

## 1. Cover

HOME ABOUT LOGIN REGISTER SEARCH CURRENT ARCHIVES

Home > Vol 9, No 6 (2025)

### JOIV : International Journal on Informatics Visualization

Journal title	JOIV : International Journal on Informatics Visualization
Abbreviation	JOIV : Int. J. Inform. Visualization
ISSN E-ISSN	2549-9610 / 2549-9904
Editor-in-chief	Prof. Halimah Badioze Zaman ( <i>Institute of Visual Informatics, Malaysia</i> ) with Rahmat Hidayat ( <i>Politeknik Negeri Padang</i> )
Organized / Collaboration	Society of Visual Informatics, Indonesia: Institute of Visual Informatics, UKM, Malaysia and Soft Computing and Data Mining Centre, UTHM, Malaysia

1.9 CiteScore 2024  
43rd percentile  
Powered by Scopus

International Journal on Informatics Visualization  
Q3 Information Systems and Management  
best quartile  
SJR 2024 0.2  
powered by scimagojr.com

Published by  
Informatics Technology Department  
Politeknik Negeri Padang

QUICK MENU

- Editorial Team
- Focus & Scope
- Indexing
- Author Guidelines
- Peer Review Process
- Author Fees
- Publication Ethics
- Online Submission
- Open Access Statement
- Plagiarism Policy
- Special Issues
- Licensing terms

## 2. Keterangan posisi jurnal

### Source details

#### International Journal on Informatics Visualization

Open Access

Years currently covered by Scopus: from 2017 to 2025

Publisher: Politeknik Negeri Padang

E-ISSN: 2549-9904

Subject area: [Decision Sciences: Information Systems and Management](#) [Decision Sciences: Statistics, Probability and Uncertainty](#)  
[Computer Science: General Computer Science](#)

Source type: Journal

[View all documents >](#)

[Set document alert](#)

[Save to source list](#)

[Feedback >](#) [Compare sources >](#)

CiteScore 2024

1.9

SJR 2024

0.196

SNIP 2024

0.447

**International Journal on Informatics Visualization**

**Q3** Information Systems and Management  
best quartile

**SJR 2024**  
**0.2**  
powered by scimagojr.com

REQUEST INDEXING

- » **SCOPUS (ACCEPTED)**
  - » Submission Received: **March 3, 2020**
  - » Submission Accepted: **July 30, 2020**
  - » [SCOPUS CiteScore Tracker 2020](#)
- » **WoS / Web of Science**
  - » Latest submission: September 16, 2018
  - » [Web of Science](#) Citation Analysis
- » **IET INSPEC**
  - » Added to review: **May 29, 2020**
- » **Ei COMPENDEX**
  - » Submission: **February 10, 2021**

### 3. Editor board

[Home](#) > [About the Journal](#) > [Editorial Team](#)

## Editorial Team

### Editor in Chief

Prof. Halimah Badioze Zaman, (Scopus ID: 25825801600); Institute of Visual Informatics, Malaysia  
Rahmat Hidayat, (Scopus ID: 57204348632); Politeknik Negeri Padang, Sumatera Barat, Indonesia

### Regional (Handling) Editor for Europe

Prof. Luca Di Nunzio, (Scopus ID:57195199010); Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata, Rome, Italy  
Benjamin Duraković, (Scopus ID:57195199010); International University of Sarajevo, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

### Regional (Handling) Editor for America

Miguel Botto-Tobar, (Scopus ID:57196152677); Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands  
Santiago Vidal, (Scopus ID:36142371300); Universidad Nacional del Centro de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, Tandil, Argentina

### Regional (Handling) Editor for Asia-Pacific

Shahreen Kasim, (Scopus ID: 36155431900); Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Batu Pahat, Malaysia  
Hairulnizam Mahdin, (Scopus ID: 35759460000); Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Batu Pahat, Malaysia

### Regional (Handling) Editors for Australia

## Regional (Handling) Editors for Australia

Vijayakumar Varadarajan, (Scopus ID: 57200993506); University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia  
Zairi Ismael Rizman, (Scopus ID: 36959761800); Universiti Teknologi MARA, Terengganu, Malaysia

## Regional (Handling) Editor for Middle East and Africa

Prof. Anton S Prabuwo, (Scopus ID: 18134309800); King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia  
Haitham Alall, (Scopus ID: 49963007000); Amman Arab University, Amman, Jordan

## Advisory International Editorial Boards

Prof. Alessandro Simonetta, (Scopus ID: 55344403700) University of Rome "Tor Vergata", Rome, Italy  
Prof. Soundararajan Ezekiel, (Scopus ID: 7003884603); Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, United States  
Prof. Shahrul Azman Mohd Noah, (Scopus ID: 35087633200); Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Malaysia  
Prof. Junzo Watada, (Scopus ID: 57189052014); Zhejiang Gongshang University, Hangzhou, China  
Prof. Gabriele Arcidiacono, (Scopus ID: 56656284600); Università degli Studi Guglielmo Marconi, Rome, Italy  
Prof. Jemal H. Abawajy, (Scopus ID: 8937496700); Deakin University, Geelong, Australia  
Abdullah Ali Alshehri, (Scopus ID: 25638201400); King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia  
Riyanto Sigit, (Scopus ID: 35811196100); Politeknik Elektronika Negeri Surabaya, Jawa Timur, Indonesia  
Guido P. Bakema, (Scopus ID: 15135171300); Hogeschool van Arnhem en Nijmegen, Nijmegen, Netherlands  
Hamid Ali Abed Al Asadi, (Scopus ID: 57202357828); University of Basrah, Basra, Iraq  
Aji Prasetya Wibawa, (Scopus ID: 56012410400) Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia, Indonesia

## Managing Editor

Hidra Amnur, (Scopus ID: 57204623296); Politeknik Negeri Padang, Sumatera Barat, Indonesia  
Aldie Alanda, (Scopus ID: 57203718850); Politeknik Negeri Padang, Sumatera Barat, Indonesia

## Support Editors :

Aldo Erlanda, (Scopus ID: 57217134570); Politeknik Negeri Padang, Sumatera Barat, Indonesia  
Taufik Gusman, (Scopus ID: 57221394882); Politeknik Negeri Padang, Sumatera Barat, Indonesia

## Technical Editor

Dwi Fajar Saputra, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta, Indonesia

## 4. Daftar isi

Home > Archives > Vol 8, No 4 (2024)

## Vol 8, No 4 (2024)

This issue has been available online since **31th December 2024** for the regular issue of December 2024. All articles in this issue (**59 original research articles**) were authored/co-authored by **237 authors** from **10 countries (Australia, Bangladesh, China, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Saudi Arabia and United States)**.




## Table of Contents

### Regular

Classification of Skin Cancer Images Using Convolutional Neural Network with ResNet50 Pre-trained Model DOI : 10.62527/joiv.8.4.2156 Agus Eko Minarno, Aaliyah Lusianti, Yufis Azhar, Hardianto Wibowo	PDF 2013-2019
Comparison of Convolutional Neural Networks Transfer Learning Models for Disease Classification of Food Crop DOI : 10.62527/joiv.8.4.1936 Ruvita Faurino, Silvia Rahma, Arie Vatesria, Agus Susanto	PDF 2020-2032
Data-Driven User Personas in Requirement Engineering with NLP and Behavior Analysis DOI : 10.62527/joiv.8.4.3625 He Liang, Sufrî Muhammad, M.N. Shah Zainudin	PDF 2033-2045
Assessing the Multifaceted Determinants of Collaborative Competence Among Students in the Digital Learning: A Comprehensive Analysis DOI : 10.62527/joiv.8.4.2202 Indra Saputra, Resti Elma Sari, Melda Mahniza, Hayatunnufus Hayatunnufus, Rahmiati Rahmiati, Merita Yanita, Mimi Yupelmi	PDF 2046-2053

<p><b>Enhancing Potato Leaf Disease Detection: Implementation of Convolutional Vision Transformers with Synthetic Datasets from Stable Diffusion</b></p> <p>DOI : 10.62527/joiv.8.4.2167</p> <p><i>Tri Astuti, Amri Nurkholis Umar, Rizki Wahyudi, Zanuvar Rifai</i></p>	<p>PDF</p> <p>2054-2065</p>
<p><b>Improved Fuzzy Possibilistic C-Means using Artificial Bee Colony for Clustering New Student's Financial Capability to Determine Tuition Level</b></p> <p>DOI : 10.62527/joiv.8.4.3087</p> <p><i>Edi Satriyanto, Ni Wayan Surya Wardhani, Syaiful Anam, Wayan Firdaus Mahmudy</i></p>	<p>PDF</p> <p>2066-2074</p>
<p><b>Grade Classification of Agarwood Sapwood Using Deep Learning</b></p> <p>DOI : 10.62527/joiv.8.4.2257</p> <p><i>Heliza Rahmania Hatta, Sri Nurdianti, Irman Hermadi, Maman Turjaman</i></p>	<p>PDF</p> <p>2075-2081</p>
<p><b>A Novel Network Optimization Framework Based on Software-Defined Networking (SDN) and Deep Learning (DL) Approach</b></p> <p>DOI : 10.62527/joiv.8.4.2169</p> <p><i>Muhammad Fendi Osman, Mohd Rizal Mohd Isa, Mohammad Adib Khairuddin, Mohd 'Afizi Mohd Shukran, Noor Afiza Mat Razali</i></p>	<p>PDF</p> <p>2082-2089</p>
<p><b>Toward Adoption User Experience Variables for Solo Software Development in Academic and Industry</b></p> <p>DOI : 10.62527/joiv.8.4.2172</p> <p><i>Wahyu Andhyka Kusuma, Azrul Hazri Jantan, Novia Indriaty Admodisastro, Noris binti Mohd Norowi</i></p>	<p>PDF</p> <p>2090-2096</p>
<p><b>Development of Augmented Reality Based Interactive Learning Media on Electric Motor Installation Subjects</b></p> <p>DOI : 10.62527/joiv.8.4.2256</p> <p><i>Mukhlidi Muskhir, Afdal Luthfi, Hazmi Sidiq, Rahmat Fadillah</i></p>	<p>PDF</p> <p>2097-2103</p>
<p><b>DDOS Attack Analysis on IoT Device for Smart Home Environment and A Proposed Detection Technique</b></p> <p>DOI : 10.62527/joiv.8.4.2175</p> <p><i>Mohd Izwan Ibrahim, Mohamad Yusof Darus</i></p>	<p>PDF</p> <p>2104-2110</p>
<p><b>EEG Power Analysis of Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) Based on EIBI Curriculum Levels</b></p> <p>DOI : 10.62527/joiv.8.4.2211</p>	<p>PDF</p> <p>2111-2118</p>

<p><b>Information Behavior Model of e-Health Literacy for Online Health Information-seeking Effectiveness</b></p> <p>DOI : <a href="https://doi.org/10.62527/joiv.8.4.3642">10.62527/joiv.8.4.3642</a></p> <p><i>Wang Xuewen, Masrah Azrifah Azmi Murad, Wu ZhangLi, Ismi Arif Ismail, Hayrol Azril Mohamed Shaffril</i></p>	<p>PDF 2211-2217</p>
<p><b>GLCM and PSNR Analysis of Woven Fabric Images Made from Natural Dyes Due to Sunlight Exposure</b></p> <p>DOI : <a href="https://doi.org/10.62527/joiv.8.4.2265">10.62527/joiv.8.4.2265</a></p> <p><i>Patrisius Batarius, Albertus Joko Santoso, Alfry Aristo Jansen Sinlae</i></p>	<p>PDF 2218-2224</p>
<p><b>An Investigation of the Student Learning Satisfaction Model for User Story Learning in Software Engineering Course</b></p> <p>DOI : <a href="https://doi.org/10.62527/joiv.8.4.3089">10.62527/joiv.8.4.3089</a></p> <p><i>Muhammad Ihsan Zul, Suhaila Mohd. Yasin, Dadang Syarif Sihabudin Sahid</i></p>	<p>PDF 2225-2236</p>
<p><b>Identification Critical Success Factors of Geographic Information System Development in Indonesia with AHP Approach</b></p> <p>DOI : <a href="https://doi.org/10.62527/joiv.8.4.2033">10.62527/joiv.8.4.2033</a></p> <p><i>Nur Aini, Wawan Kurniawan, Agnes Sondita Payani, Ratna Yulika Go</i></p>	<p>PDF 2237-2245</p>
<p><b>Validating a Quality Model through Expert Review for Green Information Systems</b></p> <p>DOI : <a href="https://doi.org/10.62527/joiv.8.4.3648">10.62527/joiv.8.4.3648</a></p> <p><i>Shireen Muhammad, Yusmadi Yah Jusoh, Rozi Nor Haizan Nor, Gulzat Tyrysbekovna Jussupbekova, Aidin Orisbayevna Baidibekova</i></p>	<p>PDF 2246-2252</p>
<p><b>Named Entity Recognition in Medical Domain: A systematic Literature Review</b></p> <p>DOI : <a href="https://doi.org/10.62527/joiv.8.4.3111">10.62527/joiv.8.4.3111</a></p> <p><i>Selvia Ferdiana Kusuma, Prasetyo Wibowo, Abid Famasya Abdillah, Setio Basuki</i></p>	<p>PDF 2253-2260</p>
<p><b>Metaheuristic Optimization in Dynamic Unit Commitment of Power Systems: Current Trends and Future Prospects</b></p> <p>DOI : <a href="https://doi.org/10.62527/joiv.8.4.2423">10.62527/joiv.8.4.2423</a></p> <p><i>Lilis Widayanti, Arif Nur Afandi, Heru Wahyu Herwanto, Vivi Aida Fitria</i></p>	<p>PDF 2261-2272</p>



