

Bond University  
Research Repository



## Procurement-related critical factors for briefing in public-private partnership projects: Case of Hong Kong

Tang, Liyaning; Shen, Geoffrey Qiping; Skitmore, Martin; Wang, Hao

*Published in:*  
Journal of Management in Engineering

*DOI:*  
[10.1061/\(ASCE\)ME.1943-5479.0000352](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-5479.0000352)

*Licence:*  
Other

[Link to output in Bond University research repository.](#)

*Recommended citation(APA):*  
Tang, L., Shen, G. Q., Skitmore, M., & Wang, H. (2015). Procurement-related critical factors for briefing in public-private partnership projects: Case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 31(6), [04014096]. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)ME.1943-5479.0000352](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-5479.0000352)

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

For more information, or if you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact the Bond University research repository coordinator.

1     **Procurement-related critical factors for briefing in**  
2     **Public Private Partnership projects: The case of**  
3     **Hong Kong**

5     **LiYaning Tang<sup>1</sup>, Geoffrey Qiping Shen\*, Martin Skitmore<sup>2</sup>, Hao Wang<sup>3</sup>**

6  
7

8     <sup>1</sup> Postdoctoral Fellow, Department of Building and Real Estate, The Hong Kong  
9     Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong.

10    Tel.: +852 27664308; Fax: +852 27645131.

11    E-mail address: tlyn.tang@connect.polyu.hk

12

13    \* Corresponding author. Chair Professor, Department of Building and Real Estate, The  
14    Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong.

15    Tel.: +852 27665817; Fax: +852 27645131.

16    E-mail address: bsqpshen@polyu.edu.hk

17

18    <sup>2</sup> Professor, School of Civil Engineering and Built Environment, Queensland University  
19    of Technology, 2 George Street, GPO Box 2434, Brisbane QLD4001, Australia.

20    Tel.: +61 7 3138 1059; Fax: +61 7 3138 1170.

21    E-mail address: rm.skitmore@qut.edu.au

22

23 <sup>3</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Construction Management, School of Management  
24 Science and Engineering, Central University of Finance and Economics, Beijing, China;  
25 Tel.: +852 67462534.  
26 Email: holy.wong@connect.polyu.hk

27

## 28 **ABSTRACT**

29 Public private partnerships (PPP) are widely used for construction project procurement.  
30 However, the briefing stage of PPP projects has been largely overlooked, although it has  
31 a far-reaching influence throughout the project life cycle. In response, we rectify this by  
32 exploring the critical factors involved. A set of 15 procurement-related factors are first  
33 identified from the existing literature. Then the effects of four background variables on  
34 the factors are tested with Hong Kong government data by an exploratory factor analysis  
35 extracting four major dimensions. The relationships between these dimensions and  
36 background variables indicate the need to take the background variables into account  
37 when ranking the factors. The ranking of the factors is then obtained by considering their  
38 weighted importance. Finally, the final practical value of the results is discussed.

39 **Keywords:** Critical factors, procurement, briefing stage, public private partnership,  
40 factor analysis, Hong Kong.

41

42 **INTRODUCTION**

43 Projects that require private companies in ‘design, financing, construction, ownership  
44 and/or operation of a public sector utility or service’ are called Public-Private Partnership  
45 (PPP) projects (Akintoye et al., 2003).

46 Decisions made in the early stages of a project have a far-reaching influence on the  
47 remainder of its cycle (Gray, 2008, p.21-57; Ahmadjian and Collura, 2012) –  
48 synonymous with the terms ‘architectural programming’ and ‘program’ (Yu, 2006). The  
49 briefing stage in Hong Kong is an early stage that greatly influences a project and collects  
50 views from all stakeholders.

51 The briefing process identifies and clarifies the client’s objectives and requirements of  
52 the procurement (Wood and Ellis, 2005). As an effective and efficient briefing stage is  
53 expected by both public and private sectors, accurate information is needed of client  
54 requirements to make sound and timely decisions (Tang and Shen, 2013). A good  
55 briefing process helps stakeholders form good relations and make valuable decisions for a  
56 project. Poor briefing, on the other hand, restricts the exchange of information and  
57 clarification of requirements, wasting time and delaying the whole project process. As a  
58 result, briefing needs to be well prepared and structured (Tang et al., 2013). Abdel Aziz’s  
59 (2007) analysis of USA guidelines for the successful implementation of PPPs indicates  
60 that briefing decisions, such as the delivery system to use, provide the greatest benefits to  
61 the public or users. Rebeiz (2012) uses a BOOT illustrative case study to shown how  
62 important is increasing the pool of potentially interested and qualified foreign

63 construction firms and investors in the briefing stage for the ultimate success of PPP  
64 projects.

65 Since the importance of the briefing stage in PPP projects has been largely overlooked  
66 (Kelly, 2003), this paper explores the critical factors in successful PPP project briefing.  
67 Specifically, the paper identifies the critical success factors for effective and efficient  
68 briefing in PPP projects. A mathematical model is developed to rank the factors to  
69 identify their relative importance levels. Suggestions are then be made on ways of  
70 improving the briefing stage of both public and private sectors.

71 Initially, the briefing stage is described of both conventional projects and PPP projects,  
72 focusing on the influencing factors from the literature review for further analysis. In the  
73 research method section, a questionnaire survey is described that collected public sector  
74 opinions on the critical factors involved. The questionnaire contains two parts:  
75 background information concerning the project and the extracted critical factors. This is  
76 followed by a factor analysis of the data, and examination of how background variables  
77 affect the critical factors. Finally, the factors are ranked with the aid of a mathematical  
78 model.

## 79 **PROCUREMENT FACTORS IN BRIEFING**

80 There are many forms of PPP, such as the outright privatization of previously state-  
81 owned industries (Ahadzi and Bowles, 2004) and contracting out of services (Tang et al.,  
82 2010). The latter includes refuse collection and cleaning by private firms (Robinson and  
83 Scott, 2009) and the use of private finance in the provision of social infrastructure  
84 (Carrillo et al., 2006). PPPs in the USA are defined as contractual agreements between a

85 public agency and a private sector entity to allow for greater private sector participation  
86 in the delivery and financing of transportation projects (Federal Highway Administration,  
87 2007).

88 The UK Construction Industry Board (CIB) (1997, p.5) defines briefing as:

89 *the process by which a client informs others of his or her needs, aspirations*  
90 *and desires, either formally or informally, whilst a brief is a formal document*  
91 *which sets out a client's requirements in detail.*

92 Kelly and Duerk's (2002) a more process-oriented definition is one of gathering,  
93 analyzing, and synthesizing information needed in the building process in order to inform  
94 decision-making and decision implementation. In the USA, architectural programming  
95 approaches include: design-based architectural programming, knowledge-based  
96 architectural programming, agreement-based architectural programming, and value-based  
97 architectural programming (Hershberger, 1999).

