



Building a PMO from Scratch: A Practical Governance Framework for Organizations Without Project Management Maturity

Matthew M. Fernandes
Independent Researcher, USA.

Received On: 08/04/2026 Revised On: 07/05/2026 Accepted On: 14/05/2026 Published On: 21/05/2026

Abstract: Given the increasingly dynamic nature of organizational environments in contemporary times, the adoption of projects as tools for driving organizational transformation, innovation, and competitive advantage has gained momentum. Nevertheless, organizations that exhibit low levels of maturity in project management face various issues because they do not have effective governance processes, standardized project management practices, and even PMOs that can help them undertake projects successfully. The current research seeks to explore the issues surrounding the establishment of a PMO within such organizations. In particular, through the use of systematic literature review and conceptual synthesis, the study seeks to analyze different governance models for PMOs, project maturity models, and implementation approaches in order to identify key obstacles to PMO establishment. With these results, the research proposes a phased model of governance that organizations can adopt progressively based on their readiness, maturity levels, and strategic considerations. The model underscores the importance of executive sponsorship, capability building, adaptive governance approaches, and maturity progression as key facilitators for PMO success. Through the provision of a practical and realistic approach for moving from informal to more formal project governance practices, the research makes a valuable contribution to academic discussions and practical applications. It offers an alternative approach to existing models of PMO implementation that are too complex and unrealistic.

Keywords: Project Management Office (PMO), Project Governance, Organizational Maturity, PMO Implementation, Governance Framework, Strategic Alignment, Organizational Change, Capability Development, Governance Challenges, Performance Management.

1. Introduction

In today's dynamic business world, projects are being used as major tools by organizations for transforming themselves, improving their effectiveness, introducing new technologies and surviving in competition [1]. Irrespective of whether these projects involve implementation of digital technology, expansion of business operations, introduction of new products, enhancement of infrastructures, or organizational change processes, projects have become the mainstay of attaining organizational goals. Unfortunately, while an increasing number of organizations have started becoming more dependent on project-based operations, not many organizations are equipped with formal project governance frameworks, established methodologies, and formal project management capabilities. On the contrary, many projects are often implemented haphazardly without any well-defined planning or procedures in place. With the occurrence of more challenges arising due to projects within organizations, there is a rising demand for a unified governance system in place [2].

The Project Management Office (PMO), which is a new organizational entity, plays a vital role by providing standardization, coordination, accountability, and strategic alignment in regards to managing projects. Previously, PMOs

were viewed as administrative facilitators whose major functions involved documenting and reporting [3]. However, the current generation of PMOs is seen as governance facilitators whose main functions involve portfolio management, resource optimization, risk governance, stakeholder engagement, performance management, and organizational transformation. While aware of the significance of PMOs, there is much uncertainty about how to set up their first PMO among many organizations. This situation is more pronounced in organizations that have low maturity levels in project management where there is lack of formal project governance arrangements, competent project managers, processes and organization readiness. For such organizations, one of the critical questions is: What should an organization actually do when it realizes it needs a PMO but has no idea where to start? This question is a typical governance challenge for startups, small and medium companies, governmental institutions, family businesses and operationally oriented organizations moving into formal project management settings [4]. The creation of PMOs is not only about implementing some technological framework but rather entails more of a transformational approach in terms of restructuring governance, adapting the organizational culture, making leaders commit themselves, and acquiring capabilities [5]. Many failures in PMO implementations arise since most

organizations strive to implement very sophisticated governance models without taking into account such important factors as the maturity level of the organization, culture, available resources, and real-life constraints. Such elaborate governance models can create resistance and cause excessive bureaucracy and confusion. In addition, organizations with no prior experience in sophisticated project governance systems may face some challenges in implementing them due to the lack of stakeholders' buy-in [6].

This review paper examines PMO deployment in organizations lacking project management maturity, PMO governance conceptual foundations, implementation issues, success criteria, leadership roles, governance methodologies, and maturity growth approaches for sustainable PMO advancement. A realistic governance structure that enterprises might gradually adopt depending on operational readiness and strategic goals is also presented. The study seeks to provide academic insight and managerial guidance for organizations moving from informal project execution to structured, accountable, and strategically aligned project governance systems through realistic implementation strategies rather than idealized governance complexity.

