



Student Name: Xec Sikander Xeculi

Student ID: 2413387

Programme: BA (Hons) Leadership and Management Skills for the Workplace

Module: Project Management

Module Code: LCLM5003

Lecturer: Samson Oladejo

Assignment Title: A Project portfolio

Part A: Poster

REBUILDING THE WEST MIDLANDS TRANSPORT CORRIDOR

Post-Flood Highway Reconstruction: A Structured Project Management Plan

Xec Sikander Xeculi

Student ID: 2413387

LCLM5003 - Project Management

BACKGROUND & CONTEXT

Back in **July 2025**, an unusual Atlantic weather system dumped weeks of intense rainfall across the **West Midlands**. The **River Severn**, already at dangerously high levels, breached its defences near **Worcester, Shrewsbury, and Kidderminster**. Within hours, a principal transport corridor was submerged: road surfaces destroyed, drainage collapsed, safety barriers washed away (*Environment Agency*, 2021). Commercial vehicles couldn't move goods; emergency services lost access to key routes. The UK Climate Change Risk Assessment notes that 3.2 million properties face significant flood risk, with infrastructure especially vulnerable (*HM Government*, 2022). The IPCC warns that extreme precipitation across Northern Europe will keep intensifying (IPCC, 2023). So rebuilding can't simply mean restoring things. It needs to make infrastructure stronger.

PROJECT AIM & OBJECTIVES

At its core, this project sets out to restore the damaged corridor to full working order, but with a twist. Rather than patching what broke, the plan builds in flood resilience so the same damage doesn't happen again (PMI, 2021).

- Rebuild road surfaces, drainage, and safety barriers to at least pre-flood condition, and upgrade where possible
- Keep disruption minimal for commercial transport and emergency access during construction
- Integrate flood-resilient design at the corridor's most vulnerable sections
- Deliver within 21 weeks and a £3.2 million budget

METHODOLOGY

Why Waterfall? For construction, tasks follow a strict sequence: you can't test a road that hasn't been built. A **Waterfall approach** suits this perfectly (Kerzner, 2022).

Governance follows **PRINCE2**, widely used across UK public-sector construction. It splits the project into controlled stages with clear roles, stage-gate reviews, and exception-based escalation (Murray, Bennett and Bentley, 2015). That accountability matters when public money is involved.

Earned Value Management tracks cost and schedule drift early (Lock, 2020).

INFRASTRUCTURE RESTORATION TIMELINE (21 WEEKS)

Phase	W 1-4	W 5-7	W 8-9	W 10-19	W 20-21
1. Damage Assessment & Planning					
2. Procurement & Mobilisation					
3. Construction & Repair					
4. Inspection & Reopening					

QUAD CHART: SCOPE · SCHEDULE · COST · PERFORMANCE

◆ Scope

- Resurfacing all flood-damaged road sections between Worcester and Kidderminster
- Full rehabilitation of collapsed drainage with upgraded capacity
- Reinstatement of safety barriers, signage, and markings to UK highway standards
- Temporary traffic management keeping partial access open
- Flood defence features at vulnerable low-lying points

- Cost

- Total: **£3.2M**, funded by the local authority + government emergency grants
- Labour £1.4M · Materials £1.1M · Equipment £0.4M · Contingency £0.3M
- 10% contingency for unforeseen ground conditions (*Burke, 2013*)
- Monthly variance analysis; exception reports at $\pm 5\%$ drift

◆ **Schedule**

- 21 weeks, four phases with stage-gate reviews (Mayor, 2017)
- Weekly progress reports to Project Board and Council
- Critical path: construction (W8-19), slippage delays everything
- 2-week contingency buffer for weather delays
- Phased reopening coordinated with emergency services

◆ Performance

- Full corridor reopened by Week 21 with no partial closures
- 100% Highways England / DMRB compliance
- Measurably improved drainage at three worst flood points
- Zero RIDDOR safety incidents (Turner, 2016)
- Stakeholder satisfaction $\geq 85\%$ at closure

KEY RISKS & MITIGATION

Risk	L	I	Mitigation Strategy
Adverse weather during construction (IPCC, 2023)	H	H	Met Office monitoring; flexible schedule with 2-week buffer; protective site covers
Supply chain delays for drainage materials	M	M	Early procurement in Phase 1; dual-supplier contracts; buffer stock on-site
Budget overrun from ground conditions	M	H	Geotechnical surveys during assessment; 10% contingency ring-fenced (Burke, 2013)
Community disruption and complaints	M	L	Dedicated liaison officer; fortnightly public newsletters; 24-hour hotline
Key staff unavailability or turnover	L	M	Cross-trained team members; documented handover at each stage