98 Figure 1 summarizes the PPP briefing structure (EU, 2008). The central column consists  
99 of briefing steps which give an introduction on what to do during the briefing, while the  
100 left hand column indicates the deliverables for the whole stage. Some deliverables  
101 involve more than one step. For example, the first deliverable - to assemble and develop a  
102 business case - consists of the first four steps. The right hand column represents the  
103 timeline of the briefing stage and process for writing a brief. The briefing session in PPP  
104 projects occurs approximately halfway through the bid preparation period (The  
105 Construction Industry Board, 1997). This allows the government's potential transaction  
106 advisors to consider which elements of the project need clarifying before finalising their  
107 bids.

108

*<Insert Figure 1. here>*

109 Kelly et al. (1992) argue that the major weakness of the current briefing guide is that real  
110 assistance to clients and designers is too general and implicit. Similarly, Kamara and  
111 Anumba's (2001) case studies and industrial survey to investigate the briefing process  
112 identify the limitations of current practice and that the general framework for briefing is  
113 inadequate. Kelly and Duerk (2002) also note that mandatory design guides do not  
114 adequately consider the requirements of either the public sector or large corporate  
115 organizations. Outdated or irrelevant design guides may lead to inappropriate or even  
116 incorrect design decisions. Each project has a specific briefing stage and the briefing for  
117 one project is never repeated for other projects. A regular review of the lessons learned  
118 from previous briefings and checking the progress of ongoing briefings should be key  
119 characteristics involved. Also, exposing hidden agendas by clear representation and  
120 recording of project goals is an important function of brief writing.

121 Comparing the briefing stages of conventional and PPP projects, some procurement-  
122 related steps not in conventional projects are needed in PPP project briefing. For example,  
123 preparing a Public Sector Comparator (PSC) is one of these steps. A PSC is the estimated,  
124 risk-adjusted cost of delivering a project - expressed in terms of the net present cost to the  
125 government, and using a discounted cashflow analysis to adjust the future value of the  
126 expected cashflow to a common reference date. This enables a comparison with bids and  
127 makes allowance for the cost of government borrowing (EU, 2008). Papajohn et al's  
128 (2011) examination of U.S. transportation found the government should consider the key  
129 legal issues impacting on PPPs to include procurement, financing, project characteristics,  
130 and legal authority of the owner, in addition to a political environment favoring PPPs.

131 Meng et al. (2011) use three case studies in China to identify CSFs for Transfer-Operate-  
132 Transfer urban water supply projects, some of which make the procurement process more  
133 effective and efficient. Regan et al. (2011) examine whether the current volatility and  
134 uncertainty of capital markets in Australia affects the feasibility of privately financed  
135 infrastructure and specifically the PPP method of procurement. Ho and Hsu (2013) use  
136 game theoretic analysis to help project owners choose better bid compensation strategies.  
137 Cruz and Marques (2014) find that alternative methodologies for calculating the discount  
138 rate and different assumptions can lead to completely different results, biasing the final  
139 decision. Finally, Ye et al. (2013) examine procurement systems under China's unique  
140 culture and social background and identify the key factors considered in compiling tender  
141 prices.

142 These issues show that it is crucial to identify the critical factors that affect its success as  
143 this will benefit both public and private sectors in PPPs in the briefing stage. This paper  
144 therefore focuses on these factors in relation to procurement. In all, 15 procurement-  
145 related factors are identified based on the existing literature. These factors have been  
146 tested in previous studies for their importance in the PPP approach and briefing stage and  
147 are summarised in Table 1. For example, Leung et al. (2008) recommend that "formal  
148 briefing sessions" and "regular formal meetings" influence project success and  
149 participant satisfaction. Yu et al.'s (2008), Hong Kong questionnaire survey, found  
150 significant implications for construction industry practitioners in producing their  
151 guidelines for the briefing process and for writers in drafting 'how-to' briefing guides.  
152 The Construction Industry Board (1997) suggest that "clear and agreed objectives",  
153 "carefully thought-out requirements" and other factors are critical, while Blyth and



154 Worthington (2001) also identify “defining the process”, “timely decision taking” and  
155 other key areas as essential to briefing success. Lee and Schaufelberger (2014) use case  
156 studies in East Asia and the Pacific to identify factors such as government interference,  
157 conflict of interest among parties, delays in government agency support, and political  
158 *force majeure*, must be identified at the briefing stage of BOT project development and  
159 manage them through contractual agreements and financial arrangements clearly  
160 specified in the terms and conditions.

161 *<Insert Table 1. here>*

## 162 **RESEARCH METHOD**

### 163 **Data collection**

164 A questionnaire survey was conducted from March to May 2009 to collect public-sector  
165 opinions on the importance of each of the 15 factors in PPP project briefing. The pilot  
166 study involved three interviews, with two interviewees being officers in HK government  
167 departments and one from a local construction company. All interviewees have over 10  
168 years’ working experience in the construction industry and have been involved in PPP  
169 projects at least once. Only those who had work experience of PPP projects in HKSAR  
170 government departments were selected for the survey sample (Cheung and Chan, 2011).  
171 Overall, 500 questionnaires were sent out and 122 responses were collected, yielding a  
172 response rate of 24.4%. Returns were received by respondents from the Architectural  
173 Services Department, Buildings Department, Drainage Services Department, Efficiency  
174 Unit, Environmental Protection Department, Highways Department, and Transport  
175 Department. All these Departments have had experience with PPP projects.

176 The questionnaire comprises two sections. In the first section, background information on  
177 the type of the PPP project, the nature of the PPP project, role played in the PPP project  
178 and experience in the PPP project, was requested. In the second section, the procurement-  
179 related factors which might affect the success of briefing were rated on a scale of 1-5  
180 (Zarkada-Fraser and Skitmore, 2000), where 1 represents 'strongly disagree' and 5  
181 represents 'strongly agree'. A five-point Likert scale is in common use for research of  
182 this kind as it is simple enough to answer and yet still provides sufficient information  
183 concerning different degrees of the same attribute (Chan et al., 2011; Yeung et al., 2008).  
184 Respondents answered the questionnaire based on a particular PPP project in which they  
185 had participated in Hong Kong.

