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Abstract
This thesis aims at tackling an important issue in the communication management of multi-organizational international projects. Furthermore, it focuses on the importance of effective communication in the planning stage of this kind of projects. The literature review shows the importance of effective communication among the different stakeholders at this stage of the project planning in the life cycle of such projects in particular. The empirical data received through interviews of three projects of this kind supports the literature about the importance of effective communication at this stage of the project since the lack of effective communication at this planning stage increases the chances of the failure of the whole project.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

Communication is perhaps the most important tool in achieving effective project coordination. Coordination and communication are closely related, but are distinct in their respective scopes. Coordination includes the broad range of project activities related to the management of the people and resources. Communication is the flow of information to support project activities, as practiced in meetings, telecommunications and written documents.

Good project communication may be broadly defined as the free exchange of accurate and relevant information among the right individuals in a timely manner. Good communication among project team members should be clear, honest, open, and frequent but not excessive. Therefore, achieving effective project coordination depends on the communication skills of the participants and their ability to tailor their communication style and techniques to the project at hand.

Effective communication saves money and enhances reputation (Paulus & Nijstad, 2003). It helps prevent coordination problems that can cause frustration and dissatisfaction among team members and lead to project failures.

Studies by project owners of failures, near failures, and problems with newly constructed projects indicate that at least one in four such events results from poor communication or lack of coordination among project team (American Society of Civil Engineers Guide Book, 2000).

Good project communication requires the recognition of the inherent differences among team members or partners (Northouse, 2004). For coordination and communication to be effective, project leaders must understand and compensate for individual differences of the project partners (Northouse, 2004).

Anyone leading a project has to be able to communicate with all stakeholders. That also means having the skills to negotiate when things are not going as well as they might. A project leader should adapt his/her way of communication to the specific audience with whom he/she is discussing the project related issues (Northouse, 2004). To communicate properly,
the project leader needs to deliver the right message to the right audience at the right time. Using this template, the project leader can list the communication stakeholders, identify their information needs and create a complete schedule for delivering project information to them in a timely manner. He/she should have a communication plan which mean planning on the communication strategy with all project stakeholders.

Typically, project people spend a lot of time planning, organizing, doing and fixing but often pay little heed to communication (Burns, 2005). As a result, the communication, such as it is, may be inadequate, of poor quality, or unidirectional. In project work there are two essential ingredients: people and the effective exchange of ideas (Woodward, 2007). Without people nothing gets done and without communication nobody knows what to do. After all, the very nature of a project is that it has not been done before. Max Widman (PMI's Network magazine, p.67, July 2003) argues that communication is like engine oil i.e. it needs to be applied to the machinery or the machinery will not start or, if it does, it will quickly falter and grind to a halt. And the oil, like communication, needs to be continuously recycled and regularly replaced with new oil as the old becomes no longer usable. Attention should be paid to the 'quality' of the project communication. In this world of virtual teams where some members never get to see each other from one project to the next, accurate exchanges are even more important. This is especially true over the Internet where some 60% of normal person-to-person communication, the non-verbal part, is simply removed. Even in video conferencing, this component is seriously filtered by the medium (Briner et. Al., 2004).

Project managers are responsible for ensuring clear communication. The vast majority of project failures can be traced, directly or indirectly, to communication failures. As examples from the USA cases of failure in communication are The Challenger disaster, the Kansas City Hyatt-Regency walkway collapse and FEMA’s slow response to Hurricane Katrina. All are all traceable to failures in communication.

There are far many ways for communications to go wrong than right. The number of communication channels increase exponentially as the size of the project teams is increased. It is of importance that the project manager does not assume understand his/her critical communication. Whether they do understand or not, the project manager should take the time to determine which the case is. During the meetings and business discussions, the project manager should listen actively, take the time to probe, question, and paraphrase and reflect back on his/her understanding.

Projects which are successfully implemented, that have a long operational life and are not expensive to maintain can trace the roots of their success to the groundwork done in the early
stages (Northouse, 2004). More time, more involvement of the stakeholders, plus step-by-step scoping and planning, builds the foundations that are robust and flexible (Briner et. Al., 2004). Briner et.al.(2004) mentions that the Japanese spend 80% of their time working out what to do through active planning and experimentation. Westerners spend 20% of their time on planning with 80% spent on implementation. Compared with the Japanese model, the latter usually takes add-on costs needed to sort our problems. Occasional and open projects, because of their nature, change direction as they evolve, so a more flexible approach is needed, understanding a project’s direction and the options that need to be balanced in order to realise desirable business benefits.

Project leader must communicate with people involved in the project. Communication is the vehicle through which leaders and subordinates create, nurture, and sustain useful exchanges. Effective leadership occurs when the communication of leaders and subordinates is characterised by mutual trust, respect, and commitment (Northouse, 2004, p.155). Northouse says that every project leader knows this truth, and many quake at the thought. It is an art by itself on how to fit time to communicate into a tight project plan, how to persuade busy users partners to listen, what to do with unwelcome objections and comments. The project leader should always have in his/her mind that communication make a difference. Communication is part of the project right from the start. Stakeholders are built into the project, thereby accelerating effective implementation and rendering it is seamless, rather than all the lurking difficulties emerging at the project handover, leading, in the worst case, to rejection. Communication is particularly relevant to ‘open projects’ (Briner et.al, 2003). It can not be random or an afterthought. It is vital to the project’s success, so it must involve a programme of planned, integrated activities that aim to build robust, long-term relationships.

One key factor for success in any project is communication according to Söderlund (Söderlund, 2005). According to Briner et al., the project manager is the overall responsible for success or failure of a project due these aspects it is interesting to study the communication in a project. It is also rewarding for everybody who is a project manager or those who are planning to become one to know how to use communication in a project to their advantage.

New style projects, like traditional ones, vary in scale, duration and complexity. Whether in manufacturing, retail, financial services, local government, the health service or a charitable organisation, there is usually one person, the project leader, whose role is to ensure the project is completed successfully. Although project management has traditionally been found mainly in the construction industry, modern project leaders are handling a much greater diversity of
tasks in different types of organisations in every sector of the economy. These ‘new-style’ projects have similarities to traditional construction or engineering projects, where there are hard criteria of time, cost and specifications to be met. Just as often, however, their goals are ambiguous, and project leaders have to contend much more with organisational politics, external environmental or marketing pressures and, above all, the needs of individuals inside and outside the organisation to have influence on the project. These factors have fundamental effect on the project leader’s role.

Globalisation has forced people from different parts of the world to work together. One way of such work is through collaboration through multi-organizational international projects. Multi-organizational international projects are projects where stakeholders/institutions from different educational and cultural backgrounds cooperate in the form of a project to solve a complex problem and these projects belong to ‘new-style’ projects. In these projects, the project leader has higher responsibility than in traditional projects and his role in making the stakeholders function together is of extreme importance. One key way for success of the project leader to do the job is through active communication between him/her and the different stakeholders and to make the stakeholders communicate among themselves. Grasping why different misunderstandings arise in such projects can help the project manager to fulfil the key factor of communication and therefore lead the project towards success. In Europe multi-organizational international projects have been significantly increasing in the recent years after the expansion of the European Union (EU) through different programmes and especially FP projects. In order for the expansion to be long lasting, integration in science among the nations of the EU is necessary. Multi-organizational international projects at different institutional levels are one of ways to integrate EU nations. Such projects have a necessity to be able to integrate different fields of science to get wider perspective of understanding the problem and try to better find methods to solve them. One organization can be considered good in one field while other is as good in other speciality. If they cooperate together in a project that needs both expertises, then the outcome might have higher probability to be successful. Managing multi-organizational projects can be hard when organizations from different technical, cultural, socio economical and political backgrounds are involved. The organizations can also have different management styles due to different organizational cultures which can have an impact on the team work. A well conceptual, careful and detailed preparation of multi-organizational international projects in their planning phase is vital for their success due to their complexity.
1.2. Aim of the study

The aim of this thesis is an attempt to show the importance of communication among project members/partners in the planning phase of multi-organizational international projects. It also aims to show the importance of the role of project leader in coordinating and stimulating the communication among different stakeholders in such projects. This is interesting to study since the project manager of a multi-organizational international project handles many stakeholders with different cultural- and organizational backgrounds. The importance of the project manager in initiating and coordinating the communication is to be stressed as well since he/she plays an important role in coordination of communication in the project. The following research questions will be used when studying these aspects of culture and communication in a multi-organizational international project.

1.3. Research questions

1. What does good communication mean and imply in international multi-organizational projects?
2. How can it be implemented?
3. What distinguishes good communication in the planning phase?
4. What distinguishes communications in International Multi- Organizational Projects from other forms of projects?
5. What role does the project leader have in making the communication process happen in multi-organizational international project?

1.4. Limitations

The three case studies I am taking are from one kind of project which is the nuclear energy related projects. This might make limitation while giving the conclusion about the communication in the planning stage of project because it does not include other types of project and industries. Moreover, I am working alone on this MBA thesis and the analysis would have been much deeper and probably better if others students from the MBA programme would have agreed to work with me on writing this MBA thesis.

1.5. Expected conclusion
The final conclusion I am expecting to achieve throughout the analysis and answering of the research questions is that the project leader is the centre of communication in any project and especially in ‘new-style’, “open” and “innovative projects” in the planning phase of such projects. Moreover, communication among different stakeholders of such projects in particular is crucial for the success of implementation of the project objectives.
CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

Many people argue that there is no right or wrong when it comes to methods, it is all about finding the appropriate procedures and motivating them. However, the choice of method should be carefully chosen since this affects all parts of the study.

The main purpose of virtually any research based study is to create knowledge (Lundahl & Skävad, 1992, p.10). The methodology is a systematic way of examining the reality. Methodology is the doctrine of how to collect, organise, process, analyze and interpret social facts in a way that enables others to logically derive achieved conclusions (Halvorsen, 1992, p.13).

This chapter will describe the perspective and methods that have influenced this study, as I want the reader to understand the viewpoint which will provide me with the possibility to constructively discuss the way to approach the problem.

