

concept

Helene Berg, Kjetil Holgeid,
Magne Jørgensen and Gro Holst Volden

How to succeed with
digitalization? A study of
benefit management in
public IT projects

Concept report no. 64





Helene Berg, Kjetil Holgeid,
Magne Jørgensen and Gro Holst Volden

**How to succeed with
digitalization? A study of
benefit management in
public IT projects**

Concept report no. 64

Concept report no. 64

How to succeed with digitalization? A study of benefit management in public IT projects

Original title: Hvordan lykkes med digitalisering? En undersøkelse av nyttestyring av IT-prosjekter i offentlig sektor

Helene Berg

Norwegian Defence Research Establishment (FFI)

Kjetil Holgeid

University of Oslo

Magne Jørgensen

Simula Metropolitan Center for Digital Engineering

Gro Holst Volden

Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU)

ISSN: 0803-9763 (paper version)

ISSN: 0804-5585 (web version)

ISBN: 978-82-8433-004-4 (paper version)

ISBN: 978-82-8433-005-1 (web version)

© Concept Research Programme. The publication may be quoted freely with attribution

DATE: April 2021

PUBLISHER: Ex ante academic press

Concept Research Programme

Norwegian University of Science and Technology

7491 NTNU – Trondheim

Norway

www.ntnu.no/concept

The responsibility for the information in the reports produced on behalf of the Concept Research Programme is on the commissioned party. Views and conclusions is on account of the authors and not necessarily identical to the views of the Concept Research Programme. All contributions are reviewed in a peer review process.

English summary

The level of realized benefit is crucial in deciding whether a digitalization initiative has been successful or not. As an example, it is of little help if a digitalization project succeeds in delivering the specific functionality on time and on budget if the project fails in providing actual benefit. Despite this fact, benefit management has traditionally been subject to little attention in public digitalization. This mismatch is apparently changing as more public digitalization initiatives incorporate processes and roles for benefit management. Benefit management in this context includes processes and roles to identify and analyse benefits (for example as part of a cost-benefit analysis), plans to realize benefits, en route management of benefits and documentation of realized benefits.

Benefit management is still an immature area in the public sector. Practices are different across entities and projects, and it is not always clear what are the best practices and ways to organize in order to succeed. This lack of experience and knowledge motivates this study. The purpose is to answer the following research questions:

- 1) How is identification, planning, realization and measurement of benefits conducted?
- 2) How does benefit management practices relate to the degree of success in achieving benefit?
- 3) What are evidence-based measures to obtain good benefit management?

To answer these questions, we went through existing research literature on benefit management, as well as gathering and analysing information on benefit management in digitalization of the public sector in Norway. This includes ten IT projects from the co-founding scheme of the directorate of digitalization (Medfinansieringsordningen) in 2017, eight IT projects that have been through the Norwegian government's scheme for external quality assurance (the QA-scheme), five IT projects in the defence sector, as well as continuous development of two products/services.

After a short review and explanation of concepts and different frameworks for benefit management in chapter 2, our research method is presented in chapter 3.

We here describe how data on the 23 projects and two product areas was gathered from various documents (e.g., conceptual appraisal reports, documents from management and quality assurance, cost benefit analyses, plans on benefit management and final reports evaluating realized benefits). For 15 of the projects and both product areas we also collected experiences through semi-structured interviews with project owners and other personnel with responsibility for realizing benefits. The interviews emphasized especially the respondents' perceptions and experiences on how to succeed with benefit management.

The literature review in chapter 4 summarizes evidence from extant literature, that notes that benefit management often gets much attention in the early phases of projects, in terms of cost-benefit analyses being conducted, and plans to realize benefits being developed. On the other hand, it is less common to apply benefit management practices during later phases of the project, and few evaluate actually realized benefits ex post. The review suggests that success in achieving benefits in digitalization projects is seen in relation to the following:

- Identifying a broad range of different types of benefit. (Weak/medium evidence)
- Implementing formal cost-benefit analyses. (Weak evidence)
- Describing benefits so that these can be evaluated/measured. (Weak evidence).
- Plans implementation of benefit realization. (Medium evidence)
- Has personnel with responsibility for the realization of benefits. (Medium evidence).
- Implementing benefit management during the project. (Strong/medium evidence)
- Evaluating/measuring realized benefit. (Medium/strong evidence)

Chapter 5 describes some of the key findings from our analyses of the gathered information on the 23 projects and two product areas, divided into different thematic areas and research questions.

