



**Minutes of the
Fortieth Annual General Meeting
of
Association for Project Management
held on Monday 7th November 2011
at
Ibis House
Princes Risborough
Commencing at 6.00 pm

Meeting G11**

Association for Project Management
Ibis House
Regent Park, Summerleys Road
Princes Risborough
Buckinghamshire
HP27 9LE

The APM Chairman, Mike Nichols, welcomed everyone to the meeting which was attended by 28 members and guests as listed in Appendix 2. He introduced the others seated at the table: APM President Dr Martin Barnes CBE, Chief Executive Andrew Bragg, Company Secretary John Salisbury, Deputy Chief Executive & Head of Finance and Administration Howard Dolan and Sandra De Lord, partner from the auditors Kingston Smith LLP. Bringing attention to the extensive contributions which Martin Barnes has made to both the profession and APM, as a founder member, Honorary Fellow, former Chairman and APM's longest-serving President, the Chairman invited the President to take the chair for the meeting and to deliver the President's address.

The President formally opened the meeting and acknowledged apologies for absence as listed in Appendix 3. He expressed his particular pleasure to see APM's first President, Professor Geoffrey Trimble, in the audience.

G11 1 President's address

The President gave the speech attached as Appendix 1.

G11 2 Minutes of the last general meeting

The minutes of the 39th annual general meeting, held on 8th November 2010, were approved by the meeting and signed by the President.

G11 3 To receive the annual accounts for the financial year ended 31st March 2011, the report of the trustees and the auditors' report.

Mike Nichols began by assuring the President that there is no intention to change the association's name to any variant of P3 and that the existing name will remain for the foreseeable future.

Introducing the report and accounts for the year under review he explained that 2010/11 had been another highly successful year. He paid tribute to the strength of the volunteer community, at the same time acknowledging the requirement for effective communication and engagement with all those individuals whose contributions are so willingly provided and who ask for no more than a simple 'thank you' in return. Also referring to the impressive quality of the executive team, he advised that the board is currently reviewing the association's operating model in order to achieve optimum interaction between different APM groups of people.

The Chairman confirmed that the main focus continues to be on chartered status on behalf of the profession and he expressed total confidence that with the overwhelming strength of the case, the external support received and the commitment of the board, a favourable result will soon be achieved. In the meantime the APM Registered Project Professional (RPP) designation, the gold standard for demonstrating project management competence, has been launched and is being adopted by many major organisations.

Adding that the board has been developing its future strategy, working towards a vision that "All projects succeed", the Chairman pointed out that 2012 will be a significant year, incorporating the Queen's diamond jubilee celebrations, the Olympics and, in May, APM's 40th birthday.

Andrew Bragg then gave a presentation on the highlights of the year. He referred to the challenge delivered at the October 2010 APM annual conference by Sir Peter Gershon that the profession should 'stand up and be counted'. He cited the major achievements during the year,

the launch in September 2010 of the new route to the APMP qualification for candidates who have gained prior learning through PRINCE2®, the consultation on and development of the *APM Body of Knowledge 6th edition* which commenced in Spring 2010, the development of APM's social media presence and the launch of the new website, and the launch of the RPP standard as promised, on time, on 1st March 2011. The six members of the audience who had already achieved the RPP designation were acknowledged, as were the founder members present; Rod Baker, Martin Barnes, Jim Gordon and Geoffrey Trimble. In addition, acknowledgement was given to Jim Gordon and Steve Simister for their contributions to the development of ISO 21500, the international standard for project management.

On the association's finances the Chief Executive reported that income increased by 10% to £ 5.7m, investment in projects amounted to c. £415k, net incoming resources totalled £338k, and year-end reserves stood at £1.8m, whilst individual membership closes in on 19,000.

The President invited questions on the report and accounts from the floor.

Jim Gordon enquired whether feedback is being received from the current ISO working group. On hearing confirmation from Steve Simister that reports are submitted Jim Gordon felt it would be helpful for the membership to be updated via an article in APM's magazine.

There were no further questions.