2.1. Line of approach

Considering that this is a small scale study, it is preferable according to use case studies according as a research strategy (Denscombe, 2000). With the case studies being concrete and used in context, Merriam (1994) too promotes the case studies as a desirable research tool, most suitable for specific situations where the possibility to examine in depth and detail exists and where you can address a certain problem area (Merriam, 1994).

As I have the ambition to analyse the current situation, rather than presenting new theories, focus will be the quantitative method, the interviews, with the purpose to understand and interpret the study objective.

2.2. Perspective

A thesis is affected by the perspective chosen and my approach is driven by the problem recognised. It is also said that all research is originally based on the pre comprehension of the
researchers. As I, in the role of researcher agree on the above fact, it is only natural that I will have my primary baseline in hermeneutics, which has its equivalence in interpretation.

Within the hermeneutical research ideal, it is important to note that both theory and data should contribute to conclusions and interpretations, not one over the other. As I see it, the theory will work as a framework, building the foundation of my interpretation phase within the analysis.

Within the world of research methods, there are two principal approach ways, the deductive and the inductive method. In this study, I have considered both approach ways and finally chose to have the focal point on the deductive approach since it is a tool to enhance understanding (Backman, 1998).

2.3. Primary and secondary data

The criteria for choosing the case studies should be in line with the research literature and it is normal to choose random and most typical cases (Backman, 1998). I have gathered primary data through interviews with projects coordinators/leaders of the three projects in focus.

The case studies in this thesis are multi-organisational European project and belong to the ‘new-style’ project. These projects are:

1- BSR Interreg IIIB project with title “Nuclear Installations in the Baltic Sea Region: Combining Health, Energy, Environment and Politics” (Abbreviation “NIB-HEEP”);

2- European Framework FP6 project “European Observatory For Long-Term Governance On Radioactive Waste Management” (Abbreviation “OBRA”);

3- European Framework FP6 project “Arenas for Risk Governance” (Abbreviation “Argona”).

The main method used in this case study will be done through qualitative interviews with some of the contact persons of the organisations that are involved in these projects and especially the main project managers/leaders and coordinators. The results of the answers from different projects leaders will be compared and analysed through the prism of the theoretical background to be used in the thesis.

One of the most important sources of case study information is the interview (Yin, 2003, p.89). Moreover, according to Yin (2003), interviews are essential source of case study information. The interviews will appear to be guided conversations rather than structured queries. Focused interview is a type of interview in which the respondent is interviewed for a short period of time (ex. One hour). In this type of interviews, the interviewer may still remain
open-ended and assume a conversational manner, but he/she most likely to be following a certain set of questions derived from the case study protocol (Yin, 2003, p.90).

Qualitative interviews have the aim to engage in depth in the problem recognised and they are usually divided into structured, semi-structured and unstructured interviews. I have used personal interviews and the semi-structured approach as the answers are open and the respondent is free to develop his/her ideas even though there is an interview guide that helps the interviewer to touch all areas. I arranged a short manuscript with guidelines and agreed on a certain order to stick with, to ensure the quality of my method. Interviews can be categorised based on their degree of standardization. In a highly standardized interview, the questions as well as their ordering are static. Unstandardized interview mean less static questioning and question sequences. Unstandardized interviews can also be structured or unstructured. Unstructured interviews are used when the purpose of the interview is not totally defined and when the interview aims directly to catch ones opinion. The interviews performed in this master thesis have been structured or semi-structured as their purpose was defined in advance.

As a researcher, one can also solve misunderstandings at once as I am allowed to follow-on questions. As the human behaviour is easily passed on to the other, it is important that the interviewer does not feel stressed (Lundahl & Kkärvad, 1999). Therefore, I made sure to be calm and have enough time set off for each interview, for about 45 minutes.

Another aspect which can easily affect the respondent according to Denscombe (2000) is things that can not be changed like gender, ethnicity, accent, age and the identity of the researcher himself/herself. Hence, to avoid these negative influences, the interviews were held with coordinators and stakeholders from both genders and I tried to keep myself passive and neutral while conducting the interviews since I was involved myself in two of the cases chosen and the interviews were held with people that I have already met before. Denscombe (2000) further states that it is important to not ask leading questions not take over the interview, and I believe I followed his advice.

The interviews were all conducted both in person and over the phone, with field notes as documentation, done during and after the interviews. Afterwards, the interviews were sent by e-mails to the interviews so that they confirm the written contents of their answers.

These questions, among others, were asked during the interviews:

1. What does good communication mean and imply in international multi-organizational projects?
2. How can it be implemented? How can it be taught?
3. What distinguishes good communication in the planning phase?

4. What distinguishes communications in International Multi-Organizational Projects from other forms of projects?

5. What role does the project leader have in making the communication process happen in multi-organizational international project?

6. How can he/she stimulate other stakeholders and make them communicate better?

7. How do you evaluate the communication of among the different stakeholders during the planning phase of the project you are managing?

8. How do you evaluate the communication between you and the project partners during the planning phase of you are managing?

9. What do you think about the importance of communication in the planning phase of such projects?

Secondary data, being data that is collected by others (Lundahl&Skävd, 1992, p.78), have been gathered from a number of sources. Internet has been very useful source to the theoretical part. Other written sources, e.g. articles at Lund University as well as Belekinge Technical University data bases, communication literature, articles, etc. have been helpful in fulfilling the purposes of this master thesis.

2.4. Type of research

A quantitative research approach is classified by having data that is possible to quantify. Usually, surveys or questionnaires are example of the quantitative research methods. Qualitative research approach is classified by having data that can not be quantified, e.g. interviews considering opinions, values or other “soft” data ((Lundahl&Skävd, 1992, p.82). A qualitative research project can never be as generalised as a quantitative one. However, the target group of the report must be considered (Holme&Solvang, 1997, p.81).

2.5. Reliability

If an investigation is reliable, it implicates that there are a low presence of random faults. Validity, however, refers to the amount of systematic faults ((Lundahl&Skävd, 1992, p.87-88). To ensure a comfortable degree of validity, a number of actions have been taken. The interviewees have been chosen from different projects and organisations within the three projects. The iterative working process, gathering data at a number of different times from
different sources have also increased the validity. The reliability aspect is ensured by the use of a structural interview procedure.

2.6. Objectivity
The fundamentals of science are often claimed to be objectivity together with generalisation and explanation (May, 2001, p.19). Objectivity is a multi faceted word with the implications such as differentiation of facts and values, impartiality, completeness and versatility ((Lundahl, 1992, p.71). To achieve a satisfying objectivity, part of the master thesis has been differentiated where facts differ from opinions. As an example of this is the theoretical and empirical parts which aim at illustrating an objective picture of a phenomenon in contrary to the analysis which contains objective facts, integrated facts and opinions from interviewees.

2.7. Integrated approach
The methodological outline of this master thesis is chosen to facilitate the reader’s ability to couple the different parts of the report. Thus the theoretical and empirical material has been integrated and is followed by an analysis referring back on the findings. This method was chosen because of the obvious benefits it offers when it comes to enhancing the reader value and linking collected data with analysis. In addition to enhancing the reader’s experience, this approach was also chosen so it aids the work of ensuring the quality of the master thesis. Merging theory and empiric aids the author of the work of discovering non value adding information.

2.8. Disposition
To be able to easily work through the essay, I started by constructing a disposition as I felt the need to concretize my thesis since it is hard from the beginning to grasp with its large dimensions. It is also important to let the essay follow a structure since I am able then to affect my thoughts and the contents of the thesis to develop (Backman, 1998). Another issue of importance too is to see that the red thread is thick and stable throughout the whole thesis meaning a clear and comprehensive understandable structure. Here are the components:

- **Problem recognition**: background to the problem area and actual problem;
- **Theoretical set**: The knowledge collected from literature: books and research articles, as well as projects material and internet sources;
- **Case studies and empirical set**: case studies are the material collected from interviews and empirical set is the interview material;
- **Creative phase**: the collection of different parts and comprehensive analysis;
- **Shortcomings and benefits**: the end product, thus the results of the problem recognised,
- **Critical stands**: critical review of the study and implication for future research;
- **Red thread**: the link between all parts to get a clear overview

**2.9. Theoretical sources**

Regarding the theory of project management, I have chosen the Scandinavian School of project studies as theoretical basis of my research problem analysis. Other project management schools have provided valuable inputs to the discourse and development of new and managerial tools. However, many of the handbook-type writing in project management assumes ideal conditions for management and change that are seldom found in practice. The broaden analysis of projects, when compared to more traditional and “mainstream” writing in project management, is a second key feature of the Scandinavian School. Third, the Scandinavian School of Project Studies has taken a wider approach at their study including the role of communication in the planning phase of the new style project. The Scandinavian School has widened the scope of project studies beyond that of single projects and its aim has been to reflect on and thereby contribute to the understanding of the way in which projects are contextually related (Sahlin-Andersson and Söderhol, 2002, p.12)
CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

3.1. Definition of projects

Projects are usually defined as having a goal and they are time limited (Briner et al., p. 16). A project is a set of activities intended to accomplish a specified end result of sufficient importance to be of interest to management.

“The most important difference between the management control of ongoing operations and the management control of projects is that the ongoing operations continue indefinitely, whereas... A project starts, moves forward from one milestone to the next, and then stops.” (Anthony & Govindarajan, 2005, p. 790).

Fig. 1. (Anthony and Govindarajan, 2005, p. 795)
The aims of a project may include setting up collaborative ways of working, or building effective alliances between organizations (Briner et al., p.53). Projects which are successfully implemented can trace the roots of their success to the groundwork done in the early stages (Briner et al., p.51). A project is a temporary organization. Project team members may be employees of the sponsoring organization, hired for the project, or engaged under a contract with an outside organization, or a mix of those mentioned above.

A project can be considered to have a life-cycle that is divided into four phases. Those phases are: definition, planning, implementation and reflection (Macheridis, p. 38). The definition phase is mainly about formulating goals and strategies. During the planning phase, the time plan is set into detail and the planning of the project is conducted with great accuracy.