## Identification of Critical Success Factors of Geographic Information System Development Project with AHP Approach

Nur Aini <sup>a,\*</sup>, Wawan Kurniawan <sup>b</sup>, Agnes Sondita Payani <sup>c</sup>, Ratna Yulika Go <sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department Management, Faculty of Economic and Business, Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis Ahmad Dahlan, Tangerang, Indonesia

<sup>b</sup> Department of Industrial Engineering, Faculty of Industrial Technology, Universitas Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>c</sup> Research Center for Geoinformatics, National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN), Cibinong, West Java, Indonesia

<sup>d</sup> Departement of Informatic Engineering, Faculty of Computer Science, Universitas Esa Unggul, Jakarta, Indonesia

Corresponding author: \*aini.nur1969@gmail.com

**Abstract**—An Indonesian government agency in the field of research is developing a Geographic Information System (GIS) to distribute remote sensing data to customers. To prevent project failure, it is crucial to understand the success criteria related to project objectives and the critical success factors (CSFs), which drive project success. This research identifies these CSFs, enabling organizations to prioritize project success factors. The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) ranks project success criteria and CSFs. The mixed research methodology incorporates qualitative elements through discussions with the project manager to validate the AHP hierarchy structure and quantitative aspects through questionnaires used to calculate weighted priorities using AHP. Results show stakeholder satisfaction and objective achievement as the top-ranked success criteria. The top 5 CSFs identified are team commitment and participation, clear roles and responsibilities, leadership, knowledge management, appropriate tools, infrastructure, and resources. Based on the success criteria ranking, development should enhance system functionality to maintain user satisfaction and achieve project objectives. Meanwhile, prioritizing human resources and providing adequate resources are crucial based on the identified top 5 CSFs, contributing to increased development success. This outcome aims to assist firms in improving project management and identifying the most critical success elements for GIS development. Furthermore, this research will likely be a learning experience for other government organizations seeking to enhance their information system development efforts.

**Keywords**—Geographic information system; project success criteria; critical success factors; analytic hierarchy process.

Manuscript received 7 Aug. 2023; revised 5 Dec. 2023; accepted 18 Apr. 2024. Date of publication 31 Dec. 2024.  
International Journal on Informatics Visualization is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License.



### I. INTRODUCTION

One of the main challenges in information technology (IT) project management is the risk of project failure, which may arise from diverse factors, sources, and methodologies applied during the project. Information systems development within governmental contexts is particularly susceptible to failure due to various driving and inhibiting factors throughout the development process. Analyzing success factors in developing information systems within government projects is imperative to ensure the success of IT projects in such environments.

Various literature has been explored to analyze the factors contributing to the success of IT development projects. Key success factors encompass digital literacy and internet penetration. The utilization of both internal and external knowledge through collaboration can facilitate the development of a more agile project [1] and enhance e-

government implementation [2]. The project's complexity, the team's absorptive capacity, and e-leadership are also pivotal in determining whether an e-government project will encounter delays or overspending [3], [4].

E-Government is an electronic or computer-based governmental platform that enhances capabilities and capacities in delivering public services and advancing human resources development [5]. An Indonesian government agency in the field of research has developed a Geographic Information System (GIS) dedicated to supporting e-government by facilitating the retrieval of remote sensing satellite imagery data. The system functions as a geoportal, allowing users to access remote sensing data online, which undergoes processing to generate a province mosaic. The system is designed to elevate product utilization and foster innovation through a stakeholder-oriented perspective tailored for organizational enhancement.




Fig. 1 Root Cause Problem Analysis Using Fishbone Diagram

The geoportals was launched in 2019, and its development was outsourced to external vendors or third-party entities. This system relies on web services and web portals, serving 34 provinces in Indonesia. Although it has been launched and is ready for user adoption, ongoing efforts to improve the system have been in progress since 2021, including integrating a land cover classification module. In 2022, a machine learning module was developed to facilitate tree counting and identification of burned areas. The project has transformed into a hybrid model, combining development or engineering projects with in-house research activities.

In the ongoing development process, in-house team members encounter several issues that, if left unaddressed, could impede the project's success. These challenges encompass insufficient capacity and capability of human resources, the inherent complexity of the projects, and the lack of literacy related to the system. The problems stem from the fact that the vendor undertook the initial development while subsequent refinement projects are being handled by internal staff. Although knowledge transfer from the vendor team to the internal team has been conducted previously, its effectiveness in facilitating subsequent projects remains suboptimal.

Another issue arises from the changes in work mechanisms, organizational culture, and the rotation of human resources, resulting in a reduction in the number of team members from the initial count due to the government agency's reorganization. These alterations may impact the project's success. Ideally, several modules should have been seamlessly integrated into the system by the end of 2021. However, due to the project's development, the intended scope was not achieved within the current year.

Projects can encounter failure due to various reasons. The Ishikawa Diagram, also known as fishbone analysis, served as a straightforward graphic tool for comprehending the causes of quality defects. It is employed to analyze the relationship between problems and all potential causes [6]. Following an interview with the project coordinator, Figure 1 illustrates the root cause analysis of the geoportals project failure. The underlying issues are categorized into four domains, namely People, Process, Technology, and Organization, utilizing the project failure framework [7].

To mitigate the risk of project failure, it is imperative to delineate the key factors driving the success of an IT project [8]. These factors are commonly known as Critical Success

Factors (CSF). Various scholars have conducted previous research on CSFs in information system development or IT projects. Edwita *et al.* [9], for instance, explored the CSF of information system development project through Systematic Literature Review, Guntur *et al.* [10] identified CSFs in the E-Government development of the Finance Education and Training Agency, utilizing the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) method, Gumay *et al.* [11] identified CSFs in IT projects within an Indonesian telco company AHP approach, Raharjo *et al.* [12] employed AHP for identifying CSFs in the project management office, Radujković and Sjekavica [13] utilized a literature review to identify CSFs in project management.

While numerous studies delve into identifying CSFs in information systems development, there has been little specific discussion of GIS development projects, particularly within the last five years. Recognizing this gap, the present research addresses the question, "What are the project CSFs in the geoportals development project?" To answer this research question, a thorough analysis is imperative, necessitating the application of an appropriate methodology.

The application of multicriteria decision-making is a common approach for establishing priorities or making decisions, with AHP emerging as the most frequently employed and successful method [14]. Building on prior research that highlights AHP's effectiveness in identifying CSFs by comparing the importance of one factor with another [10], [11], [12] This study utilized AHP Hierarchy for root cause analysis, guiding the examination of project success criteria and CSFs in developing geoportals. The primary aim of this research is to analyze the CSFs in geoportals development. The anticipated outcome of this study is an enhancement in the success of IT projects, particularly in developing geoportals as integral systems supporting e-government initiatives within organizations, thereby improving data services to the community.

## II. MATERIALS AND METHOD

The following are the literature materials for this research. The literature materials encompass a comprehensive review, summarizing key aspects such as IT project management, project success criteria, CSFs associated with e-government, and AHP.

### A. IT Project Management

A project comprises temporarily executed activities or tasks to create an organization's distinctive product, service, or outcome. A project manager, chosen from the organization, assumes the leadership role and is accountable for accomplishing project objectives [7]. Projects vary in size, duration, and cost, contingent upon their specific attributes. They can be small, large, short, long, or low-cost.

IT projects are IT investment activities based on products, services, or organizational investments, wherein organizations anticipate returns from the allocated resources, finances, and time invested in project implementation [7]. IT projects support diverse organizational activities, including maintaining current or legacy systems and innovative development, leveraging technological advancements and current trends. Information system development, a subset of IT projects, involves collaborating pooling resources from various experts to develop a software product. The team typically comprises system analysts, developers, testers, database analysts, trainers, and other specialized experts [15].

Project management involves applying techniques, skills, tools, and knowledge derived from project activities to fulfill project requirements. Within project management, a set of processes is organized into process groups: initiating, planning, executing, monitoring and control, and closing. The project team is required to concentrate on maintaining a balance among various project constraints, including quality, budget, resources, risk, schedule, and scope [16]. By addressing this constraint, project management facilitates the equilibrium necessary for achieving project success.

### B. Project Success Criteria and Critical Success Factors from Related Research

Unique success criteria, distinct from other IT projects, characterize every IT project. The assessment of project success hinges on factors such as timely completion, adherence to budget constraints, and fulfillment of user

requirements [10]. Defining project success criteria holds significance as they serve as the cornerstone for all project activities [17]. Various literature sources have outlined success criteria for IT projects, and a summary is presented in Table I below.

TABLE I  
PROJECT SUCCESS CRITERIA DEFINE BY LITERATURE

Project Success Criteria	References						
	[18]	[11]	[10]	[17]	[19]	[7]	[16]
Time	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Cost	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Scope	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Quality	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Risk	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Stakeholder's satisfaction	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Technical Requirement						✓	
Objective Achievement						✓	
Communication Process	✓						

CSF is often used as a key to developing information systems and IT projects. It is important to define CSF so that organizations can prioritize CSF in their strategic plans to achieve a competitive advantage. CSF is an applicable and powerful method to carry out challenges in IT implementation [20]. CSF can identify issues that need attention in emerging IT projects. If the CSF is not done well, the project will potentially not achieve its mission, goals, or business [21] [22]. Recognizing the significance of identifying CSF in information system development, a literature review was conducted on previous research pertaining to CSFs in IT/IS development projects. The review revealed the classification of 48 CSFs into categories such as people, process, technology, organization, and external environment, as illustrated in Table II.

TABLE II  
IT PROJECTS CSF MAPPING BY PREVIOUS RESEARCH

CSF	References							
	[18]	[23]	[14]	[10]	[12]	[9]	[13]	[24]
<b>People</b>								
Efficient communication	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓
Team skills and competencies		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓
Team composition, team size		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓
Leadership	✓			✓	✓		✓	
Trust						✓		
Customer Involvement		✓						✓
Project manager experience	✓							
Project manager formal power	✓	✓						
Project manager skill	✓	✓						
Clear roles and responsibilities					✓			
Team commitment and participation	✓							
<b>Process</b>								
Proper planning	✓			✓		✓		✓
Realistic schedule				✓	✓			✓
Business process reengineering								
Knowledge management, sharing knowledge		✓		✓				
Project evaluation				✓	✓	✓	✓	
Efficient project management	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓
Project size, project complexity		✓	✓			✓		

CSF	References							
	[18]	[23]	[14]	[10]	[12]	[9]	[13]	[24]
Ability to provide added value			✓		✓			
Alignment with company business goals					✓			
User-oriented change management			✓					✓
Project control and monitoring	✓							
Project risk management	✓	✓						
Project duration	✓	✓						
Vendor support		✓	✓					
<b>Technology</b>								
System compatibility, system integration			✓	✓		✓		
Familiar with technology					✓	✓	✓	
Information system expertise					✓	✓		
Clear requirements and specification	✓						✓	
Appropriate tools, infrastructure, adequate resources, IT readiness		✓	✓		✓		✓	
Data quality, data availability		✓	✓					
Software customization		✓						
HW/SF selection		✓						
<b>Organization</b>								
Top management support, management commitment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Politics in organization				✓				
Organization culture		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Business professional expertise					✓	✓		
Client expertise					✓	✓		
Independent PMO					✓			
Realistic budget and financial resource								✓
Relationship with third party	✓							
Organization strategic planning	✓	✓						
Rules and regulation	✓	✓						
Subject matter expert	✓							
Outsourcing index		✓						
<b>External Environment</b>								
Competitor pressure			✓					
Trend	✓	✓						

Like project success criteria, CSFs vary in each project and are contingent upon specific conditions. From the pool of the 48 identified CSFs, a subset related to the challenges encountered in the geoportal's development will be chosen. The project manager overseeing the geoportal development will validate this selection.

### C. Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)

AHP is known as a sophisticated technique employed in group decision-making. Saaty has introduced it into a versatile tool for decision selection across diverse situations. AHP operates as a multicriteria decision-making approach, systematically arranging factors in a hierarchical structure. This hierarchical framework organizes factors from the overall goal down to criteria, sub-criteria, and alternatives at sequential levels in the decision-making process [25].

When establishing the hierarchy, several considerations should be taken into account, as outlined in [25]:

- Hierarchies should comprehensively represent problems while remaining sensitive to changes in elements.
- It is crucial to pay attention to the environment surrounding the problem.

- Identify issues or attributes that contribute to the solution.
- Recognize participants associated with the problem.

