

Article

Sustainability in Project Management: PM² versus PRiSMTM

Patrícia Marques, Paulo Sousa * and Anabela Tereso 

ALGORITMI Research Center/LASI, Department of Production and Systems, University of Minho, 4800-058 Guimarães, Portugal; patricia.mmm@hotmail.com (P.M.); anabelat@dps.uminho.pt (A.T.)

* Correspondence: paulo.sousa@algoritmi.uminho.pt

Abstract: This paper makes a theoretical contribution by exploring the integration of sustainability principles into project management. It compares two recent methodologies, PM² and PRiSMTM, and provides a practical contribution by advocating for the adoption of these sustainability-driven practices among practitioners. Sustainability remains relatively unknown in the realm of project management, and this study aims to bridge that gap. This study follows an interpretivist philosophy and employs a combination of interviews and archival data analysis. PM², created by the European Commission, provides a project management methodology free to organizations and includes best practices from other bodies of knowledge. However, it does not include sustainability because it aims to be generic. PRiSMTM, based on the P5TM, aims to make the project management process more sustainable. PRiSMTM has a P5 Impact Analysis and Sustainability Management Plan as its main differentiating deliverables and is an extension of the Triple Bottom Line, also including product and process. The PM² Alliance CEO believes that PM² aims to be generic, so a focus on sustainability would remove the methodology's "elasticity". However, users wishing to use PM² and consider sustainability can include it in the additional objectives and use PRiSMTM to differentiate deliverables.

Keywords: P5TM; PM²; PRiSMTM; project management; sustainability



Citation: Marques, P.; Sousa, P.; Tereso, A. Sustainability in Project Management: PM² versus PRiSMTM. *Sustainability* **2023**, *15*, 15917. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su152215917>

Academic Editor: José Carlos Sá

Received: 23 August 2023

Revised: 22 October 2023

Accepted: 30 October 2023

Published: 14 November 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The 17 UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), as well as the 169 targets, are integrated and invisible and, thus, demonstrate the holistic view of this universal 2023 Agenda for Sustainable Development (SD) and align with the three perspectives of SD, according to Fonseca, Carvalho and Santos (2023) [1], as well as other authors [2–5].

The sustainability of people, organizations and the planet is a topic increasingly on everyone's agenda. Sustainability, sustainable development (SD) and project management (PM) have been the main topics of discussion among researchers [6]. Jensen et al. (2016) [7] state that projects are becoming a key fundamental factor for economic and social action. According to Vrchota et al. (2021) [8], sustainability is an integral part of PM practices that maintain the future benefits of the Triple Bottom Line (economic, environmental and social). Silvius (2017) [9] states that sustainability has become an established school of thought in PM. However, current best practice in PM does not consider environmental sustainability [10,11].

Existing PM methodologies are poorly developed in terms of sustainability, and there are few scientific publications relating PM to sustainability. This article aims to help fill this gap by broadening the debate on sustainability in PM and comparing two relatively new PM methodologies—PM² and PRiSMTM—in terms of their approach to sustainability.

This article aims to analyze the presence of sustainability in PM in some PM guides and scientific publications, obtained through the SCOPUS database. In addition, it was chosen to study a relatively recent methodology related to sustainability: PRiSMTM. We decided to study this methodology alongside another methodology, PM², which served as a baseline for comparison. Thus, a comparison was made between these two methodologies

based on their guides and scientific publications. In the search for publications on the PRiSMTM methodology, the P5TM standard was included, since PRiSMTM is based on it.

This article is divided into six sections. In the introduction, Section 1, a brief reference is made to the motivations behind the work, as well as the importance of the topic. Next, the materials and methods section, Section 2, includes the research methodology and methodological process, setting out the process used to locate, select, evaluate and analyze the available studies. Section 3 is dedicated to the theoretical background, with a literature review presenting the basic concepts that underpin this study. The next section, Section 4, is dedicated to presenting the results regarding the occurrence of the term “sustainability” and the analysis of PM² and PRiSMTM methodologies. Finally, Section 5 presents a discussion of the main findings, and Section 6 presents the conclusions.

2. Materials and Methods

This section presents the research methodology and methodological process used for the analysis of the occurrence of the term “sustainability” in PM guides, as well as in scientific publications, and the process used for the analysis of the PM² and PRiSMTM methodologies in scientific publications and through interviews (in the case of the PM² methodology). This study aims to fill the gap in studies related to sustainability in PM and broaden the debate on the subject. We decided to study a relatively recent sustainability-related PM methodology, PRiSM, in conjunction with another methodology. The second methodology chosen for the analysis was PM², as it is also a relatively recent methodology developed by the European Commission and open to all.

According to Stanitsas et al. (2021) [6], many studies present cases regarding the need for PM to evolve on the sustainability path, especially in some more specific sectors, such as industry and construction [12]. The same author, Stanitsas et al. (2021) [6], states that Silvius (2017) [9] makes an argument in which he claims that traditional PM (predictive methodologies) does not successfully address the basic principles of sustainability as presented in the TBL (Triple Bottom Line) scenario—society, the environment and the economy.

2.1. Research Methodology

As depicted in the research onion of Saunders et al. (2019) [13], shown in Figure 1, the research methodology used in this work has the following characteristics:

- Philosophy: interpretivism;
- Approach to theory development: deduction;
- Methodological choice: mixed-method simple;
- Strategies: archival research;
- Time horizon: cross-sectional.
- Techniques and procedures: literature review and analysis, as well as interviews.

Therefore, initially, in this study, a review of the state of the art was carried out regarding the main topics related to this research project to produce the theoretical background using the Scopus, Elsevier, B-on and Google Scholar databases. Then, the number of occurrences of the word “sustainability” in various PM guides was analyzed. After that, the presence of the term sustainability in academic publications and over the years was verified through a search and analysis carried out in the SCOPUS database. Next, the PM² and PRiSMTM methodology guides were analyzed. Also, articles that included the PM² and PRiSMTM methodologies and the P5TM standard, found in various databases (Scopus, Web of Science and B-on), were analyzed, from which the features associated with each of them were drawn. It was the researchers’ choice to include the P5TM standard in the research, since the PRiSMTM methodology is based on it.




Figure 1. “Research Onion” of the project. Adapted from Saunders et al. (2019) [13]. Note: the red circles represent the research methodology choices made in this study.

The methodological process of Systematic Literature Review [14] was used in the analysis of PM² and PRiSMTM methodologies, based on scientific publications, in a structured way to search and analyze the collection of the maximum number of articles (valid and relevant), as recommended by Laursen and Svejvig (2016) [15]. Two interviews were also conducted to confirm some of the findings based on archival research and collect opinions.

2.2. Methodological Process

The methodological process is divided into two subsections: (i) the occurrence of the term “sustainability” (sustainability in PM guides and sustainability in PM in scientific publications) and (ii) PM² and PRiSMTM (PM² and PRiSMTM in scientific publications and PM² interviews). This section will explain the basis and methods used to obtain the results presented in the following chapter, Section 3.

2.2.1. The Occurrence of the Term “Sustainability”

In our study of the occurrence of the term “sustainability”, we decided to study this topic in PM guides and scientific publications. This section describes the methods used to obtain the results presented below in Section 3.2, which is divided into two sub-sections: (i) sustainability in PM guides and (ii) sustainability in PM in scientific publications.

Sustainability in PM guides

Silvius (2017) [9] argues that traditional PM, namely predictive methodologies, do not successfully address the basic principles of sustainability, i.e., the TBL.

As a first approach and to verify the extent of the occurrence of the word sustainability in the various PM guides, a search for the term “sustainab*” in the English guides and “sustentab*” and “sustentav*” in the Portuguese guides was conducted to capture the largest number of words associated with sustainability.

Five guides of traditional PM methodologies/knowledge bodies were used for the search:

- Sustainable Project Management—The Green Project Management (GPM[®]) Reference Guide, by GPM[®] [16];
- Individual Competence Baseline for Project, Programme and Portfolio Management, by International Project Management Association [17];
- A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge—PMBOK[®] Guide by Project Management Institute [18];
- Managing Successful Projects with PRINCE2[®] by AXELOS [19];
- PM² Methodology Guide by PM² ALLIANCE [20].

Sustainability in PM in scientific publications

In order to understand the level of dissemination of sustainability in PM around the world and over the years, a search was carried out in just one database to facilitate the process. The database selected was Scopus because of the huge amount of data it captures, its reliability and transparency and its ease of use. A total of 6769 documents were returned by the SCOPUS database after entering the following search string: TITLE-ABS-KEY (sustainab*) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY ("project management") AND EXCLUDE (PUBYEAR, 2023). The search took place in 2022; however, articles with the year 2023 were also returned. Therefore, we decided to exclude this year from the search.

Figure 2 below shows the search protocol used.




Figure 2. Search protocol of sustainability in PM.

2.2.2. PM² and PRiSMTM

In this section, the publications for the systematic literature review (SLR) of the PM² and PRiSMTM methodologies are selected, and the interviews on the PM² methodology are organized. This section describes the methods used to obtain the results presented below in Section 3.3, which is divided into three sub-sections: (i) analysis based on guides; (ii) analysis based on scientific publications; and (iii) analysis based on interviews. For the analysis based on guides, only the guides related to the two methodologies under study, PM² and PRiSMTM, were used. The methodological process for the analysis based on scientific publications and interviews is presented below.

PM² and PRiSMTM in scientific publications

The research conducted previously was essential to identifying the state of the art on a particular topic [21]. According to Donato and Donato (2019) [22], the SLR allows authors to become knowledgeable about the topic and develop a range of skills, including searching the literature and improving their scientific writing.

According to Furlan et al. (2001) [23], a SLR answers a specific research question and uses systematic, explicit and predefined methods to identify, select and critically evaluate relevant research.

To obtain articles for review on the PM² and PRiSMTM methodology, a search was conducted using the SCOPUS, Web of Science and B-on databases.

Given that the PRiSMTM methodology is based on the P5TM standard, we decided to include it in the search terms to achieve a larger number of results. The article search period considered was between 2013 and 2022 due to the release dates of the publications. The

open edition of the PM² Guide was released in 2016 [24]. The GPM[®] Reference Guide to Sustainability in Project Management, which includes the PRiSM[™] methodology and the P5[™] Standard for Sustainability in Project Management, was released in 2013 [16,25].

The protocol used in the search is summarized in Figure 3.






Figure 3. Search protocol of PM² and PRiSM[™] methodologies.