1.1. Objective of the study

- To examine the importance of establishing a Project Management Office (PMO) in organizations with low project management maturity. To identify the major governance, operational, and cultural challenges faced while building a PMO from scratch.
- To analyze the role of project governance, leadership support, and standardization in successful PMO implementation.
- To develop a practical and scalable governance framework for organizations lacking formal project management structures.
- To explore critical success factors required for sustainable PMO growth and organizational maturity development.

1.2. Emerging Need for Structured Project Governance

In today's world, projects are becoming the basic tools for delivering innovations, business transformations, digital transformations, expansion of markets, and other strategic targets within companies. Companies now operate multiple projects at the same time, involving various collaborations, technology integration, regulations, and dynamic expectations from different stakeholders. With the growing level of size and complexity within projects, traditional and informal project management techniques prove insufficient in providing consistent and accountable solutions [7]. The lack of an adequate governance system leads to poor decision-making, poor distribution of roles, ineffective utilization of resources, failure in communication, delays in completion of projects, and increase in operational risks. For this reason, companies are becoming aware of the need for an effective approach to project execution which would include project

governance. Increasing reliance on project-oriented processes has made it crucial to implement project governance systems that will be able to provide structured methodologies, reporting frameworks, risk management measures and accountability arrangements. Organizations are no longer able to count on their ability to react in an efficient manner and/or the skillfulness of their managers to make sure that they are able to achieve successful outcomes in highly competitive and dynamic environments. They need to have governance systems that allow for strategic prioritization, organizational coordination, efficient decision making and project alignment with corporate goals. Governance allows organizations to increase operational discipline, build trust and monitor performance among other things. This way, governance is seen not only as a necessity but also as a strategic element that helps organizations remain stable and competitive in the long term [8].

2. Conceptual Foundations of PMO Governance

PMO Governance is a structured approach to governing the control, coordination, oversight, and alignment of all efforts related to projects toward the overall goals of the corporation. Modern organizations look upon projects as instruments to foster innovation, change, competitiveness, and sustainability, rather than simply as operations carried out within organizations. It is crucial to have a governance framework that can provide consistent operation, accountable management, transparency in decision-making, and strategic synchronization for any organization in such interdependent and complex situations of projects. Such a framework is provided through the concept of PMO governance that provides an organized framework for project prioritization, oversight, evaluation, and strategic synchronization [9].

2.1. Governance Architecture as an Organizational Control Mechanism

In organizations without project management maturity, governance architecture acts as the essential control mechanism that instills structure, accountability, and coordination in project-related processes. Without any form of governance architecture, most project-related activities in an organization will be done in an unstructured way that involves informal communications, authority relationships, and decision-making approaches. As such, there is bound to be inefficient operation within the organization coupled with increased risks of failure in project delivery. In this regard, having governance architecture acts as a tool for creating a control system that will help in instilling some degree of discipline in managing and running project processes within an organization. In essence, governance architecture helps an organization in establishing its control structures through reporting lines, procedures, approvals, roles, and others. To an organization setting up PMOs for the first time, governance architecture will be a source of stability [10].

2.2. Strategic Alignment as the Core Governance Principle

Strategic alignment acts as the guiding principle whereby the actions taken during the execution of a project

are related to long-term organizational objectives and goals. In cases where there is low maturity, projects may arise in response to short-term issues within the organization, and their execution might cause fragmentation and resource allocation challenges that have minimal benefits to the organization. The concept of strategic alignment helps the organization ensure that all projects have relevance in furthering the overall mission, vision and transformation plans of the organization. The PMO with the governance orientation will create the means through which projects can be selected and prioritized based on their strategic value instead of individual managers' preferences. The organization can use strategic alignment to ensure that resources are utilized more efficiently and effectively. In addition, when creating a PMO, strategic alignment helps increase visibility among top executives because project results are related to organizational performance [11].

2.3. Accountability and Decision Transparency in PMO Governance

These are important foundations when it comes to improving the level of discipline and reliability in organizations. Without formal governance systems, the role of people in the project becomes unclear, the decisions become informal, and operations remain unaddressed due to lack of clear accountabilities and communication lines. Such a situation results in delays in actions, which in turn causes the loss of stakeholder confidence regarding the implementation of the project. Governance in a PMO provides clarity about accountabilities by defining the roles of the managers, their reporting lines, and the process of making decisions. Decision transparency, on the other hand, ensures that the projects are governed using formal processes. When organizations need to build their PMOs from scratch, accountability and transparency help create a sense of ownership and understanding of the organization, which is why it becomes essential for building up the governance maturity level [12]. This is true in regard to fostering trust among stakeholders, improving the monitoring process, and ensuring better results.

