

**Case Study 11.2**

- 1. Assess the risks of this project. Given your assessment of the project complexity, clarity, and size, what management strategies would you recommend for it? What, if any, of these strategies were adopted in this project?**

A. The transportation project was extremely complicated, requiring the determination of a wide range of technological aspects such as the image storage component that gathered images and converted them into license numbers, the location of cameras, the telecommunications links between the cameras and the image store, the infrastructure for customer service, and the identification of a vast network of retail stores, kiosks, and convenience stores for toll collection. The project was also being managed by a new travel authority, had a pre-existing model to follow, and had a strict implementation schedule to follow. The project's success depended heavily on the complicated, old roadways, despite the fact that they are not typically thought of as technological. The task was assigned to a competent team able to handle its complexity. The two finalists were asked to develop a technical plan that would be compared to one another in order to assess the expertise of the consultants. In addition, a second company was hired to handle the fundamental project management aspects (first PricewaterhouseCoopers, then Deloitte and Touché). For the five bundles, the best technological developments were chosen in order to reduce the risks brought on by complexity. Thankfully, the project specifications were precise and did not change throughout execution. According to the article, the project team largely guarded against scope creep by limiting changes to the requirements, and other management techniques to deal with clarity were not particularly necessary. This large-scale project, with an estimated cost of \$11.6 billion, involved the installation of 699 cameras at 203 locations throughout an 8-square-mile area for the purpose of reducing traffic congestion. The undertaking was anticipated to produce overall in ten years, revenues of \$2.2 billion. To reduce the risks related to the project's size, it was divided into five sections, each of which was subject to strict project management controls. There were clear project milestones, and if Capita missed the deadlines, there would be consequences.

- 2. Describe the development methodology that was applied to this project. Was this the most appropriate approach? Provide a rationale for your response?**

A. It is crucial to look into the understudy responses because the method is not described in great detail. However, it appeared to suggest that the Systems Development Life Cycle was the task's improvement method. To determine what kind of arrangement would be practical to implement, a preliminary Feasibility Analysis was conducted. The outcome inspired the design of the toll framework. Project requirements were also created with the intention of choosing the best one. The project was at first clearly understood; after the needs were realized, the specialized

structure was modified and put into use. To finish the check process and put the framework into use, an analysis of it was performed.

**3. When a project is outsourced, who should manage the project—the internal group or the outsourcer? Why?**

- A. It is crucial to entrust project management to a qualified company with the necessary experience to complete that assignment when an organization lacks the capability and knowledge to manage a specific project, as was the case in this instance. This approach was used by Transport for London. When they realized they lacked the necessary expertise, they first hired PricewaterhouseCoopers and then Deloitte & Touché to handle the project on their behalf. Transport for London hired the company but kept complete control over the project by establishing strict rules, penalties, and deadlines. Organizations may decide to outsource such projects for a variety of reasons, such as cost management, access to top talent, and risk mitigation, aside from a lack of expertise and insufficient resources.