on chapter 2 (Remington & Pollack 2007). Therefore, it cannot be expected that results, accountability and transparency, based on one philosophy, will be gathered from projects assuming a contrary philosophy.

However, project management methods, assumed as a semi structure method, might not be exploited as a good management tool as it could be. By this means, a supportive potential might be misused once project team members may lose trust on it. Feedbacking and benchmarking information are a helpful support for future projects as well as good information for decision makers. Additionally, projects context will always face stakeholders that might not be comfortable with the subjective management and approaches based on trust. Relying management on subjective aspects might be a risky endeavour and it might be a sensible choice try to follow insights from management traditional methods, such as a clear communications strategy or a structured evaluation system, in order to avoid future inconveniences.

Besides, there are managerial consequences on adapting a flexible approach based on relationships and participatory projects. Participatory means promote democracy, transparency and accountability links across actors. The optimistic perspective on it is that “transparency encourages involvement, promotes trust and confidence and stimulates fresh thinking [, but also] means letting outsiders in on the project, giving […] a formal opportunity to observe how it works and it does” (Andersen 2008, p.250). Indeed, a flexible management approach struggles with subjective evaluation, once it is based on people’s reports that can be biased and easily contested. As a result, transparency might be easily contested driving organization to exhaustive communication.
As a conclusion, it seems evident that NGO projects carry particular aspects and expectations over projects accountability and, for this reason, project management methodologies must be adapted to it. Management methods for NGO and its projects must be customized to each organization needs and context, and, as had been seen in the practical case that tackled proper project management by creating complementary management approaches. At the end, this analysis of a work done in practice deemed to provide insights and indeed be a good inspiration for NGO project managers.

5.1 Implications for future research and limitations

The purpose of this study was to analyse project management in practice, deeming to add some insights for future studies. It is valid to emphasize that is not central point here to generalise findings, but to contribute with data from the analysis of one organization that might improve the understanding of NGO project management. It is also important to mention that if the work was carried in a wider temporal analysis and exploiting different point of view within the organization or even along with its partners additional insights could be gathered that could results on the improvement of this study. Future studies might be encouraged to carry similar studies analysing a greater range of NGO, more representative of the NGO’s universe, and during a temporal period of time, which might allow observe the results of each management approach.