Research question 1: How is identification, planning, realization and measurement of benefits conducted?

In the theme *cost-benefit analysis* (typically interpreted as *social* cost-benefit analysis) we find a tendency that these analyses mainly serve as means to get project approval and financing. Therefore, it is crucial for projects to document a

positive benefit-cost efficiency, but less important to use the cost-benefit analysis in the planning and management of benefits during the project. Furthermore, we observed a negative side-effect from the co-founding scheme, with future budgets being cut based on the planned internal benefits in the form of cost savings. The implication of this is that not all internal cost-savings are being identified, whereas non-monetized benefits and external and societal benefits (that do not lead to budget cuts) are fully included in the analysis. We also found indications of a lack of skills in conducting cost-benefit analysis in several of the projects. A further weakness in some of the projects was the lack of involvement of external benefit owners (i.e., those responsible for achieving benefits in other public entities affected by the digitalization initiative) in the cost-benefit analyses.

Almost all (19 out of 23) of the projects had *benefit plans* for when and how different benefits should be realized. An effective tool, that we only found used in three of the projects and one of the product areas, was a “benefit map”. Benefit maps visualize and communicate the benefit plans to involved parties, including both end users and developers. Benefit maps can also visualize relationships between deliveries and benefits, and further between benefits and strategic goals. Data from the interviews indicate that planned benefits to some degree (35% of the projects) were perceived as “best case” of what was possible to achieve. Benefits were often (50% of the projects) not prioritized against each other. The plans covered, to some degree, but far from always (65% of the projects), how to evaluate realized benefit. We analysed the quality of the benefit plans according to the SMARC criteria (S=Specified, M=Measurable, A=Accountable, R=Realistic, C=Comprehensive). This analysis revealed that projects to a large degree were successful in specifying planned benefits (S), varied in terms of being measurable (M), were rather clear when it came to responsibilities (A), had deficiencies in assessing the benefits’ uncertainty and realism (R), as well as a large variety regarding comprehensiveness (C).

Managing benefits during the execution phase of the project is well documented in literature as a prerequisite to succeed in realizing benefits. This is to some degree supported by our data where half (50%) of the projects perceived this as very important or important to succeed. In addition, many of the projects (50%) perceived it as important to have a person responsible for achieving benefits and having a plan for how to realize benefits. However, there were also projects (35%) that found the benefit plan to be not important.

Documentation of realized benefit varied a lot among the projects. About half of the projects had produced a project closure report containing, to some degree, documentation on realized benefit, but very few (17%) of these reports had a level of detail that allowed an evaluation against planned benefits. Most of the projects spent little resources on evaluation and documentation of benefits, and when this was done it was mostly centred on only a small part of the planned benefits.

Project outcome varied a lot. When we exclude the three projects (all within the external quality assurance scheme) that were stopped, most of the projects had good cost control (only 24% with more than 20% deviation from initial budget (P50)) and medium time control (47% had more than 20% deviation from initial end-date). More than half (59%) of the projects considered their ability to realize planned benefits to be at least 90%, 24% considered that between 60 and 90% of planned benefits would be realized, and only 18% of the projects considered that less than 60% of planned benefits would be realized. We found a small correlation between cost control and the realization of benefits ($r = 0.3$), and between time control and the realization of benefits ($r = 0.1$). That is, a project that delivers on time and budget, has no guarantee that it will deliver good benefits.

To examine *benefit management in continuous development* (management and further development) we looked at two products/services. Both of these were a continuation of larger digitalization projects. The main finding from these two were that processes and roles largely were scaled-down versions of benefit management practices present in the original projects. Both products were for the most part successful in creating efficient processes for continuous benefit management, but they also put effort into further improvement of these processes.

Research question 2: How does benefit management practices relate to the degree of success in achieving benefit?