A project begins when management has approved the general nature of what is to be done and has authorized the approximate amount of resources that are to be spent in doing the work. The project ends when its objective has been accomplished, or when it has been cancelled. The team of a project can involve one, a few, or thousands of persons. The time frame of a project can last for a few days, a few weeks, or several years. Its content can be similar to work done before, or unlike anything ever done before. A project usually has a single objective and the time horizon is the end of the project. In an ongoing organization (permanent organization), there are multiple objectives and managers are responsible for today’s work as well as future operations. A project is often super-imposed on an ongoing operating organization. Satisfactory relationships must be established between the project and the ongoing operating organization. The objective of a project is to produce a satisfactory product, within a specified time period, and at an optimum cost. Ongoing operating organizations focus on time periods (cost performance, quality and schedule). Projects often involve trade-offs between scope, schedule, and cost. Less scope might mean less costs or a shortened schedule leads to overtime and thus increasing costs. Plans for projects can be changed frequently and drastically. The result of one phase may alter the work originally planned for subsequent phases. Most projects start small, build up to a peak activity and then taper off as completion near. Project manager must handle unforeseen situation and influences from other departments and stakeholders (Anthony&Govindarajan, 2005). Different types of management personnel and methods may be appropriate at different stages of the project. A work package is a measurable increment of work. It should have an unambiguous, identifiable completion point, which is called a milestone. Each work package should be in the responsibility of a single manager. It is favourable if work packages can be compared and
evaluated. Work packages will aggregate to the work breakdown structure. Accounts for administration and support activities are established. The chart of accounts, the rules for charging costs, and the approval authorities are developed in advance. If the breakdown structure or the accounting systems fails, it must be revised.

In the project planning phase, a project planning team specifies the rough estimates that were made when it was decided to implement the project. The project planning phase is often the most challenging phase for a project manager as he/she needs to make an educated guess of the stakeholders to be involved, resources and equipment needed to complete the project. The project manager needs to plan communications and procurement activities. The project manager needs to create a comprehensive suite of project plans which set out a clear project roadmap ahead.

The project planning phase follows the project initiation phase and is the most important phase in project management. The efforts spent in planning can save countless hours of confusion and rework in the subsequent phases. The basic processes of the project planning phase are:

- **Scope planning**: this specifies the in-scope requirements of the project.

- **Preparing the work breakdown structure**: this specifies the breakdown of the project into tasks and sub-tasks.

- **Organizational breakdown structure**: this specifies who all in the organization need to be involved and referred to the project completion.

- **Resource planning**: this specifies who will do what work at which time of the project.

- **Project schedule development**: this specifies the entire schedule of the activities detailing their sequence of execution.

- **Budget planning**: this specifies the budgeted cost to be incurred in the completion of the project.

Thus detailed specifications for the product, time schedules, and cost budget are prepared and a management control system, a task control system and an organization chart developed. Furthermore a responsible manager is identified for each work package. Even on projects with little complexity a plan for planning exists and the planning process itself can be seen as a subproject (Anthony & Govindarajan, 2005).
The final project plan consists of three related parts which are scope, schedule and cost. The scope states the specifications of each work package and the person or organization unit responsible. The schedule expresses the estimated time required to complete each work package and their interrelationships, meaning which work package has to be finished before another can be started. These set of relationships are called networks. The costs are stated in the project budget and usually called control budget. Normally monetary costs are shown only for aggregates of several work packages and resources for individual work packages are stated in non-monetary amounts.

Although there are several tools for constructing a time schedule of a project, there are three main steps: 1. estimating the time required for each work package; 2. identifying interdependencies; and 3. calculating the critical path. These are the main questions for a network analysis.

At end of the planning process a specification of work packages, a schedule and a budget exists. After milestones in the project or specific time intervals (months, weeks) these estimates are compared with actual data in the controlling process. The project sponsor and manager have to be concerned with these three aspects.

3.2. Types of projects

There are three different project types: ‘concrete’, ‘occasional’ and ‘open’. The three project types are distinguished from each other by three criteria: 1- the extent to which output can be defined; 2- the level of structure and formality; 3- the level of know-how (Briner et al., 2004, p.36).

Concrete projects: Concrete projects will be easily recognized by companies in the construction and aerospace industries. Other familiar examples are office moves or facilities installations, systems development, logistics, exhibition organizing, theatrical/film production and new product launches. In all these examples, projects have been an effective way of organizing work. Each job will be significantly different in content, but well-tried methods have been developed for tendering, writing specifications, estimating, planning and controlling. The skills and specialist know-how needed are clear, the particular constellation will be different, but everybody can easily identify what will be required.

What distinguishes successful leaders of concrete projects is that they prefer:

- to build a team with people whose expertise they understand which is based on education and experience;
to solve problems actively, doing what it takes to get the job done;

- To take a high profile, be the visible interrogator of communication and activity.

Occasional projects: These are projects in which they are internally-focused vehicles to achieve change in the way things are done, combining people from across organizational, geographical or professional boundaries who do not normally work together. Temporariness is the occasional project’s main feature. The purpose, and therefore the deliverables, is less easily defined at the outset. A direction or theme will have been set, but the precise impact and benefits to the organization will not be specific.

Financial demands and effects are less tightly specifiable and may need to be planned and negotiated in phases. Who should be involved may be unclear, and the commitment from team members and the project leader is usually part-time. Often this particular activity has not been carried out by these people before, so they may not be confident in their abilities and will find it hard to anticipate problems. So much has to be learnt, individually and collectively about what the project entails, how to do it and how to work together. Planning will tend to be in short cycles of Plan-Do-Review-Re-plan, building rapidly on what has been learned in practice.

Simple planning tools will be all needed, and decision-making processes have to be defined and agreed by the project team and the sponsor.

There is considerable growth in occasional projects being used to define and implement organizational change. Taking people from across the depth and breadth of the organizations means that problems can be understood from many perspectives that exist, and widespread commitment can be generated to the solutions that are agreed. The solutions themselves are likely to be more easily implemented, and therefore more effective, because the implications of the problem are widely understood, options have been generated and people have been involved in decision-making. Involving a large number of people early on generates more will and energy to make it happen.

The occasional projects require leaders of different strengths than in the other projects. Successful leaders of occasional project usually prefer:

- to integrate a range of different people’s perspectives into an evolving output-alliance-builders;
- to keep a focus on the output, but be flexible about the steps necessary to achieve it i.e. tolerate ambiguity;
- to question the established ways of doing things, and modify or select to suit the situation.

*Open projects:*

Those are the projects whose objectives are unclear and where there is uncertainty about the direction or viability of what is being attempted. An open project sounds like a non-project. Its objectives will often be fuzzy and may change frequently. However, small, unofficial projects may produce significant innovations and are effective vehicles for change. Organizations which are concerned to harness rapidly the ideas and opportunities which represent themselves at all levels encourage the use of informal projects. The purpose is to test and develop new ideas for business improvement. The belief that business improvements can be made not only by large schemes, carefully planned and handled by specialists, but also by pulling together and putting into practice a thousand small ideas. This type of project is more useful than may at first appear. An increasing numbers of companies are encouraging people to form spontaneous group to resolve problems which they see as hindering their work.

Quality drives, customer-focused drives, innovation drives, performance improvement drives are all promoting more open projects. For every open project that makes the grade and emerges with substantial results, there are many that fold or remain invisible.

Many open projects transforms, as they become more formal, into either occasional or concrete projects. As they become more defined, with anticipatable benefits, they gain a sponsor, a more formal team and customer expectations. However, they have to put effort into building their market or reason for existing in order to win internal support for the allocation of the resources necessary to grow.

The main feature of open projects is that they enable limited experimentation because there is always limited time and even more limited resources.

Open projects start small and invisible, but through their demonstrated success and the energy of the team involved in gaining support step-by-step, their potential impact becomes clear and wide organizational commitment becomes mobilized.

Leaders of open projects are good at much less obvious means of getting things done. The open project leader tends to prefer:
- to work outside the bright light of the mainstream, pulling resources from wherever, finding space and time where it does not officially exist;
- to find new ways and means to test ideas;
- to build continued support with a few influencers to maintain the momentum of early successes.

This range of project leader’s preferences may imply what many project leaders have always believed, that they are supposed to be super-heroes. Alternatively it may imply that some project leaders are better suited to some types of project than others, even if they are well trained and experienced in the generic projects management skills and strategies. Both project leaders and their bosses need to think about the types of projects they have in their portfolio, and where possible, to match a project to the project leader’s preferences. These preferences will involve more than previous experience or technical capability.

3.3. Communication in relation with success of the project

If communication in the project is of low quality the project will be more likely to fail. Communication in projects is an art of expressing and exchanging ideas in speech or writing among different members of the project. People working within a project always communicate but the quality of the communication must be high. Communication is the tool through which leaders and subordinates create, nurture, and sustain useful exchange (Northouse, p.155). The communication is a significant part in any project right from the start (Briner et al., p.107). The purpose and direction of the project lie on the ability of the group leader to communicate well with the partners within the project (Briner et al., p.17). One important role of the project leader to create active communication among the project members by staying in touch with individuals and passing information between different members and between them and the funding organization (Briner et al., p. 132). Project leader should have high level of communication skills to be able to successfully manage with the project especially if it is a multi-organizational international project. In the case of multi-organizational international projects, the project leader’s role is like a spider weaving the web and should be the centre of communication and events (Briner et al., p. 132).

Communication among different organizations might lead to developing a project. Such projects are sometimes a necessity to be able to integrate different fields of science to get wider perspective of understanding the problem and try to better find methods to solve them.
One organization can be considered good in one field while other is as good in speciality. If they cooperate together in a project that needs both expertises, then the outcome has high probability to be successful. However, managing projects that are of multi organizational type is not an easy task, especially when these organizations are from different technical, cultural, political backgrounds and have different management style in their approach for handling a task. A well conceptual, careful and detailed preparation of projects, especially for inter organizational ones due to their complexity, in their planning phase is vital for their success. The manager should have high experience in planning for such projects taking into account all the factors and actors within the project are including cultural, political, technical, and socio economical aspects.

