





















versities, the difficulty to get information, the fact that the literature is very general and the necessary details remain unknown, would have given us an alert that Task 3 might be difficult. We would have asked for its financing, but we would have reduced its maximal expected scope and have asked for much less financial means than we did in the real case. And having done some progress in Task 3, we would have ended the whole project or drastically limited its scope. The attained result would have been more or less the same as it was in reality, but it would have been much cheaper. The saved financial means could have been used for other, more justified research goals.

## Conclusions

In the paper we have proposed a new approach to research project planning and controlling. The approach would require more time spent on project planning, as well as its control. Moreover, the decision about project financing would have to be remade and updated at regular periods, as the method does not pretend that in research projects it is possible to estimate the project duration and cost with a reasonable accuracy. In our opinion it is not, even allowing a rather high margin. The currently used methods do not take the fact into account, they treat research projects like other types of projects, which in our opinion often results in big amounts of money spent on activities of which it is already known that they will not lead to the desired goal, and at the same time there is no money for other, more promising research projects.

The advantage of the proposed method consists in our opinion in the fact that it will force research project planners to give for each project task the information about what about is known, what is known only partially and what is unknown, which pieces of information are still needed to plan the task in a more comprehensive and concrete way, how to get them and when they might be expected. The advantage for the research financing institutions would be to be able to see which project tasks can be planned in a reasonable way in the given moment and thus their financing is justified and in case of which project tasks it is better to wait with the financing decisions till the uncertainty level is reduced. Research projects planned and financed using such an approach can be broken without greater problems for any party involved the moment they prove not to lead to expected results.

The disadvantage of the approach is a higher workload it would impose on research project planners. However, as in research projects often huge amounts of money, and quite frequently of public money are spent, in our opinion it is important to plan and evaluate them on the basis of rigorous and true data, while true data in case of research projects often mean vagueness or uncertainty statements.

Of course, the proposed method has to be verified in practice and further elaborated. We have tried it out only post factum on a few research projects known to

the author (one of those cases is presented here), but the opinion and evaluation of other researchers is needed. It will be gathered in our further research.

The way to a complete project research planning method, being able to be used in practice, is still long. However, we hope that our paper provides a first step towards it.

## References

- Artigues C., Michelon P., Reusser S. (2003), *Insertion Techniques for Static and Dynamic Resource Constrained Project Scheduling*, "European Journal of Operational Research", Vol. 149(2), p. 249–267.
- Courtot H. (1998), *La gestion de risques des projets*, Economica, Paris.
- Energy Facility Contractors Group (2010), *Project Management in Research & Development – White Paper*, Project Management Working Group.
- Estermann T., Claeys-Kulik A.L. (2013), *Financially Sustainable Universities Full Costing: Progress and Practice*, European Universities Association.
- Haugan G.T. (2002), *Effective Work Breakdown Structures*, Management Concepts.
- Jordan G.B., Hage J., Mote J., Helper B. (2005), *Investigating Differences among Research Projects and Implications for Managers*, "R&D Management", Vol. 35(5), p. 501–511.
- Kidd J.B. (2007), *A Comparison between the VERT Program and Other Methods of Project Duration Estimation*, Omega, Vol. 15(2), p. 129–134.
- Kuchta D. (2011), *Metody planowania projektów badawczych*, „Zeszyty Naukowe – Wyższa Szkoła Oficerska Wojsk Lądowych im. gen. T. Kościuszki”, Vol. 43(4), p. 332–341.
- Kuchta D., Janczura M. (2012), *Proactive and Reactive Scheduling with Fuzzy Duration Times*, Uncertainty Modeling in Knowledge Engineering and Decision Making: Proceedings of the 10<sup>th</sup> International FLINS Conference, Istanbul, Turkey, 26–29 August 2012, C. Kahraman, E.E. Kerre, F.T. Bozbura (eds.), p. 495–500.
- Kuchta D., Skowron D. (2013), *Selection of Concepts of Research and Development Project Management*, submitted to "R&D Management Journal".
- Pritsker A.A.B. (1966), *GERT: Graphical Evaluation and Review Technique RM-4973-NASA*, National Aeronautics and Space Administration under Contract No. NASr-21. Retrieved on the 8<sup>th</sup> of May 2010.
- Turner J.R., Cochrane R.A. (1993), *The Goals and Methods Matrix: Coping with Projects with Ill-defined Goals and/or Methods of Achieving Them*, "International Journal of Project Management", Vol. 11(2), p. 93–102.
- Wysocki R.K., McGary R. (2009), *Effective Project Management: Traditional, Adaptive, Extreme*, third ed., Indiana, Wiley Publishing, Inc.
- <http://www.portal.pwr.wroc.pl/fakty,242.dhtml> (retrieved: 23.03.2013).