2.4. Organizational Capability Development Through Governance

From the practical perspective of governing in organizations with insufficient maturity in managing projects, beyond its role as a tool of control, governance acts as a facilitator of competence building within the organization. In organizations that have low levels of maturity, there are instances when the employees work on their projects without the existence of any formalized knowledge or techniques that would enable them to perform consistently and learn. Governance-led PMOs are crucial for organizations as they will help build their competencies through different processes and activities. The organizations are empowered by the governance-based approach to become more proficient in planning, communication, risk management, stakeholder coordination, and decision-making. It is the task of the PMO to create conditions under which the team members can gain experience, follow the process standards, and develop managerial skills. This skill-building makes organizations

more flexible and resilient without depending too much on ad-hoc management [13]. Speaking about organizations that establish PMOs for the first time, we can say that governance plays the role of the main instrument of development that helps go beyond project-based processes and develop organizational competencies.



Fig 1: Core Function of PMO

Above Figure 1: displays a circular structure for the Core Functions of a Project Management Office (PMO). All the functions are centralized around the center to show that the functions are not independent in their workings but interconnected and complement each other in making sure that the projects are governed effectively. The use of circles illustrates the idea that none of the functions work independently but are all part of a circle of governance that improves the performance of the projects. The center, on which "Core Functions of a PMO" is inscribed, shows the PMO as the core controlling body of the organization's project environment. The first factor, Project Governance and Control, is linked to the monitoring and controlling of project delivery through systematic guidelines, approval, and control processes [14]. Next to it, Methodology Standardization addresses the need for standardized process to ensure that all projects use consistent methodology approaches, documentation methods, and delivery approaches. Going deeper, the Resource Coordination discusses how PMO balances resources, be it human resources or budgetary allocation, among other things, in delivering many projects at the same time without conflicts. Portfolio alignment refers to making sure all projects support organizational strategy. The operational aspect of the performance monitoring process includes the collection of information regarding achievements, timeline, cost-effectiveness, and results of deliveries to inform decisions based on facts. The risk management process is aimed at early identification of possible problems and implementation of strategies to eliminate risks that could interfere with project execution [15]. With regards to knowledge management, the knowledge sharing concept is associated with organizational learning that is based on sharing lessons learned and experiences within the organization.

3. Organizational Maturity and PMO Readiness

Organization maturity and PMO readiness refer to the level of development at which an organization is ready to implement formalized project management governance frameworks. Organization maturity refers to the consistency with which organizations handle processes, decision making, and performance through structured frameworks, as opposed to the informal ways of doing things [16]. Organizations that are immature show inconsistencies in process and methodologies, lack of documentation, reactive decision-making, and inconsistency in project performance. This shows that the organization relies on its own experiences in carrying out activities. PMO readiness, however, describes the ability and the willingness of the organization to move towards a more formal approach in project management via PMO creation. This involves assessing key issues like management commitment, availability of competent personnel, strategic direction, process awareness, and change acceptance. An organization may be aware that it needs a PMO; however, if it is not ready, its efforts in creating one will meet resistance [17]. PMO readiness, therefore, can be seen as a bridging element from informal to formal project management structures. From a governance perspective that is both practical and realistic, particularly for organizations trying to create their own PMO from scratch, maturity and readiness should not be considered as absolutes, but rather as dynamic elements. The primary consideration will not be to ensure that maturity is at its highest level, but to establish basic governance processes like standardization, role clarity, reporting, and basic monitoring. Gradually, as these become stabilized, organizational maturity starts increasing, thus allowing more complex PMO capabilities such as portfolio governance, strategy alignment, and optimization to be achieved. Therefore, organizational maturity and PMO readiness combined make up the basis for development [18].

4. Literature Review

António Monteiro, (2024) examines how the project management office (PMO) integrates the complexity of the link between strategies, projects, and organization in order to improve the performance of business. Yet, there is much complexity in the definition of roles and responsibilities of PMOs since PMOs could be used in many different ways. This paper offers a systematic review of typologies, PMO types, and their associated roles. We were able to identify 16 PMO typologies and 60 PMO types from the literature. It becomes clear from this work that PMOs have great complexity and dynamism and can take diverse shapes and roles[2].