The process and search strings are shown in Figure 4 for the PM² methodology and in Figure 5 for the PRiSM[™] methodology. Initially, we decided to conduct an extensive search that led to the constitution of a 1st sample of articles. Only the most general terms were used in this search, with no time limits used. After that step, a refined search was conducted, where the time limits were introduced to the search by changing the strings, only considering articles published between 2013 and 2022 and other aspects that were considered important to add, such as the exclusion of the term PM2.5 (since it refers to a different thematic) in the case of the PM² methodology and the insertion of the terms P5 and PRiSM[™] methodology in the case of the PRiSM[™], leading to the 2nd sample. Finally, filtering was carried out where some inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied, resulting in the final set of papers for analysis. The inclusion criterion applied stated that the publications had as their main subject the keywords described above in Figure 3. The exclusion criteria applied were the removal of publications that were not written in English, Portuguese or Spanish; those that were duplicated; those whose full text was not found; and documents that were not within the scope and did not reflect the main objective of the research by reading the title and abstract.

Regarding the PM² search process, as seen in the funnel represented in Figure 4, an extensive search was performed, from which 31 publications were obtained through SCOPUS, four were obtained from Web of Science and were obtained 14 from B-on, totaling 49 publications in the 1st sample. Next, a refined search was performed, where 11 publications were obtained through SCOPUS, four were obtained from Web of Science and 11 were obtained from B-on, representing a total of 26 publications in the 2nd sample. Lastly, a final filtering stage was applied (3rd sample), resulting in a total of eight publications.

Figure 4. PM² search funnel.Figure 5. PRiSMTM search funnel.

Regarding PRiSMTM search process, as seen in the funnel represented in Figure 5, an extensive search was performed, through which 71 publications were obtained from SCOPUS, 22 were obtained from the Web of Science and 38 were obtained from B-on, totaling 131 publications in the 1st sample. Next, a refined search was performed, where 11 publications were obtained through SCOPUS, 10 were obtained from Web of Science and 29 were obtained from B-on, representing a total of 50 publications in the 2nd sample. Fi-

nally, a final filtering step was applied (3rd sample), resulting in a sample of 12 publications to be used in the literature review.

Following the two searches mentioned above, 20 publications relevant to the research project were obtained, with eight referring to the PM² methodology and 12 referring to PRiSMTM. The authors, titles and databases where the documents were found are shown in Table A1, in the Appendix A.

PM² Interviews

The interviews were conducted following a four-phase process [26–28]: (i) the preparation of the interview; (ii) the introduction; (iii) conducting the interview; and (iv) the synthesis and conclusion of the interview evaluation.

During the preparation of the interview, the selection of people or entities that have the necessary knowledge to meet the researcher information takes place. The researcher prepared an interview script as a guide to support the individual conducting the interview. In this stage, the technological means to be used in the interviews should be prepared, as well as the necessary documents to request, for example, authorization to record the interview.

The introduction is the least structured and non-directive phase. This phase should contain the introduction of the subject, the explanation of the researcher's role in the research process and the presentation of the process to the interviewee.

In conducting the interview, the researcher must obtain, from the interviewees, the information required, and the phase should consist of two steps. The thematic step, the most in-depth of the interview, is the step in which issues of interest to the study being carried out are addressed. And the mirror step is the step in which the interviewer clarifies doubts about what was said by the interviewee.

In the synthesis and conclusion of the interview evaluation, the researcher should thank the interviewee for their participation and inform them that the final results of the study, as well as the transcript of the interview, will be sent later.

To understand and explore the knowledge and experience of each of the interviewees concerning the methodologies studied, customized scripts were prepared for each of them, consisting of a range of open-ended questions. The criteria for selecting interviewees were based on their familiarity with the methodology and their practical experience in applying it to projects, enabling them to provide informed comments—Convenience Sampling. The researchers chose to interview a user of the PM² methodology—a researcher who, during their master's thesis research, studied and applied the PM² methodology in the management of projects,—and Nicos Kourounakis—the coauthor of the PM² methodology, the Agile PM² Guide and the PfM² Portfolio Management Guide, as well as President and CEO of the PM² Alliance. The interviews were performed via the Zoom platform, allowing recording with the interviewees' permission. Before the interviews were conducted, the interviewees were asked to sign the consent statement for the interview and its recording.

Table A2, in Appendix B, shows the scripts for the interviews conducted.

3. Theoretical Background

This chapter presents a literature review of the main concepts related to the themes under analysis—PM, sustainability, sustainability in PM and PM² and PRiSMTM methodologies. The literature review was performed based on a search conducted in the Scopus, Elsevier, B-on and Google Scholar databases and the guidebooks.

The literature review process is considered, in most cases, to be an initial activity that can then be refined throughout the life of the research project. This literature review aims to contextualize the present research in relation to previous research that addresses the same subject. The literature review should analyze the most relevant research on the topic [13]. In this way, we decided to review the literature on four themes: (i) PM; (ii) sustainability; (iii) Sustainability in PM; and (iv) PM² and PRiSMTM methodologies. The results are presented in the next subsections.

3.1. Project Management

According to Kerzner (2017) [29], companies are increasingly starting to consider PM as mandatory for their survival. To better understand the meaning of PM, it is important to start by understanding the meaning of project. Tuman (1983) [30] defines a project as an organization of dedicated people seeking to achieve a specific purpose and goal. Projects usually involve large, expensive, unique or high-risk undertakings that must be completed by a certain date, for a certain amount of money and within some expected level of performance. At a minimum, all projects need to have well-defined objectives and sufficient resources to accomplish all necessary tasks.

Once the concept of a project is understood, another concept should be defined: PM. Kerzner (2017) [29] considers PM to consist of planning, organizing, guiding and controlling the resources of a company, in a limited time, to achieve specific goals and objectives.

In addition to these definitions, there are many others in the literature. For a better understanding of the project and PM concepts, Table 1 was prepared, with their definitions determined according to well-known PM standards.

Table 1. Definitions of project and PM concepts.

Standard	Concept Definitions	
	Project	PM
PMI®	"A temporary endeavor undertaken to create a unique product, service, or result" [18] (p. 2).	"The application of knowledge, skills, tools, and techniques to project activities to meet project requirements" [18] (p. 2).
AXELOS	"... the means by which we introduce change and, although many of the skills required are the same, there are some crucial differences between managing business as usual and managing project work" [19] (p. 8).	"... planning, delegating, monitoring and control of all aspects of the project, and the motivation of those involved, to achieve the project objectives within the expected performance targets for time, cost, quality, scope, benefits and risk" [19] (p. 9).
PM ² ALLIANCE	"... a temporary organisation structure set up to create a unique product or service (output) within certain constraints such as time, cost and quality" [20] (p. 5).	"... activities of planning, securing, monitoring and managing the resources and work necessary to deliver specific project goals and objectives in a effective and efficient way" [20] (p. 7).
GPM®	"... an investment that requires a set of coordinated activities performed over a finite period of time in order to accomplish a unique result in support of a desired outcome" [16] (p. 44).	"... application of knowledge, skills, tools, and techniques to coordinate projects effectively and efficiently" [16] (p. 45).
APM	"... unique, transient endeavours, undertaken to bring about change and achieve planned objectives, which can be defined in terms of outputs, outcomes or benefits" [31] (p. 12).	"... application of processes, methods, knowledge, skills and experience to achieve specific objectives for change" [31] (p. 214).
IPMA®	"unique, temporary, multi-disciplinary and organized endeavor to realise agreed deliverables within predefined requirements and constraints" [17] (p. 36).	"Project management is concerned with the application of methods, tools, techniques and competences to a project to achieve goals" [17] (p. 36).

After understanding these two concepts, it is possible to verify and agree with the statement of Munns and Bjeirmi (1996) [32], who argue that the project relates to the definition and selection of a task that will generate future benefits for the company, while the PM is more concerned with planning and control.

In addition to, Wagner (2020) [33] highlights the changes in the world of work that have led projects to become a crucial way to implement innovations, techniques and organizational changes efficiently. According to Wagner (2020) [33], Midler's (1995) [34] article coined the word "projectization", describing it as the diffusion of projects as a form of business organization. The author uses the term "projectization" to describe the evolution and organizational changes at Renault, which transitioned from a classic

functional organization (1960s) to project coordination (1970s) and, finally, to autonomous and powerful project teams (1989). According to Jensen et al. (2016) [7], projects have become a key factor in and vehicle for economic and social action.

Finally, Bourne et al. (2023) [35], referring to the existence of a misalignment between goals and governance, highlight the need to use governance to guide the project over time.

3.2. Sustainability

Sustainable Development (SD) has been on the United Nations' (UN) agenda for more than 40 years, since the first conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm in 1972 [36]. In 1987, the World Commission on Environment and Development defined the concept of SD as development that meets the existing needs of current generations without compromising the needs of future generations [37]. However, some authors highlight that this definition does not provide good guidance on how to identify present and future needs, the technologies and resources needed to meet these needs and how to effectively balance the organizational responsibilities of the various stakeholders, which makes this definition difficult to apply in practice for organizations [38,39]. Furthermore, this definition encompasses social, environmental and economic issues that are generally operationalized through the TBL [40]. TBL is a SD concept that integrates three dimensions: profit, planet and people [41]. Figure 6 shows the interconnection of the various elements of this concept and their definitions.



Figure 6. The interconnection of the elements of the Triple Bottom Line concept [42] (p. 3).

Figure 6 shows that people represent the social variables, profit represents the economic variables and planet represents the environmental variables.

According to Schieg (2009) [43], TBL is a new understanding of the success of organizations, where their performances must strike a balance between economic, ecological and social criteria. This new understanding suggests that companies should be dedicated not only to socially and environmentally responsible behavior but also to achieving positive financial gains [40].

The United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development, in 2001, developed SD indicators that encompass guidelines and methodologies to guide decision-making [44]. Gladwin et al. (1995) [45] describe SD as a process to achieve human development in an inclusive, connected, equitable, prudent and safe manner. The European Commission

describes Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as a concept under which companies integrate social and environmental concerns into their operations and interact with their stakeholders voluntarily [46].

A survey conducted by the UN Global Compact on Accenture CEO Study on Sustainability concludes that CEOs believe in a new era of sustainability, which encompasses a new way of assessing corporate performance. In this new era, the focus will shift to long-term value creation, involving social and environmental impact, and away from just financial profit and loss [47].

In 2015, the 2030 Agenda defined the 17 SDGs, as represented in Figure 7 [48].



Figure 7. United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) [16] (p. 10).

These SDGs and the targets set were intended to stimulate action for the next 15 years, through an action plan that acts in five key dimensions [48]:

- People—seeks to end poverty and hunger;
- Planet—involves meeting present and future needs while protecting the planet from degradation;
- Prosperity—seeks to ensure that all human beings have prosperous and fulfilling lives;
- Peace—seeks just, peaceful and inclusive societies free from fear and violence;
- Partnership—seeks the means necessary to implement this agenda.