Our analysis of the relationship between *benefit management practices* and *the level of project success* (where realized benefit has most weight, but time and cost control also were included) provided the following key results:

- Perceived importance of, and scope of, the cost-benefit analysis are only weak indicators on how well projects performed. This result is to some degree supported by findings in the literature review, where cost-

benefit analysis typically is the benefit management practice being the least important for successful benefit management.

- Projects where the individual(s) responsible for realizing benefits had an operational role and good domain knowledge, and not for example the role of line manager, were more successful than other projects. This finding is on a subject not previously studied, but it matches the point from the literature review on the importance of having persons responsible for achieving benefits.
- Benefit plans with measurable benefits (the M in the SMARC criteria) performed better than other projects. There has only been one previous study of this subject, with an equivalent result.
- Projects perceiving the benefit plan as important, performed better than other projects. This finding corresponds entirely with previous studies. Evidence supporting the importance of having a formal plan on how benefit should be realized, and not only what benefit should be realized, is in other words strong.

Research question 3: What is evidence-based measures to obtain good benefit management?

We use the third research question to offer 28 evidence-based recommendations for benefit management in public sector digitalization projects in chapter 6. This includes, among other things, the following recommendations:

- Change in the role description for the individual responsible for realizing benefits, from being a role within the line of general management into an operational role in the project where domain knowledge and communication are emphasized.
- An increased use of benefit maps to visualize and communicate the project logic and planned benefits to both development teams, the business side and other end users.
- Increased attention to identify unplanned benefits during project implementation.
- Measures to increase competence in the implementation of cost-benefit analysis.
- Reconsider the use of budget cuts in the co-funding scheme for digitalization projects, to avoid adverse effects on identification and management of benefits.

- Review the analysis of uncertainty in benefits for a better compliance between how costs and benefits are appraised in the cost-benefit analysis.
- Measures to ensure that given benefits can both be evaluated and managed.
- Emphasis on the appointment and inclusion of external benefit owners.
- Improved processes for evaluation of realized benefits, preferably in the form of continuous evaluation where possible.
- Improved mechanisms for sharing experiences from benefit management.

This report concludes that there are good benefit management practices in public digitalization in Norway. Use of good practices within benefit management is, through this report, together with previous examinations, well documented to correspond to successful digitalization.

However, much can still be improved. Our hope is that the results and recommendations in this report can contribute to investments that even more benefits in the future. We wish you good benefit management!

Concept report series

Paper version: ISSN 0803-9763

Web version: ISSN 0804-5585

Norwegian version: <https://www.ntnu.no/concept/concept-rapportserie>

English version: <https://www.ntnu.edu/concept/concept-report-series>

Report	Title	Author (-s)
No 1	Styring av prosjektporteføljer i staten. Usikkerhetsavsetning på porteføljenivå <i>Project Portfolio Management. Estimating Provisions for Uncertainty at Portfolio Level.</i>	Stein Berntsen and Thorleif Sunde
No 2	Statlig styring av prosjektleidelse. Empiri og økonomiske prinsipper. <i>Economic Incentives in Public Project Management</i>	Dag Morten Dalen, Ola Lædre and Christian Riis
No 3	Beslutningsunderlag og beslutninger i store statlige investeringsprosjekt <i>Decisions and the Basis for Decisions in Major Public Investment Projects</i>	Stein V. Larsen, Eilif Holte and Sverre Haanæs
No 4	Konseptutvikling og evaluering i store statlige investeringsprosjekt <i>Concept Development and Evaluation in Major Public Investment Projects</i>	Hege Gry Solheim, Erik Dammen, Håvard O. Skaldebø, Eystein Myking, Elisabeth K. Svendsen and Paul Torgersen
No 5	Bedre behovsanalyser. Erfaringer og anbefalinger om behovsanalyser i store offentlige investeringsprosjekt <i>Needs Analysis in Major Public Investment Projects. Lessons and Recommendations</i>	Petter Næss
No 6	Målformulering i store statlige investeringsprosjekt <i>Alignment of Objectives in Major Public Investment Projects</i>	Ole Jonny Klakegg
No 7	Hvordan tror vi at det blir? Effektvurderinger av store offentlige prosjekter <i>Up-front Conjecture of Anticipated Effects of Major Public Investment Projects</i>	Nils Olsson
No 8	Realopsjoner og fleksibilitet i store offentlige investeringsprosjekt <i>Real Options and Flexibility in Major Public Investment Projects</i>	Kjell Arne Brekke

