

## **Deliverable Oriented Scheduling**

**Andrew Wicklund  
Project Risk Consultants  
Office: 1-877-4PM-RISK  
Mobile: 832-202-3498  
andrew@prcdesk.com**

**Michael L. Gibson  
mlgibson@uh.edu**

**Robert Zant  
rfzant@uh.edu**

**University of Houston  
College of Technology  
Information & Logistics Technology Department  
Houston, Texas 77204**

## **Abstract**

In project-centric organizations, deliverables are the one of the greatest business objective. The ISO-17799:2005 Code of practice for information security management outlines procedures for assessing “*security policy, organization of information security, asset management, human resources security, physical and environmental security, communications and operations management, access control, information systems acquisition, development and maintenance, information security incident management, business continuity management, and regulatory compliance*” (ISO 2005). In a very similar fashion (ITIL) defines the goal of the change management process as “*to ensure that standardized methods and procedures are used for efficient and prompt handling of all changes to minimize the impact of change-related incidents upon service quality, and consequently improve the day-to-day operations of the organization*”(Wedemeyer 2007).

Poorly defined deliverables and project plans are a major reason why projects fail. Because project schedules are often seen as a document that does not accurately represent the work, external influence can take priority over the schedule, as the scheduled work is expected to be unrepresentative or flawed (Speight 2007). The need to better insure project deliverables highlights the need for a framework for deliverable-based project planning and scheduling.

This research used a massive collection of secondary data to inductively derive a framework for deliverable-based project planning and scheduling. The massive collection of secondary data on the project topic resulted from iteratively applying progressive elaboration (Balci & Nance 1987) to identify addition secondary data relevant to the research topic. A content analysis (Janowitz 1968) was performed on the retained data to extract items important to deriving the framework. Affinity analysis (Scheiner 1992) and content management (Bradley 1935) was used to identify groupings of secondary data content important to deriving the framework. Inductive reasoning (Acorn 1991) was used to derive the framework. The framework was then implemented in a case study (Yin 1994) at a Southwest consulting company. Primary data was collected at the case study organization to assess their readiness to implement the framework. A complete report of the research will be distributed at the presentation at the SWDSI conference in Dallas.

**References furnished upon request**