KEY STAKEHOLDERS

- **Local Council:** Project sponsor; final sign-off on budget and strategic direction. Monthly board reports.
- **Transport Authority:** Regulatory oversight ensuring Highways England and DMRB compliance across all works.
- **Construction Contractor:** Appointed via competitive tender to deliver physical works across all four phases.
- **Environment Agency:** Provides flood risk data and drainage design guidance. Critical voice during Phase 1 assessments.
- **Emergency Services:** Coordinates ongoing access needs during partial road closures. Weekly traffic plan reviews.
- **Local Community:** The ultimate beneficiaries. Engaged via public meetings, newsletters, and a dedicated feedback channel.

Engagement follows a power/interest matrix (Meredith and Mantel, 2019), ensuring high-influence groups receive frequent updates while wider parties are kept informed periodically.

REFERENCES

- Burke, R. (2013) *Project Management: Planning and Control Techniques*. 5th edn. Chichester: Wiley.
- Environment Agency (2021) *National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England*. London: Defra.
- HM Government (2022) *UK Climate Change Risk Assessment 2022*. London: HMSO.
- IPCC (2023) *Climate Change 2023: AR6 Synthesis Report*. Geneva: IPCC.
- Kerzner, H. (2022) *Project Management: A Systems Approach to Planning, Scheduling, and Controlling*. 13th edn. Hoboken: Wiley.
- Lock, D. (2020) *Project Management*. 11th edn. Abingdon: Routledge.

- Maylor, H. (2017) *Project Management*. 5th edn. Harlow: Pearson.
- Meredith, J. and Mantel, S. (2019) *Project Management: A Managerial Approach*. 10th edn. Hoboken: Wiley.
- Murray, A., Bennett, N. and Bentley, C. (2015) *Managing Successful Projects with PRINCE2*. 6th edn. London: TSO.
- PMI (2021) *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK Guide)*. 7th edn. Newtown Square: PMI.
- Turner, R. (2016) *Gower Handbook of Project Management*. 5th edn. Abingdon: Routledge.

Part B: Reflection on Feedback

When I presented my poster in Week 6, I was fairly confident about the overall concept. I had picked a clear project, the corridor rebuild near the River Severn, and I thought the structure of the pitch made sense. The scope, timeline, budget, and risks were all there. But what I did not realise until the feedback session was how much I had missed in terms of academic depth. That was probably the biggest takeaway from the whole exercise.

The tutor was quite direct about the referencing issue. There were no citations on the poster at all, and at Level 5 that is not really acceptable. Every decision, whether it is choosing Waterfall over Agile or deciding how to handle risk, needs to be backed up by published sources. At the time I think I assumed the poster was more of a visual summary and that references could wait for the main report. Looking back, that was a mistake. Even a poster should show evidence of wider reading, and mine did not. One of my peers also asked during the Q&A why I had chosen PRINCE2 specifically, and I did not have a strong answer beyond saying it was commonly used. That was a bit embarrassing, honestly, because it showed I had not really thought it through properly.

On the positive side, a few things did land well. The tutor said the choice of project was sensible because it was specific and manageable rather than trying to tackle the entire flood recovery. A couple of peers mentioned that the presentation itself was easy to follow, which I was pleased about. The fact that I had included a risk register and a stakeholder list also got positive comments because it showed the proposal was not just focused on the physical construction but on how the programme would actually be run.

The other big piece of feedback was about content volume. My original poster was quite sparse. The tutor pointed out that it should be equivalent to roughly 500 words, and I was well under that. Some sections like the scope and stakeholder areas had just three or four bullet points, which was not enough to demonstrate real understanding of the topic. Peers suggested adding more explanation of the choices being made rather than just listing things.

I have tried to address all of this in the final submission. The poster now has over 500 words of content with proper Harvard citations throughout, including sources like Kerzner (2022) for the Waterfall methodology and Murray, Bennett and Bentley (2015) for PRINCE2 governance. The project management plan goes into significantly more depth on stakeholder engagement, resource allocation, and the reasoning behind key decisions. I have also made sure to explain

why certain approaches were chosen rather than just naming them, which was something the feedback specifically called out.