Projects generally affect sustainability both directly (by creating pollution and misusing resources) and indirectly (by creating products and/or services that indirectly affect sustainability) [49]. The study “Insights on Sustainable Project Management”, carried out by GPM®, observed that 96% of respondents believe that projects and PM are essential for SD [50].

Tsalis et al. (2020) [51] claim that the pressure on companies to report on sustainability strategies has been increasing. According to the authors, many companies have adopted strategies to achieve SD goals.

In 2019, the European Green Deal was presented in Brussels as a way forward to achieve a sustainable economy in the European Union. This pact aims to eliminate net greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, making Europe the first climate-neutral continent [52].

3.3. Sustainability in Project Management

Carvalho and Rabechin (2017) [53] and Ivanov et al. (2020) [54] state that it was only in 2010 that the link between PM and sustainability began. However, for other authors, this link started earlier [6,55,56]. Stanitsas et al. (2021) [6] state that sustainability, SD and PM have become the main topics of discussion among researchers in recent years. For Sabini et al. (2019) [57], sustainability influences traditional PM tools, techniques

and methodologies. Huemann and Silvius (2017) [58] highlight the importance of PM concerning the SD of organizations and society.

Kerzner (2017) [29] argues that the result (and success) of a project has moved from just being a delivery to the creation of business value in a sustainable way. However, there is a lack of a framework to enable the analysis and assessment of sustainability, i.e., a useful and applicable method for projects [59–61].

Kerzner (2017) [29] presents a future definition of the concepts of project—a collection of sustainable business value scheduled for realization; program—a collection of projects designed to achieve a business objective and create sustainable business value within established competing constraints; and success—achieving the desired business value within competing constraints [29]. PM's role is to identify relevant ecological systems, recognize the internal and external dimensions of social responsibility and test existing Corporate Social Responsibility standards for their applicability in projects [43].

In PM, Corporate Social Responsibility means a systematic combination of interest in the project with an interest in public welfare [43]. For PM to add value to projects, it needs to take into account ecological and social aspects [43]. Eskerod and Huemann (2013) [62] expect project stakeholder management in a SD context to be a necessity in the future. However, PM standards do not explicitly take into account SD principles [62].

Silvius and Schipper (2014) [10] consider sustainable PM to take into account the environmental, economic and social aspects of the life cycles of project resources, processes, deliverables and effects. However, some authors, [59–61] consider that there is a lack of a common framework and language to analyze and assess sustainability that can be applied to projects [59–61]. Schieg (2009) [43] and Goedknegt and Silvius (2012) [63] stress the importance of Project Managers taking responsibility for sustainability.

Also, Valdes-Vasquez and Klotz (2013) [64] point out that integrating the social considerations of end-users and considerations of the project's impact on society will improve not only the long-term performance of the project but also the quality of life of those affected by the project.

Business leaders are switching from current economic models, which devalue natural resources and only consider profit as an indicator of success, to new models that reward environmentally sustainable products and services [16].

Although the presence of sustainability in PM events is intense [58], Brones et al. (2014) [11] and Silvius and Schipper (2014) [10] claim that current PM best practices do not consider environmental sustainability. In the same line of thought, Eskerod and Huemann (2013) [62] state that PM standards do not explicitly consider SD principles. According to Carboni et al. (2018) [16], PM should make greater efforts to address social and environmental impacts in each project. According to some authors, sustainability has a positive impact on project success [8,53,65]. Other authors enhance the importance of integrating sustainability into methodologies and bodies of knowledge in order to respond to market needs [55,56,66,67]. On the other hand, A. Silvius and Schipper [10] argue that ensuring the sustainable management of a project will lead to minimal waste.

3.4. PM^2 and $PRiSM^{TM}$ Methodologies

This section presents in a nutshell two relatively recent methodologies, PM^2 and $PRiSM^{TM}$, which were studied in this study.

3.4.1. PM^2

The PM^2 methodology, developed by the European Commission, aims to “... enable Project Managers (PMs) to deliver solutions and benefits to their organizations by effectively managing the entire lifecycle of their project” [20] (p. 1). This methodology, although it can be used by any organization, was created to respond to the needs of the institutions and projects belonging to the European Union [20].

The PM^2 methodology, according to PM^2 ALLIANCE (2018) [20], has the following advantages:

- Uses universally accepted PM best practices;
- Has a common vocabulary, which allows the easy communication and application of the concepts;
- Establishes a link to the PM² Agile and PM² Project Portfolio Management models;
- Is simple and easy to apply;
- Improves the effectiveness of PM;
- Provides templates and guidelines for the process and artefacts used.

Figure 8 summarizes all phases of the PM² methodology, including the inputs, outputs and key activities of each phase.




Figure 8. PM² swimlane diagram [20] (p. 18).

The PM² methodology has four phases: Initiation Phase, Planning Phase, Execution Phase and Closing Phase. In addition to these phases, the methodology provides and advocates the use of monitoring and control activities throughout the project life cycle.

The Initiation Phase includes the definition of the intended results, the elaboration of the Business Case and the definition of the project's scope. This phase starts with the Project Initiation Request, where an idea or need is identified. This is followed by the identification of stakeholders and their needs. After that, the project is defined in more detail, and the economic justification for the project occurs, giving rise to the Business Case. Finally, the scope and organization of the project are defined, and the Project Charter is created (includes more details about the scope, cost, time, quality, risk and constraints and general requirements and establishes project milestones and deliverables). The flowchart of the Initiation Phase is shown in Figure 9, where the activities and main deliverables are presented [20].

The Planning Phase starts with a Planning Kick-off Meeting. After that, the PM² process is adapted, creating the Project Handbook and Management Plans. Then, the roles and responsibilities are assigned, developing the Project Stakeholder Matrix. This is followed by the Project Work Plan, which breaks down the work and defines the project schedule. In addition, there are other important plans, such as the Outsourcing Plan, the Deliverables Acceptance Plan, the Transition Plan and the Business Implementation Plan. After the approval by the Project Steering Committee, the Execution Phase occurs. The flowchart of the Planning Phase is shown in Figure 10, where the activities and main deliverables are presented [20].




Figure 9. Initiating phase activities and main outputs [20] (p. 31).




Figure 10. Planning phase activities and main outputs [20] (p. 39).

The Executing Phase starts with an Execution Kick-Off Meeting. The Project Coordination starts simultaneously with the beginning of the project and ends with its completion. To certify that the project work follows the best practices and standards, there is the Quality Assurance activity, defined in the Quality Management Plan (allowing us to certify that the project will have the intended scope and quality requirements and consider the project constraints). In this phase, the Project Reports are elaborated, allowing us to document the evolution of the project to keep the relevant stakeholders informed. After the Project Owner accepts the project deliverables and the Project Steering Committee authorizes them, the Project Manager can move on to the Closing Phase. A summary of the Executing Phase is shown in Figure 11, where the activities and main deliverables are presented [20].




Figure 11. Executing Phase activities and main outputs [20] (p. 55).

The Closing Phase involves finishing all activities, drawing lessons learned and recommendations and closing and archiving all documents related to the project. This phase starts with a Project-End Review Meeting. All the experience taken from the project is summarized in the Project-End Report (where the lessons learned are found). Once all the activities of this phase have been completed and after the Project Owner's approval, the project is officially closed. The flowchart of the Closing Phase, with its activities and main outputs, as recommended by the PM² methodology, is shown in Figure 12 [20].




Figure 12. Closing Phase activities and main outputs [20] (p. 63).

Monitor and Control is a set of activities, according to PM², that occurs throughout the project life cycle, although it has greater relevance in the Executing Phase. Monitoring and controlling encompasses the control of all work by the Project Manager, such as measuring progress; managing changes, risks and problems; identifying and applying corrective measures; and monitoring activities [20].

3.4.2. PRiSM™

The PRiSM™ methodology is based on the P5™ Standard for Sustainability in Project Management and aims to make the PM process more sustainable [16]. For this reason, a short explanation of the P5™ standard is presented.

The P5™ standard is based on internationally recognized standards, among them the 2030 Agenda for SD, the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Ten Principles of the UN Global Compact, ISO 20400:2017 [68], ISO 37001:2016 [69] and ISO 14001:2015 [70]. The main objective of P5™ involves the identification of possible negative and positive sustainability impacts to be analyzed and presented to management for informed decision-making and effective resource allocation [49].

The PRiSM™ methodology has five phases: the Pre-Project Phase, Discovery Phase, Design Phase, Delivery Phase and Closure Phase. The Design and Delivery phases can be repeated several times. Figure 13 shows the workflow of the PRiSM™ methodology, encompassing the five phases, which are summarized below, according to the GPM® reference guide [16].




Figure 13. PRiSM™ methodology workflow [71].

The Pre-Project Phase includes identifying the project objectives, determining the project sponsor and project manager partnership, beginning the development of the Business Case and reviewing previous lessons learned. The Business Case may include, and in most cases does include, a high-level project plan (which has key deliverables, schedule targets, cost estimates, assumptions and possible primary constraints and risks). At the end of each phase, the Phase-End Review takes place, where the PM team must evaluate what has been accomplished to define whether the project should move on to the next phase. The summary of the Pre-Project Phase is shown in Figure 14 [16].

The Discovery Phase includes the definition of requirements, the alignment of the Business Case with the organization's systems and the identification, analysis and conversion into opportunities of sustainability impacts.




Figure 14. Pre-Project Phase flowchart [16] (p. 51). Note: A—Project phase results.

This phase starts with the review of the plan developed in the Pre-Design Phase by the PM team to ensure that it remains relevant and useful. In this stage, the process of collecting the necessary information to complete the requirements documents (sustainability, user, functional, non-functional and implementation) takes place.

Next, it is necessary to reconcile the project objectives and plans with the organization's systems. Furthermore, this phase encompasses the determination of the requirements that will be addressed in each phase of the project and the Delivery. Another step belonging to this phase involves the P5 Impact Analysis, which involves analyzing environmental, social and economic criteria to achieve sustainable results. Also, in this phase, it becomes important to check the validity of the Business Case. If necessary, it should be updated. Finally, the Phase-End Review takes place, and the decision to move forward with the project to the next phase or close it is taken by the sponsor. The summary of the Discovery Phase is shown in Figure 15 [16].




Figure 15. Discovery Phase flowchart [16] (p. 52). Note: A—Project phase results; B—Discovery phase results.

