Philippine Journal of Public Administration, Vol. XXII, No. 2 (April 1978)

"Administrative Feasibility Analysis" For Development Projects: Concept and Approach

IN-JOUNG WHANG*

There is an emerging need for the integration of planning and implementation of development projects into one conceptual framework. To meet this, administrative feasibility analysis or the appraisal of administrative systems and managerial factors should be introduced as a complementing step in the project feasibility study to strengthen the planning function by which the implementability of the project could be assessed ahead of its selection. Since this analysis tends to be neglected by policy makers and planners, the preparation of the necessary administrative inputs for an improved project implementation should be taken after the selection but before activation. In this context, administrative feasibility analysis can be viewed as: (a) an integral part of the appraisal criteria in the project selection and as (b) a benchmark study for implementation support planning for project implementation. Finally, since administrative feasibility analysis requires an overall analysis of all the administrative factors involved in project management, its institutionalization would require a systematic program to produce the needed expertise in the project.

Introduction

The successful implementation of development plans and policies depends on the satisfactory achievement of individual projects which are designated as critical components of the plans and policies. Hence, the management of development projects for achieving their results tends to receive greater attention from planners and policy makers. Planners and policy makers would have accused the project failure of poor implementation by administrators and project managers in spite of relatively good planning of projects. No matter who may be responsible for project failure, would it be true that planning of a project is perfect enough to guide specific actions towards the successful implementation of a project? In other words, would planners and policy makers really take the administrative factors into careful consideration in the stage of project planning, so that the project fails only because of poor implementation? Is it again realistic to conceive project planning and implementation as separate and independent processes so that well-rounded, sound planning of projects does not help in improving the project implementation?

Analytical answers to these questions would be negative in view of the component actions involved in the overall process of the project management. The concept of project management is complex — in the sense that project management is a cumulative process of reciprocal interactions

*Expert in Policy Analysis and Development, Asian Centre for Development Administration, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

This paper was presented at the United Nations Asian Centre for Development Administration, Policy-Level Workshop on "Administrative Support Planning for Development Projects," Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, October 31-November 5, 1977.

among the links in the chain of causality towards realization of policy objectives. This complex process of reciprocal interactions among sequential activities and events involved in project management is explained in terms of project planning and management cycle[1] or "development planning cycle."[2] In view of these two normative models, project implementation could be initiated after the project was selected through careful consideration. The implementation process is the sequential activity after the project selection. In other words, the success of project implementation would also depend on how carefully the project was selected at the planning stage. This includes issues related to whether a project was properly designed and whether a project was carefully selected out of alternatives by analyzing optimality and feasibility of individual projects. Indeed, the major problem for the project management is not in developing a relatively sound project but in failing to consider the feasibility of implementing the project.[3] The problem is also related to whether there is a follow-through effort to improve the delivery capacity to implement the project after the planning stage.

"In theory, the identification, selection and preparation of projects should follow from an overall national development plan which will have identified the priority sectors and production targets, thereby providing the criteria for the selection of projects. Although projects are sometimes derived from the plan in this way, in practice they are usually selected to meet identified, specific needs or to take advantage of special opportunities — (1) the presence of natural resources or some other special circumstances permitting production of a commodity at a relatively low cost, or (2) the existence of domestic demand, either unsatisfied as is frequently the case with electric power and transport, or satisfied through imports with costs sufficiently high to permit economic domestic production. In these circumstances, the desirability of the project being appraised is determined, not by comparing it with other possible projects, but by measuring it against the estimated real marginal rate of return on newly invested capital in the country."[4]

Project Feasibility and Appraisal

In view of the sequential chain of activities in the project planning and management cycle,[5] selection of a project depends on the appraisal of proposed projects as alternatives to meet the plan (or policy) objectives. The project appraisal is the precedent activity before the project selection. The purpose of project appraisal is to search for better alternatives for the utilization of scarce resources by making as sure as the circumstances

[1]Dennis Rondinelli, "Preparing and Analyzing Case Studies in Development Project Management," Working Paper, East-West Technology and Development Institute, Hawaii, 1975.

[2]In-Joung Whang, "Development Planning Process," A lecture note presented at UN Asian Institute for Economic Development and Planning, Bangkok, 1972.

[3]Walter Williams, "Implementation Analysis and Assessment," *Policy Analysis*, Vol. I, No. 3 (Summer), p. 532.