Maria Bengtsson and Jessica Eriksson analyze the contextual influence on the flows of information, knowledge, and resources in inter-organizational projects (Sahlin-Andersson&Söderholm, 2002, p.90). They analyze the stickiness and leakiness of knowledge, information, and resources among different partners involved in the innovative project. The authors distinguish four innovative projects: well established projects with supporting competition; newly established with supporting competition; well established with supporting cooperation; and newly established with supporting cooperation. They conclude that the contexts of projects matter. Additional to that, they conclude that the contextual influence may vary during the course of the project. According to Bengtsson and Eriksson, there is a need for distinct definition between different types of flow in innovation projects (Sahlin-Andersson&Söderholm, 2002, p.94).

Jefferey Pinton and Zorica Nedovic-Budic emphasize on the importance of information sharing among the different organizations involved in an innovative project (Sahlin-Andersson&Söderholm, 2002, p.108). Such kind of information sharing also contributes to the sharing of risk in case if the project fails to reach its objectives. It also reduces the risk that the project fails since when the partners discuss the issues from different perspective, they can come up with ideas that minimizes the risk and turns the doubt into confidence and finally into successful end. During the performance of the project, some of the organizations might start hiding the information they have and can contribute to the success of the project. The reason behind that is the fear that their partners in the project, but originally could be competitors in the market, might know how they their strategy of approaching a problem is, what their strategic management and potential ideas are, and by so these organizations might loose their competitive advantage. Pinton and Nedovic-Budic write that there is a need for more inter-organizational projects due to complexity of some of the projects that it requires
professionals that have different kind of knowledge (Sahlin-Andersson&Söderholm, 2002, p.111). However, it is not an easy task to manage such kind of projects especially when the partner organizations are from different cultural, technical background and have a very much different approach for solving a problem. Moreover, not many research activities have investigated either the causes or effects of project partnering behaviour. They recommend that future research should continue to address the root causes of information sharing and its outcomes for the purpose of offering project-based organizations a better and more comprehensive understanding of the factors that might facilitate the effective information transfer in such a way that all the partners within the project can benefit.

All the permanent organizations usually start as temporary ones. With time and the influence of many factors, they become permanent ones. There are many differences between the permanent and the temporary organizations. Some of these differences are that the permanent organization is more mature, with well defined corporate structure and governance, with a strong organizational culture, more connections with the other business around in the country and overseas. Moreover, the permanent organizations are well known mainly to a specific product or service they are specialized with. In this sense, we can see that the permanent organizations have better possibilities to get loans from the banks and to attract shareholders and investments. In the contrary, the temporary organizations are not well known among the shareholders and the banks, do not have a well established organizational structures, no strong culture influencing its activities, all this make it harder for them to get loans and trust to go ahead with their business ideas. However, the temporary organizations have the advantage of having less bureaucratic structure, more flexibility, more willingness to go ahead with new creative ideas, and they usually have younger employees that are enthusiastic to contribute to the vision and the activities within the organizations. This makes the temporary organization more entrepreneur than the temporary ones. These temporary organizations are often in the form of the projects. Some of such temporary organizations might be inter-organizational projects that involve many organizations having different specialties or expertise. In such projects, it is very important for the project manager to ensure the flow of information from the different organizations involved within the project. The flow of information is vital for the success of such project or organization. Since these innovation projects are of interdisciplinary and innovative, the share of experiences, knowledge, and the cooperation in different stages of the project development become absolute necessary for its success.

The project can be considered as temporary organization because it has limited time frame, limited budget, specific goals and activities. From this point, we can see that the permanent
organization might, due to several reasons, have the need to form a new organization that is a
temporary one which is directly or indirectly controlled by the permanent one. In this case, the
permanent organization makes an attempt to venture. There are several reasons for that. One
of the reasons might be that one of the employees introduces a new idea to the organization
which is outside of the mainstream of the business that organization is good at. The idea is so
attractive that the management of the organization decides to try it. But, since the permanent
organization does not want to subject their reputation to harm in case of failure, they make a
new sub-organization that carries out the idea development and implementation, and probably
with the cooperation with other organization that might be originally a competitor. Then this
temporary organization tries its best to succeed in the market. It tries to use the contacts that
the permanent organizations inventing it have in the best case to attract clients. However,
some of the temporary organization does not get much of the contacts since it is a new
business that should have contacts with new stakeholders, shareholders, try to be independent
to finance itself, and to compete in the market with the well established organizations. It is
worth to mention here that the temporary organizations are much influenced by the culture
and values of the permanent organizations that helped in creating them. Sometimes, the
temporary organizations are formed by many permanent organizations. The purpose of such
cooperation to form such an organization is to find a ground for further cooperation to create a
business, to improve a business idea, or for political purposes. Such temporary organization
has a limited task, limited timeframe, and field of operation that makes it different for such
organizations to develop into permanent organization unless something extraordinary
happens. In this case, this organization takes the experience it has obtained from the
cooperation of different organizations and makes add a real value to the original one that
helps it to survive and compete in the market.

For a project to be successful, it is very important to have all the information required to carry
out its duties. If the permanent organizations are the information suppliers for the temporary
one or the project, then a great deal of the information supplying is the responsibility of the
permanent one. Cooperation of different permanent organizations within a project requires
forming a project. This project is considered as a temporary organization. No matter that these
organizations might be competitors before they have decided to cooperate within that specific
project, they should cooperate in providing the project with the necessary information i.e.
information sharing. Many of the failing projects that are developed from such kind of
cooperation usually fail because of the problem in communication among different
stakeholders, in this case problems in communication among permanent organizations
cooperating on that project. However, it is an art to know which information to provide and what to keep for competitive advantage. But in any case, all the organizations should provide information to the project; otherwise they should not have created this project at all. Communication is vital during the planning phase of a project since this is the time when objectives are set, funding applied for and the time when partners are being asked to participate.

3.4. Role of project managers in scoping

Project managers need to realise that important objectives are being achieved and judgements made during the process of project scoping. Later project problems most frequently stem from a lack of clarity, agreement of commitment by key players in the project to the fundamental aim of the project. Scoping is the process through which clarity, agreement and commitment are obtained. This is its overt purpose. However, it also has the covert purpose of helping the key players in the project to rehearse mentally what the implications of the project might be, how these might affect the project definition, and how they might be anticipated and prepared for. The act of imagining the whole cycle of a project, anticipating what can be expected and what might be unexpected helps to iron out problems before they occur. Gathering contributions from different stakeholders and collectively anticipating problems is the crucial element in building a team of people committed to the project. It also servers to resolve conflicts and to help all these people become more clear about what they really want to achieve, rather than what they thought they wanted to achieve. Moreover, it enables the project manager and the project team to gain sufficient understanding of the complexities involved in the project that they rapidly increase their chances of success. Throughout the scoping process, the project manager is either building or destroying people’s confidence in him/her and his/her credibility to handle the issues. At this early stage, key players are making judgements about the project chances of success.

Project managers need to be both wary and courageous in asking questions regarding relevance and rationale. The simplest way of doing this is to ask those with a stake in the project: ‘Why do you want it?’ Their answers will reveal very rapidly whether this is a mainstream activity or not.

An important part of the scoping process is to establish who the various stakeholders are. The first step is to brainstorm with other interested parties to decide who the various stakeholders in the project might be. This is called ‘stakeholder mapping’. The project leader should go out
and talk to all of those stakeholders and develop the necessary interviewing and probing skills which enable him/her to draw out of them what their expectations are. In practice, at this very early stage, these stakeholders are most unlikely to be clear about what they want. The project leader should engage in a dialogue with them to help them to think through their expectations, and to begin to point out where different expectations may conflict with each other. At this stage it is also important that the project leader challenge one-track thinking about solutions. It is of vital to explore alternatives if the real problem is to be solved. The stakeholders will frequently be somewhat anxious about a new project at this early stage, particularly when it is an open project characterised by considerable ambiguity and uncertainty. What they are really looking for as a result of the scoping process is at least a rough idea of what kinds of activities might be necessary in order to complete the project. It is rather impossible that the project leader can produce a detailed plan at this stage, but he/she can do is to sketch out some broad activity areas in conjunctions with other people who may have a contribution to the project. Some of these activities will emerge from the project leader deliberations quite clearly. However, other areas will be very vague especially where there is little previous experience within the organisation.

The project leader initial consideration of stakeholder expectations and activity areas will help him/her to begin to understand the kinds of resources the project might require. Talking about resources does not mean only talking about tangible resources of money, time and materials, but also about those intangible resources of technical skills, non-technical managerial and communication skills, and the vital intangible of commitment and support from particular people within the project organisation and outside it.

At an early meeting during project start-up, the project leader, sponsor and some key clients, contributors or suppliers need to map the risk by going through a structured process. Such process might include:

- brainstorm possible risks;
- considering what has wrong in similar projects previously,
- clustering into related topics;
- weighting-seriousness and probability;
- focusing on the very serious and highly probable;
- defining the project type, and review typical risks;
- Planning how to run the project with the risks in mind. Highlight where in the project the risks will be most crucial;
- Deciding how to reduce the risks so that the chances and consequences of failure are minimised.

3.5. Project communication
As mentioned before, communication is the exchange of information between parties. Communication planning involves identifying and meeting the information needs of the project stakeholders. Specifically, identifying which people need what information, when the information is needed, and how the information is collected and communicated. Communication planning strives to simplify and document effective communications within the project organization.

Project communication is the exchange of project-specific information. Effective communication creates understanding of the information given and received. The project team must provide timely and accurate information to all stakeholders who are defined as the people affected by a project. Members of the project team prepare information in a variety of ways to meet the needs of various project stakeholders.

Project communication differs from general communication in that it centres on Work Breakdown Structure (WBS).

3.6. Project communication management
Project communication management includes the process required to ensure timely and appropriate generation, collection, dissemination, storage, and ultimate disposition of project information (PMBOK Guide, 2000, p.117).

3.7. Communication Plan Development
The communication plan documents the information requirements of stakeholders and defines the procedure to meet those requirements. The plan details what, when, and how the information is collected and reported. Information required in the communications plans includes (ITRM Guidline, 2006):
- Identification of stakeholders within information needs;
- Stakeholders information requirements;
- Time frame or period the stakeholder needs the information;
- Detailed description of the information need;
- Description of when and how information is collected and who collects it;
- Description of document distribution methods and frequency of distribution;
- Definition of the handling procedures for temporary storage and final disposition of project documents.