Goals, attributes, issues, and stakeholders are organized in a hierarchy to offer a comprehensive view of the complex relationships within a situation. This hierarchical structure aids decision-makers in assessing problems, enabling accurate comparisons of elements [25]. In the application of AHP to this study, a literature review was conducted and revealing a substantial body of previous research that utilized AHP in studies related to IT/IS Projects [10], [11], [12], [14], [23], [24], [26].

The methodology employed in this research is outlined in the following sections. The methodology is discussed in several sections: research flow, research instrument, and data collection and technique. This research utilizes a mixed method approach, combining qualitative and quantitative procedures sequentially or simultaneously. Qualitative research focuses on "words" to capture a phenomenon, employing ethnography and case studies to emphasize qualitative data. On the other hand, quantitative research involves procedures such as experiments or surveys, highlighting "numbers" or quantitative data [27]. This study utilized qualitative methods to analyze the root of the problem

and validate the list of project success criteria and CSFs obtained from a compilation found in the literature. Quantitative methods were applied to rank or prioritize CSFs and project success criteria using the AHP method.

#### D. Research Flow

This study consists of 11 stages, as illustrated in Figure 2. The explanation of each stage is as follows:

1) *Problem Identification*: This involves identifying problems and root causes through observations of ongoing projects within the organization. The findings are validated through discussion with project managers or coordinators.

2) *Literature Study*: Conduct a literature review of previous research related to identifying CSF in IT/IS projects that used AHP or other methods.

3) *Project Success Criteria and CSF Identification*: In this stage, project success criteria and CSF are collected and summarized based on the literature review. Further validation is performed through discussions with the project manager.

4) *Define Hierarchy*: Creating an AHP hierarchy that serves as the framework for this study.

5) *Determine Participants*: Identifying participants directly involved in the project. Participants were chosen based on their direct involvement in the ongoing GIS project. All active remaining team members were included to ensure firsthand knowledge and relevant experience. Participants are coded R1 to R5.

6) *Define questionnaire*: Preparing an online questionnaire using the AHP Online System (AHP-OS) by Bpmsg.com [28]. For example, the questionnaire posed comparative questions such as comparing Factor A to Factor B, Factor B to C, and Factor A to Factor C, asking participants to determine which factor is more crucial. This process continued until all factors were compared with one another.




Fig. 2 Research Flow

7) *Distribute Questionnaire*: The questionnaire was distributed to predetermined participants through a link (bmsg.com). Participants can access the link, fill in personal

data, and answer questions. The data collected automatically will be analyzed for consistency using AHP-OS tools.

8) *Calculate Weight of Project Success Criteria and CSF*: Determining the weight of project success criteria and CSFs, forming the basis for priority rankings based on participant-assigned weights. The weight calculation employs the AHP eigenvector method, a widely accepted approach in the literature [28]. This method assigns weights to each criterion and factor based on the participant's responses to pairwise comparisons, ensuring a systematic and consistent calculation process. The AHP eigenvector method provides a rigorous and transparent way to quantify the relative importance of success criteria and CSFs, contributing to the robustness of the prioritization process.

9) *Calculate the Consistency Ratio (CR)*: Ensure the CR is below 10%. If it exceeds 10%, participants are required to correct their questionnaire until it falls below 10%.

The CR formula used in AHP-OS is as follows [28]:

$$CR = \frac{\lambda - n}{2.7699n - 3.43513 - n} \quad (1)$$

Here,  $\lambda$  is the value of  $n \times n$  decision matrix for  $n$  criteria.

10) *Rank the Project Success Criteria and CSF*: The project success criteria and CSFs are ranked using the processed weights. AHP-OS provided a group consensus result to ensure that the weight results do not lead to a deadlock due to conflicting judgments for two criteria. The interpretation of the AHP consensus indicator is presented in Table III.

TABLE III  
AHP GROUP CONSENSUS INDICATOR [28]

Consensus Indicator	Explanation
$\leq 50\%$	Very low
50% - 65%	Low
65% - 75%	Moderate
75% - 85%	High
$\geq 85\%$	Very High

11) *Conclusions*: Based on the preceding stages, it can be deduced which factors must be considered to achieve project success.

#### E. Research Instrument

In Table I, 10 criteria for project success were identified. Following validation with the project manager, six project success criteria were selected: Time, Cost, Scope, Quality, Stakeholder Satisfaction, and Objective Achievement. Table II presents 48 CSFs gathered from the literature, with 23 factors selected, distributed as follows: seven factors in the People category, six factors in the Process category, six factors in the Technology category, and four factors in the Organizational category. A comparison of each success criterion and CSFs is conducted using an absolute scale, as illustrated in Table IV [28].

Additionally, based on the extensive number of CSFs utilized in this study, 57 questionnaire items were designed. It offers a participant-driven prioritization of factors according to their subjective significance. The Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) creates rankings based on participants' responses to these pairwise comparisons. According to the AHP hierarchy presented in Figure 3, the scale mentioned

earlier yields a priority ranking of the project success criteria and CSF for comparison.

#### F. Data Collection Technique

The initial data collection involved qualitative data, including observation and discussion with the project manager to identify problems and root causes and validate the success criteria and CSFs for the GIS development project. The validation results were then used to create a questionnaire instrument, which was subsequently distributed to team members.

For the data collection phase using questionnaires, the distribution took place online among members of the geoportal development project team in May 2022. The questionnaire employed AHP-OS tools from bpmmsg.com to facilitate calculations and analyze results [28]. Efforts were made to keep the CR below 10% to mitigate the inconsistency and

contradiction in AHP. Fortunately, AHP-OS checks the CR of each user inputting his questionnaire, highlighting any inconsistencies. Users can then revise their questionnaire responses to determine the rating until the CR meets the requirements of being below 10%.

### III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

#### A. Results

Based on the previous research stage, an AHP hierarchy model was developed. Following validation with the project manager, six project success criteria relevant to this project were selected, namely Time, Cost, Scope, Quality, Stakeholder Satisfaction, and Objective Achievement. The weighting of project success criteria will be conducted using AHP, with participants determining the priority of criteria in the geoportal development.




Fig. 3 AHP Hierarchy Model

Additionally, there are four categories of CSF: People, Process, Technology, and Organization, encompassing 23 CSFs related to the project, all of which have been validated by the project manager. This hierarchy serves as the foundation for creating AHP questionnaires with a structure comprising two hierarchy levels, 23 hierarchy leaves, and five hierarchy nodes. The research questionnaire utilizes AHP-OS [28]. The weighting results of project success criteria are presented in Table V, while the weights for the CSF Group Categories are displayed in Table VI. A Group Consensus of 84.8% indicates a high consensus on the success criteria, ensuring that the resulting solution is meaningful for the decision problem. All respondents provided CR calculations below 10%, confirming the consistency of the questionnaire results. In addition to individual weights per respondent, the final weights are calculated in groups, as in Table V and Table VI. The criterion or factor with the highest weight is

considered the organization's most important and recommended priority.

TABLE V  
RANK OF PROJECT SUCCESS CRITERIA

Success Factor Criteria	Weight (%)					Group
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	
Stakeholder's satisfaction	21.1	33.4	26.5	25.6	16.7	25.9
Objective achievement	21.1	33.4	26.5	25.6	16.7	25.9
Quality	19.6	11.6	10.9	25.6	16.7	17.3
Time	15.3	7.3	26.5	9.5	16.7	14.6
Cost	18.2	12	4.8	4.3	16.7	10
Scope	4.8	2.3	4.8	9.5	16.7	6.3
CR	8.8	9.1	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.4
Group Consensus Indicator	84.8% (high)					

Table V reveals that the most crucial success criteria for a project are stakeholder satisfaction and objective achievement.

This aligns with the geoportal's purpose, serving as a tool to enhance remote sensing data services through E-Government.

TABLE VI  
RANK OF CSF GROUP CATEGORY

CSF Category	Weight (%)					Group
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	
People	56.5	56.5	5.5	56.5	56.5	43.8
Technology	5.5	26.2	26.2	26.2	26.2	23.5
Process	26.2	11.8	56.5	11.8	11.8	23.4
Organization	11.8	5.5	11.8	5.5	5.5	9.3
CR	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	1.9
Group Consensus Indicator	67.5% (moderate)					

Table VI indicates that People are the most important factor in achieving development success, highlighting the significant influence of human resources on the development process. Table VII details the consolidation of each CSF group category weighing from 5 respondents.

TABLE VII  
SUMMARY OF CSF LOCAL WEIGHT

Group Category	CSF	Local Weight (%)	Ranking	Indicator (%)
People	Efficient Communication	12.12	5	CR=0.3684 Group Consensus = 84.3 (high)
	Team skills and competencies	14.48	4	
	Team composition and team size	3.44	7	
	Leadership	17.63	3	
	Project Manager Experience	7.18	6	
	Clear roles and responsibilities	21.30	2	
	Team commitment and participation	23.86	1	
	Proper planning	12.13	4	
	Realistic schedule	12.80	3	
	Knowledge management	31.43	1	
Process	Efficient project management	11.67	5	CR=0.8431 Group Consensus = 78.7 (high)
	Project complexity	8.48	6	
	Project control and monitoring	23.49	2	
	System compatibility	15.89	3	
Technology	Familiar with technology	10.19	5	CR=0.1881 Group Consensus = 73.6 (moderate)
	Clear requirements and specification	13.01	4	
	Appropriate tools, infrastructure, and resource	28.23	1	
	Data quality and availability	23.13	2	
	HW/SF selection	9.56	6	
Organization	Top management support and commitment	30.30	2	CR=1.0722 Group Consensus = 87.9 (very high)
	Organization culture	9.14	4	
	Financial resource	42.83	1	
	Organization strategic plan	17.74	3	

All four group categories have CR below 10%, indicating the consistency of the AHP questionnaire results. Furthermore, all group consensus values are above 65%, affirming that the rank of the CSF groups is a viable solution to the problem. In

the People category, team commitment and participation are the most crucial factors

The most important factor in the process category is knowledge management. Within the Technology category, the most significant factor is the availability of appropriate tools, infrastructure, and resources. Finally, in the Organizations category, the most critical factor is the availability of financial resources.

For a comprehensive view of the ranking of all factors serving as CSFs in geoportal development, Figure 4 illustrates the overall combined CSF ranking across the four group categories. The overall CR showed a value of 1.9263%, indicating that after merging the four categories, the factors provided by the five respondents were consistently filled in, making the results feasible for use as a solution to address the problem.



Fig. 4 Summary of CSF Global Weight (CR = 1.9263%)

## B. Discussion

Based on the findings, the top 5 critical success factors for GIS project development are in consecutive order.

1) *Team Commitment and Participation*: This factor, ranked first under the People category, significantly impacts GIS project development. Literature supports the notion that thorough commitment and active participation from each team member are crucial for successful geoportal development [18]. Organizations should ensure that human resource concentration is not overly divided among multiple projects to support geoportal's successful development.

2) *Clear Roles and Responsibility*: Ranked second under the People category, Clear Roles and Responsibilities are crucial. The literature emphasizes the importance of involving team members not only during execution but also in the planning phase [12]. Assigning tasks and responsibilities clearly ensures that every member knows and agrees on their roles, preventing unassigned tasks.

3) *Leadership*: Ranked third factor under the People category, Leadership is a vital factor supported by various literature sources as an IT/IS success factor [10], [11], [12], [13], [18]. Project managers must efficiently distribute tasks, persuade and motivate team members, and adhere to timelines for effective contributions to geoportals development.

4) *Knowledge Management*: Ranked fourth under the Process category, Knowledge Management is identified as an IT/IS success factor [10], [23]. Regularly sharing tools or media about experiences in GIS development is necessary, and effective documentation minimizes difficulties in further development.

5) *Appropriate Tools, Infrastructure, and Resources*: Ranked fifth under the Technology category, the availability of Appropriate Tools, Infrastructure, and Resources is emphasized by literature [11]–[14], [23]. The organization must be committed to providing IT facilities for geoportals development readiness.

The following three factors are Team Skills and Competencies (under the People category), Project Control and Monitoring (under the Process category), and Data Quality and Availability (under the Organization category). This indicated that human resources development through certified training, internal monitoring and evaluation, and data availability for trials in executing draft modules are crucial for success [29]–[30].

The last three factors ranked are Organizational Culture, Team Composition and Size, and Organizational Strategic Plan. These factors suggest that changes in organizational structure, reduced team size, and cultural changes minimally interfere with the development process. Financial resources are ranked 10<sup>th</sup> because they play a significant role in meeting facility needs for development.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the AHP-weighted results, project success criteria and CSFs were ranked for the GIS project development. Stakeholder satisfaction and objective achievement emerged as the top project success criteria. The top five CSFs identified are Team Commitment and Participation, Clear Roles and Responsibilities, Leadership, Knowledge Management, Appropriate Tools, Infrastructure, and Resources. These findings will guide organizations in enhancing project management and prioritizing success factors crucial for GIS development success. Moreover, the research is a valuable learning experience for other government agencies seeking to improve their information system development projects.