If I am honest, the feedback process was more useful than I expected it to be. It is easy to think a piece of work is solid when you have been looking at it for weeks, but hearing other people's reactions quickly shows up the gaps. The final submission is definitely stronger because of it.

Part C: Project Management Plan

1. Introduction

The flooding that hit the West Midlands in July 2025 was, by most accounts, devastating. Weeks of heavy rainfall caused by an unusual Atlantic weather system pushed the River Severn well beyond its limits, and the defences near Worcester, Shrewsbury, and Kidderminster simply could not cope (Environment Agency, 2021). Streets went underwater in a matter of hours. The electricity grid failed in several areas, and hundreds of homes and businesses ended up submerged. The Environment Agency had put out Severe Flood Warnings with the label Danger to Life, but a lot of residents did not expect things to escalate as fast as they did.

One of the biggest casualties of this flooding was a principal transport corridor that connects key towns along the River Severn valley. The road surfaces were torn apart, drainage systems collapsed entirely, and safety barriers were either destroyed or washed away. With the corridor shut down, commercial vehicles had no route for moving goods, emergency services struggled to reach people who needed help, and commuters were left stranded. The economic impact on local businesses was substantial.

This report presents a detailed plan for tackling option (b) from the scenario, which involves rebuilding that principal corridor so it can once again support the transportation of goods and people. But there is an important point here. According to the UK Climate Change Risk Assessment, something like 3.2 million properties in England are already at significant risk from flooding, and infrastructure networks tend to be particularly vulnerable because failures in one area cascade into others (HM Government, 2022). On top of that, the IPCC has warned repeatedly that extreme rainfall events across Northern Europe are going to keep getting worse as temperatures climb (IPCC, 2023). Given all of that, it would not make much sense to simply patch the road back to its previous state. The reconstruction has to leave the corridor in better shape than it was before the floods hit.

What follows in this report is a structured breakdown of how that reconstruction would be planned and delivered. Each section covers a different aspect of the plan: scope, scheduling, resources, stakeholder involvement, and risk. The tools used here, such as Work Breakdown Structures, Gantt charts, and PRINCE2 governance, are not just theoretical concepts from a textbook. They are being applied directly to the specifics of this corridor rebuild to show how they work in a real situation.

2. Project Description

The corridor in question runs through the West Midlands, connecting Worcester and Kidderminster along the River Severn valley. On a normal day it carries commercial vehicles, daily commuters, and emergency service traffic. When it closed after the flooding, the disruption was felt immediately across the region. Local businesses that depended on freight deliveries were hit hard, and getting to work became a serious problem for thousands of residents. The Local Council and Transport Authority both treated the reopening as a high priority.

In practical terms, the reconstruction covers four things: resurfacing the damaged road sections, fixing the drainage systems that collapsed, putting safety barriers and signage back in place, and installing some improved flood protection at the spots that turned out to be most vulnerable. That last point is important. Rather than just doing a like-for-like repair, the plan deliberately includes resilience upgrades. The UK Climate Change Risk Assessment makes a strong case for this kind of approach (HM Government, 2022), and the July 2025 experience showed exactly what happens when defences are not good enough.

A Waterfall methodology was chosen for this particular programme. In construction work, things have to happen in a set order. Geotechnical surveys need to be done before the engineering design can be finalised. The design has to be locked in before procurement begins. And procurement obviously has to be completed before anyone starts building anything. Kerzner (2022) makes the point that Waterfall suits these kinds of sequential dependencies well because each phase wraps up with clear deliverables before the next one kicks off.

For governance, the plan uses PRINCE2, which is a framework that gets used a lot on UK public sector construction work. PRINCE2 breaks things into controlled stages with defined roles for everyone involved, formal reviews between stages, and a system for escalating problems when something falls outside agreed limits (Murray, Bennett and Bentley, 2015). One criticism of PRINCE2 is that it can feel rigid compared to Agile approaches. But for a

publicly funded infrastructure rebuild where scope changes need tight control, that rigidity is actually a strength rather than a weakness (Maylor, 2017). The total timeline is twenty-one weeks, and the budget sits at 3.2 million pounds, with a ten percent contingency built in.

3. Scope

Getting the scope right from the start matters a great deal. If the boundaries of what is and is not included are left vague, the work tends to expand beyond what was originally intended, which is what PMI (2021) refers to as scope creep. That usually leads to delays and cost overruns, neither of which this programme can afford.