In the Design Phase, the solution is designed, a sustainability analysis is carried out and acceptance criteria are established. The Design Phase begins with the review and validation of the plan developed by the project team in the previous phase. Next, the projection of a product or service of the project takes place to determine the needs related to resources, costs, schedule, risk, value, benefits and impacts. After that, the definition

of acceptance criteria follows, where criteria to be met before the approval of the project deliveries by the sponsor are documented. At this stage, it is also important to update the Business Case, so that it remains valid. In addition, the execution of the P5 Impact Analysis takes place, where the design processes are analyzed concerning environmental, social and economic criteria to ensure that the results are considered sustainable. As in the previous phases, at the end of the Design Phase, the Phase-End Review takes place. The summary of the Design Phase is shown in Figure 16 [16].




Figure 16. Design Phase flowchart [16] (p. 54). Note: B—Discovery phase results; C—Design phase results.

The Delivery Phase includes the production of the required deliverables by the project team to achieve the expected objectives and benefits. This phase also starts with the review and validation of the plan developed at the end of the previous phase. From that moment onward, components are developed, and the project deliverables are made or purchased. In addition, the testing of the acceptance criteria takes place, so that the sponsor can decide on the project deliveries and the update of the Business Case. In this phase, a P5 Impact Analysis is also carried out, where the delivery processes are analyzed concerning environmental, social and economic criteria. At the end of this phase, the Phase-End Review also takes place. The summary of the Pre-Project Phase is shown in Figure 17 [16].




Figure 17. Delivery Phase flowchart [16] (p. 56). Note: C—Design phase results; D—Delivery phase results.

In the Closure Phase, the adoption of the project deliverables by the project team is facilitated, and the project is administratively closed. This phase starts with the review and validation of the plan developed at the end of the previous phase. After that, acceptance

and adoption facilitation takes place, where the sending of deliverables to relevant parties and their adoption are coordinated, which may include support to ongoing operations and maintenance, organizational changes and end-of-life planning. In addition, a final project review takes place, where successful or unsuccessful elements of the project are reviewed by the project team. Also, in this phase, information for the Sustainability Report is provided through the production of an organizational materiality report of the Sustainability Management Plan. Finally, the formal release of the project team and the realization of business benefits as a result of the project takes place. The summary of the Closure Phase is shown in Figure 18 [16].




Figure 18. Closure phase flowchart [16] (p. 57). Note: D—Delivery phase results.

4. Results

This chapter contains the results obtained from the analysis of the presence of the term “sustainability” in PM guides and scientific publications and the analysis of PM² and PRISMTM methodologies based on guides, scientific publications and interviews.

4.1. The Presence of the Term “Sustainability”

This section presents the results obtained from the analysis of the presence of sustainability in some PM guides and scientific publications obtained through the SCOPUS database.

4.1.1. Sustainability in Project Management Guides

From the previously mentioned guides, as discussed in Section 2.2.2, we removed the number of times the words mentioned previously in the same section appeared, as shown in Figure 19.

Through the analysis of this figure, it can be concluded that the standard that most mention sustainability is the GPM[®] standard, with a total of 276 mentions, which would already be expected since its vision focuses on the “green” PM. The PM² methodology was, among the standards analyzed, the one which mentioned sustainability the least, with only one mention. ICB4 mentions this topic 96 times, PMBOK[®] mentions it 10 times and PRINCE2[®] mentions it eight times.

4.1.2. Sustainability in Project Management in Scientific Publications

To understand to what extent sustainability in PM is disseminated throughout the world and over the years, the 6769 documents, returned via the SCOPUS database mentioned earlier in Section 2.2.2., were analyzed. The results are present in Figures 20 and 21.




Figure 19. Number of occurrences of the word sustainability in the PM guides.




Figure 20. Number of sustainability papers in PM around the world.




Figure 21. The number of documents about PM sustainability per year.

The number of papers found is considered relatively small, a fact also noted and justified by Stanitsas et al. (2021) [6], and this issue is due, according to the same author, to the fact that the area under analysis is relatively new and under development.

The separation of the articles based on the continents from which they originated is shown in Figure 20.

Through the analysis of Figure 20, it can be seen that North America, Europe, Asia and Australia have more publications on sustainability in PM than Africa and South America.

The United States, China and the United Kingdom are the three countries with the most documents on this subject. It should be noted that in Portugal, the number of documents on these themes seems to be relatively small.

Next, the temporal distribution of the documents was carried out to identify the trend over the years, which resulted in the graph shown in Figure 21.

By analyzing Figure 21, the following results can be observed:

1. The junction of the two themes appears in the 1980s, more precisely in the year 1986, with only one publication;
2. Between 1985 and 1994, the number of published articles can be considered insignificant;
3. An abrupt growth in the number of publications occurred between the years 1999 and 2004;
4. The years 2004 and 2005 had more papers that include the theme of sustainability in PM;
5. A decreasing trend was identified from 2004 to 2009;
6. A gradual rise was noted between 2009 and 2021, with some occasional exceptions.

The chart presented in Figure 22 was elaborated to depict the most “active” areas in terms of scientific writing on the topic of sustainability in PM.




Figure 22. Number of publications by scientific area.

From the analysis of the graph in Figure 22, it can be concluded that the three areas that produce the majority of the documents with the theme of sustainability in the PM are (i) engineering, (ii) environmental science and (iii) business, management and accounting. The last three positions are occupied by (i) immunology and microbiology, (ii) veterinary medicine and (iii) neuroscience.

After the analysis presented above, another analysis was performed, using the VOSVIEWER 1.6.19 software, to perform the separation by word clusters. The result is shown in Figure 23.




Figure 23. Co-occurrence of terms in the 6769 documents.

On one hand, the ten most mentioned topics are PM, SD, construction industry, sustainability, decision-making, environmental impact, economic and social effects, strategic planning, planning and societies and institutions.

On the other hand, the ten least mentioned topics are water resources management, climate change, ecology, problem-solving, employee training, cost efficiency, waste management, innovation, marketing and social aspects. It should be noted that the construction industry cluster is one of the clusters that, judging by the number of publications, is giving more importance to the topic of sustainability in PM.

4.2. Analysis of PM² and PRiSMTM Methodologies

This subsection presents the results of the analysis carried out on the two methodologies under study—PM² and PRiSMTM—in order to verify where the differences and similarities lie, both in terms of the approaches and tools/techniques proposed by the methodologies. This analysis is divided into three parts: analyses based on their guides, scientific publications and interviews.

4.2.1. Analysis Based on Guides

One of the major differences between these two methodologies can be found regarding their main objective:

- PRiSMTM—to make the PM process more sustainable;
- PM²—to address the needs of institutions and projects owned/funded by the European Union, although, according to PM² Alliance (2018) [20], it can be used by

any organization and applied to any project or activity. PM² allows adaptation and customization to effectively address the needs of any project.

Next, the similarities and differences between the definitions of the “project” and “PM” of the two methodologies were analyzed. The results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Project and PM definitions according to PM² ALLIANCE and GPM[®].

	PM ² (PM ² ALLIANCE)	PRiSM TM (GPM [®])
Project	“A project is a temporary organisational structure set up to create a unique product or service (output) within certain constraints such as time, cost and quality” [20] (p. 5).	“GPM defines a project as “an investment that requires a set of coordinated activities performed over a finite period of time in order to accomplish a unique result in support of a desired outcome” [16] (p. 45).
PM	“Project Management can be described as the activities of planning, organising, securing, monitoring and managing the resources and work necessary to deliver specific project goals and objectives in an effective and efficient way” [20] (p. 7).	“Project management is the application of knowledge, skills, tools, and techniques to coordinate projects effectively and efficiently” [16] (p. 46).

By analyzing Table 2, it can be observed that the projects definition presented in PRiSMTM and PM² appear to be very similar. Common points are the finite period of time, with a defined beginning and end, and the intention to create a unique result, which has not previously been imagined. However, while the PRiSMTM methodology defines a project as an investment, PM² defines it as an organizational structure. PM definitions have the same objective: to coordinate projects and achieve goals effectively and efficiently.

To simplify the comparison of the life cycles of the two methodologies, a summary is presented in Figure 24.




Figure 24. Comparison between the phases of the PM² and PRiSMTM methodologies.

Another difference that can be highlighted relates to the number and name of the phases of the project life cycle. The “PM² project” is divided into four phases: (i) Initiating Phase; (ii) Planning Phase; (iii) Executing Phase; and (iv) Closing Phase. The “PRiSMTM project” is divided into five phases: (i) Pre-project Phase; (ii) Discovery Phase; (iii) Design Phase; (iv) Delivery Phase; and (v) Closure Phase. The only phase with a similar name is the Closing/Closure Phase.

Based on the analysis of Figure 24, it can be seen that the PRiSMTM methodology identifies and analyzes sustainability impacts, converts them into opportunities in the

Discovery Phase and refines a sustainability analysis in the Design Phase. So, there is a great focus on the question of sustainability during the design of the project. The PM² methodology does not mention this issue—sustainability—directly in any of its phases. As mentioned earlier (Figure 19), the word sustainability is only mentioned once in the entire guide. The mention of the word “sustainability” appears in the appendices, in the PM² program management in PM² extensions, in the Closing Phase: “The Lessons Learned and Post-Programme Recommendations are formulated in the Programme-End Report, facilitating the sustainability of the realised benefits after the programme has ended” [20] (p. 108). Thus, it can be verified that sustainability appears, in a direct way, only associated with the future benefits associated with the project and is never mentioned during the project’s Executing Phase.

Next, an analysis and comparison of the deliverables of the two methodologies was conducted (see Table 3).

Table 3. Deliverables of the PM² and PRiSMTM methodologies.

Methodology	Deliverables			
	Initiating	Planning	Executing	Closing
PM ²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Initiation Request Business Case Project Charter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Kick-off Meeting Project Handbook Project Stakeholder Matrix Project Work Plan Outsourcing Plan Deliverables Acceptance Plan Transition Plan Business Implementation Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executing Kick-off Meeting Project Coordination Quality Assurance Project Reporting Information Distribution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project-End Review Meeting Project-End Report Administrative Closure
	Monitor and Control			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor Project Performance Control Schedule Control Cost Manage Stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage Requirements Manage Project Changes Manage Risks Manage Issues and Decisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage Quality Manage Deliverables Acceptance Manage Business Implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage Transition Manage Outsourcing
PRiSM TM	Management Plans (as required):			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business Case P5 Impact Analysis Requirements Document Design Document Sustainability Management Plan Project Success Criteria Stakeholder Engagement Plan Lessons Learned 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability Management Benefits Realization Management Communications Management Cost Management Procurement Management Quality Management Risk Management Schedule Management Scope Management Stakeholder Engagement Management 	

By analyzing the artefacts in Table 3, it can be observed that in the PM² methodology, there is no artefact related to sustainability. In the PRiSMTM methodology, there is the P5

Impact Analysis and the Sustainability Management Plan, an artefact directly linked to sustainability. In common, the methodologies have the Business Case and the Requirements Document. Most of the remaining deliverables seem similar in terms of scope but with slightly different names, which may be an obstacle to their simultaneous use in the same organization. Therefore, it can be confirmed that results referred to in the methodology itself regarding the P5 Impact Analysis and the Sustainability Management Plan are the main differentiators from other approaches [16].