It is important to note that this research is limited to a single case study, limiting its generalizability to the organization under study. Nevertheless, the AHP variables and hierarchies can serve as a reference for similar research in case studies involving other projects and organizations. The study acknowledges the absence of consideration for emotional influence factors, especially regarding the potential impact of a lengthy AHP questionnaire on respondent enthusiasm. Future research could explore these emotional factors and integrate additional ranking methods such as Fuzzy AHP and TOPSIS to enhance solution accuracy performance evaluation.

We thank the Faculty of Computer Science, University of Indonesia, and the Research Center for Remote Sensing, National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN) for supporting this research.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] K. Osmundsen, J. Iden, and B. Bygstad, "Digital Transformation: Drivers, Success Factors, and Implications," *Mediterr. Conf. Inf. Syst. Proc.*, vol. 12, no. January 2019, pp. 1–15, 2018.
- [2] R. Meiyanti et al., "Systematic review of critical success factors of E-government: Definition and realization," *2017 International Conference on Sustainable Information Engineering and Technology (SIET)*, pp. 190–195, Nov. 2017, doi: 10.1109/siet.2017.8304133.
- [3] T. Bjorvatn and A. Wald, "Project complexity and team-level absorptive capacity as drivers of project management performance," *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 876–888, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2018.05.003.
- [4] Y. H. C.P and T. D. Susanto, "E-Leadership: The Effect of E-Government Success in Indonesia," *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, vol. 1201, p. 012025, May 2019, doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/1201/1/012025.
- [5] O. Jonathan, C. K. Ayo, and S. Misra, "A comparative study of e-Government successful implementation between Nigeria and Republic of Korea," *Asia-Pacific World Congress on Computer Science and Engineering*, pp. 1–7, Nov. 2014, doi: 10.1109/apwccse.2014.7053869.
- [6] L. Liliana, "A new model of Ishikawa diagram for quality assessment," *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, vol. 161, p. 012099, Nov. 2016, doi: 10.1088/1757-899x/161/1/012099.
- [7] Marchewka, *Information Technology Project Management, Providing Measurable Organization Value*. 2015.
- [8] M. Albert, P. Balve, and K. Spang, "Evaluation of project success: a structured literature review," *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 796–821, Sep. 2017, doi:10.1108/ijmpb-01-2017-0004.
- [9] A. Edwita, D. I. Sensuse, and H. Noprissun, "Critical Success Factors of Information System Development Projects," in *International Conference on Information Technology Systems and Innovation (ICITSI)*, Bandung, 2017, pp. 285–290.
- [10] M. Guntur, B. Purwandari, T. Raharjo, I. Solichah, and L. Kumalalita, "Critical Success Factors for Information Systems Development," *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Business and Information Management*, pp. 29–33, Sep. 2018, doi:10.1145/3278252.3278288.
- [11] L. A. Gumay, B. Purwandari, T. Raharjo, A. Wahyudi, and M. Purwaningsih, "Identifying Critical Success Factors for Information Technology Projects with an Analytic Hierarchy Process," *Proceedings of the 2020 2nd Asia Pacific Information Technology Conference*, pp. 108–112, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1145/3379310.3379326.
- [12] T. Raharjo, B. Purwandari, R. Satria, and I. Solichah, "Critical Success Factors for Project Management Office: An Insight from Indonesia," *2018 Third International Conference on Informatics and Computing (ICIC)*, pp. 1–6, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1109/iac.2018.8780504.
- [13] M. Radujković and M. Sjekavica, "Project Management Success Factors," *Procedia Engineering*, vol. 196, pp. 607–615, 2017, doi:10.1016/j.proeng.2017.08.048.
- [14] A. N. H. Zaied, M. Grida, and G. Soliman, "fuzzy AHP Evaluation of Critical Success Factors for Business Intelligence Systems Using Fuzzy AHP," no. October 2018.
- [15] D. L. Olson, *Information systems project management*. Business Expert Press, 2014.
- [16] Project Management Institute, *A guide to the project management body of knowledge (PMBOK guide) Fifth edition*. Project Management Institute, 2013.
- [17] H. Kerzner, *Project management metrics, KPIs, and dashboards: a guide to measuring and monitoring project performance*. John Wiley & Sons, 2017.
- [18] N. W. Trisnawaty, T. Raharjo, B. Hardian, and A. Prasetyo, "Success Criteria and Factor for IT Project Application Implementation in Digital Transformation Era: A Case Study Financial Sector Industry," *2021 IEEE International IOT, Electronics and Mechatronics Conference (IEMTRONICS)*, pp. 1–7, Apr. 2021, doi:10.1109/iemtronics52119.2021.9422578.

- [19] J. Gomes and M. Romão, "Improving Project Success: A Case Study Using Benefits and Project Management," *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 100, pp. 489–497, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2016.09.187.
- [20] Z. A. Al-Sai, R. Abdullah, and M. H. Husin, "Critical success factors for big data: a systematic literature review," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 118940–118956, 2020.
- [21] C. Pollard and A. Cater-Steel, "Justifications, strategies, and critical success factors in successful ITIL implementations in US and Australian companies: an exploratory study," *Inf. Syst. Manag.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 164–175, 2009.
- [22] S. Prasad, R. Shankar, R. Gupta, and S. Roy, "A TISM modeling of critical success factors of blockchain based cloud services," *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 434–456, Sep. 2018, doi: 10.1108/jamr-03-2018-0027.
- [23] R. Octavianus, "The Analysis of Critical Success Factor Ranking for Software Development and Implementation Project Using AHP," pp. 313–318, 2018.
- [24] T. Yaghoobi, "Prioritizing key success factors of software projects using fuzzy AHP," *Journal of Software: Evolution and Process*, vol. 30, no. 1, Sep. 2017, doi: 10.1002/smr.1891.
- [25] T. L. Saaty, "How to make a decision: The analytic hierarchy process," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 9–26, Sep. 1990, doi: 10.1016/0377-2217(90)90057-i.
- [26] A. Maceika, A. Bugajev, O. R. Šostak, and T. Vilutien, "Decision Tree and AHP Methods Application for Projects Assessment: A Case Study," pp. 1–33, 2021.
- [27] J. Recker, *Scientific Research in Information Systems*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-30048-6.
- [28] K. D. Goepel, "Implementation of an Online Software Tool for the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP-OS)," *International Journal of the Analytic Hierarchy Process*, vol. 10, no. 3, Dec. 2018, doi:10.13033/ijahp.v10i3.590.
- [29] A. Ribeiro and L. Domingues, "Acceptance of an agile methodology in the public sector," *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 138, pp. 621–629, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2018.10.083.
- [30] N. Poluektova, T. Klebanova, and L. Guryanova, "Risk Assessment of Corporate Infocommunication Systems Projects Using Bayesian Networks," *2018 International Scientific-Practical Conference Problems of Infocommunications. Science and Technology (PIC S&T)*, pp. 31–34, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1109/infocommst.2018.8632150.

# joiv turnitin gis.pdf

*by 2026*

---

**Submission date:** 31-Jan-2026 09:49PM (UTC+0900)

**Submission ID:** 2867663218

**File name:** joiv\_turnitin\_gis.pdf (602.61K)

**Word count:** 4913

**Character count:** 27163

# Identification of Critical Success Factors of Geographic Information System Development Project with AHP Approach

*Abstract*—An Indonesian government agency in the field of research developing a Geographic Information System (GIS) for remote sensing data distribution to customers. To avoid the failure of a development project, it is important to know the success criteria related to the project objective, and the critical success factors (CSF) which are the driving factors for the success of a project. This research was conducted to identify the CSF so that organizations can prioritize the success factors in their projects. The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) ranks project success criteria and CSF. The methodology of this research is a mixed method, including qualitative through discussions with the project manager to validate the AHP hierarchy structure while quantitative through questionnaires were used to calculate weighted priorities using AHP. The results show that stakeholder satisfaction and objective achievement are the first-ranked success criteria. The top 5 CSFs are team commitment and participation; clear roles and responsibilities; leadership; knowledge management; and appropriate tools, infrastructure, and resources. Based on the ranking of success criteria, the development needs to be more focused on the functionality of its system to maintain user satisfaction and objective achievement. Meanwhile, based on the 5 CSFs, organizations need to focus on human resources and providing adequate resources to increase development success. This outcome is designed to help firms improve project management and identify the most important success elements for GIS development. Furthermore, this research will likely serve as a learning experience for other government organizations to improve their information system development efforts.

*Keywords*— geographic information system, project success criteria, critical success factors, analytic hierarchy process

## I. INTRODUCTION

One of the main problems in information technology (IT) project management is project failure due to various factors, sources, and methods of handling the project. The development of information systems in government is prone to failure due to various driving and inhibiting factors in the development process. Analysis of success factors in the development of information systems in government is important enough to ensure the success of IT projects in government.

Some literature has been researched to analyze the factors driving the success of IT development projects. Factors driving success include digital literacy and internet penetration. Harnessing both internal and external knowledge through collaboration can aid in the development of a more agile project [1] and e-government implementation [2]. The complexity of the project, the absorptive capacity of the team, and e-leadership also influence whether a project of e-government will experience delays or overspending [3][4].

E-Government is an electronic or computer-based government platform used to improve capabilities and capacity to provide public services and human resources development [5]. An Indonesian government agency in the field of research has developed a Geographic Information System (GIS) to support e-government to serve remote sensing satellite imagery data. The system is used as a geoportals which users can use the system to access remote sensing data online where the data is processed into a province mosaic. The system is designed to increase product utilization and innovation through a stakeholder perspective for the organization.

That geoportals has been launched since 2019 and the system is developed by vendors or third parties. This system is based on web services and web portals for 34 provinces in Indonesia. Although it has been launched and is ready for use by users, the addition of a land cover classification module for the improvement of the system has been carried out since 2021, followed by the addition of a machine learning module to perform tree counting and identification of burned areas in 2022. The project became a development or engineering project combined with in-house research activities.




Fig. 1 Root Cause Problem: Analysis Using Fishbone Diagram

In the current development process, some issues are experienced by in-house team members whereas if these issues are not addressed, they will be able to interfere with the success of this project. These problems include inadequate capacity and capability of human resources, quite complex projects, and the lack of literacy related to the system. The problem arises because the initial development is carried out by the vendor while the refinement project is carried out by internal staff. Knowledge transfer from the vendor team to the internal has previously been carried out but it is still not optimal in carrying out further projects.

Another problem is the emergence of changes in work mechanisms, culture, and some related human resources so that the number of team members is reduced from the initial members due to the reorganization of this government agency. Some changes can affect the success of the project. Ideally, some modules should have been successfully integrated into the system by the end of 2021 but in its development, the scope of the project was not achieved in the current year.

Projects can fail for a variety of reasons. Ishikawa Diagram or fishbone analysis is used as a simple graphic diagram to understand the causes of quality defects and it is used to analyze the relationship between problems and all possible causes [6]. Based on the results of an interview with the project coordinator, the root cause analysis of geoportals project failure is shown in Figure 1. The root of the problem is divided into four categories using the project failure domain, namely People, Process, Technology, and Organization [7].

To minimize the failure of a project, it is necessary to define the driver factors of an IT project's success [8]. Those factors are referred to as the Critical Success Factors (CSF). Previous research on CSF information system development or IT projects including Edwita *et al.* who discussed the CSF of information system development project using Systematic Literature Review [9], Guntur *et al.* identified CSF of E-Government development of the Finance Education and Training Agency case study using Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) method [10], Gumay *et al.* identified CSF on IT projects of Indonesian telco company case study using AHP [11], Raharjo *et al.* used AHP for CSF identification in Project Management Office [12], Radujković & Sjekavica used literature review for CSF identification in Project Management [13].

Many studies discuss the identification of CSF in the development of information systems but there is not much specific to discuss for GIS development projects, especially in the last 5 years. By looking at the gap, this research was

conducted to answer, "What are the project CSF in the geoportals development project?". To answer the research question, it is necessary to conduct an analysis using the right method.

The use of multicriteria decisions is often used to determine priorities or decisions where AHP is the most frequently used and successful method [14]. Based on previous research, AHP can be used to identify CSF by comparing the importance of one factor with another [10]–[12]. The root cause analysis will then be a guideline for conducting project success criteria and CSF analysis in the development of geoportals as AHP Hierarchy in this study. The purpose of this study is to analyze the CSF in the development of geoportals. The result of this research is expected can increase the success of IT projects, especially the development of geoportals as one of the systems that support e-government at the organization so that it can improve data services to the community.

## II. MATERIALS AND METHOD

The following are the literature materials for this research. A literature study was conducted to summarize IT project management, project success criteria, CSF related to e-government, and AHP.

### A. IT Project Management

A project is a collection of activities or work that are carried out temporarily to create a unique product, service, or result in an organization, where a project manager will be selected from the organization to lead the team and be responsible for achieving project objectives [7]. A project can be large or small; short or long duration; low or high cost; depending on the attributes of the project.

IT projects are IT investment activities based on products, services, or organizational investments where organizations will expect returns from the use of resources, money, and time of project implementation [7]. The project supports various organizational activities such as maintaining the current or legacy system or even innovative development by utilizing technological developments and current trends. Information system development is part of the IT Project which requires resources from various experts to jointly develop a software product where the team consists of system analysts, developers, testers, database analysts, trainers, and other experts [15].