[4]John A. King, Jr., *Economic Development Projects and Their Appraisal* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1967), p. 4.

[5]Rondinelli, *op. cit.* and Whang, *op. cit.*

permit that the project is technically sound, that it will provide a reasonable economic, social and, where appropriate, financial return, that its objectives can be achieved in some less costly way, and that it fits in with the overall economic and social objectives and development strategies of the country.

A project feasibility study is a series of careful analyses and examination of a proposed project which lead to the project appraisal. Feasibility refers to the possibility of realizing the policy objectives or the implementability of the project. It is defined in terms of all relevant constraints: economic, commercial, technical, technological, political, social, environmental, institutional, managerial, and administrative. When an important constraint is disregarded during the stage of project appraisal, some difficulties will inevitably arise in the stage of project implementation. In other words, the incomplete feasibility study, by disregarding some important factors which would impinge on the implementation process and its environment, would bring about the breakdown in the realization of policy goals and objectives. The investigation of the conditions of feasibility of development projects seems extremely important in project planning because of the intrinsic limitation of optimization model within the constraints imposed in the government environment.[6] Indeed, the feasibility study is the main process of project analysis and appraisal.

It seems quite true that the technical and economic aspects of project feasibility have received greater attention by planners and policy makers than other aspects. Planners and policy makers are primarily concerned about location, availability of suitable technology, technical soundness, cost-benefit analysis, marginal rate of return, marketing, financing, etc. Political, social, and other environmental feasibility of the projects have received proper attention, though generally at a later stage before projects are finally selected.[7] Too little attention has, however, been paid to managerial and administrative aspects of project feasibility. It is seemingly a strong and persistent tendency of policy makers to ignore, suppress, and delay early and thorough attention to this critical aspect of project feasibility.

Administrative feasibility tends to be overlooked because planners and policy makers do hardly understand the critical importance of the managerial component to the success of a proposed project. In fact, too little is known about it to accept orderliness or rigor when the analysis is actually undertaken.[8] It is also presumed that administrative capacity for project implementation could be strengthened and improved by the project managers at the implementation stage. Furthermore, planners and policy makers tend to dislike to identify the negative aspects of their administrative systems and managerial competence through its rigorous analysis. Instead, their major concern is how much will be the possible economic and social (or

[6] Giandomenico Majone, "The Feasibility of Social Policies," *Policy Sciences*, Vol. VI (1975), pp. 51-53.

[7] For the definition of political feasibility, see Yehezkel Dror, *Public Policy Making Reexamined* (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1968), p. 35.

[8] Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 535.

political) returns from a proposed project.

Whatever the reason for such negligence of administrative feasibility, it is important to admit that the concept of administrative feasibility analysis has not been operationalized yet and appropriate tools and techniques are still not available for the systematic analysis of the administrative feasibility of a project. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to develop a conceptual framework of administrative feasibility analysis in operational terms, although some may view it simply as "an art and not a science."[9]

From the perspective of project management as a whole, the administrative feasibility, if it is appropriately institutionalized as a *complementary* analysis of project feasibility, will be utilized as an important criterion for project selection in addition to economic and technical criteria. The administrative and managerial analysis for project selection will indeed strengthen the planning function to secure the successful implementation of a proposed project and *integrate* the planning function with the implementation process. The timing is crucial. It must be performed before the project selection. In reality, however, the institutionalization of administrative feasibility analysis as part of a mechanical tool for project selection may not be readily acceptable except in the case of determination of development loan by banks. Because project implementation would be regarded as the process undertaken by the next order subsystem after the political decision had been made on a proposed development project by the highest system as a mandate, administrative feasibility analysis tends to be a secondary consideration (or powerless accessory) in many cases. Whether a project should be selected or rejected would depend on the will of the political power.

Regardless of administrative feasibility of a proposed project, in reality, development projects would have been selected, as far as the public sector is concerned, when they are found economically feasible, technically sound, and sometimes politically acceptable or desirable. *Ad hoc* measures for improvement in administrative capacity have been sometimes introduced during the process of project implementation, which in fact have made limited contribution to the improvement of administrative capability. So far, however, there has been no systematically planned effort made to improve the administrative capacity in connection with the implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, it is suggested in this paper that a specific planning for improvement of the delivery capacity for project implementation be introduced as a *supplementary* step to be taken immediately after the project selection but before the project activation. In this paper, such intervening effort is called "implementation support planning" by which administrative and managerial inputs required for project implementation will be systematically identified and prepared at an earlier stage for the improvement in the project delivery capacity.