The PRiSMTM methodology establishes success criteria (Structured Success Criteria, Product Success Criteria, Project Management Success Criteria and Criteria for Good Success Criteria) concerning the product and the PM in the Business Case. In addition, in monitoring and control, the success criteria are referred to, since the objective of controlling is presented as the best way to achieve the project success criteria. We still propose the application of corrective actions to improve the opportunity to achieve the success criteria, and it is up to the sponsor to verify the viability of a project considering the success criteria in the various phases [16]. The PM² methodology establishes success criteria, via which the project will be evaluated, in the Project Initiation Request [20]. Therefore, it can be stated that the success criteria are more detailed in the PRiSMTM methodology, which in itself is a guarantee of a better understanding by all stakeholders.

4.2.2. Analysis Based on Scientific Publications

The 20 publications referred to previously were analyzed according to their areas of study, years of publication, geographical dispersion and methodologies' features.

Of the eight publications referring to PM², five are Conference Papers and three are Journal Papers. Of the 12 publications referring to PRiSMTM, five are Conference Papers and seven are Journal Papers. Thus, it can be seen that the publications relating to the PM² methodology are mostly Conference Papers, while those of the PRiSMTM methodology are Journal Papers.

Initially, the publications were analyzed according to their areas of study, which resulted in the histograms shown in Figures 25 and 26.




Figure 25. Study area frequency—PM² methodology.

Through the analysis of the histograms, it is clear that the publications of the PM² methodology are more concentrated in the areas of computer science and business, management and accounting. In the case of the PRiSMTM methodology, the publications are more concentrated in the areas of engineering and materials science, different to the PM² methodology.




Figure 26. Study area frequency—PRiSM™ methodology and P5™ standard.

The number of articles published per year regarding the two methodologies is shown in Figure 27.




Figure 27. Number of publications per year—PM² and PRiSM™ methodology.

Based on the analysis of the graph (Figure 27), there is an increasing trend in the number of publications that address the PM² methodology. Those that address the PRiSM™ methodology, contrary to expectations, show a decreasing trend. From the analysis of the graph, it is also possible to conclude that the two methodologies—PM² and PRiSM™—went in a counter-cycle: while one gained traction, the other decreased in popularity in terms of the number of publications between 2015 and 2019. Only between the years 2020 and 2022 are the methodologies aligned in terms of publication number trends—when one grows, the other also grows, and when one declines, the other also declines, although with small differences in pace.

To analyze how the 20 selected publications are distributed throughout the world map based on the identified country of publication, two graphs were produced (Figures 28 and 29), one for articles referring to PM² and another for articles referring to PRiSM™.




Figure 28. Number of documents on PM² methodology per country.




Figure 29. Number of documents on PRiSM™ methodology per country.

By analyzing Figure 28, it can be noted that most publications originate from the European continent. This fact may be due to the PM² methodology being developed by the European Commission. It should be noted that the only country which has a publication on this methodology and does not belong entirely to the European continent is Russia, a country which belongs to both the European and Asian continents. Another relevant fact is that Portugal is the country with the most articles on this topic, with a total of four publications. However, three of these publications are related to the same theme, successful management in PM, and belong to the same authors [72–74].

By analyzing Figure 29, it can be verified that 50% of the previously selected publications on the PRiSM™ methodology and the P5™ standard originate from Malaysia, a Southeast Asian country and that only four out of 12 total publications originate from Europe, not including Russia, a Euro-Asian country. Contrary to the PM² methodology, the selected publications mainly originate from continents other than the European continent. The GPM® aims to encourage sustainable business and achieve the 2030 SDGs presented by the UN, an organization that is present all over the world. This may justify this dispersion across the globe.

Through the reading and analysis of the selected papers, some important conclusions regarding the two methodologies under study were drawn. Some features concerning the PM² methodology are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Features of the PM² methodology according to the authors.

Feature	Author and Year ¹								Total
	A 2017	B 2019	C 2019	D 2020	E 2021	F 2021	G 2021	H 2022	
Good “recipe book”	✓								1
Includes transition management	✓						✓		2
Embracing	✓							✓	2
Simple and easy to implement	✓						✓	✓	3
Standardized language		✓	✓						2
Best practices from other bodies of knowledge	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	7
Customizable								✓	1
Available online					✓	✓		✓	3
Free		✓	✓			✓			3
Shift from traditional design to a holistic view	✓								1
PM ² Alliance certification is available					✓				1
Follows a process approach							✓		1
Describes individual strengths/virtues	✓				✓				2
Description of skills and virtues is limited and fragmented	✓								1
Offers templates of the artefacts					✓				1
Artefacts with unclear explanations								✓	1
Smallest dimension								✓	1
Includes specific activities to identify success factors and criteria in the initiation and planning stages		✓	✓	✓					3
Does not clearly address success management in all phases of the project		✓	✓	✓					3
Lack of scientific papers regarding its use								✓	1

¹ Legend: A—Pantouvakis (2017) [75]; B—Takagi and Varajão (2019) [72]; C—Takagi et al. (2019) [73]; D—Takagi and Varajão (2020) [74]; E—Moya-Colorado et al. (2021) [76]; F—Fiddicke et al. (2021) [77]; G—Katunina and Fomina (2021) [78]; H—Ribeiro-Lopes et al. (2022) [79]; ✓—Feature mentioned by the author on that date and article.

By viewing the table, it can be seen that, in the opinion of the authors of the publications, the most mentioned feature relates to the fact that the methodology includes best practices from other bodies of knowledge, followed by the fact that it is a free methodology.

On the other hand, an analysis of the same authors’ articles was conducted to draw conclusions concerning the PRiSMTM methodology and the P5TM standard. The respective taxonomies were built, which resulted in Table 5.

Table 5. Characteristics of the PRiSMTM and P5TM methodologies, according to the authors.

Feature	Author and Year ¹										Total
	A 2015	B 2016	C 2016	D 2016	E 2016	F 2016	G 2016	H 2017	I 2018	J 2018	
Value-oriented methodology	✓										1
Principles of “green” management	✓										1
P5 TM can be developed at any stage of the process				✓							1
Set of good practices for companies’ SD				✓							1
First PM tool for sustainability analysis					✓						1
Guide to implement sustainable objectives				✓							1
Combines three basic CSR parameters				✓							1
Stepping stone to effective CSR practice				✓							1
Comprehensive			✓								1
Extension of TBL, considers profit, planet, people, product and process		✓	✓		✓			✓		✓	5
Set of good practices for SD				✓							1
Increased longevity and profitability		✓									1
P5 TM can be a training pathway for engineering students							✓	✓			2
Contains sustainability components at the organizational level					✓						1
Creates difficulties in a single-project context					✓						1
Representation of life cycle processes only occurs on a qualitative level									✓		1
Minimal research in developing countries			✓								1

¹ Legend: A—Verba and Ivanov (2015) [80]; B—Turan and Johan (2016) [81]; C—Turan et al. (2016) [82]; D—Salcedo Díaz et al. (2016) [83]; E—Szabó (2016) [84]; F—Johan and Turan (2016) [85]; F—Johan and Turan (2016) [86]; H—Wan Lanang et al. (2017) [87]; I—Piterska, Kolesnikov, et al. (2018) [88]; J—Lanang et al. (2018) [89]; ✓—Feature mentioned by the author on that date and article.

By analyzing Table 5, it can be seen that the most mentioned feature is related to the fact that it is an extension of the TBL—profit, planet and people—since it also includes the product and the process, followed by the fact that the P5TM standard can be a training path, which includes sustainability, for engineering students.

4.2.3. Analysis Based on Interviews

This section presents the results obtained from the interviews conducted with a user of the PM² methodology and Mr. Nicos Kourounakis, co-author of the PM² methodology.

Interview with a user of PM² methodology

This section presents the results obtained from an interview with a former researcher from the University of Minho who carried out a project, which involved the use of the PM² methodology. Table 6 shows the key points from this interview.

Table 6. Summary of results obtained from the interview with the user of PM² methodology.

Question Topic	Answer
PM ² Advantages	Free; Small size; Well-built methodology; Useful; Valid; Easy to apply; Similar to other guidelines; Allows the customization of the documents; Artefacts are adaptable and adjustable to the project.

Table 6. *Cont.*

Question Topic	Answer
PM ² Disadvantages	Difficulty in finding training related to the methodology; Confusing initial phase; Lack of follow-up regarding success management during the project; Tools of the final part of the methodology are little explored.
PM ² Future Suggestions	Documentation management—moving from Word and Excel documents to a digital platform.
PRiSM TM	No knowledge of the GPM [®] , the P5 TM standard and the PRiSM TM methodology.
Sustainability	Increased appreciation and importance of sustainability area over time; Sustainability criteria should be more regularly included.
	PM ² mentions sustainability for the following reasons:
Sustainability PM ²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It advocates that PM should be carried out more effectively and efficiently with the optimization of resources; • It is adaptable; • The methodology does not speak directly on the environmental part; • The methodology does not predict sustainability criteria; • The insertion of sustainability is viable since the methodology is adaptable.

Interview with Mr Nicos Kourounakis

Table 7 presents a summary table encompassing the key points of the interview with Mr Nicos Kourounakis.

Table 7. Summary of the results obtained from the interview with Mr Nicos Kourounakis.

Question Topic	Answer
Sustainability	Important dimension; Needs to be achieved at the organizational and cultural levels; A topic that can be addressed and improved in PM; The methodology cannot specify something in such a narrow way; After the project definition, not much action can be taken to integrate sustainability objectives.
PM ² Sustainability	Improvements can be made in this direction; Addresses the broader issue of sustainability; Can be included in the Project Handbook, additional objectives and PM ² mind-sets; PM ² is a generic methodology that tries to have a holistic approach, so environmental sustainability cannot be a dominant dimension.
Success Management	Need to define generic ways to measure success, as each project has different objectives.
PM ² Success Management	Critical success factors and critical success criteria, besides being addressed in the initiation phase, are integrated into the project objectives; The project team and the project itself have to focus on achieving the four objectives (scope, time, cost and quality); Control and monitoring verify the level of achievement of these objectives; Criteria and activities for measuring success are found in two aspects of PM ² : at the end of the project (lessons learned, post-project recommendations and degree of success) and each phase of the project (phase gates and monitoring and control and management activities).
Examples to bridge the gap in understanding the explanation of artefacts	An excellent and valuable way to learn; Should be used at organizational and educational/training level.
Examples to overcome the difficulty of understanding the explanation of the artefacts in PM ²	PM ² is a generic methodology, which can be used by any organization and type of project, and the examples are quite specific. Thus, inserting examples would make the methodology more complex.