Project Management is an application of techniques, skills, tools, and knowledge from project activities to meet project

requirements. In project management, the **1** is a project management process which is grouped into 4 process groups, namely **initiating, planning, executing, monitoring and control**, as well as **closing**. In project management, the project **team** needs to focus on balancing project constraints such as **quality, budget, resources, risk, schedule, and scope** [16]. Project management helps the constraints on the project to be balanced and produce a successful project.

**B. Project Success Criteria and Critical Success Factors from Related Research**

Each IT project has varying project success criteria and can be different from other IT projects. The success of a project is determined based on the status of whether the project was completed on time, within budget, and by user requirements [10]. The project success criteria are important to define because these can be the foundation for every project activity [17]. Some literature has defined the success criteria for an IT project which is summarized in Table I below.

TABLE I  
PROJECT SUCCESS CRITERIA DEFINED BY LITERATURE

Project Success Criteria	References						
	[18]	[11]	[23]	[14]	[10]	[9]	[24]
Time	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Cost	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Scope	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Quality	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Risk	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Stakeholder's satisfaction	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Technical Requirement					✓		
Objective Achievement					✓		
Communication	✓						
Process	✓						

CSF is often used as a key to the development of information systems and IT projects. CSF is important to define so that organizations can prioritize CSF in organization strategic plans to achieve competitive advantage. CSF is an applicable and powerful method to carry out challenges in IT implementation [20]. CSF can identify issues that need attention in emerging IT projects. If the CSF is not done well, the project will potentially not achieve its mission, goals, or business [21] [22].

TABLE III  
IT PROJECTS CSF MAPPING BY PREVIOUS RESEARCH

CSF	References									
	[18]	[11]	[23]	[14]	[10]	[9]	[13]	[24]		
<b>People</b>										
Efficient communication, social ties	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓	
Team skills and competencies		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Team composition, team size			✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
Leadership	✓	✓			✓	✓		✓		
Trust							✓			
Customer Involvement		✓	✓							✓
Team motivation		✓								
Project manager experience	✓									
Project manager formal power	✓		✓							
Project manager skill	✓		✓							
Clear roles and responsibilities							✓			
Team commitment and participation	✓									
<b>Process</b>										
Proper planning	✓				✓		✓		✓	
Realistic schedule					✓	✓			✓	
Business process reengineering										
Knowledge management, sharing, knowledge			✓		✓					
Project evaluation					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Efficient project management	✓		✓		✓		✓		✓	
Project size, project complexity			✓	✓			✓			
Ability to provide added value				✓		✓				
Alignment with company business goals							✓			
User-oriented change management				✓						✓
Project control and monitoring	✓									
Project risk management	✓		✓							
Project duration	✓		✓							
Vendor support			✓	✓						
Scope control										
<b>Technology</b>										
System compatibility, system integration				✓	✓		✓			

CSF	References								
	[18]	[11]	[23]	[14]	[19]	[12]	[9]	[13]	[24]
Familiar with technology						✓	✓	✓	
Information system expertise						✓	✓		
Clear recruitments and specification	✓	✓							✓
Appropriate tools, infrastructure, adequate resources, IT readiness			✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Data quality, data availability				✓	✓				
Software customization				✓					
HW/SF selection				✓					
<b>Organization</b>									
Top management support, management commitment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Politics in organization					✓				
Organization culture			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Business professional expertise						✓	✓		
Client expertise						✓	✓		
Independent PMO						✓			
Realistic budget and financial resource									✓
Relationship with third party	✓								
Organization strategic planning	✓		✓						
Rules and regulation	✓		✓						
Subject matter expert	✓								
Outsourcing index				✓					
<b>External Environment</b>									
Competitor pressure				✓					
Trend	✓		✓						

Given the importance of identifying CSF information system development, a literature review of previous research on CSF on IT/IS development projects was carried out. Based on the literature review, it was found that 49 CSFs were grouped into the factors category of people, process, technology, organization, and external environment displayed in Table II.

Like the project success criteria, the CSF in each project is varied and depends on the conditions of the project. Of the 49 CSFs, CSF will be selected related to problems that occur in

the development of geoportal and it will be validated by the project manager of geoportal development.

### C. Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)

AHP is known as a technique used in group decision-making and is complex. AHP was proposed by Saaty, and it is currently a tool for decision selection in a wide range of situations. AHP is a multicriteria decision-making approach where factors are organized in a hierarchical structure. In the process of such a hierarchy, it is organized that the factors to be selected are derived from the overall goal to criteria, sub-criteria, and alternatives at the sequential level [25].

In establishing the hierarchy, several things need to be considered, as follows [25]:

- Hierarchies represent problems comprehensively but remain sensitive to changes in elements.
- Pay attention to the environment around the problem.
- Identify issues or attributes that contribute to the solution.
- Identify participants associated with the problem.

Goals, attributes, issues, and stakeholders are arranged in a hierarchy to provide a broad view of the complex relationships in a situation and it helps decision-makers assess problems so that decision-makers can compare elements accurately [25]. As a reference in applying AHP to this study, a literature review was carried out and obtained quite a lot of previous research that used AHP in research related to IT/IS Projects [10]-[12], [14], [23], [24], [26].

The following explains the methodology employed in this research. The methodology is discussed in several sections, namely research flow, research instrument, and data collection and technique. This research uses a mixed method, which is a study that combines qualitative and quantitative procedures either sequentially or simultaneously. Qualitative research focuses on "words" to capture a phenomenon, ethnography, and case studies by emphasizing qualitative data. Quantitative research uses procedures such as experiments or surveys with distinctive characteristics that emphasize "numbers" or quantitative data [27]. In this study, qualitative was used to analyze the root of the problem and validate the list of project success criteria and CSF to be used from a collection of lists found through the literature. Quantitative methods are used for the process of making a ranking or order of CSF priorities and project success criteria using the AHP method.

### D. Research Flow

This study has 11 stages, which can be seen in Figure 2. The explanation of the stages of the research carried out is as follows:

1. Problem identification, including the identification of problems and root causes based on observations on the currently running projects in the organization and validated based on discussion with project managers or project coordinators.
2. Literature study, including the literature review of previous research related to the identification of CSF in an IT/IS project that used AHP or other methods.
3. Project success criteria and CSF identification, including collecting and summarizing project success criteria and

CSF based on the literature review. Furthermore, it is validated based on discussions with the project manager.

4. Define hierarchy, that is to create an AHP hierarchy that will become a framework in this study.
5. Determine the participant, where the participants are directly involved in the project. The selection of participants who filled out the questionnaire was based on the team leader being aware of the problems occurring in the current development of geoportals. Because the team leader can directly know the problems that occur directly in the field. These participants will be given codes R1 to R5.




Fig. 2. Research Flow

6. Define the questionnaire, including the preparation of an online questionnaire using tools AHP Online System (AHP-OS) by bpmsg.com [28]. The questionnaire built based on the hierarchy is defined as follows:

Success Criteria: Time, Cost, Scope, Quality, Stakeholders Satisfaction, Objective Achievement;

Project Development Success Factor: People, Process, Technology, Organization;

People: Efficient Communication, Team skills and competencies, Team composition and team size, Leadership, Project Manager Experience, Clear roles and responsibility, Team commitment and participation;

Process: Proper planning, Realistic schedule, Knowledge management, Efficient project management, Project complexity, Project control and monitoring;

Technology: System compatibility, Familiarity with technology, Clear requirement and specification, Appropriate tools infrastructure and resources, Data quality and availability, HW SW selection;

Organization: Top management support and commitment, Organization culture, Financial resources, Organization strategic plan;

7. Distribute the questionnaire to predetermined participants. The questionnaire distributed is in the form of a link, namely bpmsg.com. Participants can access the link and immediately fill in their personal data and answer the questions asked. The results of the data that have been collected automatically are analyzed for consistency using AHP-OS tools.
8. Calculate the weight of project success criteria and CSF, which will later become the basis for making priority rankings based on the weights filled by participants.
9. Calculate the Consistency Ratio (CR), including paying attention to whether the CR is below 10% or not. If the CR is above 10% then the questionnaire needs to be corrected by the participant until the CR reaches below 10%.

The CR formula used in AHP-OS is [28]:

$$CR = \frac{\lambda - n}{2.7699n - 3.43513 - n} \quad (1)$$

Where  $\lambda$  is the value of  $n \times n$  decision matrix for  $n$  criteria.

10. Rank the project success criteria and CSF, based on the results of the weights processed, it will produce project success criteria and CSF rankings. AHP-OS also give group consensus result to make sure the result of weight is not a deadlock situation because of the opposite judgments for two criteria. The interpretation of the AHP consensus indicator is in Table III.

TABLE III  
AHP GROUP CONSENSUS INDIKATOR [28]

Consensus Indicator	Explanation
$\leq 50\%$	Very low
50% - 65%	Low
65% - 75%	Moderate
75% - 85%	High
$\geq 85\%$	Very High

11. Conclusions, based on the previous stages, it can be concluded what factors must be considered to achieve the success of the project.

#### E. Research Instrument

In Table I, it was found 10 criteria for project success. Based on the validation results with the project manager, 6 project success criteria were selected, including Time, Cost, Scope, Quality, Stakeholder Satisfaction, and Objective Achievement. In Table II there are 49 CSFs collected from the literature. 23 factors were selected with the following details: 7 factors in the People category, 6 factors in the Process category, 6 factors in the Technology category, and 4 factors in the Organizational category. Each success criterion and CSF will be compared with each other using an absolute scale as shown in Table IV [28].

TABLE IV  
AHP COMPARISON SCALE [28]

AHP scale	Explanation
1	A is of Equal Importance over B
3	A is moderately importance over B

AHP Scale	Explanation	AHP Scale	Explanation
5	A is strongly importance over B	2, 4, 6, 8	Importance values in-between
7	A is very strongly importance over B		
9	A is extremely importance over B		




Fig. 3. AHP Hierarchy Model

According to the AHP hierarchy of Figure 3 later from this scale, the roots produce a priority ranking of the project success criteria and CSF which is compared.

#### F. Data Collection Technique

Initial data collection used qualitative data, including observation and discussion with the project manager to identify problems, root causes, and validation of success criteria and CSF to be studied for the GIS development project. The results of the validation will be continued to make a questionnaire instrument that will be distributed to team members.

Data collection using questionnaires was distributed online to members of the geoport development project team in Mei 2022. The questionnaire utilizes AHP-OS tools from bpmsg.com to facilitate calculations and analysis results [28]. The inconsistency and contradiction of AHP can be reduced by maintaining the CR below 10%. Fortunately, AHP-OS can already check the CR of each user who inputs his questionnaire so that it will highlight inconsistent fillings. Users will be able to revise the results of filling out the questionnaire to determine the rating until the CR meets the requirements, which is below 10%.

### III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

#### A. Result

Based on the previous research stage, an AHP hierarchy model was created as shown in Figure 3. Based on the validation results with the project manager, 6 project success criteria were selected that are relevant to this project, including Time, Cost, Scope, Quality, Stakeholder Satisfaction, and Objective Achievement. Project success criteria weighting will be carried

out using AHP by participants to find out what criteria are most prioritized in the geoport development.

In addition, there are 4 CSF group categories, including People, Process, Technology, and Organization with a total of 23 CSFs related to the project and those have been validated by the project manager. This hierarchy is the basis for making AHP questionnaires with a structure of 2 hierarchy levels, 23 hierarchy leaves, and 5 hierarchy nodes. This research questionnaire used AHP-OS [28].

TABLE V  
RANK OF PROJECT SUCCESS CRITERIA

Success Factor Criteria	Weight (%)					Group
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	
Stakeholder's satisfaction	21.1	33.4	26.5	25.6	16.7	25.9
Objective achievement	21.1	33.4	26.5	25.6	16.7	25.9
Quality	19.6	11.6	10.9	25.6	16.7	17.3
Time	15.3	7.3	26.5	9.5	16.7	14.6
Cost	18.2	12	4.8	4.3	16.7	10
Scope	4.8	2.3	4.8	9.5	16.7	6.3
CR	8.8	9.1	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.4
Group Consensus Indicator	84.8% (high)					

The weighting result of project success criteria is shown in Table V, while the weighting of the CSF Group Category is displayed in Table VI. A Group Consensus of 84.8% indicates

that consensus at the success criteria is high so that the resulting solution makes sense for the decision problem. All respondents gave CR calculations below 10% so that the questionnaire results were considered as consistent. In addition to each weight per respondent, the final weight is calculated in groups as attached in Table V and Table VI. The highest weight is the criterion or factor that is considered the most important and recommended to be a priority for the organization to pay attention to.

Table V shows that the success criteria of a project are most importantly presence of stakeholder satisfaction and objective achievement. This is by the purpose of geoportal itself as a tool in improving remote sensing data services through E-Government. Table VI shows that People are the most important factor in achieving the success of the development. This means that human resources are an important asset and greatly influence the development process.