In this connection, administrative feasibility analysis could be utilized as an initial part of the extensive "implementation support planning" towards improving administrative capac-

[9] King, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

ity which will contribute to the successful achievement of project objectives. It is expected that through administrative feasibility analysis it will be possible to identify strengths and weaknesses of the current administrative system for project implementation in terms of organizational and institutional arrangements, staff manpower, personnel recruitment and training policy, management techniques, linkages with external environment, etc. Therefore, administrative feasibility analysis is viewed as playing two significant roles in project management: (a) as a complementary analysis to economic and technical feasibility studies of a project and (b) as a benchmark study for implementation support planning which will be a supplementary step for improving administrative capability to insure the successful implementation of a project.

Operational Definition of Administrative Feasibility[10]

What then do we mean by "administrative feasibility" in operational terms? Administrative feasibility means the possibility of achieving the project values (goals) from the perspective of administrative capability to deliver the project results. Administrative capability is defined in terms of three major variables: performance, structure, and environment of an organization.[11] Similarly, "organizational feasibility" is defined in terms of technological, behavioral, and structural elements.[12] Since these concepts are yet to be operationalized, however, administrative feasibility should be defined in terms of more specific middle-range variables which would impinge upon the process of project implementation. They may include organizational/institutional arrangement, internal structure, managerial personnel, staff manpower and training, level of management techniques available, organizational device for external linkages, legal provisions and

[10]This part conceptually relies on J. Bainbridge and S. Sapirie, *Health Project Management: A Manual of Procedure for Formulating and Implementing Health Projects* (Geneva: World Health Organization, 1974); Bertram Gross, "National Planning: Findings and Fallacies," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. XXV, No. 4 (December 1965), pp. 263-273; United Nations, "Some Factors Involved in Appraising Administrative Performance in Development Planning," *Administrative Aspects of Planning* (New York: United Nations, 1969), pp. 266-237; Elyas Omar, "Administrative Capacity and TMP," *INTAN Bulletin*, Vol. I, No. 2 (September 1976) (Malaysia: National Institute of Public Administration); Charles C. Martin, *Project Management* (New York: AMACOM, 1976); John D. Montgomery, *Technology and Civic Life: Making and Implementing Development Decisions* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1974), pp. 190-233; Jeffrey Pressman and Aaron Wildavsky, *Implementation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973); United Nations, *Administration of Development Programs and Projects: Some Major Issues* (New York: United Nations, 1971); *Proceedings of the Interregional Seminar on Organization and Administration of Development Planning Agencies* (New York: United Nations, 1974); Shelton Wanasinghe, "Proposed Outline of the Pilot Project on Preparation of Administrative Planning," (Bangkok: ECAFE); and In-Joung Whang, "Project Implementation," A lecture note presented at the UN Institute for Economic Development and Planning, Bangkok, 1972.

[11]United Nations, *Appraising Administrative Capability for Development* (New York: United Nations, 1969), pp. 8-10

[12]Eliezer Fuchs, "The Policy Formation Process: A Conceptual Framework for Analysis" (Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, Chapter 5, 1972), pp. 88-96.

environmental constraints.[13]

In the actual process of decision implementation, the multitude of political/bureaucratic layers and actors are involved in various roles. Actors may be viewed by some as primarily decision-makers and by others as primarily implementors. Because of such complexity in the project implementation, administrative analysis of a proposed project to examine the extent[14] to which a proposed project is administratively feasible — i.e., implementable — has to do with both static and dynamic factors. In this paper, therefore, an attempt is made to develop an operational definition of administrative feasibility in the form of an analytical checklist incorporating both static and dynamic factors. The checklist will include issues related to organizational and institutional arrangements, the internal structure of the organizations, managerial personnel, staff manpower and training, the level of management techniques available, external linkages, legal provisions and other constraints.

Organizational and Institutional Arrangements

Since an organization is viewed as an action agent for getting projects (activities and tasks) performed, the initial inquiry for the estimation of administrative feasibility is related to its organizational setup and its institutional arrangement of relationships with other agencies and organizations. The following questions should be included in the examination of this organizational aspect.