Udechukwu Ojiako, (2025) review the Project Management Offices (PMOs) have been proven to be vital in project, program and portfolio management. In this mini-literature review, there will be a review of the dynamic nature of PMOs with a focus on their functions, types, and strategic value. Although PMOs have historically had an emphasis on facilitation and portfolio management, the

dynamic environment of current projects necessitates PMOs to be able to accommodate novel, complex and uncertain environments. The objective of this mini-literature review is to discuss the trends, contributions, and research areas in PMO-related literature. To accomplish this goal, a bibliometric analysis of the literature regarding PMOs between the years 2002 and 2024 was carried out using VOSviewer through the utilization of information obtained from the SCOPUS database. From this review, the continuous transition from traditional PMO models to newer strategic models that support stakeholder inclusiveness and value creation has emerged as a key theme. Moreover, some of the leading journals, researchers and conferences in the field of PMO will be identified in this paper [19].

Vladimir Obradović, (2022) Modern institutions employ projects for conducting development processes within the organization. The current study uses an extensive literature review in order to propose a conceptual framework for setting up the Project Management Office (PMO) in the public sector. This research paper explores the role of the Project Management Office in project management, the benefits offered by the PMO emphasizing the PMO in the public sector, and finally, provides a theoretical and empirically supported review of project management approaches, methodologies, and models. Using a systematic literature review and based on almost two decades of practical experiences in the area, the principal result of this study is a nine-steps framework for setting up PMO in the public sector.

Jéssica Vivianne (2021) presents a theoretical framework that can be used to conduct research about how the PMO helps organizations execute their strategy in PBB. An exhaustive literature review was conducted in Web of Science and Scopus databases to identify appropriate literature. In this study, 19 articles were analyzed following Saldana's coding cycles (2016). Results indicate that the PMO contributes to strategy execution via project integrity, monitoring processes, integration and communication among projects and stakeholders, standardization of procedures and techniques, alignment of goals, and portfolio management. Through such contributions, PMO contributes to strategies and connects projects and strategies. This leads to creation of an enabling environment that makes it possible for the strategies to be executed. The study is unique in the sense that the focus is on the role of PMO in PBB [20]. Sreekumar Menon's (2024) research paper aims to identify the best project management practices and examine the obstacles that organizations may encounter in implementing these practices. Through the application of best practices, organizations will be able to evade some of the common pitfalls and attain maximum benefits from the project management processes. The main steps in applying the best practices include setting up the PMO as the hub of the project management process, choosing an appropriate methodology, building project manager capabilities, and managing change and risks. In addition, examining project implementation obstacles from the point of view of critical success factors will enable organizations to surmount common difficulties

associated with project management and succeed in the process. Common obstacles that may arise in the implementation of project management practices include top management's lack of support, inefficient stakeholders, poor efficiency of PMO, insufficient project planning, and people-related issues [21].

António Monteiro, (2016) In today's organizations, competitive pressures and globalization, along with changing environment that demands organizational re-engineering of business model structures to increase efficiency. Practices of project management are useful tools to enhance organizational success and raise the value of projects within organization. Project Management Office (PMO) represents a structure designed to support and enhance project management process through employing proper techniques to reach the optimum level of

effectiveness and efficiency. Various functions and roles of PMO were introduced in literature, ranging from PMO with a mere role of reporting project execution, to PMO having role in formulation of organizational strategies. This paper aims to introduce the concept and typology of Project Management Office. Due to the increasing role of PMO in organization, outcomes of this study will be useful for organizational managers in designing and developing their own PMOs [22].

Existing literature extensively discusses PMO typologies and strategic roles; however, limited attention has been given to phased PMO implementation frameworks specifically designed for low-maturity organizations. This gap forms the basis of the present study. As more finding explain in below 1.

Table 1: Comparison Analysis on Literature Review

Author(s) & Year	Focus of Study	Methodology / Approach	Key Findings
Vitor Santos (2016)	PMO concept, roles, and typologies	Literature-based conceptual study	PMOs range from reporting units to strategic governance bodies; typologies vary widely
António Monteiro (2024)	PMO typologies and role complexity	Systematic literature review	Identified 16 typologies and 60 PMO types; PMOs are highly dynamic and context-dependent
Udechukwu Ojiako (2025)	Strategic evolution and bibliometric PMO trends	Bibliometric analysis (Scopus, VOSviewer)	PMOs are shifting from operational to strategic, value-driven entities
Vladimir Obradović (2022)	PMO framework in public sector	Systematic literature review	Developed a nine-step PMO setup framework for public organizations
Jéssica Vivianne (2021)	PMO role in strategy execution (PBB context)	Qualitative literature review (19 articles, coding analysis)	PMO improves strategy execution via alignment, communication, and monitoring
Sreekumar Menon (2024)	PMO best practices and implementation barriers	Conceptual/practice-oriented study	Key barriers include weak leadership support, poor planning, and inefficiency in PMO structure