### 3.8. The need of project communication management

Project communication management tools and techniques ensure the timely and appropriate generation, collection, dissemination, storage and ultimate disposition of project information. The project manager use project communications management to:

- Develop a communication plan for the project;
- Distribute information via the methods that reach the partners and the other stakeholders;
- File data;
- Archive records.

Understanding the communication process is the first step in communication planning. The following four factors should be considered while planning the communication process:

- Who the communication process is involving e.g. the identified stakeholders.
- The communicated issue e.g. the message or the information being communicated;
- The time interval the information is communicated: weekly, monthly, quarterly, as needed or as identified;
- The way the information is disseminated, e.g. in a meeting, a memorandum, an e-mail, a newsletter, a presentation, etc.

### 3.9. Developing the communication plan

Preparing the project communication plan assists the project team in identifying internal and external stakeholders and enhances communication among all parties involved in the project. The project team writes a communication plan to ensure that an effective communication strategy is built into the project delivery process. The plan is a framework and should be a living, evolving document that can be revised when appropriate. The communication plan is part of the project management plan.

Project stakeholders have information and communication needs. Identifying the information needs of the stakeholders and determining a suitable means of meeting those need are important for project success (PMBOK Guide, 2000, p.119).

The project communication plan includes the information needed to successfully manage project products deliverable. It should include the following:
- Brief introduction and background. It should answer the question about the necessity of project communication plan;
- A list of project sponsor, project manager, and other key stakeholders;
- Methods of communications to be used, including formal meetings to be held;
- Project reporting information
- Stakeholders analysis which includes internal stakeholders and external stakeholders;

3.10. Communication methods
Project leader/manager use a variety of communication methods to deliver project information, including meetings, telephone calls, e-mail, voicemail, and websites. Meetings in particular are often the most effective way to disseminate information to project stakeholders. Before planning a meeting, the project manager should consider the communication objectives carefully and choose a meeting format that will meet the objectives.

3.11. Forms of Communication
Different forms of communication are appropriate in different project situations and for different participants. The following are among the important forms:
- Direct communication: Face-to-face meetings and consultations, either in groups or one-on-one are useful for defining and addressing issues, problems, or complex matters. Direct communication is valuable for its interactive nature, which promotes brainstorming and creative problem solving, and consensus building. Direct communication also lends weight to important announcements, actions, and decisions. Direct communication is often the best opportunity for fostering clear understanding.
- Telecommunication: Telephone calls, teleconferences, and two-way radio are useful for sharing information quickly and connecting people when schedules or geographical distance make face-to-face meetings impractical. With the proliferation of cellular phones, pagers, and other wireless devices, telecommunication is enhancing its most considerable advantage which is immediacy.
- Written communication: Memos, E-mail, facsimiles, reports, newsletter, and other documents and publications are valuable for transmission of information that requires more formality than a conversation or phone call. Written documents (in paper and electronic formats) are the principal form in which project decisions, agreements, and actions are recorded. E-mail, though often used with frequency and casual nature of a telephone call, is a permanent record.
3.12. Frequency of communication

The effectiveness of project coordination increases with the frequency of good communication. Frequent contact provides project partners and stakeholders with increased opportunity to assess workloads, identify critical path items, and develop solutions to problems. Frequent contact can serve as a backup for other types of project communication. For example, a meeting offers team members the opportunity to clarify what may have been said in a letter. Frequent communication aids participants in building a common project vocabulary that further enhances understanding.

But, as crucial as communication is to a project success, there is a distinct danger of over-communicating. For example, if routine information is distributed widely regardless of its importance, the result may be that important issues are ignored. Over-communication detracts the project teams’ effectiveness because people have to spend time trying to figure out if the information they just received is important. Good communication requires judgement in determining how much is enough though over-communicating is preferred to under-communicating. If information senders are not sure if they are striking the right balance, one strategy has proven effective in nearly every situation and this strategy is to ask the recipient (American Society of Civil Engineers, 2000, p.41).
Chapter 4

Description of case study projects and analysis of their communication process

In this section, I will describe the three projects NIB-HEEP, OBRA, and Argona their aims, management style, what had been done in the project, and how communication during the planning phase was conducted. The interviews will give answers to the research questions from empirical data additional to the answers that were obtained from the literature.

4.1. NIB-HEEP project

4.1.1. Background and aim
The aim of the NIB-HEEP project was to integrate the four fields of security (health, environment, energy and political) by analysing awareness, preparedness, responsibilities and decision making related to nuclear installations. Important questions rose within the NIB-HEEP project. One of those questions, for example, is: what necessary trade offs is required in order to maintain energy security while at the same time minimising the risk for nuclear terrorism, reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases and to protect the population from radiation hazards?

4.1.2. Description of the NIB-HEEP project initiation process
The NIB-HEEP project idea was initiated by LUCSUS director the end of the year 2004. He searched for funding organization that might fund his idea and found out that Baltic Sea Region “BSR Interreg III B” was the proper funding organization for this type of project. BSR Interreg III B was the proper organization since it is usually interested in funding projects that encourage communication and cooperation between different institutions in the Baltic Sea Region where the NIB-HEEP project had the focus. The project leader contacted appointed a project manager, I, and one meeting was held between both of us to set the strategy for the planning part for seed money funding and it was decided to start to cooperate in finding stakeholders. The requirements from BSR Interreg III B to fund the proposal application was that at least two organizations from different countries within the Baltic Sea region had to participate, therefore at least two partners had to be found. Radiation Research Department at Risoe Research Laboratory, Denmark, and Stockholm Environment Institute, Tallin Office, Estonia were contacted and they later agreed to participate in writing an
The application for seed money project planning through BSR Interreg III B. The application was written by the project leader since he agreed to be the leader for the planning phase and was submitted in February 2005. To approve the application for seed money, the BSR Interreg III B put the condition that the partner institutions should contribute to the same amount of financial resources to the project expenditure as the money applied for which was the maximum ten thousands Euro. LUCSUS agreed to contribute seven thousand Euros in time value and the partner institutions agreed to contribute the rest of the budget i.e. three thousands Euro in time value. In March and April in 2005, two meetings were held between the professor from Risoe (Elis Holm) and the project manager and leader in Lund in order to discuss the seed money application for the NIB-HEEP project for administrative reasons. In April 2005, the BSR Interreg III approved the application for ten thousand Euros in the form of seed money to be able to write the final application and arrange the consortium activities. In May 2005, the project planning phase of NIB-HEEP started and it ended by end of September 2005. The seed money could only be used for planning activities within that time period because of the rules set by the funding organization.

The project planning started virtually with twenty thousand Euros. From those, ten thousands Euros were cash the rest was equivalent to ten thousands Euros worth of working time. The seed money that was given by the BSR Interreg III B was supposed to be used to plan the activities within the project but also to write a project proposal application for the two coming years. The deadline for submitting the application was the 23rd of September 2005. If the application had been submitted in time and if the funding had been given, the project would have started up its full scale activities in January 2006 and end in December 2007. However, the project failed to reach that aim due to several reasons, among them one is believed to be the lack of sufficient and effective communication between the project leader and manager and the other project partners.

**4.1.3. Activities in the planning phase of the NIB-HEEP**

The seed money was given to plan activities in the NIB-HEEP project. The result of the planning was the planned activities and the expected result. The achieved results are the outcome of the project and it is based on the report done by the project manager.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned activity</th>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Achieved results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Screening of policy documents from EU and the countries. The countries having major nuclear installations (reactors or waste due to former military operation) will be selected. The current plans and documents for addressing security issues will be analysed and compared.</td>
<td>1- The results will be a report describing the outline of the security regime in each of these countries. There will be a preliminary mapping of stakeholders related to the four fields of security. This mapping will form the basis for next step, interviews with selected stockholders.</td>
<td>1- This part was completed in details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Based on the previous step, a number of potentially important stakeholders will be interviewed in order to provide the formal structure laid out by the report in the previous activity with more content. Some of the selected interviewees will become project partners.</td>
<td>2- A corroborated report on the stakeholder mapping from the previous activity but also a more focused list of potential partners.</td>
<td>2- This part was completely done. However, most of them were unwilling to contribute to 50% of the project cost as future partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- All the potential partners (ca 8-12) will be invited to a workshop in Tallinn. The aim of the workshop is to form a consistent and adequate team for addressing the four areas of security related to nuclear installations.</td>
<td>3- A comprehensive background from all the partners will be provided for the full proposal that will be drafted by the core team.</td>
<td>3- The workshop in Tallinn did not take place. The reason is that not so many stakeholders were willing to accept the conditions of participation in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Formulation of full proposal. Lund University will take the main responsibility to coordinate the development of the proposal based on the principle of a&quot; single negotiating text&quot;.</td>
<td>4- Submission of full proposal</td>
<td>4- The full proposal was not submitted due to not sufficient stakeholders and the leadership institution realised that it did not anymore want to go ahead with coordinating the project due to lack of time and competence in the research area of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.4. NIB-HEEP project team and communication

The project leader had appointed project manager for “NIB-HEEP” on part time basis for assisting in the project formulation and information management. After that appointment, the project leader was not giving much of his attention to the project planning, according to the project manager who was allowed to take strategic decisions without asking the project leader. The project manager tried to make the project leader and the other partner institutions within the project to start effective communication. During the period from May till end of June 2005, all institutions were busy trying to reach the obligations for their ongoing projects. There was no effective communication amongst the different stakeholders and partners in the project during that period. Then the summer vacation started and the project partners from these institutions went into their vacations which meant that the communication level was at a minimum. There were only a few replies to the e-mails sent by the project manager prompting them to actively coordinate their efforts. The replies were that it was vacation time, which the project manager perceived as he shouldn’t disturb them further.