TABLE VI  
RANK OF CSF GROUP CATEGORY

CSF Category	Weight (%)					Group
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	
People	56.5	56.5	5.5	56.5	56.5	43.8
Technology	5.5	26.2	26.2	26.2	26.2	23.5
Process	26.2	11.8	56.5	11.8	11.8	23.4
Organization	11.8	5.5	11.8	5.5	5.5	9.3
CR	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	1.9
Group Consensus Indicator	67.5% (moderate)					

Furthermore, the consolidation result of each CSF group category weighting from 5 respondents is shown in Table VII. All four groups category have CR below 10% so it can be said that the AHP questionnaire results are consistent. All group consensus is above 65% so the rank of the CSF group is feasible for being a solution to the problem. In the People category, the most important factor is team commitment and team participation. In the Process category, the most important factor is knowledge management. In the Technology category, the most important factor is the availability of appropriate tools, infrastructure, and resources. In the Organizations category, the most important factor is the availability of financial resources.

TABLE VII  
SUMMARY OF CSF LOCAL WEIGHT

Group Category	CSF	Local Weight (%)	Ranking	Indicator (%)
People	Efficient Communication	12.12	5	CR=0.3684 Group Consensus = 84.2 (high)
	Team skills and competencies	14.48	4	
	Team composition and team size	3.44	7	
	Leadership	17.63	3	
	Project Manager Experience	7.18	6	
Process	Clear roles and responsibilities	21.30	2	CR=0.8431
	Team commitment and participation	23.86	1	
	Proper planning	12.13	4	

Group Category	CSF	Local Weight (%)	Ranking	Indicator (%)
Technology	Realistic schedule	12.80	3	CR=0.1881 Group Consensus = 78.7 (high)
	Knowledge management	31.43	1	
	Efficient project management	11.67	5	
	Project complexity	8.48	6	
	Project control and monitoring	23.49	2	
	System compatibility	15.89	3	
	Familiar with technology	10.19	5	
	Clear requirements and specifications	13.01	4	
	Appropriate tools, infrastructure, and resource	28.23	1	
	Data quality and availability	23.13	2	
Organization	HW/SF selection	9.56	6	CR=1.6722 Group Consensus = 87.9 (very high)
	Top management support and commitment	30.30	2	
	Organization culture	9.14	4	
	Financial resource	42.83	1	
	Organization strategic plan	17.74	3	

To make it easier to see the ranking of all the factors that become CSF in geoportal development, Figure 4 displays the ranking of the overall combined CSF of 4 group categories. Overall, CR showed a value of 1.9262% meaning that after the merger of the four categories, the factors were filled in by the five respondents consistently so that the results were feasible for being used as a solution to solve the problem.




Fig. 4. Summary of CSF Global Weight (CR = 1.9262%)

B. DISCUSSION

Based on the findings, the top 5 critical success factors for GIS project development are team commitment and participation; clear roles and responsibility; leadership; knowledge management; appropriate tools infrastructure; and team skills and competencies in consecutive order.

#### 1. Team commitment and participation

This is the first rank CSF under the people category that impacted GIS project development. This is supported by literature found [18]. This means that the development of geoportal is in dire need of thorough commitment and active participation from each team member. Organizations need to arrange so that the human resource concentration is not too much divided with other projects for the successful development of geoportal.

#### 2. Clear roles and responsibility

The second rank factor is clear roles and responsibilities under the people category. This factor is used by literature [12]. This shows that the project manager needs to involve team members, not only during execution but also starting with planning. Every member needs to know and agree on each of his or her roles and responsibilities. To make it easier, each task needs to be assigned who is in charge and there must be no members who have not been assigned.

#### 3. Leadership

The third factor, namely leadership under the People category. Five kinds of literature use this factor as an IT/IS success factor [10]–[13], [18]. It means that project managers need to be more disciplined in distributing details of tasks and persuading and motivating the team members to effectively contribute to geoportal development. Adherence to the timeline also needs to be improved.

#### 4. Knowledge management

The fourth factor is knowledge management under the process category where this factor is used as an IT/IS success factor by literature found [10], [23]. It is necessary to make tools or media sharing regularly about experiences in carrying out GIS development. Good documentation is expected to minimize difficulties in further development.

#### 5. Appropriate tools, infrastructure, and resources

The fifth factor, namely appropriate tools, infrastructure, and resources under the technology category. This factor is supported by literature found [11], [14], [23]. This means that the organization needs to be serious in providing facilities for IT readiness in geoportal development.

#### 6. Other factors

The next three factors are team skills and competencies under the People category; project control and monitoring under the Process category; and data quality and availability under the Organization category. This shows that human resources development through refreshed certified training will help achieve success in geoportal development. Monitoring and evaluation are also important to be carried out internally by the team and at the organizational level. In addition, the availability of data for trials in executing draft modules under construction is also important [29].

The last three factors rank are organization culture; team composition and team size; and organization strategic plan. This

shows that even with changes in organizational structure, reduced number of members, and the emergence of cultural changes, this does not interfere too much with the development process. Organizational factors are factors with low weight, except for the financial resource factor [30]. Financial resources are the 10th highest factor because they are very influential in meeting the needs of facilities in development.

### IV. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of weighting using AHP, a rank of project success criteria and CSF was found in the development of the GIS Project. Stakeholder satisfaction and objective achievement are the first project success criteria for the GIS project. The top five CSFs are team commitment and participation; clear roles and responsibilities; leadership; knowledge management; and appropriate tools, infrastructure, and resources. This result is expected to be an input for organizations to improve project management and know the priority success factors to achieve the success of GIS development. In addition, this research is expected to be a lesson learned for other government agencies in performing better information system development projects.

This research is limited to one case study so it cannot be applied in general but is only beneficial to the organization in which the research is conducted. However, AHP variables and hierarchies can be used as a reference in similar research for case studies of other projects and organizations. In addition, this study has not considered emotional influence factors, especially for the need to fill out a long AHP questionnaire to affect the enthusiasm of respondents. Further research can be carried out by considering emotional factors and integrating other ranking methods such as Fuzzy AHP and TOPSIS to enhance the accuracy of the solution and evaluate performance.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to thank the Faculty of Computer Science, University of Indonesia for the support of this research.



# Wawan Kurniawan FTI

## Identification of Critical Success Factors of Geographic Information

 TEKNIK INDUSTRI

---

### Document Details

Submission ID

trn:oid::3618:127232242

Submission Date

Jan 31, 2026, 10:27 AM GMT+7

Download Date

Jan 31, 2026, 11:20 AM GMT+7

File Name

Identification of Critical Success Factors of Geographic Information.pdf

File Size

3.6 MB

9 Pages

5,532 Words

33,143 Characters

# 11% Overall Similarity

The combined total of all matches, including overlapping sources, for each database.

## Filtered from the Report

- ▶ Bibliography
- ▶ Quoted Text
- ▶ Small Matches (less than 10 words)

## Exclusions

- ▶ 3 Excluded Sources

## Match Groups

- 20 Not Cited or Quoted 11%**  
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
- 0 Missing Quotations 0%**  
Matches that are still very similar to source material
- 0 Missing Citation 0%**  
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
- 0 Cited and Quoted 0%**  
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

## Top Sources

- 9% Internet sources
- 1% Publications
- 4% Submitted works (Student Papers)

## Integrity Flags

0 Integrity Flags for Review

Our system's algorithms look deeply at a document for any inconsistencies that would set it apart from a normal submission. If we notice something strange, we flag it for you to review.

A Flag is not necessarily an indicator of a problem. However, we'd recommend you focus your attention there for further review.

### Match Groups

- **20 Not Cited or Quoted 11%**  
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
- **0 Missing Quotations 0%**  
Matches that are still very similar to source material
- **0 Missing Citation 0%**  
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
- **0 Cited and Quoted 0%**  
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

### Top Sources

- 9% Internet sources
- 1% Publications
- 4% Submitted works (Student Papers)

### Top Sources

The sources with the highest number of matches within the submission. Overlapping sources will not be displayed.

1	Internet	docs.google.com	6%
2	Student papers	Purdue University on 2024-04-01	<1%
3	Student papers	School of Business and Management ITB on 2016-08-11	<1%
4	Student papers	LL DIKTI IX Turnitin Consortium Part III on 2025-02-06	<1%
5	Student papers	University of Warwick on 2011-08-25	<1%
6	Internet	ejurnal.itats.ac.id	<1%
7	Internet	blueprint.ng	<1%
8	Internet	ejournal.undip.ac.id	<1%
9	Internet	doaj.org	<1%
10	Internet	ijece.iaescore.com	<1%


11	Student papers	Indian Institute of Technology, Madras on 2016-08-25	<1%
12	Student papers	Liverpool John Moores University on 2022-04-22	<1%
13	Student papers	Universitas Siswa Bangsa Internasional on 2020-11-09	<1%
14	Student papers	Heriot-Watt University on 2017-08-23	<1%
15	Internet	libweb.kpfu.ru	<1%

4

JOIV : Int. J. Inform. Visualization, 8(4) - December 2024 2237-2245



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL ON INFORMATICS VISUALIZATION

journal homepage : [www.joiv.org/index.php/joiv](http://www.joiv.org/index.php/joiv)

1

## Identification of Critical Success Factors of Geographic Information System Development Project with AHP Approach

Nur Aini <sup>a,\*</sup>, Wawan Kurniawan <sup>b</sup>, Agnes Sondita Payani <sup>c</sup>, Ratna Yulika Go <sup>d</sup><sup>a</sup> Department Management, Faculty of Economic and Business, Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis Ahmad Dahlan, Tangerang, Indonesia<sup>b</sup> Department of Industrial Engineering, Faculty of Industrial Technology, Universitas Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia<sup>c</sup> Research Center for Geoinformatics, National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN), Cibinong, West Java, Indonesia<sup>d</sup> Department of Informatic Engineering, Faculty of Computer Science, Universitas Esa Unggul, Jakarta, Indonesia

Corresponding author: \*aini.nur1969@gmail.com

6

9

10

1

**Abstract**—An Indonesian government agency in the field of research is developing a Geographic Information System (GIS) to distribute remote sensing data to customers. To prevent project failure, it is crucial to understand the success criteria related to project objectives and the critical success factors (CSFs), which drive project success. This research identifies these CSFs, enabling organizations to prioritize project success factors. The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) ranks project success criteria and CSFs. The mixed research methodology incorporates qualitative elements through discussions with the project manager to validate the AHP hierarchy structure and quantitative aspects through questionnaires used to calculate weighted priorities using AHP. Results show stakeholder satisfaction and objective achievement as the top-ranked success criteria. The top 5 CSFs identified are team commitment and participation, clear roles and responsibilities, leadership, knowledge management, appropriate tools, infrastructure, and resources. Based on the success criteria ranking, development should enhance system functionality to maintain user satisfaction and achieve project objectives. Meanwhile, prioritizing human resources and providing adequate resources are crucial based on the identified top 5 CSFs, contributing to increased development success. This outcome aims to assist firms in improving project management and identifying the most critical success elements for GIS development. Furthermore, this research will likely be a learning experience for other government organizations seeking to enhance their information system development efforts.

**Keywords**—Geographic information system; project success criteria; critical success factors; analytic hierarchy process.

2

Manuscript received 7 Aug. 2023; revised 5 Dec. 2023; accepted 18 Apr. 2024. Date of publication 31 Dec. 2024.  
International Journal on Informatics Visualization is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License.



### I. INTRODUCTION

One of the main challenges in information technology (IT) project management is the risk of project failure, which may arise from diverse factors, sources, and methodologies applied during the project. Information systems development within governmental contexts is particularly susceptible to failure due to various driving and inhibiting factors throughout the development process. Analyzing success factors in developing information systems within government projects is imperative to ensure the success of IT projects in such environments.

Various literature has been explored to analyze the factors contributing to the success of IT development projects. Key success factors encompass digital literacy and internet penetration. The utilization of both internal and external knowledge through collaboration can facilitate the development of a more agile project [1] and enhance e-

government implementation [2]. The project's complexity, the team's absorptive capacity, and e-leadership are also pivotal in determining whether an e-government project will encounter delays or overspending [3], [4].

E-Government is an electronic or computer-based governmental platform that enhances capabilities and capacities in delivering public services and advancing human resources development [5]. An Indonesian government agency in the field of research has developed a Geographic Information System (GIS) dedicated to supporting e-government by facilitating the retrieval of remote sensing satellite imagery data. The system functions as a geoportal, allowing users to access remote sensing data online, which undergoes processing to generate a province mosaic. The system is designed to elevate product utilization and foster innovation through a stakeholder-oriented perspective tailored for organizational enhancement.

1




Fig. 1 Root Cause Problem Analysis Using Fishbone Diagram

The geoportal was launched in 2019, and its development was outsourced to external vendors or third-party entities. This system relies on web services and web portals, serving 34 provinces in Indonesia. Although it has been launched and is ready for user adoption, ongoing efforts to improve the system have been in progress since 2021, including integrating a land cover classification module. In 2022, a machine learning module was developed to facilitate tree counting and identification of burned areas. The project has transformed into a hybrid model, combining development or engineering projects with in-house research activities.