#### 186 **Preliminary findings**

187 Among the different types of PPP projects, about one third of the respondents had  
188 worked on road projects (34%), followed by drainage projects (30%), waste transfer  
189 stations (13%), theme parks (9%), tunnels (7%), schools (5%) and rail projects (2%). Of  
190 the four different natures of projects, slightly more than half of the projects involved  
191 refurbishment (53%), followed by new build (34%) and schemes comprising both new  
192 build and refurbishment (13%). In terms of roles played in PPP projects, 51 respondents  
193 are engineers (42%), followed by client representatives (23%), administrators (10%),  
194 contract managers (8%), surveyors (7%), financial managers (5%), architects (2%), and  
195 contractors/suppliers (3%).

196 Note that the bulk of respondents (77%) were not directly involved in briefing, leaving 23%  
197 of respondents directly involved in briefing. Despite this, their active involvement in a  
198 project is expected to provide useful data. This applies especially when briefing is

199 perceived to be part of the inception stage of a project, as professionals who work on later  
200 stages of a project should be able to provide opinions on how to improve the briefing  
201 stage for the benefit of these later stages.

202 For example, an engineer involved only in the later stages of a project, such as the  
203 maintenance stage after the concession period when PPP projects are delivered back to  
204 the host government, may wish to correctly record the decisions made and change the  
205 contents of the brief to save cost and avoid dissension (Yuan et al., 2012a, 2012b, 2013).

206 For another example, a client representative not involved in the briefing stage may  
207 identify missing client requirements and/or misunderstandings when the concept or detail  
208 design is completed, and want to clearly identify and fully understand the client  
209 requirements during the briefing stage to save project time. Soomro and Zhang (2013)  
210 investigate the actions and decisions of private-sector partners by evaluating 35 failed  
211 transportation PPPs around the world, and suggest a better understanding of partners'  
212 actions and decisions and their influence on project success would be beneficial at the  
213 briefing stage.

## 214 **DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION**

### 215 **Factor analysis**

216 An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to identify the latent dimensions that affect  
217 the briefing stage. The purpose of this was to reduce the amount of work needed to test  
218 the effect of background variables on the factors (as described in the next section). The  
219 total percentage of variance explained was used to determine the number of components

220 involved (Chan and Lee, 2008). This was obtained by principal component analysis with  
221 varimax rotation to generate factor loadings for the extracted components.

222 Prior to the factor analysis, the data samples were analysed to check their appropriateness.  
223 The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test and Bartlett's test were conducted. The KMO  
224 measure of sampling adequacy examines whether the partial correlations among variables  
225 are small (Khazanchi, 2005). The KMO test value should be greater than 0.5 for a  
226 satisfactory factor analysis to proceed. Bartlett's test of sphericity determines whether the  
227 correlation matrix is an identity matrix, which would indicate that the factor model is  
228 inappropriate. The null hypothesis should be rejected prior to factor analysis. The test  
229 results indicate that the KMO measure was above the threshold of satisfaction ( $=0.755$ ),  
230 while the significance value of Bartlett's test was sufficiently small ( $=0.000$ ). Therefore,  
231 both measures support the undertaking of a factor analysis.

232 A total of four dimensions were extracted from the factor analysis with eigenvectors  
233 greater than one and accounting for 61% of the common variance as shown in Table 2.  
234 The scree plot was also indicates that the contributions are relatively low after the fourth  
235 component. This is consistent with the preceding conclusion that the four dimensions  
236 offer a reasonable summary of the data. Each dimension consists of a set of factors.  
237 According to Hair et al. (1998), the item-total correlation should exceed 0.5 for  
238 identifying significant loading. From Table 3, the loadings for all 15 factors exceed 0.500  
239 ( $p < 0.01$ ) with the sole exception of one factor with a factor loading of 0.481, which was  
240 still included in the subsequent analysis since it is only marginally significant in  
241 exploratory research (Hair et al., 1998).

242

*<Insert Table 2. here>*

243

<Insert Table 3. here>

244 The four extracted dimensions were labelled as follows:

- 245 (1) *Client requirements and decisions for briefing* contains the following four  
246 factors (shown with their factor loadings): ‘adequate time for the briefing  
247 process’ (0.685), ‘good record of decisions made’ (0.507), ‘identification of  
248 client requirements’ (0.671), and ‘thorough understanding of client  
249 requirements’ (0.684).
- 250 (2) *Briefing documentation and flexibility* contains the four factors of ‘time for  
251 freezing of brief documents’ (0.578), ‘flexibility of briefs to cater for changes’  
252 (0.576), ‘feedback from completed projects’ (0.764), and ‘clear and precise  
253 briefing documents’ (0.775).
- 254 (3) *Clear briefing process and control* contains four the factors of ‘clear goal and  
255 objectives’ (0.695), ‘experience of the brief writer’ (0.778), ‘clear end user  
256 requirements’ (0.672), and ‘control of process’ (0.481).
- 257 (4) *Stakeholders’ involvement in briefing* contains the three factors of  
258 ‘development of a framework agreed by the key parties’ (0.653), ‘consensus  
259 building’ (0.708), and ‘proper priority setting’ (0.777).

260 The means, standard deviations, Cronbach alpha, and correlations are presented in Table  
261 4. The means indicate that respondents rated Clear briefing process and control (4.41) the  
262 highest, followed by Clients’ requirements and decisions for briefing (4.08), Briefing  
263 documentation and flexibility (3.90), and Stakeholders’ involvement in briefing (3.82).

264

<Insert Table 4. here>

265 In order to test the extent to which the corresponding factors measure the dimension, an  
266 internal consistency reliability test was conducted. A Cronbach alpha value was  
267 computed for each dimension. The alpha coefficients ranged from 0.66 to 0.73 which  
268 were all greater than 0.6, indicating acceptable and good internal consistency reliability  
269 (Zhang, 2006). Moreover, two-tailed Spearman rank correlations between the four  
270 dimensions were computed to test the relationship between dimensions. The correlation  
271 matrix (in Table 4) indicates that the four dimensions were significantly related to each  
272 other. In general, the analysis supports the existence of four distinct but correlated  
273 components of the critical factors.

#### 274 **Effect of background variables on the four extracted dimensions**

275 The effect of the background variables on the four dimensions was investigated for, if  
276 they exert a considerable influence on the factors, then their effect should be included in  
277 estimating the relative levels of importance of the factors. Four background variables  
278 were used: “type of PPP project” (e.g. road project, drainage project), “nature of PPP  
279 project” (e.g. refurbishment, new build), “role in PPP projects” (e.g. engineers, client  
280 representatives), and “experience of PPP projects” (directly involved in briefing, non-  
281 directly involved in briefing). These variables are basic and essential for analyzing the  
282 effects of the critical factors. Since these categorical variables involve different numbers  
283 of groups, they were tested with different statistical methods.