No 9	<p>Bedre utforming av store offentlige investeringsprosjekter. Vurdering av behov, mål og effekt i tidligfasen</p> <p><i>Improved Design of Public Investment Projects. Up-front Appraisal of Needs, Objectives and Effects</i></p>	<p>Petter Næss med bidrag fra Kjell Arne Brekke, Nils Olsson and Ole Jonny Klakegg</p>
No 10	<p>Usikkerhetsanalyse – Kontekst og grunnlag</p> <p><i>Uncertainty Analysis – Context and Foundations</i></p>	<p>Kjell Austeng, Olav Torp, Jon Terje Midtbø, Ingemund Jordanger, and Ole M Magnussen</p>
No 11	<p>Usikkerhetsanalyse – Modellering, estimering og beregning</p> <p><i>Uncertainty Analysis – Modeling, Estimation and Calculation</i></p>	<p>Frode Drevland, Kjell Austeng and Olav Torp</p>
No 12	<p>Metoder for usikkerhetsanalyse</p> <p><i>Uncertainty Analysis – Methodology</i></p>	<p>Kjell Austeng, Jon Terje Midtbø, Vidar Helland, Olav Torp and Ingemund Jordanger</p>
No 13	<p>Usikkerhetsanalyse – Feilkilder i metode og beregning</p> <p><i>Uncertainty Analysis – Methodological Errors in Data and Analysis</i></p>	<p>Kjell Austeng, Vibeke Binz and Frode Drevland</p>
No 14	<p>Positiv usikkerhet og økt verdiskaping</p> <p><i>Positive Uncertainty and Increasing Return on Investments</i></p>	<p>Ingemund Jordanger</p>
No 15	<p>Kostnadsusikkerhet i store statlige investeringsprosjekter; Empiriske studier basert på KS2</p> <p><i>Cost Uncertainty in Large Public Investment Projects. Empirical Studies</i></p>	<p>Olav Torp (red.), Ole M Magnussen, Nils Olsson and Ole Jonny Klakegg</p>
No 16	<p>Kontrahering i prosjektets tidligfase. Forsvarets anskaffelser.</p> <p><i>Procurement in a Project's Early Phases. Defense Aquisitions</i></p>	<p>Erik N. Warberg</p>
No 17	<p>Beslutninger på svakt informasjonsgrunnlag. Tilnærminger og utfordringer i prosjekters tidlige fase</p> <p><i>Decisions Based on Scant Information. Challenges and Tools During the Front-end Phases of Projects</i></p>	<p>Kjell Sunnevåg (red.)</p>

No 18	<p>Flermålsanalyser i store statlige investeringsprosjekt</p> <p><i>Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis In Major Public Investment Projects</i></p>	<p>Ingemund Jordanger, Stein Malerud, Harald Minken and Arvid Strand</p>
No 19	<p>Effektvurdering av store statlige investeringsprosjekter</p> <p><i>Impact Assessment of Major Public Investment Projects</i></p>	<p>Bjørn Andersen, Svein Bråthen, Tom Fagerhaug, Ola Nafstad, Petter Næss and Nils Olsson</p>
No 20	<p>Investorers vurdering av prosjekters godhet</p> <p><i>Investors' Appraisal of Project Feasibility</i></p>	<p>Nils Olsson, Stein Frydenberg, Erik W. Jakobsen, Svein Jessen, Roger Sørheim og Lillian Waagø</p>
No 21	<p>Logisk minimalisme, rasjonalitet - og de avgjørende valg</p> <p><i>Major Projects: Logical Minimalism, Rationality and Grand Choices</i></p>	<p>Knut Samset, Arvid Strand and Vincent F. Hendricks</p>
No 22	<p>Miljøøkonomi og samfunnsøkonomisk lønnsomhet</p> <p><i>Environmental Economics and Economic Viability</i></p>	<p>Kåre P. Hagen</p>
No 23	<p>The Norwegian Front-End Governance Regime of Major Public Projects – A Theoretically Based Analysis and Evaluation</p>	<p>Tom Christensen</p>
No 24	<p>Markedsorienterte styringsmetoder i miljøpolitikken</p> <p><i>Market oriented approaches to environmental policy</i></p>	<p>Kåre P. Hagen</p>
No 25	<p>Regime for planlegging og beslutning i sykehusprosjekter</p> <p><i>Planning and Decision Making in Hospital Projects. Lessons with the Norwegian Governance Scheme.</i></p>	<p>Asmund Myrbostad, Tarald Rohde, Pål Martinussen and Marte Lauvsnes</p>
No 26	<p>Politisk styring, lokal rasjonalitet og komplekse koalisjoner. Tidligfaseprosessen i store offentlige investeringsprosjekter</p> <p><i>Political Control, Local Rationality and Complex Coalitions. Focus on the Front-End of Large Public Investment Projects</i></p>	<p>Erik Whist and Tom Christensen</p>
No 27	<p>Verdsetting av fremtiden. Tidshorisont og diskonteringsrenter</p>	<p>Kåre P. Hagen</p>