The project manager continued monitoring the other institutions and searching for information related to nuclear installations in the Baltic Sea Region. The purpose was to invite them for partnership in the final project proposal application. Official invitations to join the project were sent to these potential partners by the end of August 2005 when the project leader came back from his vacation. During that summer period, practically no communication was established between the partner institutions of the project and the group leader. In September 2005, the project leader told the project manager that he and his institution were not willing anymore to be the coordinating institution of the project. The reason was for this was that the project leader decided he didn’t have enough competence nor he had the time to lead such project which was out of the scope of their main research area at his institution. He did not inform this to the other partner institutions until the mid of September, 2005. None of the organizations contacted was willing to coordinate the project in the future if the project application will be funded. They had very short time to decide on coordinating or even participating in the project since the application deadline was the 23rd of September, 2005. Not many institutions that were invited to participate or coordinate the project were willing to join the project. This was mainly due to the fact that they had to contribute financially for the budget of the project. The budget for the NIB-HEEP application for funding through the BSR Interreg III B was estimated to be 850,000 Euros for the period of two years had the application been submitted and the funding been approved. This meant that the partner
institutions had also to contribute as minimum to 50% of the project budget according to BSR Interreg III B funding regulations. Many of the institutions that had interest in joining the project were from the Baltic States and Russia. But they did not have any enough money/time to contribute with for such project. They were informed about the issue of co-funding only after they showed the interest to participate. They most probably thought at the beginning that they would gain financial support for participating in the project, but later they found the contrary.

The project manager met with the Risoe partner in the end of August 2005 and discussed the project management planning and development for short at a conference which both attended. The project manager did not meet the partner in Tallinn face to face. The project potential partners had no face-to-face meeting and most of them did not know each other nor even communicated by e-mail or phone.

By 20th September 2005 the project leader gave up and decided to put the project activities for the future on hold. He reported the activities done by the seed money grant to the funding institution when the project period ended. He decided so without discussing the issue with the project partners. But the project partners did not ask him anything regarding the project development also. So, all parties within the project hold the responsibility for the project failure to go further with writing the final project proposal ideas for getting the funding.

4.1.5. Reasons for the failure of the NIB-HEEP project according to official reporting

The project leader, in his report about the activities to the BSR Interreg III B where he declared the activities for the money received and why he can not go further with the project idea, stated that the project team received many interested and positive responses (NIB-HEEP official report to BSR Interreg IIIB officer). He also states that the followings issues were the reasons why the project team did not receive enough partners for a full proposal and eventually failed to achieve all its goals. These reasons were (according to the project leader in the official report):

*Information trickle down*

In many organizations, particularly in the Baltic States and Russia, the project leadership had difficulties reaching the right persons. Sometimes the project team had to write back several times in order to reach a person who was in a position to give us a response. The project team was receiving such responses from the invited organizations even after the project proposal submission deadline was over.
Complex decision making

Many of the national organisations have complex and slow decision making processes. After establishing a good relationship with a contact person it could pass several months before a decision (at least a decision with financial implications, such as joining a project) could be made.

Timing

Timing of the seed-money project was not the best. Most of the project’s team work of contacting stakeholders coincided with summer holidays.

Co-funding

Many of the organisations were genuinely interested but were unable to contribute on a co-funding basis. To some extent this might also be a problem of time. If such activity was well known in advance (i.e. more than one year), then they might have been able to include it in the annual budget.

Because only a few organisations were able to commit themselves to participate, the project team did not organise the planned meeting in Tallinn. However the project leader did not mention that the most important reason for the failure was the poor management of communication among the project potential partners and his failure to coordinate the active communication processes.

4.1.6. Interviews with leadership and stakeholders of NIB-HEEP

I have conducted four focused interviews: with the project leader, Professor Lennart Olsson; with the main partner in the project, Professor Sven Nielsen from Radiation Research Department at Risoe Research Laboratory, Roskilde, Denmark; Professor Elis Holm, partner from Radiation Physics Department, Lund University; and the last interview was done with Dr Tiit Kallaste, from Stockholm Environment Institute, Tallinn Office. I had the interviews with Lennart Olsson, Elis Holm and Sven Nielsen in person, while I will have the interview with Dr Tiit Kallaste by phone since he lives in Estonia. The people that will be involved in these interviews are the main people who took part in the project discussion and planning of NIB-HEEP. These interviews are meant to be used to understand the importance of
communication in the planning phase of the project and the role of the project leader in coordinating and stimulating such communication. No matter that these questions and answers analyse the process of communication and role of the project leader of communication in the project NIB-HEEP, it is still a credible way to understand the role of communication and the role of project leader in relation to communication in general. I asked the same questions to the four of them to compare their views and answers, mainly about the importance of communication in the planning phase of such projects and how they assess the communication during the planning phase of the NIB-HEEP.

*Interview with Sven Nielsen at Risoe National Laboratory, Denmark*

According to Sven Nielsen, communication is extremely important for the planning of projects involving several participants in order to agree on what is needed and when. When I asked him about his impression regarding the communication within NIB-HEEP, he said that few communication attempts took place between the project leader and the stakeholders and no communication among all the stakeholders took place.

According to Sven Nielsen, communication among the stakeholders is the most direct and efficient way to prepare the project proposal.

When asked about the communication between him and the project leader, Sven said that communication between the project leader and him was very limited. He said that an initial meeting would have been very useful to get a clear understanding of the project objectives and to agree on what was required to do from both sides. Moreover, he added that communication by email is fine but can not quite replace a face-to-face meeting. He believes that an initial face-to-face meeting with the project leader would have been most useful on his part for the subsequent planning process. His impression was that neither Lennart nor himself put a sufficiently priority for a meeting. Sven said that he was never really certain that NIB-HEEP project would be of interest to his group and that lack of commitment influenced his communication with Lennart Olsson and the project manager, and that consequently had a negative impact on the preparation of the final project proposal. However, according to Sven, there may be other reasons for the unsuccessful project formulation that Sven is not aware.
Interview with Tiit Kallaste at Stockholm Environment Institute, Tallin

Tiit Kallaste thinks that communication in the planning phase of such kinds of projects is probably the most important issue for the project to succeed. According to Tiit, since most of the researchers involved in such projects had not met before and do not know each others well, communication is vital to have sort of personal relations that help in establishing good working and planning conditions.

When asked about his impression about the communication within NIB-HEEP, his impression was that there was extreme lack of any communication between him and the project leader with the exception of one e-mail they exchanged at the start of the project idea development to apply for the seed money. He has been a partner in similar types of projects, but the difference is that he feels that proper time was given from each of the stakeholders to communication and discussion of the goals and strategies of these projects. According to him, lack of effective communication among the different stakeholders in the project NIB-HEEP led to the failure of the project to develop from idea into execution.

When asked about the communication between him and the project leader, Tiit said that communication between the project leader and him was limited to only one e-mail and no phone calls at all not to talk about meetings. He also said that an initial meeting would have been very useful to get a clear understanding of the project objectives and agree on what was needed from both sides. Moreover, his also similar opinion like Sven that communication by email is fine but can not quite replace face-to-face meetings. He said he was not at all happy with the way how the communication process was handled during the planning phase of the project, and due to that, he eventually lost the interest in being a partner in the project.

Interview with Professor Elis Holm at Radiation Physics Department, Lund University, Sweden

Elis stresses also that the communication is very important. He added that it is also a matter of how much time one can set aside also apart from other work. According to Elis, he mainly or only had contact with Risoe and not with any other stakeholders. However, he says that he had good contact with the project leader. During the first weeks of the planning phase of NIB-HEEP, he got the firm impression that Lennart Olsson and I decided to not go further with the project since there was not enough money to put in from the different stakeholders involved. He was not perfectly clear about how our work for developing the project idea and application would be financed. As he understood, half of the funding of the project must have come from the University and half from the BSR Interreg IIIB. Elis said that normally he can not use his
time for the seed money we got from EU. According to him, it must be for non-permanent staff, but we should get all marginal costs from EU.

Interview with Professor Lennart Olsson, the project leader, at Lund University Centre for Sustainability Studies (LUCSUS)

Lennart said he was encouraged to go ahead with the idea of the project and to put energy in writing the project proposal for funding. However, he did not want to lead the project because it is not in his major reasearch. His idea was that some other institution should lead the project, while LUCSUS could be just a partner. Since he could not find anyone who agreed to lead the project, as he had earlier hoped, he decided eventually not to go any further with the final project proposal for the Interreg IIIB.

Regarding the communication with the other stakeholders, Lennart acknowledges that it was not enough. He said that he expected the other stakeholders and the potential partners to contact him if they had some ideas for discussion, but only few of them wrote some e-mails for him to clarify some financial aspects. He himself had no time to invest in the NIB-HEEP since he was busy with other projects. Moreover, it was summer time when he had vacation as well as the other partners had. Lennart said he did not feel that the other partners were enthusiastic about the idea of leading the project and they were reluctant and confused about how the funding for the project can be done. He said that eventually decided to give up the project rather than to have problem in its coordination if it gets funds. He said it is important that the project leader should know his/her weakness and strength and not to take projects that are totally unrelated to his/her area of interests.

4.1.7. Analysis of NIB-HEEP communication process
In this section the communication within the planning phase of the NIB-HEEP project will be analysed.

NIB-HEEP project planning and communication
The NIB-HEEP project had partners from organizations that should have tried to communicate through effective means and mainly the face to face communication to plan the project well. They had to work together on setting the goals of the project and the strategy how to attract and include appropriate partners from different educational, geographical, and cultural backgrounds. The project goals to be properly set needed much more intensive and direct communication among the partners. The project goal was written only by the project
leader with very insufficient communication and practically without taking the opinions of the other project potential partners. Moreover, the milestones and steps were determined by the project leader himself. This could be one of the reasons why the partners from Risoe and SEI Tallinn were not so enthusiastic to contribute to the activities of the project. The project leader should have considered the issues of different organizational cultures and try to find a way of working that would have suited all those partners involved to improve the team work performance. This would have done through effective communication.