284 From the analysis, no background variable affects the extracted dimension “*client*  
285 *requirement and decision for briefing*”: this means that illustrating the client  
286 requirements well is considered in the same way by all respondents, no matter what their  
287 background. Other results are:

- 288 (1) Three types of PPP projects - “building”, “infrastructure”, and “specific  
289 projects” -were investigated. An ANOVA test was used and results indicate  
290 that type of PPP project did not significantly relate to all dimensions;
- 291 (2) As there were three different natures of PPP projects, the ANOVA test was  
292 again employed and the results indicate that “nature of PPP project” does  
293 significantly affect both the dimensions of *Briefing documentation and*  
294 *flexibility* ( $p = 0.007$ ) and *Stakeholders’ involvement in briefing* ( $p = 0.023$ );
- 295 (3) The variable “the experience in PPP projects” is a dichotomous variable, so a  
296 t-test was adopted. The results indicate that “experience in PPP projects”  
297 significantly affects the three dimensions of: *Briefing documentation and*  
298 *flexibility* ( $p = 0.023$ ), *Clear briefing process and control* ( $p = 0.017$ ), and  
299 *Stakeholders’ involvement in briefing* ( $p = 0.018$ ); and
- 300 (4) The two roles of “professional” group and “management” group, being  
301 dichotomous, were subject to t-tests. These showed that “role in PPP projects”  
302 also significantly affects the three dimensions of *Briefing documentation and*  
303 *flexibility* ( $p = 0.005$ ), *Clear briefing process and control* ( $p = 0.011$ ), and  
304 *Stakeholders’ involvement in briefing* ( $p = 0.009$ ).

## 305 **FACTOR RANKING**

### 306 **Sample visualization method**

307 Since three of the four background variables exert a significant influence on the four  
308 factor dimensions, their effect needs to be considered when identifying the importance of

309 the original factors. In view of this, a sample visualization method is developed to  
310 estimate the weighted importance of the 15 factors. The method is described below.

311 Suppose there are  $N$  respondents, where  $N$  is 122. Each respondent is denoted as

312  $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, \dots, x_{i,d}) \in R^d$ , which is a dimensional vector. Each dimension is an item with  
313 values ranging from 1 to 5. The class labels used in pattern recognition (Hastie et al.,  
314 2008) are defined based on the indicator of different variables, i.e. the options mentioned  
315 above. These variables are used to help distinguish between different data samples.

316 Suppose there are  $C$  classes, and the label of  $\mathbf{x}_i$  is  $l_i$ . Linear discriminate analysis (LDA)  
317 produces a linear projection matrix  $\mathbf{W} \in R^{d \times m}$  to project the original data onto lower-  
318 dimensional data

319 
$$\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{x}_i \quad (1)$$

320 where  $\mathbf{y}_i \in R^m$  is an  $m$  dimensional vector.

321 To estimate  $\mathbf{W}$ , two scatter matrices are introduced, which are the within-class scatter  
322 matrix  $\mathbf{S}_w$  and between-class scatter matrix  $\mathbf{S}_b$ :

323 
$$\mathbf{S}_w = \sum_{i=1}^C \sum_{\mathbf{x}_j: l_j=i} (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{m}_i)(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{m}_i)^T \quad (2)$$

324 
$$\mathbf{S}_b = \sum_{i=1}^C (\mathbf{m}_i - \mathbf{m})(\mathbf{m}_i - \mathbf{m})^T \quad (3)$$

325 where  $\mathbf{m}_i$  is the mean of class  $i$ , and  $\mathbf{m}$  is the mean of all data samples.  $\mathbf{S}_w$  measures the  
326 intra-class variances and  $\mathbf{S}_b$  measures the inter-class variances. The optimization of the  
327 projection matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  is obtained by finding a lower-dimensional space to simultaneously



328 maximize the between-class scatter and minimize the within-class scatter. Compared with  
 329 principal component analysis, which is based on the total variances ( $\mathbf{S}_w + \mathbf{S}_b$ ), LDA  
 330 projects the data sample with most discriminative directions (Bishop, 2006). This means  
 331 that the projected data have the property such that samples with the same label have a  
 332 clustering property in the projected space. Visualization then helps to identify classes  
 333 with similar levels of importance but different working experiences. The optimization  
 334 criterion is formulated as:

$$335 \quad \mathbf{W}^* = \arg \max_{\mathbf{W} \in R^{d \times m}} \text{tr} \left( \left( \mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{S}_w \mathbf{W} \right)^{-1} \left( \mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{S}_b \mathbf{W} \right) \right) \quad (4)$$

336 Here tr represents the trace of the matrix. The solution to this criterion has been proven to  
 337 be the m largest eigenvectors of the matrix  $\mathbf{S}_w^{-1} \mathbf{S}_b$  and the optimal value of the criterion  
 338 is the sum of the corresponding largest eigenvalues (Hastie et al., 2008).

### 339 **Projection result**

340 Since we use each vector  $\mathbf{x}_i$  to represent a sample, the similarity between two samples  $\mathbf{x}_i$   
 341 and  $\mathbf{x}_j$  can be represented by a function of Euclidean distance. The smaller the Euclidean  
 342 distance between the two samples, the more similar they are. Therefore, we can also  
 343 make use of the Euclidean distance between two projected vectors  $\mathbf{y}_i$  and  $\mathbf{y}_j$  to  
 344 approximately represent the similarity. Although this may lose some information, it does  
 345 not affect the use of the 2D plane to visualize the clustering property.

346 The visualization results are shown in Figure 2. The horizontal and vertical axes represent  
 347 the scale value of the projected coordinate system. The scale value is a weighted  
 348 combination of original factor values. The weighting scheme is determined by the

349 projection matrix  $\mathbf{W}$ . In Figure 2, shows the clustering properties of the samples, i.e. the  
 350 samples with the same class label projected onto nearby places. Since all the original  
 351 rating values are normalized to zero mean and uniform variance, many of the samples  
 352 cluster around zero.

