REVIEWING TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT PROJECTS USING BIMODAL DEVELOPMENT AND "JUST DO IT" APPROACHES

Torben Tambo(*), Nicolai Dybdal Clausen
Department of Business Development and Technology
Aarhus University, DK-7400 Herning, Denmark
torbento@btech.au.dk, nikolaj_d_clausen@hotmail.com

Purpose of the paper

Technology management is often idealizing project-based activities in uniform categories fitting into selected project models favorite schemata, e.g. Stage-Gate models, Prince2, Scrum/Agile, P3O, UPMM. Smaller projects are treated as larger ones with unacceptable redundancy as a consequence. Larger projects are not significantly assessed out of their impact smaller ones and vice versa. Low criticality projects are done without registration and disregard from the general portfolio. The purpose of this paper is to contribute to an improved understanding of corporate practices in pragmatically classifying technological project in operable segments and at the same time maintaining monitoring of portfolio.

Related work

This paper is related to positions of management of technology through systematic approaches of recording, prioritisations, ongoing data collection, assessment and resource utilisation (Jolly, 2003; Meskendahl, 2010, Unger et al., 2013).

Design/Methodology/Approach

This paper is using a mixed method approach. Firstly, it is based on an extensive qualitative case study of a larger European manufacturing company. Secondly, the case study is supplemented with a system-theoretic analysis using business process management tools supplemented with a quantitative data sample. This paper is based on reviews of Gartner's proposal of bimodal project management philosophy (Horlach et al., 2016) and the "just do it" approaches on low-criticality projects (Hoerl, 2004).

Findings

Key findings of this paper relates to improved alignment of the overall portfolio with substantial reduction of risks within overlapping scopes and cross-project negative impact. Especially larger projects requiring stable environments are better protected from unanticipated change, but also rapid initiatives are better governed.

Research limitations/implications

This research demonstrates practical value of making technology management explicit and with defined, system-supported processes and governance. Limitations are related to repeatability of the defined model in other organisational contexts. Limitations are furthermore related to academic precision of "just do it" as balancing between portfolio items and routines

Practical implications

Gartner's bimodal is demonstration in practical use and with practical benefits. The idea of "just do it" is also demonstrated from its practical value. Avoidance of abundant portfolios of feral systems (Tambo and Bækgaard, 2013) is furthermore focal to this initiative.

Originality/value of the paper

By introducing systematic classification of the technology management project portfolio supported in an information system bridging project practice and ERP-system, the company can navigate better on both short term and long term projects. Specifically improvements are seen on the organisations willingness to

submit project for portfolio management, but also negative cross-project side-effects are mapped and addressed.

* Corresponding author.

Keywords: Project portfolio management, Management of Technology, Innovation, bimodal, "just do it", business process management

References

Cooper, R. G., Edgett, S. J., & Kleinschmidt, E. J. (2000). New problems, new solutions: making portfolio management more effective. Research-Technology Management, 43(2), 18-33.

D'Adderio L.: The performativity of routines: Theorising the influence of artefacts and distributed agencies on routines dynamics. Research Policy 37(5), 769–789 (2008)

Haffke, I., Kalgovas, B., & Benlian, A. (2017). The Transformative Role of Bimodal IT in an Era of Digital Business.

Hoerl, R. (2004). One perspective on the future of Six-Sigma. International Journal of Six Sigma and Competitive Advantage, 1(1), 112-119.

Horlach, B., Drews, P., & Schirmer, I. (2016). Bimodal IT: Business-IT alignment in the age of digital transformation. Multikonferenz Wirtschaftsinformatik (MKWI), 1417-1428.

Jolly, D. (2003). The issue of weightings in technology portfolio management.Technovation, 23(5), 383-391.

Meskendahl, S. (2010). The influence of business strategy on project portfolio management and its success, Int. Journal of Project Management 28 (2010), 807-817

Mikkola, J. H. (2001). Portfolio management of R&D projects: implications for innovation management. Technovation, 21(7), 423-435.

Tambo, T., & Bækgaard, L. (2013, September). Dilemmas in enterprise architecture research and practice from a perspective of feral information systems. In Enterprise Distributed Object Computing Conference Workshops (EDOCW), 2013 17th IEEE International (pp. 289-295). IEEE.

Unger et. al. (2012). The three roles of a project portfolio management office: Their impact on portfolio management execution and success, Int. Journal of Project Management 30, 608-620

Van Wyk, R. J. (2010). Technology assessment for portfolio managers. Technovation, 30(4), 223-228.