In the ongoing development process, in-house team members encounter several issues that, if left unaddressed, could impede the project's success. These challenges encompass insufficient capacity and capability of human resources, the inherent complexity of the projects, and the lack of literacy related to the system. The problems stem from the fact that the vendor undertook the initial development while subsequent refinement projects are being handled by internal staff. Although knowledge transfer from the vendor team to the internal team has been conducted previously, its effectiveness in facilitating subsequent projects remains suboptimal.

Another issue arises from the changes in work mechanisms, organizational culture, and the rotation of human resources, resulting in a reduction in the number of team members from the initial count due to the government agency's reorganization. These alterations may impact the project's success. Ideally, several modules should have been seamlessly integrated into the system by the end of 2021. However, due to the project's development, the intended scope was not achieved within the current year.

Projects can encounter failure due to various reasons. The Ishikawa Diagram, also known as fishbone analysis, served as a straightforward graphic tool for comprehending the causes of quality defects. It is employed to analyze the relationship between problems and all potential causes [6]. Following an interview with the project coordinator, Figure 1 illustrates the root cause analysis of the geoportal project failure. The underlying issues are categorized into four domains, namely People, Process, Technology, and Organization, utilizing the project failure framework [7].

To mitigate the risk of project failure, it is imperative to delineate the key factors driving the success of an IT project [8]. These factors are commonly known as Critical Success

Factors (CSF). Various scholars have conducted previous research on CSFs in information system development or IT projects. Edwita *et al.* [9], for instance, explored the CSF of information system development project through Systematic Literature Review, Guntur *et al.* [10] identified CSFs in the E-Government development of the Finance Education and Training Agency, utilizing the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) method, Gumay *et al.* [11] identified CSFs in IT projects within an Indonesian telco company AHP approach, Raharjo *et al.* [12] employed AHP for identifying CSFs in the project management office, Radujković and Sjekavica [13] utilized a literature review to identify CSFs in project management.

While numerous studies delve into identifying CSFs in information systems development, there has been little specific discussion of GIS development projects, particularly within the last five years. Recognizing this gap, the present research addresses the question, "What are the project CSFs in the geoportal development project?" To answer this research question, a thorough analysis is imperative, necessitating the application of an appropriate methodology.

The application of multicriteria decision-making is a common approach for establishing priorities or making decisions, with AHP emerging as the most frequently employed and successful method [14]. Building on prior research that highlights AHP's effectiveness in identifying CSFs by comparing the importance of one factor with another [10], [11], [12] This study utilized AHP Hierarchy for root cause analysis, guiding the examination of project success criteria and CSFs in developing geoportals. The primary aim of this research is to analyze the CSFs in geoportal development. The anticipated outcome of this study is an enhancement in the success of IT projects, particularly in developing geoportals as integral systems supporting e-government initiatives within organizations, thereby improving data services to the community.

## II. MATERIALS AND METHOD

The following are the literature materials for this research. The literature materials encompass a comprehensive review, summarizing key aspects such as IT project management, project success criteria, CSFs associated with e-government, and AHP.

5

A. IT Project Management

A project comprises temporarily executed activities or tasks to create an organization's distinctive product, service, or outcome. A project manager, chosen from the organization, assumes the leadership role and is accountable for accomplishing project objectives [7]. Projects vary in size, duration, and cost, contingent upon their specific attributes. They can be small, large, short, long, or low-cost.

IT projects are IT investment activities based on products, services, or organizational investments, wherein organizations anticipate returns from the allocated resources, finances, and time invested in project implementation [7]. IT projects support diverse organizational activities, including maintaining current or legacy systems and innovative development, leveraging technological advancements and current trends. Information system development, a subset of IT projects, involves collaborating pooling resources from various experts to develop a software product. The team typically comprises system analysts, developers, testers, database analysts, trainers, and other specialized experts [15].

Project management involves applying techniques, skills, tools, and knowledge derived from project activities to fulfill project requirements. Within project management, a set of processes is organized into process groups: initiating, planning, executing, monitoring and control, and closing. The project team is required to concentrate on maintaining a balance among various project constraints, including quality, budget, resources, risk, schedule, and scope [16]. By addressing this constraint, project management facilitates the equilibrium necessary for achieving project success.

B. Project Success Criteria and Critical Success Factors from Related Research

Unique success criteria, distinct from other IT projects, characterize every IT project. The assessment of project success hinges on factors such as timely completion, adherence to budget constraints, and fulfillment of user

requirements [10]. Defining project success criteria holds significance as they serve as the cornerstone for all project activities [17]. Various literature sources have outlined success criteria for IT projects, and a summary is presented in Table I below.

TABLE I  
PROJECT SUCCESS CRITERIA DEFINE BY LITERATURE

Project Success Criteria	References						
	[18]	[11]	[10]	[17]	[19]	[7]	[16]
Time	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Cost	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Scope	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Quality	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Risk	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Stakeholder's satisfaction	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Technical Requirement						✓	
Objective Achievement						✓	
Communication Process	✓						

CSF is often used as a key to developing information systems and IT projects. It is important to define CSF so that organizations can prioritize CSF in their strategic plans to achieve a competitive advantage. CSF is an applicable and powerful method to carry out challenges in IT implementation [20]. CSF can identify issues that need attention in emerging IT projects. If the CSF is not done well, the project will potentially not achieve its mission, goals, or business [21] [22]. Recognizing the significance of identifying CSF in information system development, a literature review was conducted on previous research pertaining to CSFs in IT/IS development projects. The review revealed the classification of 48 CSFs into categories such as people, process, technology, organization, and external environment, as illustrated in Table II.

TABLE II  
IT PROJECTS CSF MAPPING BY PREVIOUS RESEARCH

CSF	References							
	[18]	[23]	[14]	[10]	[12]	[9]	[13]	[24]
<b>People</b>								
Efficient communication	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓
Team skills and competencies		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓
Team composition, team size		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓
Leadership	✓			✓	✓		✓	
Trust						✓		
Customer Involvement		✓						✓
Project manager experience	✓							
Project manager formal power	✓	✓						
Project manager skill	✓	✓						
Clear roles and responsibilities					✓			
Team commitment and participation	✓							
<b>Process</b>								
Proper planning	✓			✓		✓		✓
Realistic schedule				✓	✓			✓
Business process reengineering								
Knowledge management, sharing knowledge		✓		✓				
Project evaluation				✓	✓	✓	✓	
Efficient project management	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓
Project size, project complexity		✓	✓			✓		

CSF	References							
	[18]	[23]	[14]	[10]	[12]	[9]	[13]	[24]
Ability to provide added value			✓		✓			
Alignment with company business goals					✓			
User-oriented change management			✓					✓
Project control and monitoring	✓							
Project risk management	✓	✓						
Project duration	✓	✓						
Vendor support		✓	✓					
<b>Technology</b>								
System compatibility, system integration			✓	✓		✓		
Familiar with technology					✓	✓	✓	
Information system expertise					✓	✓		
Clear requirements and specification	✓						✓	
Appropriate tools, infrastructure, adequate resources, IT readiness		✓	✓		✓		✓	
Data quality, data availability		✓	✓					
Software customization		✓						
HW/SF selection		✓						
<b>Organization</b>								
Top management support, management commitment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Politics in organization				✓				
Organization culture		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Business professional expertise					✓	✓		
Client expertise					✓	✓		
Independent PMO					✓			
Realistic budget and financial resource								✓
Relationship with third party	✓							
Organization strategic planning	✓	✓						
Rules and regulation	✓	✓						
Subject matter expert	✓							
Outsourcing index		✓						
<b>External Environment</b>								
Competitor pressure			✓					
Trend	✓	✓						

Like project success criteria, CSFs vary in each project and are contingent upon specific conditions. From the pool of the 48 identified CSFs, a subset related to the challenges encountered in the geoportal's development will be chosen. The project manager overseeing the geoportal development will validate this selection.

C. Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)

AHP is known as a sophisticated technique employed in group decision-making. Saaty has introduced it into a versatile tool for decision selection across diverse situations. AHP operates as a multicriteria decision-making approach, systematically arranging factors in a hierarchical structure. This hierarchical framework organizes factors from the overall goal down to criteria, sub-criteria, and alternatives at sequential levels in the decision-making process [25].

When establishing the hierarchy, several considerations should be taken into account, as outlined in [25]:

- a. Hierarchies should comprehensively represent problems while remaining sensitive to changes in elements.
- b. It is crucial to pay attention to the environment surrounding the problem.

c. Identify issues or attributes that contribute to the solution.

d. Recognize participants associated with the problem.

Goals, attributes, issues, and stakeholders are organized in a hierarchy to offer a comprehensive view of the complex relationships within a situation. This hierarchical structure aids decision-makers in assessing problems, enabling accurate comparisons of elements [25]. In the application of AHP to this study, a literature review was conducted and revealing a substantial body of previous research that utilized AHP in studies related to IT/IS Projects [10], [11], [12], [14], [23], [24], [26].

The methodology employed in this research is outlined in the following sections. The methodology is discussed in several sections: research flow, research instrument, and data collection and technique. This research utilizes a mixed method approach, combining qualitative and quantitative procedures sequentially or simultaneously. Qualitative research focuses on "words" to capture a phenomenon, employing ethnography and case studies to emphasize qualitative data. On the other hand, quantitative research involves procedures such as experiments or surveys, highlighting "numbers" or quantitative data [27]. This study utilized qualitative methods to analyze the root of the problem

and validate the list of project success criteria and CSFs obtained from a compilation found in the literature. Quantitative methods were applied to rank or prioritize CSFs and project success criteria using the AHP method.

D. Research Flow

This study consists of 11 stages, as illustrated in Figure 2. The explanation of each stage is as follows:

1) *Problem Identification*: This involves identifying problems and root causes through observations of ongoing projects within the organization. The findings are validated through discussion with project managers or coordinators.

2) *Literature Study*: Conduct a literature review of previous research related to identifying CSF in IT/IS projects that used AHP or other methods.

3) *Project Success Criteria and CSF Identification*: In this stage, project success criteria and CSF are collected and summarized based on the literature review. Further validation is performed through discussions with the project manager.

4) *Define Hierarchy*: Creating an AHP hierarchy that serves as the framework for this study.

5) *Determine Participants*: Identifying participants directly involved in the project. Participants were chosen based on their direct involvement in the ongoing GIS project. All active remaining team members were included to ensure firsthand knowledge and relevant experience. Participants are coded R1 to R5.

6) *Define questionnaire*: Preparing an online questionnaire using the AHP Online System (AHP-OS) by Bpmsg.com [28]. For example, the questionnaire posed comparative questions such as comparing Factor A to Factor B, Factor B to C, and Factor A to Factor C, asking participants to determine which factor is more crucial. This process continued until all factors were compared with one another.




Fig. 2 Research Flow

7) *Distribute Questionnaire*: The questionnaire was distributed to predetermined participants through a link (bpmsg.com). Participants can access the link, fill in personal

data, and answer questions. The data collected automatically will be analyzed for consistency using AHP-OS tools.

8) *Calculate Weight of Project Success Criteria and CSF*: Determining the weight of project success criteria and CSFs, forming the basis for priority rankings based on participant-assigned weights. The weight calculation employs the AHP eigenvector method, a widely accepted approach in the literature [28]. This method assigns weights to each criterion and factor based on the participant's responses to pairwise comparisons, ensuring a systematic and consistent calculation process. The AHP eigenvector method provides a rigorous and transparent way to quantify the relative importance of success criteria and CSFs, contributing to the robustness of the prioritization process.

9) *Calculate the Consistency Ratio (CR)*: Ensure the CR is below 10%. If it exceeds 10%, participants are required to correct their questionnaire until it falls below 10%.

The CR formula used in AHP-OS is as follows [28]:

$$CR = \frac{\lambda - n}{2.7699n - 3.43513 - n} \quad (1)$$

Here,  $\lambda$  is the value of  $n \times n$  decision matrix for  $n$  criteria.

10) *Rank the Project Success Criteria and CSF*: The project success criteria and CSFs are ranked using the processed weights. AHP-OS provided a group consensus result to ensure that the weight results do not lead to a deadlock due to conflicting judgments for two criteria. The interpretation of the AHP consensus indicator is presented in Table III.

TABLE III  
AHP GROUP CONSENSUS INDICATOR [28]

Consensus Indicator	Explanation
$\leq 50\%$	Very low
50% - 65%	Low
65% - 75%	Moderate
75% - 85%	High
$\geq 85\%$	Very High

11) *Conclusions*: Based on the preceding stages, it can be deduced which factors must be considered to achieve project success.

E. Research Instrument

In Table I, 10 criteria for project success were identified. Following validation with the project manager, six project success criteria were selected: Time, Cost, Scope, Quality, Stakeholder Satisfaction, and Objective Achievement. Table II presents 48 CSFs gathered from the literature, with 23 factors selected, distributed as follows: seven factors in the People category, six factors in the Process category, six factors in the Technology category, and four factors in the Organizational category. A comparison of each success criterion and CSFs is conducted using an absolute scale, as illustrated in Table IV [28].