Research Gap: Despite considerable body of knowledge accumulated by PMO researches, there are still some gaps in it. Previous investigations concentrate mostly on the PMO typology, role and evolution, however, little evidence about the practical influence of PMO types on the performance of organizations is provided. The issue of the PMO evolution from operational to strategic role was considered but the exact measurement of its contribution to value creation and project success remains unconsidered. Moreover, the models of PMO implementation including those of the public sector context are poorly validated for various business sectors and national cultures. Another gap consists of little knowledge about the mechanisms of sustaining strategy-project alignment via PMO.

5. Practical Governance Framework for Building A PMO from Scratch



Fig 2: PMO Governance Framework

Above Figure 2: The framework describes a staged process of creating a PMO incrementally, systematically, and gradually. The first stage involves diagnosing organizational issues and evaluating the level of PM maturity to justify creating the PMO. At the second stage, the organization specifies the goal and scope of the proposed PMO and defines the appropriate model, beginning with less complex supporting services. Then, at the next stage, organizations implement governance by creating policies, defining roles, and developing templates to maintain uniformity and accountability. In the next stage, the focus will be on enhancing organizational capability in terms of training employees, gaining leadership commitment, and developing governance culture. At the next stage, organizations introduce tools that include measurement and performance indicators in order to improve coordination and decision-making. The final stage is characterized by continuous improvement and maturity development that leads organizations from the simplest form of coordination to strategic governance.

In Phase I, (Governance Recognition and Organizational Diagnosis), the company first recognizes issues such as delays, budget overruns, inadequate communication, and a lack of responsibility. After that, it conducts an analysis of the present project environment, which includes the culture, procedures, leadership expectations, and resource capabilities. This stage guarantees that the PMO is implemented in accordance with the actual requirements of the firm [23].

In Phase II, (Defining the Purpose of the PMO), in the beginning stages of the project, the Project Management Office (PMO) is maintained straightforward and functioning, with the primary goals of standardizing project procedures, enhancing visibility, bolstering communication, and providing support for coordination. In addition, the business chooses a PMO type that is ideal for its needs, which can be supporting, controlling, or directive. Supporting PMOs is the most appropriate for enterprises that are not yet fully developed [24].

In Phase III, (Designing the Core Governance Structure) fundamental governance mechanisms are developed. This involves setting the rules for project approval, the formats for reporting, the procedures for escalation, and the communication protocols. There is a clear assignment of duties to various stakeholders, including executive sponsors, project management office (PMO) heads, project managers, and steering committees. For the purpose of avoiding complexity, straightforward templates such as project charters and risk logs are implemented [25].

Phase IV, (Building Organizational Capability), focuses on skills and culture. Training is offered to the employees in the aspects of project planning, risk management, and communications. Leadership, accountability, and communication are the key components of a governance culture. Executive sponsorship is the only thing that can ensure the acceptance of the PMO into society [26].

Phase V is Technology and Performance Integration

phase where companies adopt digital technologies that will enhance their performance. The tools may include dashboards, task management tools, and reporting tools among others. To measure the effectiveness of the PMO, performance indicators are created. These may include compliance with the schedule, budget management, risk management, and stakeholder satisfaction among others [27].

The Final Phase VI (Scaling & Continuous Improvement) is the time during which the PMO will slowly mature. The initial steps include basic coordination and eventually evolve into governance standardization, portfolio management, and finally strategic governance at the last phase. This maturation is facilitated through information exchange, lessons learned sharing, and regular governance reviews [28].

In terms of critical analysis, it appears that the portrayal of staged framework for PMO development presents logical and systematic process from problem realization to strategic governance, thus making the model more practical for organizations with problems associated with lack of maturity in project management. Linear approach to developing PMO is the one providing the opportunity to incorporate governance capacity incrementally and with minimum opposition. Nevertheless, the linear approach may not be relevant to reality since stages may overlap or even repeat due to political reasons, resource availability, and new strategic goals of organization. The paradigm emphasizes importance of governance structure, building capabilities, and using technology; however, lack of consideration of the external factors like market instability, regulation changes, and inter-organizational ties is apparent. The role of strong leaders cannot be overstated but this paradigm does not cover possible problems associated with weak executive support. In spite of all merits of this paradigm, its flaw consists in absence of verifiable maturity levels in transition from operational to strategic governance.