(a) Which ministry or agency will be responsible for activating project implementation? Who will be responsible for determining the project implementation unit or the executing agency?

(b) Has a suitable ministry (or agency) been identified as responsible for implementation of the proposed project?

(c) If "yes," is the organization established as a regular government agency (central or local), or as a public enterprise? Does the organization or agency have enough authority and power which are necessary for project implementation?

(d) How is the organization related to other agencies? Are the relationships suitably arranged for the implementation of the proposed project in view of the coordination, competition, or conflict with other agencies, or inducement or popular participation in project implementation process?

(e) To what extent are the right clients clearly identified in the stage of project design? To what extent is the institutional arrangement suitable for making the benefit of the project accessible to the right clients?

(f) If it is necessary to establish a new organization, should it be as a government agency or branch, or as a public enterprise?

[13] In-Joung Whang, "Implementation of the National Family Planning Programme of Korea, 1962-71," in Gabriel U. Iglesias (ed.), *Implementation: The Problem of Achieving Results* (Manila: Eastern Regional Organization for Public Administration, 1976), pp. 309-336.

[14] Administrative feasibility is not viewed as a dichotomy but as a continuum.

Internal Structure of Organization

Internal structure of organization is, in behavioral terms, defined as a pattern of interactions among the personnel involved in getting a particular project performed. The organizational structure would be identified in terms of centralized vs. decentralized structure, or a mixture of it, and/or authoritarian/hierarchical vs. non-authoritarian/collegial structure, or its mixed type, etc. Such patterns of organizational structure would be considered as devices for mutual interactions among members of organizations in achieving the project results. Therefore, the patterns should depend on the characteristics of the project, technologies, environment of organization, leader ship, etc. The organizational aspect of administrative feasibility can be estimated by examining the following questions:

(a) How is the organization patterned, formally or informally, in terms of allocation of power and authority for decision-making with respect to the implementation of a proposed project? To what extent is it hierarchically structured and to what extent does it allow for the decentralization of decision-making?

(b) To what extent is the organizational structure conducive to efficiency in producing the project results?

(c) To what extent is the organizational structure conducive to the coordination of tasks to be performed within the scope of the organizational jurisdiction?

(d) To what extent does the organizational structure facilitate satisfactory communication among the divisions and the personnel within the organization? To what extent does it also facilitate rapid flow of necessary information with respect to managerial decisions?

(e) To what extent is the organizational structure conducive to renovating "project-oriented" management information system so as to serve the proposed project?

Managerial Personnel

Theories indicate that the success of project implementation would depend heavily on the dynamics of leadership which will be exercised by a group of managerial personnel. The managerial personnel means those who participate in critical decision-making with respect to project implementation. Since they play quite extensive roles in task specification in association with major decisions, coordination, control, supervision and monitoring, an adequate amount and right quality of managerial personnel seems to be an essential ingredient of the delivery capacity for project implementation. In this respect, the following questions could be asked:

(a) What would (will) be the posts for the managerial personnel with respect to the implementation of a proposed project?

(b) Are they sufficiently provided in terms of number of personnel, qualifications, and required skills?

(c) What are the conditions under which the managerial personnel

can really be motivated to the achievement of the main objectives of the projects rather than by other personal or political interests?

(d) To what extent is it possible to provide such conditions including effective incentives and stimulus to enhance their zeal for job performance?

Staff Manpower and Training

In addition to the managerial talents, the actual force to deliver the project results would depend on the sufficient amount and right quality of manpower. Policies and mechanisms related to recruitment as well as holding capacity would be crucial in this respect. Also the training program will be an additional factor in considering the manpower aspect. The questions to be asked are as follows:

(a) Is there a well described manning table indicating suitable personnel required for the project implementation?

(b) To what extent are the job descriptions of these personnel suitable to the performance of activities and tasks involved in project implementation?

(c) To what extent is the staff recruitment channel appropriate to the mobilization of relevant human resources for a proposed project?

(d) What is their level of motivation? What are the patterns of incentives and disincentives affecting their motivation to perform? To what extent is it possible to improve their motivational level?

(e) Is there a suitable program to train the personnel for enhancing their skills and knowledge required in the implementation of a proposed project? If it is necessary to introduce a new program, under what conditions is it possible to make a proposed training program integrated for the better implementation of a proposed project?