5. Discussion

The aim of this study was to fill an existing gap in studies of sustainability in PM and broaden the debate on the subject. This study also made it possible to analyze the presence of sustainability in PM guides and scientific publications. Sustainability is a very topical issue, which is why we decided to study a relatively recent sustainability-related PM methodology, PRiSM, in combination with another methodology. The methodology selected for the comparative analysis was PM² because it is also a relatively recent methodology and is freely available. To this end, the two methodologies were compared on the basis of their guides, and scientific publications about them were selected and analyzed. Finally, interviews were conducted regarding the PM² methodology. This study contributes to broadening readers' knowledge of these two methodologies and the integration of sustainability into PM.

With the analysis of the presence of sustainability in some current PM guides, it was concluded that in PMBOK®, PRINCE2® and PM², the reference to sustainability is not significant. These results are in line with the statements made by Brones et al. (2014) [11], Silvius and Schipper (2014) [10] and Eskerod and Huemann (2013) [62] related to PM best practices not considering environmental sustainability.

Through the analysis of the scientific publications present in the databases, it was found that the United States has more publications on sustainability in PM, and engineering is the area that produced many publications on this theme.

In addition, the number of articles found is considered to be relatively small, which is in line with the fact pointed out by Stanitsas et al. (2021) [6], who justify this limited number of articles by stating that the area under analysis is relatively new and under development.

The main difference between the PM² and PRiSMTM methodologies is their main objective. The PRiSMTM methodology seeks to make the PM process more sustainable, while the PM² methodology aims to address the needs of institutions and projects belonging to the European Union. The project definitions of the two methodologies are very similar; however, PM² defines it as an organizational structure, and PRiSMTM defines it as an investment. The PRiSMTM methodology has two differentiating deliverables compared to other approaches, including PM², the P5 Impact Analysis and the Sustainability Management Plan, which is in line with the findings of Carboni et al. (2018) [16].

While in the PRiSMTM methodology, sustainability is very present in the project life cycle, in the PM² methodology this theme is not explicit in any of the project phases. The PRiSMTM methodology identifies and analyzes sustainability impacts, converts them into opportunities and produces a sustainability analysis. The PM² methodology does not directly address the issue of sustainability in any of its phases. This may happen because the methodology aims to be generic and adaptable to any project and type of activity. Both PM² and PRiSMTM have the Business Case and the Requirements Document as deliverables. In general, the other deliverables seem to be quite similar in scope, but they have slightly different names. The Closure/Closing Phases are similar in both methodologies. Both methodologies, PM² and PRiSMTM, refer to success criteria; however, these are more developed in the PRiSMTM methodology.

The publications analyzed for the PM² methodology mostly originate from the European continent, which is expected since this methodology was developed by the European Commission. Contrary to what happens in PM², in the PRiSMTM methodology and P5TM standard, the publications belong mostly to other continents, being dispersed around the globe. The goal of the GPM® is to promote sustainable business and achieve the 17 SDGs by the horizon year 2030, as planned when it was created by the UN. Since the UN is a global organization, it is expected that there are publications all over the world, which was the case.

After analyzing the selected publications, it was found that the most mentioned feature regarding the PM² methodology is related to the fact that the methodology includes best practices from other bodies of knowledge, followed by the fact that it is an open and free methodology. Concerning the PRiSMTM methodology and P5TM standard, it was

found that the most mentioned characteristic is related to the fact that it is an extension of the Triple Bottom Line, since it also includes the product and the process, followed by the fact that the P5TM standard can be a training path, which includes sustainability, for engineering students.

Lastly, through the interviews with Mr Nicos Kourounakis and the user of PM² methodology, it was concluded that the PM² methodology is intended to be generic and adaptable to any type of project. Therefore, adding sustainability to the PM² methodology might not be appropriate. However, users who choose to include sustainability in their PM and use an approach other than PRiSMTM, such as the PM² methodology, can include it in the additional objectives of the project and use as sustainable-related deliverable, for example, the P5 Impact Analysis and the Sustainability Management Plan. These templates are available online for free. Thus, it can be concluded that PRiSMTM is an option to complement PM² in terms of integrating sustainability with its differentiating products.

Due to the unavailability of schedules, it was not possible to conduct interviews with professionals who are used to working with/implementing the PRiSMTM methodology, which is a limitation of this study. In future work, interviews with users and experts in the PRiSMTM methodology are planned.

6. Conclusions

Although PM best practices do not make reference to environmental sustainability, there is a new methodology that aims to make PM more sustainable: PRiSMTM. PM² is a PM methodology developed by the European Commission that aims to enable Project Managers to provide solutions and benefits to organizations. Although the PM² and PRiSMTM methodologies are relatively recent, they have very different objectives and characteristics. The first major difference between the two methodologies lies in their main objectives: PRiSMTM seeks to make the PM process more sustainable, and PM² aims to meet the needs of institutions and projects belonging to the European Union. The P5 Impact Analysis and the Sustainability Management Plan are the main differentiating deliverables in relation to other approaches such as PM². It is considered that these deliverables can be quickly and easily added to other PM approaches.

The PM² methodology does not take sustainability into account, as it aims to be a generic methodology that can be adapted to any project and type of activity, which was discovered through interviews with Mr Nicos Kourounakis and the user of the PM² methodology. In this way, this methodology is an example of a methodology in which sustainability and the deliverables mentioned above can be added to the scope of the project.

Both methodologies have positive and negative points, according to the authors. The most cited characteristic in relation to PM² is related to the fact that the methodology includes best practices from other bodies of knowledge, followed by the fact that it is an open and free methodology. The most cited characteristic in relation to PRiSMTM and the P5TM standard is the fact that it is an extension of the Triple Bottom Line, as it also includes the product and the process.

Finally, it is concluded that both methodologies are valid and advantageous. However, they are quite different and have different objectives. Furthermore, PRiSMTM is an option to complement PM² in order to integrate sustainability. To this end, sustainability can be added to the project's additional objectives and the P5 Impact Analysis, and the Sustainability Management Plan can be added to the project deliverables.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, P.M., P.S. and A.T.; methodology, P.M., P.S. and A.T.; software, P.S.; validation, P.S. and A.T.; formal analysis, P.M., P.S. and A.T.; investigation, P.M., P.S. and A.T.; resources, A.T.; data curation, P.M., P.S. and A.T.; writing—original draft preparation, P.M.; writing—review and editing, P.S. and A.T.; visualization, P.M., P.S. and A.T.; supervision, P.S. and A.T.; project administration, P.S. and A.T. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This work has been supported by FCT—*Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia*—within the R&D Units Project Scope: UIDB/00319/2020.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in this study.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Acknowledgments: I would like to thank Sofia Lopes and Nicos Kourounakis for their availability and fundamental contribution to this project.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Appendix A

Table A1. Articles extracted from SCOPUS, Web of Science and B-on databases.

	Authors	Title of the Document	Database *		
			S	W	B
PM ²	Takagi and Varajão (2019) [72]	Integration of success management into project management guides and methodologies—Position paper	✓	✓	✓
	Pantouvakis (2017) [75]	How can IPMA contribute to new PM ² EU commission standard?	✓	✓	✓
	Moya-Colorado et al. (2021) [76]	The role of donor agencies in promoting standardized project management in the Spanish development non-government organizations	✓	✓	✓
	Ribeiro-Lopes et al. (2022) [79]	Application of the PM ² Methodology in the Project Management of the Portuguese Project Management Observatory Creation—Initiating Phase	✓		✓
	Takagi and Varajão (2020) [74]	Success management in information systems projects—Work-in-progress	✓		✓
	Takagi et al. (2019) [73]	Integrating success management into EU PM ²	✓		✓
	Fiddicke et al. (2021) [77]	A Phased Approach for preparation and organization of human biomonitoring studies	✓	✓	✓
	Katunina and Fomina (2021) [78]	In search of excellence in social entrepreneurship project management: experience and standards of the European Union			✓
PRiSM TM	(Piterska, Kolesnikov, et al., 2018) [88]	Development of the Markovian model for the life cycle of a project's benefits	✓		✓
	(Turan & Johan, 2016) [81]	Assessing sustainability framework of automotive related industry in the Malaysia context based on GPM P5 standard	✓		✓
	Piterska, Rudenko, et al. (2018) [90]	Development of the method of formation of the architecture of the innovation program in the system "University -State-Business"	✓		
	Johan and Turan (2016) [85]	Industrial training approach using GPM P5 Standard for Sustainability in Project Management: A framework for sustainability competencies in the 21st century	✓	✓	
	Turan et al. (2016) [82]	Development of Systematic Sustainability Assessment (SSA) for the Malaysian Industry	✓	✓	
	Johan and Turan, 2016b) [86]	The development of Sustainability Graduate Community (SGC) as a learning pathway for sustainability education—A framework for engineering programmes in Malaysia Technical Universities Network (MTUN)	✓	✓	
	Wan Lanang et al. (2017) [87]	Systematic Assessment Through Mathematical Model for Sustainability Reporting in Malaysia Context	✓	✓	
	(Trzeciak (2021) [91]	Sustainable risk management in it enterprises	✓	✓	✓
	Lanang et al. (2018) [89]	Incorporating attitudinal parameter in assessing sustainability of Malaysia manufacturing industry	✓	✓	
	Verba and Ivanov (2015) [80]	Sustainable Development and Project Management: Objectives and Integration Results		✓	✓
	Salcedo Díaz et al. (2016) [83]	Corporative social responsibility: model of process development for products with base on PRiSM and the p5 strategy		✓	✓

* Legend: S—SCOPUS; W—Web of Science; B—B-on; ✓—article found in that database.

Appendix B

Table A2. Interview scripts.