6. Challenges in PMO Implementation

Implementation of a PMO in firms that have a low maturity level in project management is usually a more complicated change process than a mere structural change. Organizational, behavioral, and operational barriers may considerably affect the implementation process. The problems mentioned become very common especially when the level of informality of project management practices is high. Organizational Unawareness about Foundational Governance is one of the biggest challenges when it comes to setting up a PMO in a less mature organization. In such organizations, people have little awareness regarding governance of projects, which results in them depending mostly on their personal experience when making decisions about certain issues. People including senior executives may fail to appreciate the true role of a PMO, which is to serve as an instrument through which an organization improves its project alignment, standardization, and effectiveness [29]. The PMO may be viewed by the people in an organization merely as a way of adding more bureaucracy and increasing workload. This

means that initially, people will be resistant since the importance of process and reporting will not be clear to them. Structural and Role Ambiguity is one of the obstacles that can emerge in implementing the PMO within organizations with low project management maturity. The problem emerges when an organization lacks proper structures, reporting channels, or hierarchical levels in order to manage projects. In such cases, there tends to be some role uncertainty and overlap among the various stakeholder roles involved in the management of projects. The lack of clarity in roles makes it difficult for stakeholders to know who should make decisions. Such a scenario creates a situation where there tends to be poor performance in completing project tasks, inefficient approval processes, and poor departmental coordination [30]. Without clearly defined role descriptions, individuals may end up duplicating work done by others or not taking any ownership because of the presumption that someone else is handling things. In such circumstances, it becomes difficult for a PMO to enforce proper standards due to limited recognition of authority. Leadership & Strategic Alignment Gaps pose a major barrier to PMO implementation in organizations where project management maturity is relatively low. This barrier arises due to lack of consistency on the part of top management in aligning organizational strategic objectives and prioritizing corresponding projects or in providing any tangible support in terms of enforcing the PMO's governance functions. Many organizations adopt the practice of offering mere endorsements that do not carry enough weight to help the PMO exercise control and oversight over all related issues. The result is the failure to assign appropriate authority, resources, and influence for implementing necessary measures in the governance process. Moreover, without clear strategy/project alignment, organizations end up launching various projects that fail to contribute towards meeting strategic organizational objectives in the long run. Therefore, the PMO cannot fulfill its primary objective of serving as an effective integrator of various organizational strategies and plans. Capability and Skills Shortages is a significant problem. This problem appears because employees, especially those who manage projects and their assistants, do not have the skills that are essential for performing projects based on standard procedures. Companies that are at early maturity stages do not possess specialists who would know how to use different practices related to planning, scheduling, risk management, communicating with stakeholders and monitoring performances all of which are necessary for proper PMO operations [31]. Thus, project management becomes rather spontaneous, depending on the experience of people working on certain projects. It also means that the company cannot apply various tools and techniques associated with PMO because its employees cannot comprehend their significance. Hence, it will be difficult for the PMO to make project management predictable and efficient. With time, the deficiency prevents further implementation of PMO in the company. Implementation Challenges of Governance come about due to an organization's efforts to institute a PMO in the absence of prior project management maturity or governance framework. The greatest challenge would be the creation and implementation of governance frameworks that would effectively oversee project activities without bringing in a

bureaucratic approach. At this stage, control and flexibility are never balanced; hence making the implementation process of governance policies and procedures a tough task. Employees may not take favorably to rules such as report formats and procedures since they are seen as limitations to efficient performance. Moreover, the lack of established performance measures makes it even difficult to gauge effectiveness, thus making it a weak basis for decision-making and governance itself. Without proper measures in place, it becomes hard for any organization to measure performance effectively. This therefore leaves most governance initiatives only in name since they become ineffective [32].