Valuing the future. Time Horizon and Discount Rates

- | | | |
|-------|--|---|
| No 28 | Fjorden, byen og operaen. En evaluering av Bjørvikautbyggingen i et beslutningsteoretisk perspektiv <i>The Fjord, the City and the Opera. An Evaluation of Bjørvika Urban Development</i> | Erik Whist and Tom Christensen |
| No 29 | Levedyktighet og investeringstiltak. Erfaringer fra kvalitetssikring av statlige investeringsprosjekter

<i>Sustainability and Public Investments. Lessons from Major Public Investment Projects</i> | Ola Lædre, Gro Holst Volden and Tore Haavaldsen |
| No 30 | Ettrevaluering av statlige investeringsprosjekter. Konklusjoner, erfaringer og råd basert på pilotevaluering av fire prosjekter

<i>Evaluating Public Investment Projects. Lessons and Advice from a Meta-Evaluation of Four Projects</i> | Gro Holst Volden and Knut Samset |
| No 31 | Store statlige investeringers betydning for konkurranse- og markedsutviklingen. Håndtering av konkurransemessige problemstillinger i utredningsfasen

<i>Major Public Investments' Impact on Competition. How to Deal with Competition Issues as Part of the Project Appraisal</i> | Asbjørn Englund, Harald Bergh, Aleksander Møll and Ove Skaug Halsos |
| No 32 | Analyse av systematisk usikkerhet i norsk økonomi.

<i>Analysis of Systematic Uncertainty in the Norwegian Economy.</i> | Haakon Vennemo, Michael Hoel and Henning Wahlquist |
| No 33 | Planprosesser, beregningsverktøy og bruk av nytte-kostnadsanalyser i vegsektoren. En sammenlikning av praksis i Norge og Sverige.

<i>Planning, Analytic Tools and the Use of Cost-Benefit Analysis in the Transport Sector in Norway and Sweden.</i> | Morten Welde, Jonas Eliasson, James Odeck and Maria Börjesson |
| No 34 | Mulighetsrommet. En studie om konseptutredninger og konseptvalg

<i>The Opportunity Space. A Study of Conceptual Appraisals and the Choice of Conceptual Solutions.</i> | Knut Samset, Bjørn Andersen and Kjell Austeng |
| No 35 | Statens prosjektmodell. Bedre kostnadsstyring. Erfaringer med de første | Knut Samset and Gro Holst Volden |