G11 4 To appoint Kingston Smith as auditors of the association until the conclusion of the next annual general meeting and to authorise the trustees to set the fees paid to the auditors

This resolution was carried unanimously on a show of hands.

G11 5 Board election

The Secretary advised the meeting that the four board members retiring are Charles Egbu, John Gordon, Mary McKinlay and Jonathan Simcock.

Six nominations were received for the four vacancies and an election was administered externally by Electoral Reform Services Ltd. There had been 12,002 eligible voters with 1,602 votes cast, a turnout of 13.3%. 72% of the votes cast had been submitted by post compared to only 28% online.

The number of votes cast for each candidate was as follows:

Jonathan Simcock	1165
Mary McKinlay	1072
John Gordon	967
Charles Egbu	912
Steve Wake	661
Nick Johns	601

The four candidates therefore elected are Charles Egbu, John Gordon, Mary McKinlay and Jonathan Simcock.

G11 6 To receive response to members' questions

Four questions received in writing prior to the meeting within the specified time limit were read out and answered by the Chief Executive.

- Q.** Can you please give more information about the progress and issues relating to achieving chartered status? What are the problems? What is the project plan? What are the stakeholder issues? What are the risk mitigation plans? How can APM members help?

Alasdair Stirling

- A.** The earlier presentation described the current state of our chartered application on behalf of the profession. We recognise that the length of time the process has taken and the “dignified silence” which APM is obliged to maintain in public, so that the due process of consultation can complete, are both extremely frustrating.

Gaining chartered status is the Board’s number one priority and the Board is maintaining robust governance over the process so that members may be assured that all is being done which can be done to manage stakeholders, manage risks and to secure the outcome which the profession deserves.

APM members can help by supporting APM’s campaigns for increased professionalism in project management through word and action through their own professional practice, and by continuing to recognise APM’s need for a “dignified silence”.

Gerald Orman added that in his opinion APM does not satisfy all the criteria for chartered status as published on the Privy Council Office website. The Chief Executive responded that those criteria are only indicative guidelines, and that the overriding criterion is whether an application is in the public interest. He urged members to maintain their trust in the Board and the governance process.

- Q.** We contribute significant recurring levels of our resources to IPMA each year. Why do members hear so little about a) what is happening and b) what they and we are planning and doing?

Richard Hickman

- A.** That’s a fair challenge, and probably reflects the fact that the International Project Management Association (IPMA) is at a level of maturity which APM was some ten years ago.

This means that IPMA is currently embarked on some internal transformation – what Tom Taylor called “the getting ready stage” when, as the then APM Chairman, he championed and introduced new governance arrangements – only once these arrangements were in place has APM been able to look more outwards, to really “get going”, and it will probably be the same with IPMA.

This means that much of APM’s recent engagement with IPMA has of necessity been inward-focused and not particularly newsworthy, although quite wide-ranging, and includes active participation in:

- IPMA Council of Delegates through APM Deputy Chairman and APM Chief Executive;

- IPMA's all-important Certification and Validation Management Board through Joseph Alba, who also supports the work of the ISO 21500 committee alongside such APM luminaries as Dr Terry Cooke-Davies and Dr Steve Simister, recognising that ISO 21500 is chaired by APM Vice President Miles Shepherd;
- IPMA awards process through Mary McKinlay and Graham Woodward;
- The refresh exercise of IPMA's International Certification Regulations and Guidelines and International Competence Baseline through professional standards and knowledge staff Liz Wilson and Esther Fry, and APM Chief Executive, an exercise in which Joseph Alba also plays a leading role;
- Steering group for the *International Journal of Project Management*, of which APM Vice President Rodney Turner is editor, of which APM shares a 50% holding with IPMA, which was the first such journal to receive the accolade of listing on the Thomson Citation Index, and which from January 2012 will include APM's logo on the front cover to reflect its shared ownership which it currently does not do; and
- Supporting and working with various like-minded IPMA member associations, an activity in which Tom Taylor and Mary McKinlay play a conspicuous role.