Interviewee	Previous PM ² Methodology Masters' Researcher	CEO of PM ² Alliance—Mr. Nicos Kourounakis
Questions	<p>How many methodologies did you use before PM²?</p> <p>How did you learn about PM²? Was it only for your thesis or did you know about it before? If it was only for your thesis, was it a university thesis proposal or did you choose to use it yourself?</p> <p>Now I would like you to tell me about your experience of using the PM² methodology, what the project consisted of, and what it was like for you.</p> <p>What are the main advantages that you have observed regarding the use of the methodology?</p> <p>What are the main disadvantages you found with the use of the methodology?</p> <p>What challenges have arisen or had to be overcome using the methodology?</p> <p>Did you use all the artefacts of the methodology? If not, do you consider that some are not important or were not relevant to your project in particular?</p> <p>One disadvantage presented by the authors relates to success management. The PM² methodology identifies success factors in the initiation phase and defines the criteria for evaluating project success in the planning phase. But after this identification and definition stage, PM² does not provide management activities regarding these artefacts, and there is no monitoring and control throughout the project. Do you think these aspects should be incorporated into the methodology?</p> <p>What do you think is missing in the methodology, and what do you think is important to be there and is not? Or do you think that nothing is missing? Why?</p> <p>Do you think that including sustainability in this methodology would be a topic to think about in the future and provide added value? If yes, why?</p> <p>Do you know the PRiSMTM methodology and the P5TM of the GPM[®]?</p> <p>Do you think there is anything else that we should talk about regarding this methodology or another topic that we have not talked about yet?</p>	<p>After performing a literature review, it was found that sustainability is absent in almost all of the PM methodologies. Do you consider sustainability a relevant issue to be considered in PM?</p> <p>Do you consider that incorporating sustainability into the next version of the PM² methodology would add value? If yes, how?</p> <p>Are you familiar with the GPM[®] P5TM? Do you think that it could be used to complement the PM² methodology?</p> <p>One of the disadvantages raised by some authors [72–74] is related to success management. The PM² methodology identifies the success factors in the initiation phase (in the Project Initiation Request and the Business Case) and defines the project success evaluation criteria in the planning phase, which are included in the Project Handbook. However, after this identification and definition, PM² does not provide management activities regarding these artefacts, as there is no monitoring and control throughout the project. Why were these activities not considered? Do you consider that it could be a topic to think about in the next version?</p> <p>As a solution to the above issue, Takagi and Varajão (2019) [72] proposed a success management process integrated into the PM² methodology. This integrative model aimed to increase the robustness of success management and integrate the management of success criteria and factors into the planning, execution, closure, monitoring and control phases. What do you think about it?</p> <p>Another disadvantage raised, by some authors [79], is related to the lack of clarity and difficulty in understanding the explanation of the artefacts, even with guidance. As a solution, the authors advocate adding a project example that includes all the completed documents. What are your thoughts on this proposal?</p> <p>Do you have anything else that you would like to say about the PM² methodology that would be useful for research?</p>

References

1. Fonseca, L.; Carvalho, F.; Santos, G. Strategic CSR: Framework for Sustainability through Management Systems Standards—Implementing and Disclosing Sustainable Development Goals and Results. *Sustainability* **2023**, *15*, 11904. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
2. Rosati, F.; Faria, L.G.D. Addressing the SDGs in Sustainability Reports: The Relationship with Institutional Factors. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2019**, *215*, 1312–1326. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
3. Fonseca, L.; Carvalho, F. The Reporting of SDGs by Quality, Environmental, and Occupational Health and Safety-Certified Organizations. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 5797. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
4. Fonseca, L.M.; Domingues, J.P.; Dima, A.M. Mapping the Sustainable Development Goals Relationships. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 3359. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

5. Yin, C.; Zhao, W.; Fu, B.; Meadows, M.E.; Pereira, P. Key Axes of Global Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2023**, *385*, 135767. [CrossRef]
6. Stanitsas, M.; Kirytopoulos, K.; Leopoulos, V. Integrating Sustainability Indicators into Project Management: The Case of Construction Industry. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2021**, *279*, 123774. [CrossRef]
7. Jensen, A.; Thuesen, C.; Gerald, J. The Projectification of Everything: Projects as a Human Condition. *Proj. Manag. J.* **2016**, *47*, 21–34. [CrossRef]
8. Vrchota, J.; Řehoř, P.; Maříková, M.; Pech, M. Critical Success Factors of the Project Management in Relation to Industry 4.0 for Sustainability of Projects. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 281. [CrossRef]
9. Silvius, G. Sustainability as a New School of Thought in Project Management. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2017**, *166*, 1479–1493. [CrossRef]
10. Silvius, A.; Schipper, R. Sustainability in Project Management: A Literature Review and Impact Analysis. *Soc. Bus.* **2014**, *4*, 63–96. [CrossRef]
11. Brunes, F.; De Carvalho, M.M.; De Senzi Zancul, E. Ecodesign in Project Management: A Missing Link for the Integration of Sustainability in Product Development? *J. Clean. Prod.* **2014**, *80*, 106–118. [CrossRef]
12. Saad, M.H.; Nazzari, M.A.; Darras, B.M. A General Framework for Sustainability Assessment of Manufacturing Processes. *Ecol. Indic.* **2019**, *97*, 211–224. [CrossRef]
13. Saunders, M.; Lewis, P.; Thornhill, A. *Research Methods for Business Students*, 8th ed.; Pearson: Harlow, UK, 2019; ISBN 978-1292208787.
14. Page, M.J.; McKenzie, J.E.; Bossuyt, P.M.; Boutron, I.; Hoffmann, T.C.; Mulrow, C.D.; Shamseer, L.; Tetzlaff, J.M.; Akl, E.A.; Brennan, S.E.; et al. The PRISMA 2020 Statement: An Updated Guideline for Reporting Systematic Reviews. *Syst. Rev.* **2021**, *10*, 89. [CrossRef]
15. Laursen, M.; Svejvig, P. Taking Stock of Project Value Creation: A Structured Literature Review with Future Directions for Research and Practice. *Int. J. Proj. Manag.* **2016**, *34*, 736–747. [CrossRef]
16. Carboni, J.; Duncan, W.; Gonzalez, M.; Milsom, P.; Young, M. *Sustainable Project Management—The GPM Reference Guide*, 2nd ed.; GPM Global: Novi, MI, USA, 2018.
17. IPMA. *ICB4—Individual Competence Baseline for Project, Programme & Portfolio Management, Version 4.0*; International Project Management Association: Nijkerk, The Netherlands, 2015.
18. PMI. *PMBOK Guide—Seventh Edition*; Project Management Institute, Inc.: Newton Square, PA, USA, 2021; ISBN 9781628256642.
19. AXELOS. *Managing Successful Projects with PRINCE2®*, 6th ed.; TSO (The Stationery Office): Belfast, UK, 2017.
20. PM2 ALLIANCE. *Metodologia de Gestão de Projetos—Guide 3.0*; PM2 Alliance: Luxembourg, 2018.
21. Pais Ribeiro, J.L. Research Review and Scientific Evidence. *Psicol. Saúde Doença* **2014**, *15*, 671–682. [CrossRef]
22. Donato, H.; Donato, M. Stages for Undertaking a Systematic Review. *Acta Med. Port.* **2019**, *32*, 227–235. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
23. Furlan, A.D.; Clarke, J.; Esmail, R.; Sinclair, S.; Irvin, E.; Bombardier, C. A Critical Review of Reviews on the Treatment of Chronic Low Back Pain. *Spine* **2001**, *26*, E155–E162. [CrossRef]
24. European Union. Evolution of PM2. 2018. Available online: https://europa.eu/pm2/evolution-pm2_en (accessed on 22 August 2023).
25. GPM. GPM Media Release: GPM Releases New P5 Standard for Sustainable Project Management. 2019. Available online: <https://greenprojectmanagement.org/news-media/1115-gpm-releases-new-p5-standard-for-sustainable-project-management> (accessed on 22 August 2023).
26. Silva, N.R. *Normalização de Publicações Técnicas e/Ou Científicas: Guia Prático Para Docentes, Pesquisadores e Discentes de Cursos Técnicos, Superiores e Pós-Graduação: Atualizado Conforme a Norma ABNT NBR 6023/2018*, 1st ed.; Editora Appris: Paraná, Brasil, 2021; ISBN 9786525005188.
27. Nogueira, A. *Metodologia Do Trabalho Científico*; Clube de Autores: Lisbon, Portugal, 2015.
28. Moura, D.L. *Pesquisa Qualitativa: Um Guia Prático Para Pesquisadores Iniciantes*, 1st ed.; Editora CRV: Curitiba, Brasil, 2021; ISBN 9786558686118.
29. Kerzner, H. *Project Management: A Systems Approach to Planning, Scheduling, and Controlling*, 12th ed.; Wiley: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2017; ISBN 978-1119165354.
30. Tuman, G.J. Development and Implementation of Effective Project Management Information and Control Systems. In *Project Management Handbook*; Van Nostrand Reinhold: New York, NY, USA, 1983; pp. 495–532.
31. APM. *APM Body of Knowledge*, 6th ed.; Association for Project Management: Reino Unido, UK, 2012; ISBN 978-1-903494-82-0.
32. Munns, A.K.; Bjeirmi, B.F. The Role of Project Management in Achieving Project Success. *Int. J. Proj. Manag.* **1996**, *14*, 81–87. [CrossRef]
33. Wagner, R. Projectification and Its Impact on Societal Development in Germany. *PM World J.* **2020**, 2330–4480.
34. Midler, C. “Projectification” of the Firm: The Renault Case. *Scand. J. Manag.* **1995**, *11*, 363–375. [CrossRef]
35. Bourne, M.; Bosch-Rekveltdt, M.; Pesämaa, O. Moving Goals and Governance in Megaprojects. *Int. J. Proj. Manag.* **2023**, *41*, 102486. [CrossRef]
36. Sachs, J.D. The Age of Sustainable Development. In *The Age of Sustainable Development*; Columbia University Press: New York, NY, USA, 2015; ISBN 0231173148.
37. WCED. *Our Common Future*, 1st ed.; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 1987; ISBN 019282080X.