7. Conclusion

This study indicates that the establishment of Project Management Office (PMO) in organizations characterized by low levels of project management maturity is essentially a transformational governance approach, rather than a structural one. From the above discussion, it can be seen that even though PMOs have been established as coordination mechanisms that enhance coordination, accountability, and alignment, the success of implementing PMOs lies in organizational readiness, leadership commitment, and cultural flexibility. Where the organization is still immature, variables such as governance ambiguity, lack of competent employees, reluctance toward structure, and lack of strategic alignment limit the performance of PMOs. However, by implementing PMOs using an iterative approach, organizations will be able to mature their PMOs into strategic governance tools. In future, research should focus on creating an empirical framework for transitioning from one level of PMO maturity to another, with specific criteria indicating the extent of achievement of each level of governance. There is need for research on how PMOs perform in different types of organizations, including small businesses, public sector organizations, and organizations undergoing digital transformation. Moreover, future studies should address the role of new technologies such as artificial intelligence, predictive analysis, and dashboards in improving the process of decision-making in PMOs. Additionally, another critical topic for future study should be the effect of organization culture and dynamics on the sustainability of PMO governance effectiveness, particularly in organizations that do not appreciate project management structure. In regard to the policy approach, organizations should consider adopting a step-by-step approach to governance implementation whereby the creation of PMOs should be in accordance with the level of organizational maturity. Internal policies must clearly outline roles, decision rights, escalation processes, and accountability frameworks in order to remove any ambiguities surrounding project delivery. Leadership policies will need to outline the requirement for executive involvement in PMOs such that there is enough power and resources allocated to them in order to effectively integrate project delivery with organizational goals. Organizations need to develop training and certification frameworks for project management skills. Reporting and performance metrics as well as digital tools for project monitoring should be embedded within organizational policy.

References

1. G. Silvius, "The role of the project management office in sustainable project management," *Procedia Comput. Sci.*, vol. 181, pp. 1066–1076, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2021.01.302.
2. A. Monteiro, J. Varajão, and V. Santos, "Project Management Office Typologies, Types, and Functions: A Systematic Analysis of the Literature and Directions for Research," *Proj. Manag. J.*, vol. 56, no. 5, 2025, doi: 10.1177/87569728241297899.
3. M. Ershadi, M. Jefferies, P. Davis, and M. Mojtahedi, "Achieving sustainable procurement in construction projects: The pivotal role of a project management office," *Constr. Econ. Build.*, 2021, doi: 10.5130/AJCEB.v21i1.7170.
4. A. Naresh, R. Rao Thallada, and K. Nallabothu, "Risk-Based Governance for Autonomous Decision Systems," *J. Bus. Manag. Stud.*, vol. 8, no. 6, pp. 69–73, 2026, doi: 10.32996/jbms.2026.8.6.5.
5. J. W. Sajja, G. B. Komarina, and N. K. R. Choppa, "Enterprise Data Transformation in the Era of S/4HANA: Real-World Cloud Migration Architecture, Governance Strategies, and Lessons from the Field," *World J. Adv. Res. Rev.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 3596–3619, May 2025, doi: 10.30574/wjarr.2025.26.2.2038.
6. A. M. Alshabragi, A. S. Almohsen, and A. A. Bin Mahmoud, "Developing a Maturity Rating System for Project Management Offices," *Systems*, vol. 12, no. 9, 2024, doi: 10.3390/systems12090367.
7. O. Ayeni, "Advanced Multi-Phase Project Management Frameworks: Optimizing AI-Driven Decision-Making, Risk Control, and Efficiency.," *Int. J. Res. Publ. Rev.*, 2025, doi: 10.55248/gengpi.6.0325.1117.
8. I. Rincon, "Building a PMO from the Ground Up: Three Stories, One Result," in *PMI Global Congress*, 2014.
9. K. V. Masiba and M. S. Xegwana, "Leadership And Governance Factors In Project Failures: A Focus On Cost And Budget Management," *J. Public Adm. Financ. Law*, 2024, doi: 10.47743/jopaf1-2024-32-21.
10. R. Akhigbe, A. Falemi, and O. T. Akin-Oluyomi, "An Advanced Governance Model for Improving Transparency Accountability and Strategic Execution in Complex Enterprises," *Int. J. Adv. Multidiscip. Res. Stud.*, 2025, doi: 10.62225/2583049x.2025.5.6.5341.