353 *<Insert Figure 2. here>*

### 354 **Ranking of key factors**

355 By inspecting the 2D visualization of the samples, it is clear that most of the samples are  
 356 located approximately on a Gaussian distribution near the zero point. To reduce the  
 357 influence of those clustered away from zero, a class-mean based ranking method is  
 358 developed. A function of class mean and the total data mean is used to weight the factor  
 359 agreement values. In particular, the weighting for data  $\mathbf{x}_i$  in background variable  $k$  is  
 360 calculated as:

$$361 \quad w_{l_i}^k = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{m}_{l_i}^k - \mathbf{m}^k\right)^T \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^k\right)^{-1} \left(\mathbf{m}_{l_i}^k - \mathbf{m}^k\right)\right) \quad (5)$$

362 where  $k$  is the indicator of different background variables, ranging from 1 to 4 to  
 363 represent “type of PPP project”, “nature of PPP project”, “role in PPP project” and  
 364 “experience of PPP projects” respectively.  $l_i$  is the class label for  $\mathbf{x}_i$ .  $\mathbf{m}_{l_i}^k$  is the mean of  
 365 class  $l_i$  in background variable  $k$ .  $\mathbf{m}^k$  is the total data mean of the background  $k$ .  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^k$   
 366 is the total data covariance matrix which is calculated based on all the data samples over  
 367 background  $k$ , so that:

368 
$$\Sigma^k = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{m}^k)(\mathbf{x}_i^k - \mathbf{m}^k)^T \quad (6)$$

369 where  $\mathbf{x}_i^k$  is the vector composed of the factors of data  $\mathbf{x}_i$  in background  $k$  and the  
 370 weighting coefficient is just the exponential term of a multivariate Gaussian distribution:

371 
$$\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \frac{1}{|\Sigma^k|^{1/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{m}_{l_i}^k - \mathbf{m}^k)^T (\Sigma^k)^{-1} (\mathbf{m}_{l_i}^k - \mathbf{m}^k)\right) \quad (7)$$

372 ignoring the constant term. Moreover, the weighting ranges from 0 to 1. Therefore, if the  
 373 class mean  $\mathbf{m}_{l_i}^k$  in background variable  $k$  is distant from the total data mean  $\mathbf{m}^k$ , a small  
 374 weighting is given to the samples with that background variable option. Contrarily, if the  
 375 experience class  $\mathbf{m}_{l_i}^k$  in experience type  $k$  is near the total data mean  $\mathbf{m}^k$ , a large weight  
 376 is given, since the samples of that background variable represent the majority of the  
 377 collected data. Similar weighting schemes have been widely used in non-parametric  
 378 kernel methods (Schölkopf and Smola, 2001), neural network-based machine learning  
 379 (Bishop, 1995), and manifold approximation (Belkin and Niyogi, 2005).

380 Based on the weighting of each background variable option, the weighting for each data  
 381 sample  $\mathbf{x}_i$  is defined as:

382 
$$w_{\mathbf{x}_i} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k=1}^4 w_{l_i}^k = \frac{1}{4} (w_{l_i}^1 + w_{l_i}^2 + w_{l_i}^3 + w_{l_i}^4) \quad (8)$$

383 where  $w_{l_i}^k$  is the weight for  $\mathbf{x}_i$  with class label  $l_i$  in background variable  $k$ . Therefore, if  
 384 a data sample is in the majority of all of the four background variables, it is allocated a  
 385 large weighting in calculating the final ranking.

386 With the weighting value for each data sample, the final ranking score for item  $j$  is:

$$387 \quad r_j = \sum_{i=1}^N w_{x_i} x_{i,j} = w_{x_1} x_{1,j} + w_{x_2} x_{2,j} + \dots + w_{x_N} x_{N,j} \quad (9)$$

388 The results are shown in the Table 5 and discussed in the next section.

### 389 **Discussion**

390 Table 5 lists the ranking of factors related to procurement in the PPP briefing stage  
391 according to public-sector opinions. It is noted that the scores presented are lower than  
392 the mean values of factors. This is because the scores were calculated in a different way.  
393 Therefore, the weighted scores and the mean values cannot be directly compared. Only  
394 the ranks based on the two methods can be compared. It is clear that the two ranking  
395 orders are not the same when the four background variables are taken into consideration.  
396 However, the rank estimated by the sample visualization method is more accurate and  
397 reliable.

398 *<Insert Table 5. here>*

399 As shown in Table 5, “clear goals and objectives” are ranked first (=3.1932), followed by  
400 “clear end users requirements” (=3.1914). Therefore, in order to maximize the benefit to  
401 be obtained from a project, the briefing should provide clear goals and objectives in the  
402 form of clear instructions from the client (Abdel Aziz, 2007). End users of the project  
403 may have specific requirements. Unfortunately, these requirements are not always made  
404 known in the briefing process. Thus, the client has the responsibility to make sure that all  
405 the user groups’ requirements are heard (Blyth and Worthington, 2001).  
406 In third and fourth place are “experience of the brief writer” (=3.1869) and “thorough  
407 understanding of client requirements” (=3.0674). Briefing documents specify all the

408 requirements demanded by a project. Brief writers therefore play an important role in  
409 capturing all these requirements in a clear overall picture for project stakeholders,  
410 including clients and designers (Hyams, 2001). On the other hand, the needs and  
411 requirements of all stakeholders should also be included in a comprehensive manner in  
412 stating the required end product (Karama et al., 2001). For example, site, environmental,  
413 and regulatory requirements should be combined when specifying design requirements  
414 “Good record of decisions made” occupies fifth place in the ranking list (=2.9563). The  
415 reasons for its importance are similar to those of “experience of the brief writer”.  
416 Decisions should be clearly recorded in the brief documents by the brief writer for later  
417 use. There are many well-known techniques, such as computer-aided tools, that can help  
418 in keeping these records (Tang et al., 2010).

## 419 **CONCLUSIONS**

420 The briefing stage is important for all construction projects, especially PPP-type projects,  
421 which are more complex because of the increased numbers, involvement and  
422 responsibilities of stakeholders and the longer periods involved. Better briefing can save  
423 both time and value in the later stages of projects.

424 The purpose of the research is to identify the critical success factors for the briefing stage  
425 of PPP projects. The most important factor is “Clear goals and objectives”. This reminds  
426 both the public sector and the private sector of their roles at this stage. The same result is  
427 also found in research on conventional projects and means that both conventional projects  
428 and PPP projects need to provide clear goals and objectives in their briefing stages. The  
429 main findings also highlight the need for clarity, experience and understanding these

430 critical success factors. Statistical and mathematical analyses of the data from different  
431 Hong Kong government departments regarding the significance of the 15 procurement-  
432 related factors also provide the following results:

- 433 (1) The KMO test supports the conclusion that the survey data are adequate for  
434 factor analysis;
- 435 (2) Factor analysis establishes four dimensions of briefing stage procurement:  
436 *Clients' requirements and decisions for briefing, Briefing documentation and*  
437 *flexibility, Clear briefing process and control, and Stakeholders' involvement*  
438 *in briefing*. Also, the effect of four background variables on the four  
439 dimensions was tested and partially supported;
- 440 (3) Validity analysis and reliability analysis confirm the quality of the  
441 questionnaire survey, the soundness of the factor analysis and the internal  
442 consistency of the procurement-related factors; and
- 443 (4) A new mathematical model, namely the sample visualization method, adopted  
444 from Gaussian distribution was used to add weights generated by the four  
445 background variables to estimate the weighted ranking scores of factors.