Level of Management Techniques Available

Management techniques are instrumental devices used to determine goals and objectives and to provide effective communication and coordination, monitoring of performance, effective supervision and feedback within the organizational framework. The questions to be asked are as follows:

(a) What management techniques would (will) be available for the operation of a proposed project?

(b) To what extent are the managerial personnel as well as working staff acquainted with the techniques?

(c) To what extent are they appropriate and effective in making a clear definition of goals and objectives of individual component activities of a proposed project? To what extent are they helpful to project-oriented communication, coordination, control, and monitoring of job performance?

(d) Is it necessary to introduce new management techniques for a proposed project? If so, under

what conditions can it be possible? Are there any difficulties foreseen in improving the existing management techniques or in introducing new ones?

External Linkages

Because of the complexity involved in the implementation of a development project, consistent interaction with its environment is necessary for the management of environmental constraints in order to obtain societal support for the project and to legitimize changes implied in the project. Environmental interactions are performed with institutional linkages of organization: enabling linkages, functional linkages, normative linkages and diffused linkages.[15] Which linkage is most critical for the viability of the project would depend on the characteristics of individual projects as well as on bottlenecks in environmental interactions bounded by the given constraints. The questions to be asked in this respect are as follows:

(a) To what extent is the environmental interaction important in the implementation of a proposed project?

(b) Which are the critical linkages for the successful operation of the project?

(c) What are the enabling institutions and agencies which authorize powers and resources to the organization concerned with a proposed project? Is there a set of formally established relationships between the organization and the enabling institutions? To what extent are the current pattern of managerial personnel and their leadership style likely to gain support among the enabling institutions? Under the given conditions, is it possible to build up the desirable image of managerial leadership for the proposed project?

(d) What are the critical resources, human or material, for the successful implementation of the project? What are the major sources from which the most suitable working staff and/or raw materials can be recruited and mobilized for a proposed project? What are the conditions under which they are likely to be obtained within the framework of project implementation systems? To what extent can these conditions be controlled by the initiation of the organization concerned with a proposed project?

(e) Which institutions and agencies impose norms, rules and regulations which would (will) be constraints to the implementation of a proposed project? What are the existing relationships between those normative institutions and the organization concerned with a proposed project? To what extent is it possible to improve the relationship in favor of the implementation of the proposed project?

(f) What agencies and instruments are (will be) used for diffusion of images of the project (prod-

[15] Milton J. Esman and Hans Blaise, "Institution-Building Research: The Guiding Concept," (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, Inter-University Research Program in Institution-Building, 1966).

uct or service image, process image, social image, etc.)? What are the bottlenecks to the creation of a favorable public image? If the diffusion is critical for the success of the proposed project, what other instruments can be additionally mobilized for this function? To what extent can it be possible to improve the relationships with normative institutions and agencies which help in building the project image? To what extent will the available leadership contribute to this function?

Legal Provisions and Other Constraints

The successful implementation of a proposed project would, in many instances, require certain legislative action, either as new legislation or as legal revision. Therefore, adequate attention should be paid to the legal factors and constraints in project implementation for analysis of administrative feasibility for a proposed project. In actual practice, it is viewed that many other constaints impinge on the implementation of a project. These will, of course, depend on the characteristics of project goals, the strategies for project implementation, and the technical, substantive contents of the project. The questions to be asked in this respect are as follows:

(a) Are there any legal and other constraints which would delay the project implementation or constitute some obstacles to it?

(b) Is it necessary to provide certain legislative measures and/or to change administrative rules and regulations in order to stimulate necessary action and cooperation or to get rid of possible hindrances to project implementation?

(c) If the citizens' participation is crucial to the success of the project, to what extent is popular participation institutionally and actually encouraged in the process of project implementation?

(d) To what extent is it possible to overcome legal and other constraints by the project manager?