It is finally worth noting that IPMA validators visit APM tomorrow for a formal review of all APM IPMA-related activity and we are confident of a very positive result which we can publicise in due course.

So, we'll take on board the comment, and make sure that APM's website and magazine carry appropriate externally-focused information during the year.

- Q.** Concern is being expressed in the APM on three of its key initiatives: 1) the chartered status application which has now been dormant for over three years, 2) the problems relating to the fitness for purpose of the refresh Body of Knowledge, and 3) the APM's entitlement to describe its RPP qualification as a 'standard for a professional qualification' which is based merely on the applicant's experience statement and an interview.

If these are justified, do they not represent a failure of project management?

Gerald Orman

- A.**
- 1) We would hope that the response to the earlier question addresses the first part of this question on chartered status. In short, we remain confident that APM's chartered application will succeed and are convinced that the concerns expressed, although perhaps understandable in the context of the "dignified silence" referred to earlier, are completely unjustified.
 - 2) In answer to the generic alleged "problems" around the *APM Body of Knowledge*, it is perhaps best to note the following:
 - i. The Board mandated the refresh exercise, with a clear purpose and a scope which required that the updated Body of Knowledge should embrace programme and portfolio management;
 - ii. A rigorous governance process including the Board and the Professional Standards and Knowledge Committee has been established and then followed;

- iii. The refresh exercise has been based on extensive consultation amongst the profession, using not only APM channels but also mechanisms to engage those outside the normal APM networks – over 1,000 people have been engaged so far;
 - iv. This consultation includes a number of extensive contacts with the author of this question, where points of detail have been discussed in great depth;
 - v. The Body of Knowledge has currently completed consultation on the second draft, and comments are now being analysed by the Structure Working Group and consistency author group; and
 - vi. Because of the process followed, we are confident that the Body of Knowledge once complete will be fit-for-purpose as a sign-post to the boundaries of knowledge required by those engaged in project, programme and portfolio management.
- 3) APM Registered Project Professional is a designation, and is the product of extensive consultation within the profession, and of extensive benchmarking against other chartered designations, including those of the Engineering Council, which is one of the custodians of the chartered brand.

It is a competence-based assessment of professionalism, and addresses each of APM's 5 Dimensions of Professionalism, including ethics as expressed through accountability.

To state that the assessment consists purely of an experience statement and an interview is to understate the true nature of the assessment. Candidates for RPP are required to submit a portfolio which provides focused and meaningful statements of evidence, based on their recent history in managing complex projects, and managing others managing complex projects, against the 29 core competences (from the *APM Competence Framework*) which were identified by the RPP development groups as being critical to effective project management. The total word count which candidates need to generate is equivalent to a 5,000 word dissertation. The tried and tested assessment methodology requires trained assessors to make objective judgements about the sufficiency, authenticity and validity of the evidence presented by the candidate. Candidates, when they submit their portfolios, are also required to provide a track record, showing details of two supporting referees who are asked to confirm, through their relationship as a senior manager or senior stakeholder, that the candidate has

- worked in a complex project environment and
- demonstrated responsible leadership by managing others.

Only if the assessors are satisfied that the evidence presented meets the requirements are candidates invited to the structured professional review, which lasts for 45 minutes.

Both Gerald Orman and Peter Campbell voiced the opinion that the majority of SIGs do not support the direction which the 6th edition of the Body of Knowledge is taking. The Head of Professional Standards and Knowledge, Liz Wilson, advised that areas of disquiet are recognised and she has undertaken to respond to all comments on either the process or the content. She added that other users are 85 – 90% satisfied with both the process and the content, and that the view of the SIGs is not the normal view of all those involved in the consultation.

Referring to the APM Registered Project Professional standard Gerald Orman said that a standard should be measurable and the provision of a CV followed by an interview does not meet the criteria for a standard. In response the Head of Professional Standards and Knowledge confirmed that the standard is based on core competences drawn from the *APM Competence Framework* and that these competences are evaluated by appropriately trained assessors.