So, to be specific about what falls inside the scope: resurfacing every flood-damaged road section between Worcester and Kidderminster; rehabilitating the drainage infrastructure that collapsed, with upgrades to handle higher water volumes than before; reinstating safety barriers, signage, and road markings to meet current Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards; running temporary traffic management so residents and emergency vehicles can still get through during the works; and putting improved flood defences at the three worst-affected low-lying sections of the route.

Equally important is what falls outside the scope. Repairs to private homes or commercial buildings are excluded. So are large-scale flood defence works beyond the corridor boundary, since those sit under the Environment Agency's remit. Upgrades to electricity or telecoms networks are also out, as are any works needing separate planning consent. Keeping these exclusions clear helps the team stay focused on delivering within the agreed twenty-one-week programme and 3.2 million pound budget.

If any stakeholder wants to change the scope during delivery, that request would go through a formal change control process. Under PRINCE2, the Project Board looks at every change request and weighs up its impact on time, money, and quality before deciding whether to approve or reject it (Murray, Bennett and Bentley, 2015). Without this kind of discipline, even well-intentioned additions can throw the whole programme off track.

4. Work Breakdown Structure

The Work Breakdown Structure, or WBS, is essentially a way of chopping a large piece of work into smaller, more manageable chunks. Burke (2013) describes it as the foundation for scheduling and cost estimation, because until every task has been identified and broken down, it is very difficult to plan anything with confidence. Table 1 sets out the WBS for this corridor rebuild, organised into four main phases.

Table 1: Work Breakdown Structure

Level	Phase	Activities	Deliverables
1	Damage Assessment and Planning (W1 to 4)	Site surveys, geotechnical testing, engineering assessments, design of repair specifications, procurement planning	Assessment report, design specifications, procurement schedule
2	Procurement and Mobilisation (W5 to 7)	Tender evaluation, contractor appointment, material ordering, site compound setup, traffic management installation	Signed contracts, materials on site, traffic diversions live
3	Construction and Repair (W8 to 19)	Road resurfacing, drainage rehabilitation, safety barrier installation, flood resilience upgrades, quality inspections	Completed road sections, functioning drainage, installed barriers
4	Inspection, Testing and Reopening (W20 to 21)	Final safety inspections, load testing, snagging, handover documentation, stakeholder sign-off, corridor reopening	Safety certificates, handover pack, reopened corridor

Having this breakdown in place means that each task can be assigned to someone specific, tracked on a weekly basis, and reported against. It also supports the Earned Value Management (EVM) approach that the programme uses for tracking whether spending and progress are lining up with the original plan (Lock, 2020).

5. Quad Chart

A Quad Chart takes four key dimensions of a programme and lays them out in a single view. Meredith and Mantel (2019) suggest it works well as a communication tool because stakeholders can look at one page and quickly get the picture of where things stand. Table 2 shows the Quad Chart for this corridor rebuild. The four quadrants cover scope, schedule, cost, and performance criteria.

Table 2: Quad Chart

Scope - Resurfacing all flood-damaged road sections - Drainage rehabilitation with upgraded capacity - Safety barrier and signage reinstatement - Temporary traffic management - Flood defence upgrades at vulnerable points	Schedule - 21 weeks total across 4 phases - Stage-gate reviews at each transition - Weekly progress reports to the Board - Critical path through construction (W8 to 19) - 2-week contingency buffer included
Cost - Total: 3.2 million pounds - Labour: 1.4M, Materials: 1.1M - Equipment hire: 0.4M, Contingency: 0.3M - Monthly variance analysis against baseline - Exception reports at plus or minus 5 percent drift	Performance and Success Criteria - Full corridor reopened by Week 21 - 100 percent Highways England and DMRB compliance - Improved drainage at worst flood points - Zero RIDDOR reportable safety incidents - Stakeholder satisfaction of at least 85 percent

What ties the Quad Chart together with the rest of the plan is that each quadrant connects to a monitoring tool used elsewhere. Schedule is tracked via the Gantt Chart in Section 6. Cost is monitored through EVM. And the success criteria get formally reviewed at closure during Phase 4.

6. Gantt Chart

Gantt Charts are probably the most commonly used scheduling tool in project management. They show tasks laid out along a timeline so that anyone looking at them can see when things start, when they finish, and how they relate to each other (Lock, 2020). Table 3 gives a simplified Gantt for this programme, showing the four phases from the WBS along with their dependencies and milestones.