The project manager is the overall responsible for the success or failure of the project. He/she is the centre of communication in the project. The communication should be characterized by mutual trust, respect, and commitment (Northouse, p.155). This forces the project leader to determine and demand the right resources and means to make the project a success. According to the NIB-HEEP project manager, during the planning phase of the NIB-HEEP, the project leader had many other obligations for ongoing projects funded by the EU sixth framework. The project manager considered that managing the activities of those funded and ongoing projects is more important to his Research Centre than to concentrate on the planning of new ones like the NIB-HEEP project. The project leader did not have sufficient time for new projects and said that he is not an expert in such research projects. The project leader also mentioned that he wanted to be a partner in the project and not to be the coordinating and leadership institution. However, he mentioned that only to the project manager and not to all the other partners. Moreover, he mentioned all this only in September 2005 and after the project seed money planning phase was about to reach the end. No matter that it was brave from the project manager to realise that he could not manage the project or lead it, he should have known this before agreeing to apply for the seed money. Moreover, he should have communicated and discussed his opinions/thoughts with the other founding organizations of the project, which in fact he did not at all. He actually did not have any communication with partners except very few ones in the first week of the NIB-HEEP planning period. When studying the actions of the project manager, it is seen that he had goals to let the NIB-HEEP project be led by other department. The failure of the project is partially due to that fact that no one was interested in leading it. The project leader should have told the project partners from the first day about his plans and to have frank communication about the matter with them. Face-to-face meeting could have highly contributed to the understanding of the responsibilities of different partners in the project.
NIB-HEEP project stakeholders, culture and communication

Communication is a factor of success in any project. That involves access to proper networks and necessary information for all the partners within the projects (Söderlund, p. 135). Intensive discussion among the different project partners in the planning phase of NIB-HEEP regarding all the project details and activities in the planning phase had to be discussed. That would have reduced the impacts of cultural differences related to educational, professional, and geographical differences on the management and implementation of the NIB-HEEP project. As mentioned earlier, there were officially three organizations involved in the project were: Lund University Centre for Sustainability Studies (LUCSUS), which managed and coordinated the NIB-HEEP in the planning phase, Sweden Radiation Research Department, Risoe National Laboratory, Denmark and Stockholm Environment Institute, Tallinn Office, Estonia. The three organizations involved had different aims from the project. According to the communicating in group’s theory this might not be of benefit for the outcome of the project if the stakeholders strive towards different goals. Another problem was that the stakeholders had different project management styles which probably affected the team work. The radiation research uses more technical and experimental methods in their research projects, while the other two organizations are more concerned with social theories and systems analysis when they are carrying out activities in their research projects.

There were difficulties in communication among the partner organizations working with NIB-HEEP. This was due to that they were used to work and communicate in different ways. It could have been a good idea to create a common base for communication through communication planning strategy among the different organizations, taking into consideration the linguistic relativity and the cultural differences, in order to improve the communication.

One way of improving the communication could have been to have more face to face meetings to discuss and plan the project together. This is important in order to minimise the linguistic misunderstandings since when communicating in a face to face meeting, those involved can see the facial expressions and the body language which could help to eliminate the misunderstandings.

English was the official language used during the project management and activities. However, none of the involved institutions had English as its mother tongue. If there had been face-to-face meetings, the language differences impacts would have been reduced. The partners did not even once meet altogether face to face. Most of them did not meet in person neither before nor after the project had received the seed money. The two meetings that were held were between the professor from Radiation Physics Department and the project leader in
Lund. Those two meetings were held in March and April in 2005 in order to discuss the seed money application for the NIB-HEEP project for administrative reasons. Söderlund (p. 135) states that a factor for success in any project is the relation between partners which involves a dialogue with active listening among all the concerned. The partner in Tallinn was complaining that he did not receive any information from Lund and therefore he did not know what to do. The project leader was waiting for the other partners to write to him and he did not take the initiative to write first until very few days before the seed money period ended and then he got no reply. In this situation a more proper way of acting would have been to have phone contact instead of waiting for e-mails. This could also have improved the communication since they could have heard the variations in the tone of voice. Clearly there was no effective communication in the NIB-HEEP project.

The project manager did not explicitly tell the partners or the coordinator that he was not willing to lead the project into the further phases. This lack of openness was due to not effective communication and it is overall one of the reasons why the project did not reach its implementation phase.

4.2. OBRA project

4.2.1 OBRA definition and project stages

European Observatory for Long-term Governance on Radioactive Waste Management (OBRA) is a 6th EC FP Coordination Action which aims to assess the feasibility of creating a model for a European Observatory for Long-term Governance on Radioactive Waste Management. It also aims to contribute to better governance of radioactive waste by providing mechanisms for all stakeholders to have access to the knowledge that has been generated by successive EU research programmes.

The main objective of this project, according to OBRA project website, is to promote a new approach to the governance of spent fuel and long-lived radioactive wastes by bringing together a multidisciplinary network of radioactive waste management agencies, concerned stakeholders and the academic research community, in order to assess the feasibility of a European Observatory for long-term governance on radioactive waste management.

According to the OBRA project official website, OBRA project addresses the following objectives:

- To establish a European networking platform designed to facilitate the development of a common information and knowledge base for providing stakeholders with access to
independent expertise and training packages regarding spent nuclear fuel and long-lived radioactive waste;
- To develop a model for an Observatory for long-term governance which ensures an effective and systematic means for regional and local communities to address their information needs and concerns. This will require the definition of the mission, scope and strategy of such an observatory;
- To facilitate the networking between universities with support of national waste management agencies to combine technical and social science on radioactive waste management;
- To test the efficiency of a pilot training package as a mechanism for the transfer and dissemination of knowledge to local and regional stakeholders with regard to the management and disposal of spent nuclear fuel and long-lived radioactive waste;
- To make recommendations on how the model of the Observatory could be implemented

OBRA work programme

The OBRA consortium consists of 10 organisations from 7 different countries.

Table 1. Organizations involved in the project consortium and their country of origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENVIROS</td>
<td>Enviros Spain S.L.</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ITC</td>
<td>ITC School of Underground Waste Storage and Disposal</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>POSIVA</td>
<td>Posiva Oy</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ARAO</td>
<td>Agency for Radioactive Waste Management</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RAWRA</td>
<td>Radioactive Waste Repository Authority</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GMF</td>
<td>Group of European Municipalities with Nuclear Facilities</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OKO</td>
<td>Oeko-Insitut e.V.</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ENRESA</td>
<td>Empressa Nacional Radioactivos S.A.</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LUND</td>
<td>Lund University</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KTH</td>
<td>Royal Technical University</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to OBRA website and the project leader, the five Work Packages proposed for the development of OBRA are:

**WP1. Setting the baseline (leader of WP1 is OKO Institute)**

This work package will map previous and current activities and programmes on participation and governance, focusing on radioactive waste management. The aim of this task is to provide a synthetic description of different models of governance in radioactive waste management, identifying a provisional set of success factors to aid in the definition of the observatory.

**WP2. Strategic elements of OBRA (leader of WP2 is Posiva)**

This work package is designed as a qualitative exploration of the views of all the project participants and other stakeholders regarding the development of mechanisms for knowledge transfer, providing interdisciplinary training and expert support to local and regional communities and contributing to availability of a new generation of experts through multidisciplinary education. The main objective of this Work Package is to develop a shared proposal for the setting up and implementation of the observatory.

**WP3. Implementation and testing of a pilot OBRA (leader of WP3 is ITC)**

The pilot model developed in WP2 will be set up and tested in WP3 in order to validate it. A trial training and communication interactive package will be produced and tested in a workshop.

A possible model of the training package for local community leaders could include the following options:
- Training module on the key scientific, technical, economic, socio-political and legal domains in which local communities need to gain knowledge and competence in order to be able to carry out meaningful initiatives or influence the decision-making processes regarding the management and disposal of radioactive waste;
- Training module providing experience and advice on how to interact with different stakeholders in the decision-making process (implementers, regulators, local interest groups, national NGOs, international bodies, etc);
- Interactive exercises on the most efficient means to access information;
- Interactive discussion forums on a number of specific technical and non-technical issues (e.g. institutional control, monitoring, organising public meetings, etc).
WP4. Knowledge management and assessment (leader of the WP4 is Enviros Spain)

The main objective of this work package is the dissemination of knowledge at different levels, giving special emphasis to the science-public interface and the dissemination of results outside the project consortium.

This WP includes the following tasks to be delivered:
- Web portal
- Virtual Forum
- Communication activities and final meeting
- Final seminar, assessment and way forward

WP5. Consortium management

This work package covers OBRA management activities as well as coordination with other EURATOM FP6 projects on governance

4.2.2. OBRA Project management

The coordinator of the project is the environmental consultancy “Enviros Spain S.L” and the project leader/coordinator is Dr. Meritxell Martell from Enviros Spain S.L. The Coordinator is responsible for the overall legal, technical, contractual, ethical, financial and administrative management of the project; and the coordination and administration at all levels between the Contractors and the EC, including communication and information flow. The Coordinator is the point of contact between the European Commission and the Consortium.

The project is managed by the steering committee, which consists of a group of four consortium members close to the work to be carried out and representing those organisations having a major participation in OBRA (Fig.1.).

In the Governing Board all consortium members are represented and have one vote. The coordinator chairs it. The Governing Board is the highest authority of the Project, and has the responsibility of taking the main decisions concerning the project. Principal decisions of the Governing Board concern:
- The approval of past activities and/or reorientation decisions
- Entering of a new contractor in the Project on a cost free basis.
4.2.3. Communication process analysis of OBRA project

To analyse the communication process and the importance of communication in the OBRA project, I performed two interviews: the first was with the project leader Meritxell Martell and the second interview was with the WP2 leader Marjatta Palmu from Posiva.

Interview with Meritxell Martell

Asked about what communication means and imply in international multi-organizational projects, Meritxell said that it is “Fluent” relationship with the other members of the team, access to the information when needed, and to have regular contacts.

When asked about how it can be implemented and how communication can be taught, she said that it is implemented on-line via email, good internet platforms to share information and knowledge, but also by means of meeting, workshops, seminars and regular contacts face-to-face.
After that I asked her what distinguishes good communication in the planning phase. She said that good communication is when the different partners are active by sending the information needed on time and the deadline is met without too much stress!

Then I asked her about what distinguishes communications in International Multi-Organizational Projects from other forms of projects. According to Meritxell, communication in multi-organizational international projects is more difficult for the diversity of partners, cultures, languages involved; reaching the people takes more time to communicate and to understand each others.