Q. Background

- 1) An author group are currently working on the 3rd edition of the *Project Risk Analysis and Management (PRAM) Guide* with the expectation that APM would publish it as they did for PRAM 1st and 2nd editions.
- 2) At an initial meeting of this author group APM stated that in order for them to publish PRAM 3rd edition the author group would have to sign an agreement giving APM sole copyright to the text. This has caused a major problem, in that, this is a move from previous copyright agreements and is a condition that cannot be met.
- 3) APM has stated that the authors can retain their IPR but must pass copyright to APM. This cannot happen for the following reason:
 - Intellectual property (IP). IP is not a separate right from copyright, copyright is just one type of IP. The four main types of IP are Patents, Trade Marks, Designs and Copyright. Therefore whoever owns the copyright also owns the IP. There is a provision under 'Moral Rights' which retains the right for authors to be identified whenever their text is published; however it is the copyright owner who has the right to edit or change this text.
 - There is also something called 'Typographical' copyright which is claimed through publishing the guide. This means that APM already own the layout of the guide but do not, as yet, own the contents.

Questions

- 1) Considering that authors of PRAM, or any other guide submitted for APM publication, will be required to relinquish copyright of their work:
 - Has the APM Board considered the effect this will have on the support volunteer contributors are prepared, or allowed, to give?
 - Taking that PRAM authors will not relinquish their copyright, do APM realise that they are in danger of losing not only an important and respected publication(s) but are sending the wrong signals to SIGs, APM members and the general profession?
- 2) Which of the following two options does the Board wish to pursue:
 - Keep to the current demands over IPR and not have a PRAM 3rd edition to publish?
 - Continue with the PRAM 1st & 2nd IPR agreement and have a PRAM 3rd edition to publish?

Peter Campbell

- A. APM takes these questions very seriously and is fully aware that this is not a straightforward issue. APM is keen both to follow correct procedure in relation to copyright and to maintain the valued support of its volunteer contributors.

Consequently, and in answer to both questions, APM is seeking specialist advice in order to clarify the position and to reach a settlement which is entirely satisfactory to both parties. A clear public statement of this intent was made by APM at the recent SIG Forum, and followed up by individual discussions with senior Risk SIG members present. The Board, and particularly its Professional Standards & Knowledge Committee, will be appropriately involved throughout these discussions.

In response to a question from Steve Simister as to whether this issue was general or PRAM-specific the Chairman advised that this is a dilemma experienced by other professional bodies. He added that an identical situation had arisen with the Institute of Civil Engineers (ICE) and the publication of the RAMP Guide, in which case copyright had been passed to ICE. Peter Campbell confirmed that the focus of his interest was not to lose the engagement of the volunteers involved.

At the conclusion of members' questions the Chairman announced the separation of the APM conference from the annual awards in 2012, with the awards retaining its Autumn slot and the date of the conference moving to late Spring.

Finally Tom Taylor presented the President with an Honorary Fellowship awarded to him by the Australian Institute of Project Management.

There being no further business the President closed the meeting at 7.20pm.

Appendix 1

President's address by Dr Martin Barnes CBE

It's a great privilege to address you once again as President of APM. I am so proud of how APM grows in membership, influence, activity and respect in the community – year by year.

This is due to two factors. Mainly the work of the staff and active members day by day and week by week throughout the year. Secondly the real fact that project management continues to be taken up, recognised and developed in every sector of human activity in our country. This is in a major way due to the activities of our members who set examples of the effectiveness of project management in their daily lives which draw attention to the power of the applied science of project management which we espouse. They advance our profession by what they achieve.

Others will tell you about the statistics of what has been done in the past year. I just observe that we are widening the range of human activities in which our skills are applied and that we are gaining wider appreciative recognition in our community. On one point of detail, I should say that I think our magazine has improved significantly in the last year. It has always been good – now it is better than good.

We are at a high point in the public perception of the power of good project management because of the success of the London 2012 Olympic construction projects. Never before has a completely new set of Olympic facilities been built on a hostile urban site such that everything is finished ahead of programme, within budget and so that it is all very high quality and distinctive design. And that has been done by 'Project Management UK'. There were some Americans involved but very few! 92% of all the work by value was done by British companies and businesses.