Systems Approach to Administrative Feasibility Study

The next important question is how we can really estimate the administrative feasibility by analyzing such variables (constraints). The approach to the study of administrative feasibility would depend on situations in which a proposed project is under examination. Does the agency or organization responsible for the implementation of the proposed projects have some experience in the implementation of a project of a similar nature before? If not, does a similar agency have such experience? If the answer is "yes" to either question, the administrative feasibility of a proposed project could be estimated by analyzing the overall evaluation and managerial assessment of similar projects performed in the past. However, if the answer is "no," a systematic estimation of administrative feasibility should be an essential part of the project appraisal. In fact, most of the development projects tend to be "new" undertakings of government agencies in developing countries. They are characterized as being basically

change-oriented, large-scale, investment-type with long gestation period, complex and non-routine in their nature, and having a broad range of multiplying impact of the project results. Therefore, in developing countries, the administrative capacity for development projects cannot be taken as given and it should be seriously appraised and vigorously developed to meet the requirements for the implementation of projects.

Economic feasibility is concerned with the significance of a proposed project to the national economy in terms of costs and benefits and marginal rate of return with a view to securing efficiency in the allocation of scarce resources.[16] Administrative feasibility is viewed as being concerned rather with the allocation of scarce time and effort in terms of physical as well as administrative (social) time.[17] It is especially so when we assume that project approval implies the provision of necessary financial resources. Therefore, administrative feasibility analysis of a proposed project means examining the extent to which a proposed project could be delivered in a given (or projected) frame of time by analytically appraising various managerial factors and administrative mechanisms involved in the project implementation. These factors, mechanisms and institutions were discussed in the previous section.

Approaches to administrative feasibility analysis may be classified in terms of the scope of appraisal, and its methodology. The former may range from partial appraisal (arm's-length survey) to the full-length organization appraisal.[18] As regards techniques and methods, a simple methodological guideline is suggested here. This consists of several steps which should be taken in the analytical assessment of each aspect of administrative feasibility.

(1) *Analysis of component activities (and tasks) which should be performed in the implementation process of a proposed project.* Since a project is an integrated set of activities and tasks and their performance leads to the achievement of goals and objectives of the project as a whole, the analysis of component activities and tasks is an initial step in understanding the magnitude, scope, complexity, significance and socio-political implications of a proposed project. This job can be derived from the technical and economic feasibility study of a proposed project.

(2) *Identification of critical activities in step 1.* Critical activities for project implementation could be identified as those which take longer time for their completion, which require involvement of foreign countries or other ministries and agencies, enactment or revision of legal provisions, introduction of new technology, or which involve other bottlenecks in getting a proposed project performed. Those activities will be identified by the professional judgment of management experts.

(3) *Interpretation of administrative implications of each critical activity in*

[16] King, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-5.

[17] Hans-Helmut Taake, "The Implementation of Development Plans: Organization and Policies," *Development Economics*, Vol. XIII, No. 1 (March 1975), pp. 22-37.

[18] United Nations, (1969), *op. cit.*, p. 13.

terms of requirement of administrative inputs. What administrative inputs are required for the completion of critical activities is defined in terms of necessary arrangement of institutions, organizational structure, staff requirement (quantity and quality), training in specialized skills, norms and procedures, management techniques, external linkages, etc. This step will be undertaken on the basis of professional expertise.

(4) *Estimation of additional requirement of administrative inputs for each critical activity in terms of the gap between availability and requirement (at the activity level).* How much additional inputs are necessary for performance of each activity can be defined after appraisal of the current availability of administrative inputs (already mobilized or readily mobilized). This will be estimated through systematic survey of the organization to be responsible for a proposed project.

(5) *Estimation of additional requirement of administrative inputs for a proposed project as a whole (at the project level).* The summation of the additional requirement of administrative inputs at the activity level does not necessarily indicate the additional requirement of administrative inputs at the project level. Therefore the project level estimation should be considered from the perspective of coordination, overall efficiency, monitoring and control, management information and decision-making, linkages for environmental control and impact analysis.

(6) *Estimation of additional requirement of administrative inputs for gaining necessary support from the environment (at the environmental level).* Support from task environment as well as socio-political environment is of critical importance in the success of some development projects. The estimation of administrative inputs required to obtain such support can be defined and estimated in terms of functional device (linkage device) on the project management side.

(7) *Appraisal of resources availability to provide the additional requirement of administrative inputs estimated at the three levels (step 4-6).* The successful implementation of a proposed project would depend on the appropriate decisions and right actions of the government which finances and allocates resources to mobilize the administrative inputs additionally required for the implementation of a proposed project. Therefore, the job at this step can be done by analyzing whether the additionally required inputs should be provided with domestic resources (government to private) within the given time constraints, or whether they should be initially provided with foreign assistance (technical assistance or loan).