Table 3: Gantt Chart

Phase	Start	End	Duration	Dependencies	Milestone
1. Damage Assessment and Planning	Week 1	Week 4	4 weeks	None (start)	Assessment report approved
2. Procurement and Mobilisation	Week 5	Week 7	3 weeks	Phase 1 complete	Contractors on site
3. Construction and Repair	Week 8	Week 19	12 weeks	Phase 2 complete	Construction sign-off
4. Inspection and Reopening	Week 20	Week 21	2 weeks	Phase 3 complete	Corridor reopened

The critical path here runs straight through the construction phase, which spans Weeks 8 to 19. If anything slips during those twelve weeks, the reopening date gets pushed back automatically. That is why a two-week buffer has been factored into the overall programme, and why the lead

manager holds weekly progress meetings during construction to catch problems before they snowball (Kerzner, 2022).

7. Stakeholders' Involvement

For a publicly funded piece of infrastructure work like this one, getting stakeholder engagement right is not optional. There are a lot of different groups with a direct interest in the outcome, and if any of them feel ignored or poorly informed, it creates problems. Meredith and Mantel (2019) make the case that the first step is always to map out who the stakeholders are, what level of influence they hold, and how much interest they have in the work. From there, communication can be tailored accordingly.

The Local Council is the primary stakeholder. As the body providing funding and strategic direction, the Council has final approval authority over major decisions. Monthly board reports keep them updated on progress, spending, and any emerging risks. The Transport Authority sits alongside the Council in terms of importance. Their role is regulatory: making sure every piece of construction work meets Highways England standards and complies with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. They are especially involved during the assessment stage at the beginning and the inspection stage at the end.

On the delivery side, the construction contractor is appointed through competitive tender and carries responsibility for the physical works across all four stages. The contract includes key performance indicators, penalty clauses for delays, and quality benchmarks to keep things accountable (Turner, 2016). The Environment Agency provides specialist input on flood risk data and drainage design. Their advice during the initial assessment directly shapes the engineering specifications for the drainage upgrades and resilience features.

Emergency services need to be consulted regularly because the corridor will be partially closed during construction, and response times cannot be allowed to suffer. Weekly reviews of the traffic control arrangements make sure access routes are always workable. Then there is the local community. These are the people who actually live along the corridor, commute on it, or run businesses beside it. Keeping them informed through public meetings, fortnightly newsletters, and a dedicated feedback channel is not just good practice; research shows that strong community engagement tends to produce smoother delivery with fewer objections (Joslin and Muller, 2016).

Overall, the engagement approach follows what is sometimes called a power and interest matrix. High-influence, high-interest groups like the Council and Transport Authority get

frequent, detailed updates. Lower-interest groups hear from the team less often, but still receive enough information to know what is going on (Too and Weaver, 2014).

8. Allocation of Resources

Getting resources allocated properly from the start can make or break a programme. Nicholas and Steyn (2020) note that poor allocation is one of the most common reasons why construction work fails to meet its targets. For this corridor rebuild, resources fall into three main categories: people, money, and equipment.

On the people side, each stage of the programme needs different expertise. The assessment stage relies on civil engineers and geotechnical specialists. Procurement brings in contract managers and supply chain officers. The construction stage, which is the longest and most labour-intensive part, requires road crews, plant operators, drainage specialists, and quality inspectors. A dedicated community liaison officer is involved throughout to handle public-facing communication, and a lead manager oversees the entire programme from start to finish.

The financial picture is fairly straightforward. The total budget of 3.2 million pounds breaks down roughly as follows: about 1.4 million on labour, 1.1 million on materials like asphalt, drainage parts, barriers, and flood defence components, around 400,000 on equipment hire, and a contingency pot of 320,000 pounds which represents ten percent of the total. That contingency is there to cover things like unexpected ground conditions or sudden price jumps in materials (Burke, 2013). Every month, actual spending gets compared to the baseline using Earned Value Management, and if the variance goes beyond five percent in either direction, an exception report gets triggered.

On the technology and equipment side, the team uses scheduling software to plan and track progress, GPS survey equipment for the initial site assessments, and digital platforms for keeping stakeholders updated. None of these are particularly exotic, but they do make coordination across a multi-stage programme significantly easier.