446 The briefing stage of PPP projects has been largely overlooked to date in terms of its  
447 importance, although decisions made at this stage have a far-reaching influence  
448 throughout the project life cycle. A set of 15 procurement-related factors affecting the  
449 success of the briefing stage is first identified based on the existing literature. Then the  
450 effects of the four background variables on the factors are tested for the first time with a  
451 sample of data from government departments in Hong Kong. The results support the view  
452 that the background variables should be taken into account when ranking the factors,

453 which suggests that Factor Analysis should not be used as the only way to analyze  
454 questionnaire survey data on this topic.

455 The literature review concerns the briefing stage and relevant procurement studies. A  
456 statistical analysis is then conducted in order to obtain solid and credible analysis results.  
457 The practical value of the analysis is that the findings facilitate all stakeholders in  
458 attending and collaborating in the briefing to increase the value of PPP projects. As the  
459 briefing stage is usually led by the public sector, the public sector can use these CSFs to  
460 prepare the briefing while obtaining private sector benefits as benchmarks in attending  
461 and collaborating at the briefing stage.

462 The limitation of the research is that only factors related to procurement issues and the  
463 success of PPP briefing through the perspective of perceptions of PPP practitioners were  
464 studied. For further research, these factors could be used in real cases by government  
465 departments. In theoretical terms, there are other aspects which impact on the success of  
466 briefing stages, such as stakeholder-related, risk-related, and finance-related issues (Tang  
467 et al., 2010). Likewise, in practice, these factors should be studied and tested in later  
468 research in order to develop a more comprehensive picture of what is needed to improve  
469 PPP briefing. Case studies focussing on how proper attention to these factors would have  
470 improved the performance of previous PPP projects should also be a subject of further  
471 study. The findings of this research need to be tested by studies of briefing in real PPP  
472 projects in order to verify the relevance of the analysed briefing factors for the success of  
473 entire PPP projects.

474 In summary, the main findings highlight the need for clarity, experience and  
475 understanding of what is needed for PPP projects and how these needs are represented

476 and documented. Although the respondents of the questionnaire survey are drawn from  
477 the Hong Kong public sector, these findings facilitate all stakeholders in attending and  
478 collaborating in briefings so as to increase the value of PPP projects. This is likely to  
479 contribute to the success of an effective and efficient briefing stage of the majority of  
480 PPP-type construction projects world-wide.

#### 481 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

482 The research was conducted with the financial support of the Hong Kong Polytechnic  
483 University.

#### 484 **REFERENCES**

- 485 Abdel Aziz, A.M. (2007). "Successful delivery of public-private partnerships for  
486 infrastructure development", *J. Constr. Eng. Manage.*, 133(12), 918-931.
- 487 Ahadzi, M. and Bowles, G. (2004). "Public-private partnerships and contract negotiations:  
488 an empirical study." *Constr. Manage. Econ.*, 22(9), 967-978.
- 489 Ahmadjian, C. and Collura, J. (2012). "Evaluating Public-Private Partnership  
490 Organizational Alternatives for Existing Toll Roads." *J. Manage. Eng.*, 28(2), 114–119.
- 491 Akintoye, A., Beck, M. and Hardcastle, C. (2003). "Introduction: public-private  
492 partnership in infrastructure development". *Public-private partnerships: Managing*  
493 *risks and opportunities*. A. Akintoye, M. Beck and C. Hardcastle, eds., Blackwell  
494 Science Ltd. U.K.



495 Belkin, M. and Niyogi, P. (2005). "Towards a theoretical foundation for Laplacian-based  
496 manifold methods", *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*,  
497 486–500.

498 Bishop, C. M. (1995). *Neural networks for pattern recognition*. Oxford University Press.

499 Bishop, C.M. (2006). "Pattern recognition and machine learning", *Information Science  
500 and Statistics*, Springer. New York.

501 Blyth, A. and Worthington, J. (2001). *Managing the brief for better design*, Spon Press,  
502 London and New York.

503 Carrillo, P.M., Robinson, H.S., Anumba, C.J. and Bouchlaghem, N.M. (2006). "A  
504 knowledge transfer framework: the PFI context", *Constr. Manage. Econ.*, 24(11),  
505 1045-1056.

506 Chan, A., Yeung, J., Yu, C., Wang, S., and Ke, Y. (2011). "Empirical Study of Risk  
507 Assessment and Allocation of Public-Private Partnership Projects in China." *J.  
508 Manage. Eng.*, 27(3), 136–148.

509 Chan, E.H.W. and Lee, G. K.L. (2008). "Contribution of urban design to economic  
510 sustainability of urban renewal projects in Hong Kong", *Sustainable Development*,  
511 16(6), 353-364.

512 Cheung, E. and Chan, A. (2011). "Evaluation Model for Assessing the Suitability of  
513 Public-Private Partnership Projects." *J. Manage. Eng.*, 27(2), 80–89.

514 Construction Industry Board (CIB) (Great Britain) (1997). *Briefing the team*, CIB,  
515 Thomas Telford Publishing, London.

516 Cruz, C. and Marques, R. (2014). "Theoretical Considerations on Quantitative PPP  
517 Viability Analysis." *J. Manage. Eng.*, 30(1), 122–126.

518 Efficiency Unit (2008). *Efficiency Unit Serving the Community by Using the Private*  
519 *Sector-An Introductory Guide to Public Private Partnerships (PPPs)* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition),  
520 The Government of HKSAR, Hong Kong.

521 Federal Highway Administration (2007). *User guidebook on implementing public-private*  
522 *partnerships for transportation infrastructure projects in the United States*, AECOM:  
523 FHWA Work Order 05-002, Washington, D.C.

524 Gray, C.F. (2008). *Project management: the managerial process* (4th ed.) Gray, C.F. and  
525 Larson, E.W. (eds.) New York, McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

526 Gurgun, A. and Touran, A. (2013). "Public-Private Partnership Experience in the  
527 International Arena: Case of Turkey." *J. Manage. Eng.*, 10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-  
528 5479.0000213, 04014029.