After that I asked her about the role of the project leader in making the communication process happen in multi-organizational international project. She said that it is his/her task to merge the different perspectives and take decisions which are based on common agreement and consensus. Furthermore he/she stimulate other stakeholders and make them communicate better by taking a proactive approach in relating each others’ views.

I asked her further about how she evaluates the communication among the different stakeholders during the planning phase of OBRA. Her answer was that communication among the different project partners was very limited because most of them did not know each other.

Then the question to her was about how she evaluates the communication between you and the project partners during the planning phase of OBRA. Her answer was that it depended on the partners, and that with some of them the communication was easier than the others because of the past relationship she had and the level of interest in the project.

Finally, I asked her about what does she think about the importance of communication in the planning phase of such types of projects. According to her, it is very difficult if there is no face to face meeting. I think there should be a meeting in order to facilitate this relationship and to communicate better.

*Interview with Palmu Marjatta*

The first question was about what, in her opinion, does good communication mean and imply in international multi-organizational projects. According to her, it means: 1- sufficient information and common understanding of the objectives and task related to the project; 2-
updated and advance alert on specific administrative issues (especially related to EC); 3-
going communication on relevant and interrelated activities of the project from the coordinator (the network contact point) and partners communication on activities taken to the coordinator.

Then I asked her about How she thinks communication can be implemented and How can it be taught. According to Marjatta, communication requires experienced coordinator assisting the partners, but also it requires experienced partners help in the communication process.

I asked her about what, in her opinion distinguishes good communication in the planning phase. She said that it is making sure that things have been understood in the same way.

Afterwards, I asked her about what distinguishes communications in International Multi-Organizational Projects from other forms of projects. According to her, it is the role of the external grant provider EC and related requests (administration, grant specific financial controls).

Later, the question to her was about the role of the project leader having in making the communication process happen in multi-organizational international project. She said that coordinator is the main actor and main responsible for making things happen (the key crossing point of the network) and that if the information does not flow to and from the coordinator, then there is no proof of success.

I asked her about how evaluates the communication of among the different stakeholders during the planning phase of OBRA. According to Marjatta, she is not able to assess this issue at the current stage of the project.

Asked about how she evaluates the communication between her and the project partners during the planning phase of International Multi-Organizational Projects. She said that it was obviously not sufficient since the tasks are understood differently
4.3. Argona project

4.3.1. Argona project objectives and stages

According to the official Argona project website, The ARGONA Project (Arenas for Risk Governance) is a project within the sixth Euratom research and training Framework Programme (FP6) on nuclear energy of the European Commission. The project, which started in November 2006 and will last for three years, is coordinated by the Swedish Nuclear Power Inspectorate and managed by Karita Research.

According to its official website, the ARGONA project intends to demonstrate how participation and transparency link to the political and legal systems and how new approaches can be implemented in nuclear waste management programmes. Theoretical development is done and new approaches are tested. Decision-makers and stakeholders at national and local levels will be involved in the project. ARGONA will develop guidelines for the application of novel approaches to participation and transparency.

The point of departure for the ARGONA project is that participation and transparency are key elements of effective risk governance. The acronym ARGONA stands for "Arenas for Risk Governance" and the project investigates how approaches of transparency and deliberation relate to each other and also how they relate to the political system in which decisions, for example on the final disposal of nuclear waste, are ultimately taken. The project then turns to study the role played by mediators, who facilitate public engagement with nuclear waste management issues, and the conduct of the conduct of public consultations. By the latter is meant the communication of models used for deliberation and transparency.

Furthermore, the project investigates how good risk communication can be organized taking cultural aspects and different arenas into account. In a central part of the project major efforts are made to test and apply approaches to transparency and participation by making explicit what it would mean to use the RISCOM model and other approaches within different cultural and organizational settings. Finally, the ARGONA partners develop guidelines for the application of novel approaches that will enhance real progress in nuclear waste management programmes.

The project coordinator organisation is the Swedish Nuclear Power Inspectorate and Karita Research AB is responsible for the project management where Kjell Andersson is the manager (Argona website).
The following institutions are forming the consortium of the project (Argona website):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swedish Nuclear Power Inspectorate (SKI)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göteborg University</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Research Institute Rez plc (NRI)</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karita Research AB</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tempre</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECONTA</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCK. CEN</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Lancaster</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAWRA</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm University</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Research Centre</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Stavanger</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galson Sciences Ltd</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3.2. Communication process evaluation in Argona

The communication process in Argona is evaluated by an interview with the project manager Kjell Andersson. I first of all asked Kjell what communication means and implies in international multi-organizational projects. According to Kjell, it is important to meet the participants face to face and learn to know them. Then communication by e-mail etc becomes effective. One should keep participants informed without overloading them with information. One should remind about coming deadlines well in advance.

Then I asked him about how communication be implemented and taught. He said he thinks this can only be learnt “the hard way” which means learning by doing.

Then I asked him about what distinguishes good communication in the planning phase. According to him, in the planning phase it is difficult because there is really a need to meet but there is no funding for that. According to him, the best way is to build a network starting with people the project manager knows. He added that the project coordinator/manager can easily come into trouble if participants are late with the necessary information to build the project and that each one should feel responsible to contribute in a constructive way.
Afterwards, I asked him about what in his opinion distinguishes communications in International Multi-Organizational Projects from other forms of projects. He said that it is more important to have the project defined in detail when it starts since problems in timing of funding take a lot of energy from the project.

Then I asked him about the role of the project leader in making the communication process happen in multi-organizational international project. He said that the project leader must be in contact with the participants so that he can see where the communication works well and where it doesn’t. He added that when problems arise, face to face meetings should be arranged. According to him, it is on the other hand also important that he/she makes clear that work package leaders have their own responsibility to integrate their parts of the work.

The question about how can the project manager should stimulate other stakeholders and make them communicates better. He said that it by arranging for clear substructure, so that not everything needs to go through him/her.

Then, I asked about how he evaluates the communication among the different stakeholders during the planning phase of Argona. He said that there were a few key persons in the consortium who helped to bring in new participants, and who took responsibility to arrange for project activities.

Afterwards, I asked him about how he evaluates the communication between himself and the project partners during the planning phase of Argona. He answered that the key persons mentioned above became my first contact persons, who then communicated with their contacts. In the end I felt good support from everyone to produce a good application.

Finally, I asked him about what thinks about the importance of communication in the planning phase of such projects to sum up. He said that It important to be precise in what each shall do in the project and that helps in avoiding many problems later on.
CHAPTER 5
GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

My proposition that the communication among the different stakeholders during the planning phase has been proved correct and this is seen from the qualitative theoretical part as well as from the communication of the three projects I have analysed. While the second and third projects have been successful, the first one (NIB-HEEP) failed to go further mainly due to ineffective and little communication during the planning phase of the project. Face-to-face communication between the project leader and among the stakeholders of any project is very important factor for successful start of any project and this has been pointed out by theoretical part of this thesis as well as by all the interviewees.

While everyone leading or managing such projects knows well about the importance of communication, not so many of them put well planned communication strategy for the project. This is a factor which might influence the projects negatively from the start of the project. If the negative influence will not obviously appear from the start, and if there will be further underestimated of the communication planning and implementation, then this factor will definitely have negative influence at further stages of the project success.

This content of this thesis is of importance for managers and those who are practicing leadership in projects since it gives evidences both in theories and practice about the importance of communication and especially on the planning stage of any project.

The conclusions drawn from analysing the communication process in the three projects is that communication during the planning phase of multi-organization international projects is of vital importance for their success. This was proved by the theoretical part of the thesis as well as by the empirical data obtained from the interviews within the three projects.

The lack of communication and insufficient communication can be the reason why such projects fail. After analysing the communication processes in these projects, one can learn that there is more ways to communication effectively than just talking by phone and sending emails. How active the project manager/leader is in initiating effective communication reflects how the rest of the partners communicate with each other and with the manager. It is important to be active both during sending a message and when receiving a message and also to consider how the person involved in the communication will decode the message.
people express themselves during communication is dependent on their mother tongue according to the linguistic relativity. The project manager should be aware of that the language differences might lead to that the partners could interpret the written or spoken information differently. It is also probable that people from different organizational cultures and different domestic cultures express themselves differently. Therefore face-to-face dialogues among project partners are very important in multi-organizational international projects so that misunderstandings and ambiguous issues can be resolved immediately. These meetings could also minimize the levels of uncertainties and the ambiguities among partners. Due to financial situation there might not be possible to have face-to-face meetings regularly when the project partners are situated in different countries and different organizations. In that case, which is also the case of the NIB-HEEP project, it is even more important for the project manager to be the centre of effective communication and to coordinate it actively with the project partners, and this requires high communication skills of the project manager/leader. One possibility to do so is to use today's technologies such as video conference over the Internet or telephone conferences instead of just emailing. Another possibility to keep the partners updated about the project might be the use of an internet homepage for the project or to put out information on a ftp-server. Using these ways of communication could also encourage the project partners to establish relationships with each other. This is a form of networking which benefits the project since the bond among the partners becomes stronger.

To succeed with the project management of a multi-organizational international project all of the above needs to be taken into consideration by project managers of such projects. The project manager is the over all responsible for the success or failure of a project. If we want to be successful project managers of multi-organizational international projects, we should pay special attention to the importance of communication management. If there is lack of communication in the project, especially in the planning phase, then the project is bound to fail.

Finally, I end this thesis by a reply from Professor Neil Chapman, the chairman of the ITC School of Undergraduate Waste Storage and Disposal in Switzerland, when asked to comment on his opinion about the importance of communication in the planning stage of such projects. Here is his answer which gives a real picture of how communication planning is regarded in most of the projects:

"Your questionnaire also implies a much more structured approach to project communications than most people ever adopt. Generally, we just tend to 'roll up our sleeves' and wade into projects. The main communication takes place at the project design stage (who
does what, where and how) and is largely structural and technical, then at workshops and progress meetings, where it is ad hoc. I do not think that I have ever been involved in a science or engineering project where communication planning and mechanisms became a significant issue in its own right. So, one of your conclusions might be that we should do better!”.
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