38. Starik, M.; Rands, G.P. Weaving an Integrated Web: Multilevel and Multisystem Perspectives of Ecologically Sustainable Organizations. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **1995**, *20*, 908–935. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
39. Hart, S.L. A Natural-Resource-Based View of the Firm. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **1995**, *20*, 986. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
40. Gimenez, C.; Sierra, V.; Rodon, J. Sustainable Operations: Their Impact on the Triple Bottom Line. *Int. J. Prod. Econ.* **2012**, *140*, 149–159. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
41. Elkington, J. *Cannibals with Forks: The Triple Bottom Line of 21st Century Business*; New Society Publishers: Gabriola Island, BC, Canada; Stony Creek, CT, USA, 1998; ISBN 0865713928 9780865713925.
42. Dalibozhko, A.; Krakovetskaya, I. Youth Entrepreneurial Projects for the Sustainable Development of Global Community: Evidence from Enactus Program. *SHS Web Conf.* **2018**, *57*, 1009. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
43. Schieg, M. The Model of Corporate Social Responsibility in Project Management. *Verslas Teor. Ir Prakt.* **2009**, *10*, 315–321. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
44. UNCSO. *Indicators of Sustainable Development: Guidelines and Methodologies*; United Nations: New York, NY, USA, 2001.
45. Gladwin, T.N.; Kennelly, J.J.; Krause, T.-S. Shifting Paradigms for Sustainable Development: Implications for Management Theory and Research. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **1995**, *20*, 874–907. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
46. European Commission. *Green Paper: Promoting a European Framework for Corporate Social Responsibility*; European Commission: Brussels, Belgium, 2001.
47. Lacy, P.; Cooper, T.; Hayward, R.; Neuberger, L. *A New Era of Sustainability*; UN Global Compact, Accenture: New York, NY, USA, 2010.
48. UN. *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*; United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs: New York, NY, USA, 2015.
49. GPM. *The P5 Standard for Sustainability in Project Management*; GPM Global: Novi, MI, USA, 2019; ISBN 9789896540821.
50. GPM Insights into Sustainable Project Management—Study on the P5TM Standard for Sustainability in Project Management. 2019. Available online: <https://greenprojectmanagement.org/2019-insights-into-sustainable-project-management> (accessed on 22 August 2023).
51. Tsalis, T.A.; Malamateniou, K.E.; Koulouriotis, D.; Nikolaou, I.E. New Challenges for Corporate Sustainability Reporting: United Nations' 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals. *Corp. Soc. Responsib. Environ. Manag.* **2020**, *27*, 1617–1629. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
52. Comissão Europeia Pacto Ecológico Europeu. 2022. Available online: https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/priorities2019-2024/european-green-deal_pt (accessed on 22 August 2023).
53. Carvalho, M.M.; Rabechini, R. Can Project Sustainability Management Impact Project Success? An Empirical Study Applying a Contingent Approach. *Int. J. Proj. Manag.* **2017**, *35*, 1120–1132. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
54. Ivanov, I.; Vlasova, T.; Orlova, L. Project Management Regarded as a Driver of Sustainable Development. *E3S Web Conf.* **2020**, *210*, 10005. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
55. Sneddon, C.; Howarth, R.B.; Norgaard, R.B. Sustainable Development in a Post-Brundtland World. *Ecol. Econ.* **2006**, *57*, 253–268. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
56. Sánchez, M.A. Integrating Sustainability Issues into Project Management. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2015**, *96*, 319–330. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
57. Sabini, L.; Muzio, D.; Alderman, N. 25 Years of 'Sustainable Projects'. What We Know and What the Literature Says. *Int. J. Proj. Manag.* **2019**, *37*, 820–838. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
58. Huemann, M.; Silvius, G. Projects to Create the Future: Managing Projects Meets Sustainable Development. *Int. J. Proj. Manag.* **2017**, *35*, 1066–1070. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
59. Cole, R.J. Building Environmental Assessment Methods: Redefining Intentions and Roles. *Build. Res. Inf.* **2005**, *33*, 455–467. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
60. Deakin, M.; Huovila, P.; Rao, S.; Sunikka, M.; Vreeker, R. The Assessment of Sustainable Urban Development. *Build. Res. Inf.* **2002**, *30*, 95–108. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
61. Thomson, C.S.; El-Haram, M.A.; Emmanuel, R. Mapping Sustainability Assessment with the Project Life Cycle. *Proc. Inst. Civ. Eng. Eng. Sustain.* **2011**, *164*, 143–157. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
62. Eskerod, P.; Huemann, M. Sustainable Development and Project Stakeholder Management: What Standards Say. *Int. J. Manag. Proj. Bus.* **2013**, *6*, 36–50. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
63. Goedknecht, D.; Silvius, A.J.G. The Implementation of Sustainability Principles in Project Management. In Proceedings of the 26th IPMA World Congress, Crete, Greece, 29 October 2012; pp. 875–882.
64. Valdes-Vasquez, R.; Klotz, L.E. Social Sustainability Considerations during Planning and Design: Framework of Processes for Construction Projects. *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.* **2013**, *139*, 80–89. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
65. Martens, M.L.; Carvalho, M.M. The Challenge of Introducing Sustainability into Project Management Function: Multiple-Case Studies. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2016**, *117*, 29–40. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
66. Økland, A. Gap Analysis for Incorporating Sustainability in Project Management. *Procedia Comput. Sci.* **2015**, *64*, 103–109. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
67. Sroufe, R. Integration and Organizational Change towards Sustainability. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2017**, *162*, 315–329. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
68. ISO 20400:2017; Sustainable Procurement—Guidance. ISO: Geneva, Switzerland, 2017.
69. ISO 37001:2016; Anti-Bribery Management Systems—Requirements with Guidance for Use. ISO: Geneva, Switzerland, 2016.

70. ISO 14001:2015; Environmental Management Systems—Requirements with Guidance for Use. ISO: Geneva, Switzerland, 2015.
71. GPM Global. PRISMTM (Projects Integrating Sustainable Methods). Available online: <https://greenprojectmanagement.org/prism-methodology> (accessed on 22 August 2023).
72. Takagi, N.; Varajão, J. Integration of Success Management into Project Management Guides and Methodologies—Position Paper. *Procedia Comput. Sci.* **2019**, *164*, 366–372. [[CrossRef](#)]
73. Takagi, N.; Varajão, J.; Ribeiro, P. Integrating Success Management into EU PM2. In Proceedings of the Atas da Conferencia da Associacao Portuguesa de Sistemas de Informacao, Lisboa, Portugal, 11–12 October 2019; Associação Portuguesa de Sistemas de Informação: Guimarães, Portugal, 2019.
74. Takagi, N.; Varajão, J. Success Management in Information Systems Projects—Work-in-Progress. In Proceedings of the Atas da Conferencia da Associacao Portuguesa de Sistemas de Informacao, Lisbon, Portugal, 11–12 October 2019; Associacao Portuguesa de Sistemas de Informacao: Évora, Portugal, 2020; Volume 2020.
75. Pantouvakis, J.P. How Can IPMA Contribute to New PM2 EU Commission Standard? In Proceedings of the 12th International Scientific and Technical Conference on Computer Sciences and Information Technologies, CSIT, Lviv, Ukraine, 5–8 September 2017; Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc.: New York, NY, USA, 2017; Volume 2, pp. 246–251.
76. Moya-Colorado, A.; León-Bolaños, N.; Yagüe-Blanco, J.L. The Role of Donor Agencies in Promoting Standardized Project Management in the Spanish Development Non-Government Organizations. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 1490. [[CrossRef](#)]
77. Fiddicke, U.; Pack, L.K.; Tolonen, H.; Sepai, O.; López, M.E.; Castaño, A.; Schoeters, G.; Kolossa-Gehring, M. A Phased Approach for Preparation and Organization of Human Biomonitoring Studies. *Int. J. Hyg. Environ. Health* **2021**, *232*, 113684. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
78. Katunina, I.V.; Fomina, Y.A. In Search of Excellence in Social Entrepreneurship Project Management Experience and Standards of the European Union. *Strateg. Decis. Risk Manag.* **2021**, *12*, 92–101. [[CrossRef](#)]
79. Ribeiro-Lopes, S.; Tereso, A.; Ferreira, J.L.; Sousa, P.; Engrácia, P. Application of the PM² Methodology in the Project Management of the Portuguese Project Management Observatory Creation—Initiating Phase. *Procedia Comput. Sci.* **2022**, *196*, 816–823. [[CrossRef](#)]
80. Verba, Y.; Ivanov, I. Sustainable Development and Project Management: Objectives and Integration Results. *Econ. Soc. Changes Facts Trends Forecast.* **2015**, *5*, 135–146. [[CrossRef](#)]
81. Turan, F.M.; Johan, K. Assessing Sustainability Framework of Automotiverelated Industry in the Malaysia Context Based on GPM P5 Standard. *ARPN J. Eng. Appl. Sci.* **2016**, *11*, 7606–7611.
82. Turan, F.M.; Johan, K.; Lanang, W.N.S.W.; Nor, N.H.M. Development of Systematic Sustainability Assessment (SSA) for the Malaysian Industry. In Proceedings of the IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, Melaka, Malaysia, 24–25 November 2016; Volume 160.
83. Salcedo Díaz, L.; Porto Solano, A.F.; Echeverri Gutiérrez, C.; Boss Agudelo, J.; Moreno Ortiz, C.A. Responsabilidad Social Empresarial: Modelo de Procesos de Desarrollo de Productos Con Base En La Metodología PRISM y La Estrategia P5. *Prod. Más Limpia* **2016**, *11*, 111–125. [[CrossRef](#)]
84. Szabó, L. Sustainability, Creativity and Innovation in Project Management—Model Development for Assessing Organizational Performance through Projects. *Vez. Bp. Manag. Rev.* **2016**, *47*, 3–18. [[CrossRef](#)]
85. Johan, K.; Turan, F.M. Industrial Training Approach Using GPM P5 Standard for Sustainability in Project Management: A Framework for Sustainability Competencies in the 21st Century. In Proceedings of the IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, Melaka, Malaysia, 24–25 November 2016; Volume 160.
86. Johan, K.; Turan, F.M. The Development of Sustainability Graduate Community (SGC) as a Learning Pathway for Sustainability Education—A Framework for Engineering Programmes in Malaysia Technical Universities Network (MTUN). In Proceedings of the IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, Melaka, Malaysia, 24–25 November 2016; Institute of Physics Publishing: Bristol, UK, 2016; Volume 160.
87. Wan Lanang, W.N.S.; Turan, F.M.; Johan, K. Systematic Assessment Through Mathematical Model for Sustainability Reporting in Malaysia Context. In Proceedings of the IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, Melaka, Malaysia, 6–7 May 2017; Institute of Physics Publishing: Bristol, UK, 2017; Volume 226.
88. Piterska, V.; Kolesnikov, O.; Lukianov, D.; Kolesnikova, K.; Gogunskii, V.; Olekh, T.; Shakhov, A.; Rudenko, S. Development of the Markovian Model for the Life Cycle of a Project's Benefits. *East. Eur. J. Enterp. Technol.* **2018**, *5*, 30–39. [[CrossRef](#)]
89. Lanang, W.N.S.W.; Turan, F.M.; Johan, K. Incorporating Attitudinal Parameter in Assessing Sustainability of Malaysia Manufacturing Industry. In Proceedings of the IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, Pekan, Malaysia, 1–2 March 2018; Institute of Physics Publishing: Bristol, UK, 2018; Volume 342.
90. Piterska, V.; Rudenko, S.; Shakhov, A. Development of the Method of Formation of the Architecture of the Innovation Program in the System “Univers-State-Business”. *Int. J. Eng. Technol. (UAE)* **2018**, *7*, 232–239. [[CrossRef](#)]
91. Trzeciak, M. Sustainable Risk Management in It Enterprises. *Risks* **2021**, *9*, 135. [[CrossRef](#)]

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.