529 Hair, J.F., Anderson R.E., Tatham, R.L., and Black, W.C. (1998). *Multivariate Data*  
530 *Analysis*, 5<sup>th</sup> Ed, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

531 Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R. and Friedman, J. (2008). *The Elements of Statistical Learning:*  
532 *Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*, 2nd Ed., Springer. New York.

533 Hershberger, R. (1999). *Architectural Programming and Predesign Manager*, McGraw-  
534 Hill, USA.

535 Ho, S. and Hsu, Y. (2013). "Bid Compensation Theory and Strategies for Projects with  
536 Heterogeneous Bidders: A Game Theoretic Analysis." *J. Manage.*  
537 *Eng.*, 10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-5479.0000212 , 04014022.

538 Hyams, D. (2001). *Construction companion to briefing*, RIBA Publications, London.

539 Kamara, J.M. and Anumba, C.J. (2001). "A critical appraisal of the briefing process in  
540 construction", *J. Constr. Research*, **2**(1), 13-24.

- 541 Kelly, J. (2003). "Value management in public-private partnership procurement", *Public-*  
542 *private partnerships: managing risks and opportunities*, Akintoye A, Beck M,  
543 Hardcastle C. (eds.), Blackwell Science Ltd. U.K.
- 544 Kelly, J. and Duerk, D. (2002). *Construction project briefing/architectural programming-*  
545 *best value in construction*, Kelly, J., Morledge, R. and Wilkinson, S. (eds.) Blackwell  
546 Science Ltd. U.K.
- 547 Kelly, J.R., MacPherson, s. and Male, S.P. (1992.) *The briefing process: a review and*  
548 *critique*, The Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, Londres.
- 549 Khazanchi, D. (2005). "Information technology (IT) appropriateness: the contingency  
550 theory of "FIT" and it implementation in small and medium enterprises", *The J.*  
551 *Computer Information Syst.*, 45(3), 88-95.
- 552 Lee, N. and Schaufelberger, J. (2014). "Risk Management Strategies for Privatized  
553 Infrastructure Projects: Study of the Build–Operate–Transfer Approach in East Asia  
554 and the Pacific." *J. Manage. Eng.*, 30(3), 05014001.
- 555 Leung, M.Y., Chen, D.Y. and Yu, J.Y. (2008). "Demystifying moderate variables of the  
556 interrelationships among affective commitment, job performance, and job satisfaction  
557 of construction professionals", *J. Constr. Eng. Manage.*, 134(12), 963-971.
- 558 Meng, X., Zhao, Q., and Shen, Q. (2011). "Critical Success Factors for Transfer-Operate-  
559 Transfer Urban Water Supply Projects in China." *J. Manage. Eng.*, 27(4), 243–251.
- 560 Papajohn, D., Cui, Q., and Bayraktar, M. (2011). "Public-Private Partnerships in U.S.  
561 Transportation: Research Overview and a Path Forward." *J. Manage. Eng.*, 27(3),  
562 126–135.

- 563 Rebeiz, K. (2012). "Public–Private Partnership Risk Factors in Emerging Countries:  
564 BOOT Illustrative Case Study." *J. Manage. Eng.*, 28(4), 421–428.
- 565 Regan, M., Smith, J., and Love, P. (2011). "Impact of the Capital Market Collapse on  
566 Public-Private Partnership Infrastructure Projects." *J. Constr. Eng. Manage.*, 137(1),  
567 6–16.
- 568 Robinson, H.S. and Scott, J. (2009). "Service delivery and performance monitoring in  
569 PFI/PPP projects", *Constr. Manage. Econ.*, 27(2), 181-197.
- 570 Schölkopf, B and Smola, A. J. (2001). "Learning with Kernels: support vector machines",  
571 *Regularization, optimization, and beyond (adaptive computation and machine*  
572 *learning*, The MIT Press.
- 573 Soomro, M. and Zhang, X. (2013). "Roles of Private-Sector Partners in Transportation  
574 Public-Private Partnership Failures." *J. Manage. Eng.*, 10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-  
575 5479.0000263, 04014056
- 576 Tang L.Y.N. and Shen Q.P. (2013). "Factors affecting effectiveness and efficiency of  
577 analyzing stakeholder's needs at the briefing stage of public private partnership  
578 projects". *Int. J. Proj. Manage.*, 31(4), 513-521.
- 579 Tang, L.Y.N., Shen, Q.P., and Cheng, E.W.L. (2010). "A review of studies on Public-  
580 private partnership projects in the construction industry", *Int. J. Proj. Manage.*, 28(7),  
581 683-694.
- 582 Tang, L.Y.N., Shen, Q.P., Skitmore, M., and Cheng, E. (2013). "Ranked Critical Factors  
583 in PPP Briefings". *J. Manage. Eng.*, 29(2), 164–171.

584 Wang, N. (2013). "Correlation Analysis of Capital and Life Cycle Costs in Private  
585 Financial Initiative Projects." *J. Manage. Eng.*, 10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-  
586 5479.0000277, 06014002.

587 Wood, G.D. and Ellis, R.C.T. (2005). "Main contractor experiences of partnering  
588 relationships on UK construction projects", *Constr. Manage. Econ.*, 23(3), 317-325.

589 Ye, K., Li, B., and Shen, L. (2013). "Key Factors Considered in Compiling Tender Prices  
590 for China's Public Works Projects." *J. Manage. Eng.*, 29(3), 206–215.

591 Yeung, J.F.Y., Chan, A.P.C. and Chan, D.W.M. (2008). "Establishing quantitative  
592 indicators for measuring the partnering performance of construction projects in Hong  
593 Kong", *Constr. Manage. Econ.*, 26(3), 277-301.

594 Yu, A.T.W. (2006). *A value management framework for systematic identification and  
595 precise representation of client requirements in the briefing process*. Ph.D. thesis,  
596 The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong.

597 Yu, A.T.W., Shen, Q.P., Kelly, J. and Hunter, K. (2008). "Comparative study of the  
598 variables in construction project briefing/architectural programming", *J. Constr. Eng.  
599 Manage.*, 134(2), 122-138.

600 Yuan, J., Chan, A., Xiong, W., Skibniewski, M., and Li, Q. (2013). "Perception of  
601 Residual Value Risk in Public Private Partnership Projects: Critical Review." *J.  
602 Manage. Eng.* , 10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-5479.0000256 , 04014041.

603 Yuan, J., Guang, M., Wang, X., Li, Q., and Skibniewski, M. (2012a). "Quantitative  
604 SWOT Analysis of Public Housing Delivery by Public–Private Partnerships in China  
605 Based on the Perspective of the Public Sector." *J. Manage. Eng.*, 28(4), 407–420.