The media in our country, which habitually report disasters not successes, now have to say that our profession is not just good but very good.

Personally it gave me a great thrill to present my President's Medal to Howard Shiplee, Director of Construction of ODA, at our wonderful awards dinner three weeks ago.

The people in the London 2012 projects are very keen to learn the lessons as part of the legacy which it has been their objective to create. I ask tonight that the right people in APM should involve themselves in this movement so that the lessons for project managers in every aspect of our skill in the course of the London 2012 projects is recorded and then disseminated. Will those of you listening to me now who think it may be them please do something about this.

So many people here at HQ and up and down our country work for our profession and for APM now that we are a force so much stronger than we ever were before. This is something of which to be proud – but also to control with care. We now have influence greater than we ever did – which requires us to be more rigorous than ever before in our choice of what we seek to influence.

I have only one worry in this area. It is that we risk confusing the community of our nation by the message we now send them – so much more comprehensively and effectively than we ever did before. Who do we say we are? Project Managers? No. We confuse them and dilute our message by saying that some of us (the bigger boys) are programme managers and some of us (the really big boys) are portfolio managers.

The draft of our own new Body of Knowledge begins by saying it is all about 'P3 Management'. I quote from the first page: "Work of a lesser scale and complexity is a project. Work which combines projects with change management is a programme. A collection of projects and

programmes designed to achieve strategic objectives is called a portfolio.” I believe that it is very damaging to confuse the public and our clients by proposing these distinctions.

We are still a young profession making our mark in our community. It is folly to confuse our community by introducing spurious subdivisions of our realm with different names. All the great professional bodies in our country and the world have simple descriptive titles. The RIBA, the RSM, the IMechE. They all have subsets of skill within them. None of them have been so stupid as to invent superior subsets and use it as their name.

Please take note. The people of our country are beginning to understand what project management is and they think of it as management of anything which has an objective which can be realised with a tolerable consumption of resources by a target date. And they are right. How stupid would we be to say that they have it wrong and that the big projects are actually programmes and the even bigger projects are actually portfolios.

Shall we shortly change our name to the Association for P3 Management? Who will know what that means? Or shall we say, after we get our Royal Charter, that we wish to get an amending charter to make us the Association for Portfolio, Programme and Project Management? I suspect that programme and portfolio management are names invented by particular management consultants to make it seem like their offering is different, new and more valuable. I've been there – I recognise the technique.

The first really hugely big project was when Almighty God created the world. In six days without using the one day's float. It wasn't a 'programme' or a 'portfolio' – it was a 'project'. We already have universities setting up programme management courses as if project management was inferior. We have a serious problem with proliferation of nomenclature. It's our job to solve it – not to make it worse.

I end my address by asking, inviting, exhorting APM as a body to clobber this problem before it is too late. We should start with our own Body of Knowledge. Portfolio management and programme management, if they are real, are subsets of project management. We are not the Association for P3 Management. We must stop this movement to corrupt our name and confuse our community in its tracks. In this respect the draft Body of Knowledge must be changed. I feel so strongly about this that I will stop here – lest anything I might have said afterwards became what you remember.

Appendix 2

Members and guests present

R Baker
Dr M Barnes CBE
S Bradbury
A Bragg
P Campbell
D Coombes
S De Lord
H Dolan
D Dunkerley
A Godbold
Dr J H Gordon
D Hart
G Hawkins
P Johnson
J Legge
A Lester
G Lowe
M McKinlay
M Nichols
G Orman
Professor K Robinson
J Salisbury
Dr S Simister
T Taylor
Professor E G Trimble
J Trimble
R Tween
L Wilson

Appendix 3

Apologies for absence received

P Bishop
M Brown
Professor C Egbu
K Gawler
J Gordon
R Hickman
P Hodgkins
R Jamieson
D Palmer
Dr P Parkes
D Shannon
J Simcock
P Simon
A Stirling