11. L. Yang, Y. Xu, and P. Hui, "Framing metaverse identity: A multidimensional framework for governing digital selves," *Telecomm. Policy*, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.telpol.2025.102906.
12. A. Jha, "AI-Augmented Project Management: The Rise of the Intelligent Project Manager and the Intelligent PMO," *J. Adv. Dev. Res.*, 2025, doi: 10.71097/ijaidr.v16.i2.1616.
13. Z. Zheng, Y. Su, and J. Liu, "Unlocking the Potential of Construction Governance: Developing Participants' Capability Scale," *Systems*, vol. 12, no. 11, 2024, doi: 10.3390/systems12110497.
14. Azzam Hasan Thiab Qaddoura, "The Role of Project Management Office (PMO) in Enhancing Organizational Performance in INGOS," *J. Inf. Syst. Eng. Manag.*, 2025, doi: 10.52783/jisem.v10i46s.8770.
15. C. J. Sawaia, "The PMO as Performance Driver for Non-Profit Organizations – From Operational Data to Strategic Goals," *J. Digit. Innov. Humanit.*, vol. 3, 2022, doi: 10.31355/87.
16. K. Chadwick, "The role of the Project Management Office (PMO) in knowledge management and transfer: A systematic literature review and future research agenda," *Int. J. Manag. Entrepreneur. Res.*, 2025, doi: 10.51594/ijmer.v7i2.1804.
17. Y. V. Sinyagin, "Characteristics of Social Sector Managers with Different Attitudes towards the Pandemic and Its Consequences," *Educ. Self Dev.*, 2022, doi: 10.26907/esd.17.2.19.
18. T. Al Hraki, "Introducing and building the project management office using the ADKAR change model," *Paper. Present. PMI® Glob. Congr. 2013—North Am. New Orleans, LA. Newt. Sq.*, 2013.
19. U. Ojiako, L. Wang, T. Williams, and M. K. S. Al-Mhdawi, "Mini-literature review on Project Management Offices (PMOs)," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2025, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.5140029.
20. J. V. da C. S. de Brito and J. V. de Medeiros Junior, "The contribution of project management offices (PMO) to the strategy implementation in Project-Based Businesses: systematic literature review and proposal of a model," *Rev. Gestão e Secr.*, 2021, doi: 10.7769/gesec.v12i2.1166.
21. S. Menon, "Best Practices and Implementation Challenges in Effective Project Management," *Int. Bus. Res.*, vol. 17, no. 2, 2024, doi: 10.5539/ibr.v17n2p66.
22. A. Monteiro, V. Santos, and J. Varajão, "Project Management Office Models - A Review," *Procedia Comput. Sci.*, vol. 100, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2016.09.254.
23. N. Pouti and M. R. Taghva, "Determining Organizational Maturity of Information Technology with Information Technology and Business Alignment Approach by Capability Maturity Model Integration and Best Practices of Information Technology Infrastructure Library; Case Study: Kermanshah Electric Power Distribution Company," *Iran. J. Inf. Process. Manag.*, 2020.
24. J. Varajão, L. Lopes, and A. Tenera, "Framework of standards, guides and methodologies for project, program, portfolio, and PMO management," 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.csi.2024.103888.
25. A. Al Ahmad, "Project management office: The strategic trend in petroleum industry," in *Society of Petroleum Engineers - Abu Dhabi International Petroleum Exhibition and Conference, ADIPEC 2015*, 2015, doi: 10.2118/177580-ms.
26. C. Bredillet, S. Tywoniak, and M. Tootoonchy, "Exploring the dynamics of project management office and portfolio management co-evolution: A routine lens," *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.04.017.
27. R. Duarte, F. Deschamps, E. P. de Lima, A. Pepino, and R. M. G. Clavijo, "Performance management systems for project management offices: A case-based study,"

- in *Procedia Manufacturing*, 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.promfg.2020.01.397.
28. A. A. A. G. Al Khoori and M. S. R. Abdul Hamid, "Success Factors of PMO Implementation for UAE Project-Based Organizations," *Int. J. Sustain. Constr. Eng. Technol.*, 2022, doi: 10.30880/ijscet.2022.13.04.020.
29. R. J. Mahabir and K. F. Pun, "Revitalizing project management office operations in an engineering-service contractor organization: a key performance indicator-based performance management approach," *Bus. Process Manag. J.*, 2022, doi: 10.1108/BPMJ-10-2021-0655.
30. S. K. Reddy and C. Priyadarshini, "Successful Implementation Of Project Management Office In Industry," *Int. J. Pharm. Sci. Bus. Manag.*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 1–18, 2016.
31. M. Simard and M. Aubry, "The Project Management Office's Active Participation in a Digital Transformation: A Trajectory Full of Twists and Turns," *Proj. Manag. J.*, 2025, doi: 10.1177/87569728241242029.
32. L. F. da Silva and N. J. Rosamilha, "Value Management Office (VMO) as a pillar of organizational value management," *Rev. Gest. E Proj.*, vol. 16, no. 1, 2025, doi: 10.5585/2025.28191.