***
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## APPENDIX I– List of environmental NGO working in Sweden – Target organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Short Description</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 A</td>
<td>FIRST ** Swedish Foundation for Strategic Environmental Research Stiftelsen för miljöstrategisk forskning (MISTRA)</td>
<td>The foundation supports strategic environmental research, i.e. research with a long-term perspective directed towards solving major environmental problems.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mistra-research.se">www.mistra-research.se</a></td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>Eva Thörnelöf Administrative Director <a href="mailto:eva.thornelof@mistra.org">eva.thornelof@mistra.org</a> Phone: +46-8-791 1026</td>
<td>Mistra is a foundation and as such must comply with the Swedish Foundations Act. The relevant paragraph from the statutes states that: The aim of the foundation is to support research of strategic importance for a good living environment. The foundation shall promote the development of robust research environments of the highest international class that will have a positive impact on Sweden’s future competitiveness. The research shall play a significant role in solving major environmental problems and contribute to the development of a sustainable society. The potential for achieving industrial applications shall be realised as far as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A</td>
<td>SECOND ** Swedish Society for Nature Conservation (SSNC) Naturskyddsföreningen</td>
<td>The SSNC is Sweden's oldest and largest environmental organization. It was founded in 1909 by a group of researchers and cultural figures.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.snf.se">www.snf.se</a></td>
<td>SSNC National Office Stockholm Tel: (+46) 8-702 65 00 <a href="mailto:info@naturskyddsforeningen.se">info@naturskyddsforeningen.se</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>We spread knowledge, map environmental threats, create solutions, and influence politicians and public authorities, at both national and international levels. Moreover, we are behind one of the world's most challenging ecobalancing, “Bra Miljöval” (Good Environmental Choice). Climate, the oceans, forests, environmental toxins, and agriculture are our main areas of involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 A</td>
<td>THIRD - World Wide Fund Sweden Världsnaturfonden WFF Sverige</td>
<td>WWF Sweden is one of the 27 independent national organizations that go to make up the World Wide Fund for Nature, the world's largest independent nature conservation organization.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wwf.se">www.wwf.se</a></td>
<td>Kontakt</td>
<td>Tel: 08-624 74 00 <a href="mailto:info@wwf.se">info@wwf.se</a></td>
<td>To stop the degradation of the planet's natural environment and to build a future in which humans live in harmony with nature, by: • conserving the world's biological diversity • ensuring that the use of renewable natural resources is sustainable • promoting the reduction of pollution and wasteful consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 A</td>
<td>Stockholm Environment Institute The Stockholm Environment</td>
<td>Institute is an independent, international research, consulting and training organization working to promote global sustainable development.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sei.se">www.sei.se</a></td>
<td>Katarina Axelsson Stockholm <a href="mailto:katarina.axelsson@sei.se">katarina.axelsson@sei.se</a> Telephone: +46 8 674 75 26</td>
<td></td>
<td>About the Stockholm Environment Institute SEI is an independent, international research institute specializing in sustainable development and environment issues. It works at local, national, regional and global policy levels. Mission: SEI’s mission is to support decision-making and induce change towards sustainable development around the world by providing integrative knowledge that bridges science and policy in the field of environment and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 B</td>
<td>Nordic Greenpeace Nordiska Greenpeace</td>
<td>Greenpeace opened offices in Sweden, Denmark, Norway and Finland. In may 1998 Sweden, Norway and Finland formed Greenpeace Nordic, with the headquarters in Stockholm, Sweden. In March 1999 Denmark joined.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.greenpeace.se">www.greenpeace.se</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenpeace exists because this fragile earth deserves a voice. It needs solutions. It needs change. It needs action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 B</td>
<td>Swedish Environmental Research</td>
<td>The IVL is Sweden's leading organization for</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ivl.se">www.ivl.se</a></td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission: IVL has a mission to promote sustainable growth. We do that by ensuring that knowledge is compiled, refined,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendixes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Institute Svenska miljöinstitutet (IVL)**  
**It is not a NGO; Research Institute** |  
Applied environmental research and one of the most qualified in Europe. It comprises Sweden's largest gathering of environmental expertise and competence. | **Gothenburg** |  
Value-added, and implemented in society.  
Aim of the Foundation is to promote long-term conditions for environmental research and through ownership guarantee IVL an independent position. |
| **7 B**  
**Friends of the Earth Sweden Miljöförbundet Jordens Vänner** |  
Friends of the Earth Sweden is an organization aiming to protect the environment and build solidarity between people. The goal is to build an ecologically and socially sustainable society and to take action in specific issues.  
Friends of the Earth Sweden is the Swedish branch of Friends of the Earth International, which has a worldwide membership of over one million people. | **www.mjv.se** |  
Adress: Box 7048  
402 31 Göteborg  
Tel: 031-12808  
info(a)mjv.se |  
Friends of the Earth Sweden is a non-partisan organization that works on the local, national, and international levels to promote ecological sustainability and solidarity.  
FoE Sweden is a radical voice in the environmental movement. The organization advocates fair distribution of the Earth's resources, and an adaptation of society to what is ecologically sustainable. FoE Sweden strives to increase democracy, and gender and cultural equality. |
| **8 B**  
**Keep Sweden Tidy Håll Sverige rent** |  
Keep Sweden Tidy’s mission is to work for sustainable development by increasing people’s environmental responsibility via education and information. | **www.hsr.se** |  
The Keep Sweden Tidy Foundation is a creator of public opinion on environmental issues, promotes recycling and combatts litter through public awareness campaigns, awards and environmental education. The Foundation strives to influence people's attitudes and behaviour in order to promote sustainable environmental development. The Foundation is a non-profit organization with wide support from other non-profit organizations, associations, national and local authorities, as well as from the business and public sectors. Today it is also one of the market leaders within environmental education, providing courses, environmental teaching methods and educational material to public schools and the business sector. |
| **9 C**  
**Swedish Youth Association of Nature Studies and Environmental Protection Fältbiologerna – Website not in ENGLISH** |  
Founded in 1947, the organization was — and still is — a separate youth branch of the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation | **www.faltbiologern a.se** |  
KRAV is a key player in the organic market in Sweden. We develop organic standards and promote the KRAV label. |
| **10 C**  
**KRAV** |  
KRAV is developing organic standards in Sweden. Food, clothes and flowerpot soil are examples of certified products from organic farming. | **www.krav.se** |  
KRAV is a key player in the organic market in Sweden. We develop organic standards and promote the KRAV label. |
| **11 C**  
**Swedish Ecodemics** |  
Swedish Ecodemics is a network of student associations which works for a sustainable development and environment, particularly in Sweden. | **www.svenskaekodem iker.se** |  
Swedish Ecodemics is a network for organizations, committees and other interest groups which, at universities, are working with sustainable development. The student organization was founded in 1994 and the purpose is to work for a better environment and a sustainable development. Swedish Ecodemics has 43 members at 26 universities. |
| **12 C**  
**Swedish Environmental Management Council Svenska Miljöstyrningsrådet** |  
A company jointly owned by the Ministry of the Environment, the Federation of Swedish Industries and the Swedish Association of Local Authorities. The business goal of the Council is to support the industry and public sectors in developing their environmental work in a systematic and cost-effective way. | **www.environmark et.com**  
http://www.msr.se/  
en/  
Stockholm  
Telephone +46 (0)8  
700 66 90  
E-mail info@msr.se |  
The Swedish Environmental Management Council (MSR) was formed in 1995 and is a company owned jointly by the Swedish Government, the Confederation of Swedish Enterprises and the Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions. The owners have assigned MSR the administration of three tools – the Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS), Environmental Product Declarations (EPD) and MSR GPP criteria. |
| **13 C**  
**Swedish Environmental Protection Agency Naturvårdsverket** |  
The Swedish Environmental Protection Agency is a central national agency whose tasks include pressing for national and international action on environmental issues. | **www.naturvardsver ket.se** |  
The Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, created in 1971, is the national agency for environmental protection and nature conservation as well as outdoor recreation and hunting issues. |
APPENDIX II– First interview structure.