	investeringstiltakene som har vært gjennom ekstern kvalitetssikring	
No 36	Investing for Impact. Lessons with the Norwegian State Project Model and the First Investment Projects that Have Been Subjected to External Quality Assurance	Knut Samset and Gro Holst Volden
No 37	Bruk av karbonpriser i praktiske samfunnsøkonomiske analyser. En oversikt over praksis fra analyser av statlige investeringsprosjekter under KVV-/KS1-ordningen. <i>Use of Carbon Prices in Cost-Benefit Analysis. Practices in Project Appraisals of Major Public Investment Projects under the Norwegian State Project Model</i>	Gro Holst Volden
No 38	Ikke-prissatte virkninger i samfunnsøkonomisk analyse. Praksis og erfaringer i statlige investeringsprosjekter <i>Non-Monetized Impacts in Economic Analysis. Practice and Lessons from Public Investment Projects</i>	Heidi Bull-Berg, Gro Holst Volden and Inger Lise Tyholt Grindvoll
No 39	Lav prising – store valg. En studie av underestimering av kostnader i prosjekters tidligfase <i>Low estimates – high stakes. A study of underestimation of costs in projects' earliest phase</i>	Morten Welde, Knut Samset, Bjørn Andersen and Kjell Austeng
No 40	Mot sin hensikt. Perverse insentiver – om offentlige investerings-prosjekter som ikke forplikter <i>Perverse incentives and counterproductive investments. Public funding without liabilities for the recipients</i>	Knut Samset, Gro Holst Volden, Morten Welde and Heidi Bull-Berg
No 41	Transportmodeller på randen. En utforsking av NTM5-modellens anvendelsesområde <i>Transport models and extreme scenarios. A test of the NTM5 model</i>	Christian Steinsland and Lasse Fridstrøm
No 42	Brukeravgifter i veisektoren <i>User fees in the road sector</i>	Kåre Petter Hagen and Karl Rolf Pedersen
No 43	Norsk vegplanlegging: Hvilke hensyn styrer anbefalingene <i>Road Planning in Norway: What governs the selection of projects?</i>	Arvid Strand, Silvia Olsen, Merethe Dotterud Leiren and Askill Harkjerr Halse

No 44	<p>Ressursbruk i transportsektoren – noen mulige forbedringer</p> <p><i>Resource allocation in the transport sector – some potential improvements</i></p>	James Odeck (ed.) and Morten Welde (ed.)
No 45	<p>Kommunale investeringsprosjekter. Prosjektmodeller og krav til beslutningsunderlag.</p> <p><i>Municipal investment practices in Norway</i></p>	Morten Welde, Jostein Aksdal and Inger Lise Tyholt Grindvoll
No 46	<p>Styringsregimer for store offentlige prosjekter. En sammenliknende studie av prinsipper og praksis i seks land.</p> <p><i>Governance schemes for major public investment projects: A comparative study of principles and practices in six countries</i></p>	Knut F. Samset, Gro Holst Volden, Nils Olsson and Eirik Vårdal Kvalheim
No 47	<p>Governance Schemes for Major Public Investment Projects. A comparative study of principles and practices in six countries.</p>	Knut F. Samset, Gro Holst Volden, Nils Olsson and Eirik Vårdal Kvalheim
No 48	<p>Investeringsprosjekter og miljøkonsekvenser. En antologi med bidrag fra 16 forskere.</p> <p><i>Environmental Impact of Large Investment Projects. An Anthology by 16 Norwegian Experts.</i></p>	Kåre P. Hagen and Gro Holst Volden
No 49	<p>Finansiering av vegprosjekter med bompenger. Behandling av og konsekvenser av bompenger i samfunnsøkonomiske analyser.</p> <p><i>Financing road projects with tolls. The treatment of and consequences of tolls in cost benefit analyses.</i></p>	Morten Welde, Svein Bråthen, Jens Rekdal and Wei Zhang
No 50	<p>Prosjektmodeller og prosjekteierstyring i statlige virksomheter.</p> <p><i>Project governance and the use of project models in public agencies and line ministries in Norway.</i></p>	Bjørn Andersen, Eirik Vårdal Kvalheim and Gro Holst Volden
No 51	<p>Kostnadskontroll i store statlige investeringer underlagt ordningen med ekstern kvalitetssikring.</p> <p><i>Cost performance in government investment projects that have been subjected to external quality assurance.</i></p>	Morten Welde
No 52	<p>Statlige investeringer under lupen. Erfaring med evaluering av de 20 første KS-prosjektene.</p>	Gro Holst Volden and Knut Samset

*A Close-up on Public Investment Cases.
Lessons from Ex-post Evaluations of 20
Major Norwegian Projects*