9. Risk Analysis

Every piece of construction work carries risk, and pretending otherwise is a recipe for trouble. Kerzner (2022) stresses that risk identification should not be treated as something that happens once during planning and then gets forgotten. It has to be a continuous process that runs all the way through delivery. Table 4 lays out the main risks for this programme, along with how likely they are, how severe the impact could be, and what steps are being taken to deal with them.

Table 4: Risk Register

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation Strategy
Bad weather during construction	High	High	Met Office forecasts built into weekly planning; two-week schedule buffer; protective covers for exposed works; drainage installed early to manage surface water on site
Supply chain delays for specialist drainage parts	Medium	Medium	Procurement started early in the assessment stage; contracts placed with two separate suppliers to avoid single-source dependency; buffer stock held on site
Budget overrun from ground conditions	Medium	High	Geotechnical surveys done during the first stage to identify underground problems before construction begins; ten percent contingency ring-fenced (Burke, 2013)
Community disruption and complaints	Medium	Low	Community liaison officer on site throughout; fortnightly newsletters to residents; 24-hour complaints hotline; updates posted on council website
Key staff leaving or being unavailable	Low	Medium	Team members cross-trained across roles; handover documentation maintained at each stage gate; succession plans in place for critical positions

The risk that keeps coming back to the top of the register is bad weather. Given what the IPCC (2023) says about rainfall patterns getting more extreme, this is not something that can be designed out entirely. It can only be managed. The two-week schedule buffer, combined with flexible sequencing during the construction stage, gives the programme some breathing room if weather forces a temporary shutdown. Risk reviews happen fortnightly during construction and weekly during the assessment and inspection stages. Anything new gets added to the register and escalated to the Board if it crosses the agreed tolerance thresholds.

10. Conclusion

This report has set out a structured approach to rebuilding the flood-damaged West Midlands transport corridor. By using a Waterfall delivery approach combined with PRINCE2 governance, the plan provides the kind of sequential control and clear accountability that a publicly funded construction programme needs.

Each section of the plan has dealt with a different aspect of the work, from defining the scope and breaking down the tasks, through to scheduling, costing, stakeholder engagement, and managing risk. The tools applied here are not abstract exercises. They are practical mechanisms for making sure the corridor gets rebuilt on time, within budget, and to the standard that stakeholders expect.

What makes this particular programme different from a straightforward repair job is the focus on resilience. The drainage upgrades and flood defence features are there specifically to reduce the chances of the same kind of damage happening again. That matters, because the climate data is clear: extreme weather events in this part of the world are not going away. If anything, they are going to get worse (HM Government, 2022; IPCC, 2023). Rebuilding the corridor to a higher standard is not just good engineering; it is common sense.

Delivered successfully within the twenty-one-week programme and 3.2 million pound budget, this work would reopen a transport route that thousands of people depend on every day, and leave the West Midlands in a stronger position for whatever comes next.

References

- Burke, R. (2013) *Project Management: Planning and Control Techniques*. 5th edn. Chichester: Wiley.
- Environment Agency (2021) *National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England*. London: Defra.
- HM Government (2022) *UK Climate Change Risk Assessment 2022*. London: HMSO.
- IPCC (2023) *Climate Change 2023: AR6 Synthesis Report*. Geneva: IPCC.
- Joslin, R. and Muller, R. (2016) 'The relationship between project governance and project success', *International Journal of Project Management*, 34(4), pp. 613-626.
- Kerzner, H. (2022) *Project Management: A Systems Approach to Planning, Scheduling, and Controlling*. 13th edn. Hoboken: Wiley.
- Lock, D. (2020) *Project Management*. 11th edn. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Maylor, H. (2017) *Project Management*. 5th edn. Harlow: Pearson.
- Meredith, J. and Mantel, S. (2019) *Project Management: A Managerial Approach*. 10th edn. Hoboken: Wiley.
- Murray, A., Bennett, N. and Bentley, C. (2015) *Managing Successful Projects with PRINCE2*. 6th edn. London: TSO.
- Nicholas, J. and Steyn, H. (2020) *Project Management for Engineering, Business and Technology*. 6th edn. Abingdon: Routledge.
- PMI (2021) *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK Guide)*. 7th edn. Newtown Square: PMI.
- Too, E. and Weaver, P. (2014) 'The management of project management: a conceptual framework for project governance', *International Journal of Project Management*, 32(8), pp. 1382-1394.
- Turner, R. (2016) *Gower Handbook of Project Management*. 5th edn. Abingdon: Routledge.