Interviewee: SEI Deputy Director - Katarina Eckerberg

Date: 17 of November (11h30 – 12h15)

Research question: How does a NGO manage the transition between project phases and how it addresses projects efficiency in respect to organizational accountability?

Project Management Methodology

Objective 1: To understand the project methodology applied and how it addresses the transition between project life cycle phases;

a. Is there a method or a framework used to guide the transition between the planning and operational phases of a project?

b. How do you perceive the transition between these two phases?

c. What is your view about the results for the operational phase? And the planning phase?

d. How do you perceive the difference between project monitoring and evaluation?

e. Do you believe the project performance monitoring reflects the aim for the project strategic objective? Is there a method applied to guarantee such focus?

Objective 2: To understand how the project procedure deals with challenges such as strategy indeed deployed; results consistency; and monitoring system uncertainties;

a. How would a manager proceed if the activity under implementation did not reflect the output expected? How it would reflect on the project operational planning? And the strategic planning?

b. Is there a standardized tracking system that ensures project performance alignment with the Institute mission?

c. If an adjustment on the project planning is needed, how it would reflect on the monitoring and verification system? How are findings from the monitoring system incorporated to the project planning (project process)? How are findings from the evaluation system incorporated to the strategy planning (project outcome)?

d. How are learning finding incorporated in the project during its implementation?

e. What are in your view the system limitations? (Concerning project performance and institutional strategy)?
**Project Management & Accountability**

**Objective 3**: To analyse how the monitoring and evaluation system addresses organizational needs for results and external claiming for project impacts;

a. How is the monitoring and evaluations system designed to address accountability data for external stakeholders? And for internal purposes?

b. Considering the soft nature of projects, such as evaluate awareness, changing behaviour, how these aspects are evaluated on projects or programmes?

c. In your point of view, do you believe that monitoring of time, cost and schedule reflect the desired outcomes of the project?

d. In which means does information follows during the project implementation?

e. Is there any project that is developed in partnership? In this cases of project how is build the interaction between partners? Is there a common monitoring and evaluation system?

f. Would you believe that this communication between partners would influence the projects results? Is there a possibility to adjust the project planning during the project execution and how it is incorporated into the project planning?

g. What is the procedure is any conflict between views and goals are emerges during the project execution?

h. Would you suggest a point that you believe it must be further developed to improve projects impacts?

***
APPENDIX III– Second interview structure.

Interviewee: SEI’ Deputy Director - Katarina Eckerberg

Date: 11 of December (11h30 – 12h10)

1) Does the draft reflects the work of the SEI as a whole (all centres) or it is suggested as a tool for the Stockholm centre? Can it be considered as a SEI principle, guideline as the manual, or it is a tentative document (mentioned at page 10)? Did it become an internal policy?

2) The need for transparency was mentioned on the page 20 (section: Science’s new social contract: trust and transparency – but what about power?), I assumed that this role is assumed by the project leader, did I understand it properly?

3) Are you familiar with the Logical Framework method? Is it applied at SEI projects?

4) It is suggested that there is a framework for progress and deviation reports, might I have a look on it?

5) How often is submitted the evolution report, mentioned on the interview. How the information flow - project leader submit it to research directors and centre directors? Is this the same document as the progress report?

6) At the project manual it is stated that “A person shall be assigned the responsibility for quality assurance of the project deliverable. The responsibility also encompasses regular monitoring of the progress of the project with the regard to time, plan, risk, etc”. Is this responsibility assumed by the project leader?

7) There is a figure which expresses the matrix management of multi-projects (Manual, p. 6). Why areas such as finance, communication and administrative departments are not expressed. How are they are considered in such structure?

Questions about projects reporting system – financial indicators.

8) I would like to further understand how the financial monitoring system is.

Particularly, I’m concerned about project finance tracking system; therefore, I would concentrate my enquiries on:

 ✓ How often is the reporting timing and what main contents.
 ✓ How such information addresses the project leader need and director needs (portfolio management)?
 ✓ What is the purpose on providing the project financial information? Is there distinction between internal and external accountability data?
 ✓ Is there a document to general public besides the annual report?
 ✓ Is there a different system for each centre?

***