No 53	Fremsynsmetoder <i>Foresight methods</i>	Tore Sager
No 54	Neglected and underestimated impacts of transport investments	Petter Næss, Gro Holst Volden, James Odeck and Tim Richardson
No 55	Kostnadsstyring i entreprisekontrakter <i>Cost performance in construction contracts</i>	Morten Welde, Roy Endre Dahl, Olav Torp and Torbjørn Aass
No 56	Erfaringer fra styring og gjennomføring av store statlige IKT-prosjekter <i>Experiences from governance and implementation of major public ICT projects</i>	Håkon Finne
No 57	Effektivitet og produktivitet i norsk veibygging 2007-2016 <i>Efficiency and productivity in Norwegian road construction 2007-2016</i>	Kenneth Løvold Rødseth, Rasmus Bøgh Holmen, Finn R. Førstund and Sverre A.C. Kittelsen
No 58	Mandater for konseptvalgutredninger. En gjennomgang av praksis. <i>The Terms of Reference Document for Conceptual Appraisal. A Review of Current Practice.</i>	Knut Samset and Morten Welde
No 59	Estimering av kostnader i store statlige prosjekter: Hvor gode er estimatene og usikkerhetsanalysene i KS2-rapportene? <i>Estimating costs in large government investment projects. How good are the estimates and uncertainty analyses in the QA2-reports?</i>	Morten Welde, Magne Jørgensen, Per Fridtjof Larsen and Torleif Halkjelsvik
No 60	Noen krevende tema i anvendte samfunnsøkonomiske analyser. En undersøkelse av praksis i Statens prosjektmodell <i>Salient topics in cost-benefit analyses of major public projects in Norway</i>	Haakon Vennemo, Jens Furuholmen, Orvika Rosnes and Leonid Andreev
No 61	Samspill i bygg- og anleggsbransjen <i>Partnering in construction projects</i>	Svein Bråthen, Maria Laingen, Paul Torgersen and Merethe Kristin Woldseth

- | | | |
|--------|---|--|
| No 62 | Vegprosjekter, verdiskaping og lokale mål
<i>Road projects and local economic impacts</i> | Morten Welde, Eivind
Tveter and Anne Gudrun
Mork |
| No. 63 | Betydningen av lønnsomhet ved valg av
vegtrasé i kommunedelplanprosessen
<i>The importance of value for money when
choosing a road route in the municipal
sub-plan process</i> | Ingri Bukkestein and Ole
Henning Nyhus |
| No. 64 | Hvordan lykkes med digitalisering? En
undersøkelse av nyttestyring av IT-
prosjekter i offentlig sektor
<i>How to succeed with digitalization? A
study of benefit management in public IT
projects</i> | Helene Berg, Kjetil
Holgeid, Magne
Jørgensen and Gro Holst
Volden |

Forskningsprogrammet Concept skal utvikle kunnskap som sikrer bedre ressursutnytting og effekt av store, statlige investeringer. Programmet driver følgeforskning knyttet til de største statlige investeringsprosjektene over en rekke år. En skal trekke erfaringer fra disse som kan bedre utformingen og kvalitetssikringen av nye investeringsprosjekter før de settes i gang.

Concept er lokalisert ved Norges teknisk- naturvitenskapelige universitet i Trondheim (NTNU), ved Fakultet for ingeniørvitenskap og teknologi. Programmet samarbeider med ledende norske og internasjonale fagmiljøer og universiteter, og er finansiert av Finansdepartementet.

The Concept research program aims to develop know-how to help make more efficient use of resources and improve the effect of major public investments. The Program is designed to follow up on the largest public projects over a period of several years, and help improve design and quality assurance of future public projects before they are formally approved.

The program is based at The Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Faculty of Engineering Science and Technology. It cooperates with key Norwegian and international professional institutions and universities, and is financed by the Norwegian Ministry of Finance.

Address:

The Concept Research Program
Høgskoleringen 7A
N-7491 NTNU
Trondheim
NORWAY

ISSN: 0803-9763 (paper version)
ISSN: 0804-5585 (web version)
ISBN: 978-82-8433-004-4 (paper version)
ISBN: 978-82-8433-005-1 (web version)