606 Yuan, J., Wang, C., Skibniewski, M., and Li, Q. (2012). "Developing Key Performance

607 Indicators for Public-Private Partnership Projects: Questionnaire Survey and  
608 Analysis.” *J. Manage. Eng.*, 28(3), 252–264.

609 Zarkada-Fraser, A. and Skitmore, M. (2000). “Decisios with moral content: collusion”,  
610 *Constr. Manage. Econ.*, 18(1), 101-111.

611 Zhang, X.Q. (2006). “Factor analysis of public clients' best-value objective in public-  
612 privately partnered infrastructure projects”, *J. Constr. Eng. Manage.*, 132(9), 956-965.

**Table 1** Procurement-related factors of briefing stages in PPPs

<b>Procurement-related factors</b>	<b>Remarks</b>	<b>Factors adopted from</b>
Clear goals and objectives	Briefing is a process which should have a clear goal and/or objectives.	The Construction Industry Board, 1997; Gurgun and Touran, 2013
Experience of the brief writer	An experienced person is needed to develop a brief.	Yu et al., 2008
Clear end user requirements	A brief needs to elucidate the end user requirements.	The Construction Industry Board, 1997; Kelly and Duerk, 2002
Development of a framework agreed by the key parties	During briefing, the process involved in formulating the brief needs to be agreed by the key parties.	Kamara and Anumba, 2001; Leung et al., 2008
Control of process	The public sector should lead throughout the briefing process.	Leung et al., 2008; Blyth and Worthington, 2001
Adequate time for briefing	Briefing should be allocated sufficient time for its conduct.	Leung et al., 2008; Blyth and Worthington, 2001
Consensus building	A consensus of the brief; contents amongst the various stakeholders needs to be developed during the briefing stage.	Yu et al., 2008
Proper priority setting	The prioritisation of decisions to be made should be agreed by the key parties in briefing.	Yu et al., 2008
Time for freezing of brief documents	A schedule should be set for the completion of the brief.	Blyth and Worthington, 2001
Flexibility of briefs to cater for changes	Sufficient flexibility in briefs should be provided to allow possible future changes.	Yu et al., 2008
Good record of decisions made	Decisions made should be recorded in detail.	Yu et al., 2008; Wang, 2013
Identification of client requirements	The client requirements should be identified during briefing.	The Construction Industry Board, 1997; Kelly and Duerk, 2002
Thorough understanding of client requirements	Client requirements should be thoroughly understood.	The Construction Industry Board, 1997; Kelly and Duerk, 2002
Feedback from completed projects	Feedback from completed projects is needed to improve briefing.	Yu et al., 2008
Clear and precise briefing documents	A clear and precise brief should be available at the end of the briefing.	Yu et al., 2008

**Table 2** Rotated Component Matrix(a)

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Adequate time for briefing	.685			
Good record of decisions made	.507			
Identification of client requirements	.671			
Thorough understanding of client requirements	.684			
Time for freezing of brief documents		.578		
Flexibility of briefs to cater for changes		.576		
Feedback from completed projects		.764		
Clear and precise briefing documents		.775		
Clear goal and objectives			.695	
Experience of the brief writer			.778	
Clear end user requirements			.672	
Control of process			(.481)	
Development of a framework agreed by the key parties				.653
Consensus building				.708
Proper priority setting				.777

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a Rotation converged in 6 iterations.



**Table 3** Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.985	33.235	33.235	4.985	33.235	33.235	2.468	16.451	16.451
2	1.586	10.570	43.806	1.586	10.570	43.806	2.468	16.450	32.901
3	1.433	9.553	53.359	1.433	9.553	53.359	2.114	14.093	46.994
4	1.147	7.645	61.004	1.147	7.645	61.004	2.102	14.010	61.004
5	.997	6.644	67.648						
6	.924	6.161	73.809						
7	.750	5.000	78.809						
8	.639	4.260	83.070						
9	.565	3.764	86.833						
10	.472	3.148	89.981						
11	.435	2.898	92.878						
12	.317	2.116	94.995						
13	.301	2.006	97.001						
14	.258	1.721	98.723						
15	.192	1.277	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

**Table 4** Correlations, means, and standard deviations

Variables	Mean	S. D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 Type of PPP projects	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2 Nature of PPP projects	—	—	-0.04	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3 Role in PPP projects	—	—	-0.16	-0.02	—	—	—	—	—	—
4 Experience in PPP projects	—	—	-0.16	-0.04	0.33 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	—	—	—
5 Client's requirements and decisions for briefing	4.08	0.52	-0.02	-0.10	0.10	0.18 <sup>a</sup>	(0.73)	—	—	—
6 Briefing documentation and flexibility	3.90	0.53	0.13	-0.29 <sup>b</sup>	0.22 <sup>a</sup>	0.22 <sup>a</sup>	0.49 <sup>b</sup>	(0.73)	—	—
7 Clear briefing process and control	4.41	0.48	0.10	-0.11	0.22 <sup>a</sup>	0.24 <sup>b</sup>	0.40 <sup>b</sup>	0.38 <sup>b</sup>	(0.66)	—
8 Stakeholders' involvement in briefing	3.82	0.54	0.13	-0.09	0.24 <sup>b</sup>	0.18 <sup>a</sup>	0.35 <sup>b</sup>	0.46 <sup>b</sup>	0.26 <sup>b</sup>	(0.68)

Note: Parentheses in the diagonal cells are coefficient alpha values.


<sup>a</sup>p<0.05.

<sup>b</sup>p<0.01, n=122.

**Table 5** Ranking scores of procurement-related factors


Factors	Weighted Scores	Means
1. Clear goals and objectives	3.193	4.410
2. Clear end user requirements	3.191	4.418
3. Experience of the brief writer	3.187	4.410
4. Thorough understanding of client requirements	3.067	4.213
5. Good record of decisions made	2.956	4.066
6. Identification of client requirements	2.941	4.041
7. Adequate time for briefing	2.888	3.984
8. Flexibility of briefs to cater for changes	2.837	3.918
9. Time for freezing of brief documents	2.821	3.902
10. Clear and precise briefing documents	2.819	3.893
11. Feedback from completed projects	2.806	3.869
12. Development of a Framework agreed by the key parties	2.797	3.877
13. Proper priority setting	2.751	3.787
14. Consensus building	2.745	3.787
15. Control of process	2.561	3.533

Figure  
[Click here to download Figure: Fig1.pdf](#)



**Fig. 1. Structure of the PPP briefing stage (adapted from EU 2008)**

Figure  
[Click here to download Figure: Fig2.pdf](#)



**Fig. 2. Projection results of background variables**