(8) *Recommendation for decision-making.* The final stage of administrative feasibility analysis is related to its major roles (as criteria for project selection and a base study for implementation support planning) in the project-planning-implementation process. Therefore, the action to be taken at this step is to develop a set of recommendations regarding project selection as well as implementation. The recommendation includes two major parts: (a) whether or not a proposed project should be selected as a decisive development project which would be undertaken within the frame-

work of development plan and policy of the government and (b) alternative courses of action with respect to the overall implementation systems for a proposed project. They are, for instance, statements related to the following aspects:

(a) How can the delivery capacity of the organization be improved and built up for a proposed project, if the project is accepted?

(b) How much finance and resources are required for the improvement in such delivery capacity?

(c) What strategies should be mobilized to overcome the bottlenecks predicted? and

(d) What should be the next steps to be taken toward implementation support planning for a proposed project implementation?

How to Organize the Study Team

Who should be involved in the administrative feasibility analysis for a proposed project? There are several alternative ways to organize the team. If administrative feasibility is seriously considered by the policy makers so that the administrative feasibility analysis is to be incorporated within the project feasibility study and appraisal, the administrative feasibility analysis should be handled by a project appraisal team which is usually organized mostly by economists and accountants with the assistance of engineers. In this case, management experts should be included in this team and should closely work with other members of the team to make consistent appraisal of a project. The management experts working with the project appraisal team also should try to obtain the cooperation of the administrators or management experts of the organization concerned. The internal experts of the organization are mobilized to make the organization partly responsible for the analysis and to let the internal experts make a professional commitment to the project implementation. The collaboration of external appraiser and appraisee will perhaps generate more reliable talents and also provide for a common understanding of the report on the administrative feasibility analysis for follow-up actions to be taken by policy makers and project managers.

In most cases, however, there are not many experts who can make extensive studies on administrative feasibility. Therefore it is recommended that a professionally-oriented training program on project management be introduced in developing countries so that it can produce relevant personnel who can meet such needs as they arise.

Conclusions

The gaps between project performance and its original plans would be a persistent phenomenon in the management of development projects. The improvement in implementation capability has been emphasized as a measure to bridge the gaps.[19] Here, a different position is taken, one that argues that better quality planning

[19] Albert Waterston, *Development Planning: Lessons of Experience* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1965), pp. 350-355.

must be consistent with prospective implementation capability.[20] These two views in fact stress the need for the integration of planning and implementation into one conceptual framework. To meet this demand, this paper suggests that administrative feasibility analysis be introduced in the project feasibility study as a complementary step. The analytical appraisal of administrative systems and managerial factors for a proposed project would be a practical step to strengthen the project planning function by which the implementability of the project could be systematically assessed ahead of the selection of a project.

In reality, however, administrative feasibility tends to be neglected by policy makers and planners partly because of the political motivation or pressure imposed upon them. Therefore, it is again suggested that implementation support planning as a supplementary step should be taken immediately after the project selection (or simultaneously with it) but before the project activation for actual implementation. The proposed step is taken for the systematic preparation of necessary administrative inputs which contribute to the improvement of the administrative capability for project implementation.

In this context, administrative feasibility analysis can be viewed as playing two important roles in project management:

(a) as an integral part of project appraisal criteria in the project selection, and
(b) as a benchmark study for implementation support planning for project implementation.

The extent to which a proposed project is administratively implementable is related to the comprehensive analysis of administrative systems in support of project implementation. In this paper, administrative feasibility is defined in terms of organizational, managerial, institutional, legal and environmental constraints and variables which impinge upon the process of project implementation. The framework for the analysis is made with a simple operational checklist. Additionally, a systems approach is suggested which could be incorporated into the ongoing project feasibility study.

Although the techniques for administrative feasibility analysis is a matter of system architecture,[21] the conceptual framework requires an overall analysis of all the administrative factors and elements involved in project management. Therefore, the institutionalization of administrative feasibility analysis for project management would require a systematic program to produce the needed expertise in this project.

[20] Ajay J. Chreshkoff, "Building Better Project Planning and Management Systems," National Institute of Public Administration, Malaysia, 1976, p. 46.

[21] John W. Sutherland, *Systems Analysis, Administration, and Architecture* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1975).