Additionally, based on the extensive number of CSFs utilized in this study, 57 questionnaire items were designed. It offers a participant-driven prioritization of factors according to their subjective significance. The Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) creates rankings based on participants' responses to these pairwise comparisons. According to the AHP hierarchy presented in Figure 3, the scale mentioned

earlier yields a priority ranking of the project success criteria and CSF for comparison.

*F. Data Collection Technique*

The initial data collection involved qualitative data, including observation and discussion with the project manager to identify problems and root causes and validate the success criteria and CSFs for the GIS development project. The validation results were then used to create a questionnaire instrument, which was subsequently distributed to team members.

For the data collection phase using questionnaires, the distribution took place online among members of the geoportals development project team in May 2022. The questionnaire employed AHP-OS tools from bpmsoft.com to facilitate calculations and analyze results [28]. Efforts were made to keep the CR below 10% to mitigate the inconsistency and

contradiction in AHP. Fortunately, AHP-OS checks the CR of each user inputting his questionnaire, highlighting any inconsistencies. Users can then revise their questionnaire responses to determine the rating until the CR meets the requirements of being below 10%.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

*A. Results*

Based on the previous research stage, an AHP hierarchy model was developed. Following validation with the project manager, six project success criteria relevant to this project were selected, namely Time, Cost, Scope, Quality, Stakeholder Satisfaction, and Objective Achievement. The weighting of project success criteria will be conducted using AHP, with participants determining the priority of criteria in the geoportals development.




Fig. 3 AHP Hierarchy Model

Additionally, there are four categories of CSF: People, Process, Technology, and Organization, encompassing 23 CSFs related to the project, all of which have been validated by the project manager. This hierarchy serves as the foundation for creating AHP questionnaires with a structure comprising two hierarchy levels, 23 hierarchy leaves, and five hierarchy nodes. The research questionnaire utilizes AHP-OS [28]. The weighting results of project success criteria are presented in Table V, while the weights for the CSF Group Categories are displayed in Table VI. A Group Consensus of 84.8% indicates a high consensus on the success criteria, ensuring that the resulting solution is meaningful for the decision problem. All respondents provided CR calculations below 10%, confirming the consistency of the questionnaire results. In addition to individual weights per respondent, the final weights are calculated in groups, as in Table V and Table VI. The criterion or factor with the highest weight is

considered the organization's most important and recommended priority.

TABLE V  
RANK OF PROJECT SUCCESS CRITERIA

Success Factor Criteria	Weight (%)					Group
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	
Stakeholder's satisfaction	21.1	33.4	26.5	25.6	16.7	25.9
Objective achievement	21.1	33.4	26.5	25.6	16.7	25.9
Quality	19.6	11.6	10.9	25.6	16.7	17.3
Time	15.3	7.3	26.5	9.5	16.7	14.6
Cost	18.2	12	4.8	4.3	16.7	10
Scope	4.8	2.3	4.8	9.5	16.7	6.3
CR	8.8	9.1	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.4
Group Consensus Indicator	84.8% (high)					

Table V reveals that the most crucial success criteria for a project are stakeholder satisfaction and objective achievement.

This aligns with the geoportal's purpose, serving as a tool to enhance remote sensing data services through E-Government.

TABLE VI  
RANK OF CSF GROUP CATEGORY

CSF Category	Weight (%)					Group
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	
People	56.5	56.5	5.5	56.5	56.5	43.8
Technology	5.5	26.2	26.2	26.2	26.2	23.5
Process	26.2	11.8	56.5	11.8	11.8	23.4
Organization	11.8	5.5	11.8	5.5	5.5	9.3
CR	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	1.9
Group Consensus Indicator	67.5% (moderate)					

15 Table VI indicates that People are the most important factor in achieving development success, highlighting the significant influence of human resources on the development process. Table VII details the consolidation of each CSF group category weighing from 5 respondents.

TABLE VII  
SUMMARY OF CSF LOCAL WEIGHT

Group Category	CSF	Local Weight (%)	Ranking	Indicator (%)		
People	Efficient Communication	12.12	5	CR=0.3684 Group Consensus = 84.3 (high)		
	Team skills and competencies	14.48	4			
	Team composition and team size	3.44	7			
	Leadership	17.63	3			
	Project Manager Experience	7.18	6			
	Clear roles and responsibilities	21.30	2			
	Team commitment and participation	23.86	1			
	Process	Proper planning	12.13		4	CR=0.8431 Group Consensus = 78.7 (high)
		Realistic schedule	12.80		3	
		Knowledge management	31.43		1	
Efficient project management		11.67	5			
Project complexity		8.48	6			
Project control and monitoring		23.49	2			
Technology	System compatibility	15.89	3	CR=0.1881 Group Consensus = 73.6 (moderate)		
	Familiar with technology	10.19	5			
	Clear requirements and specification	13.01	4			
	Appropriate tools, infrastructure, and resource	28.23	1			
	Data quality and availability	23.13	2			
	HW/SF selection	9.56	6			
Organization	Top management support and commitment	30.30	2	CR=1.0722 Group Consensus = 87.9 (very high)		
	Organization culture	9.14	4			
	Financial resource	42.83	1			
	Organization strategic plan	17.74	3			

All four group categories have CR below 10%, indicating the consistency of the AHP questionnaire results. Furthermore, all group consensus values are above 65%, affirming that the rank of the CSF groups is a viable solution to the problem. In

the People category, team commitment and participation are the most crucial factors

The most important factor in the process category is knowledge management. Within the Technology category, the most significant factor is the availability of appropriate tools, infrastructure, and resources. Finally, in the Organizations category, the most critical factor is the availability of financial resources.

For a comprehensive view of the ranking of all factors serving as CSFs in geoportal development, Figure 4 illustrates the overall combined CSF ranking across the four group categories. The overall CR showed a value of 1.9263%, indicating that after merging the four categories, the factors provided by the five respondents were consistently filled in, making the results feasible for use as a solution to address the problem.

Global Weight of CSF



Fig. 4 Summary of CSF Global Weight (CR = 1.9263%)

B. Discussion

Based on the findings, the top 5 critical success factors for GIS project development are in consecutive order.

1) *Team Commitment and Participation*: This factor, ranked first under the People category, significantly impacts GIS project development. Literature supports the notion that thorough commitment and active participation from each team member are crucial for successful geoportal development [18]. Organizations should ensure that human resource concentration is not overly divided among multiple projects to support geoportal's successful development.

2) *Clear Roles and Responsibility*: Ranked second under the People category, Clear Roles and Responsibilities are crucial. The literature emphasizes the importance of involving team members not only during execution but also in the planning phase [12]. Assigning tasks and responsibilities clearly ensures that every member knows and agrees on their roles, preventing unassigned tasks.

3) *Leadership*: Ranked third factor under the People category, Leadership is a vital factor supported by various literature sources as an IT/IS success factor [10], [11], [12], [13], [18]. Project managers must efficiently distribute tasks, persuade and motivate team members, and adhere to timelines for effective contributions to geoportal development.

4) *Knowledge Management*: Ranked fourth under the Process category, Knowledge Management is identified as an IT/IS success factor [10], [23]. Regularly sharing tools or media about experiences in GIS development is necessary, and effective documentation minimizes difficulties in further development.

5) *Appropriate Tools, Infrastructure, and Resources*: Ranked fifth under the Technology category, the availability of Appropriate Tools, Infrastructure, and Resources is emphasized by literature [11]–[14], [23]. The organization must be committed to providing IT facilities for geoportal development readiness.

The following three factors are Team Skills and Competencies (under the People category), Project Control and Monitoring (under the Process category), and Data Quality and Availability (under the Organization category). This indicated that human resources development through certified training, internal monitoring and evaluation, and data availability for trials in executing draft modules are crucial for success [29]–[30].

The last three factors ranked are Organizational Culture, Team Composition and Size, and Organizational Strategic Plan. These factors suggest that changes in organizational structure, reduced team size, and cultural changes minimally interfere with the development process. Financial resources are ranked 10<sup>th</sup> because they play a significant role in meeting facility needs for development.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the AHP-weighted results, project success criteria and CSFs were ranked for the GIS project development. Stakeholder satisfaction and objective achievement emerged as the top project success criteria. The top five CSFs identified are Team Commitment and Participation, Clear Roles and Responsibilities, Leadership, Knowledge Management, Appropriate Tools, Infrastructure, and Resources. These findings will guide organizations in enhancing project management and prioritizing success factors crucial for GIS development success. Moreover, the research is a valuable learning experience for other government agencies seeking to improve their information system development projects.

It is important to note that this research is limited to a single case study, limiting its generalizability to the organization under study. Nevertheless, the AHP variables and hierarchies can serve as a reference for similar research in case studies involving other projects and organizations. The study acknowledges the absence of consideration for emotional influence factors, especially regarding the potential impact of a lengthy AHP questionnaire on respondent enthusiasm. Future research could explore these emotional factors and integrate additional ranking methods such as Fuzzy AHP and TOPSIS to enhance solution accuracy performance evaluation.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank the Faculty of Computer Science, University of Indonesia, and the Research Center for Remote Sensing, National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN) for supporting this research.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] K. Osmundsen, J. Iden, and B. Bygstad, "Digital Transformation: Drivers, Success Factors, and Implications," *Mediterr. Conf. Inf. Syst. Proc.*, vol. 12, no. January 2019, pp. 1–15, 2018.
- [2] R. Meiyanti et al., "Systematic review of critical success factors of E-government: Definition and realization," *2017 International Conference on Sustainable Information Engineering and Technology (SIET)*, pp. 190–195, Nov. 2017, doi: 10.1109/siet.2017.8304133.
- [3] T. Bjorvatn and A. Wald, "Project complexity and team-level absorptive capacity as drivers of project management performance," *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 876–888, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2018.05.003.
- [4] Y. H. C.P and T. D. Susanto, "E-Leadership: The Effect of E-Government Success in Indonesia," *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, vol. 1201, p. 012025, May 2019, doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/1201/1/012025.
- [5] O. Jonathan, C. K. Ayo, and S. Misra, "A comparative study of e-Government successful implementation between Nigeria and Republic of Korea," *Asia-Pacific World Congress on Computer Science and Engineering*, pp. 1–7, Nov. 2014, doi: 10.1109/apwccse.2014.7053869.
- [6] L. Liliana, "A new model of Ishikawa diagram for quality assessment," *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, vol. 161, p. 012099, Nov. 2016, doi: 10.1088/1757-899x/161/1/012099.
- [7] Marchewka, *Information Technology Project Management, Providing Measurable Organization Value*. 2015.
- [8] M. Albert, P. Balve, and K. Spang, "Evaluation of project success: a structured literature review," *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 796–821, Sep. 2017, doi:10.1108/ijmpb-01-2017-0004.
- [9] A. Edwita, D. I. Sensuse, and H. Noprissun, "Critical Success Factors of Information System Development Projects," in *International Conference on Information Technology Systems and Innovation (ICITSI)*, Bandung, 2017, pp. 285–290.
- [10] M. Guntur, B. Purwandari, T. Raharjo, I. Solichah, and L. Kumalalita, "Critical Success Factors for Information Systems Development," *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Business and Information Management*, pp. 29–33, Sep. 2018, doi:10.1145/3278252.3278288.
- [11] L. A. Gumay, B. Purwandari, T. Raharjo, A. Wahyudi, and M. Purwaningsih, "Identifying Critical Success Factors for Information Technology Projects with an Analytic Hierarchy Process," *Proceedings of the 2020 2nd Asia Pacific Information Technology Conference*, pp. 108–112, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1145/3379310.3379326.
- [12] T. Raharjo, B. Purwandari, R. Satria, and I. Solichah, "Critical Success Factors for Project Management Office: An Insight from Indonesia," *2018 Third International Conference on Informatics and Computing (ICIC)*, pp. 1–6, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1109/iac.2018.8780504.
- [13] M. Radujković and M. Sjekavica, "Project Management Success Factors," *Procedia Engineering*, vol. 196, pp. 607–615, 2017, doi:10.1016/j.proeng.2017.08.048.
- [14] A. N. H. Zaied, M. Grida, and G. Soliman, "fuzzy AHP Evaluation of Critical Success Factors for Business Intelligence Systems Using Fuzzy AHP," no. October 2018.
- [15] D. L. Olson, *Information systems project management*. Business Expert Press, 2014.
- [16] Project Management Institute, *A guide to the project management body of knowledge (PMBOK guide) Fifth edition*. Project Management Institute, 2013.
- [17] H. Kerzner, *Project management metrics, KPIs, and dashboards: a guide to measuring and monitoring project performance*. John Wiley & Sons, 2017.
- [18] N. W. Trisnawaty, T. Raharjo, B. Hardian, and A. Prasetyo, "Success Criteria and Factor for IT Project Application Implementation in Digital Transformation Era: A Case Study Financial Sector Industry," *2021 IEEE International IOT, Electronics and Mechatronics Conference (IEMTRONICS)*, pp. 1–7, Apr. 2021, doi:10.1109/iemtronics52119.2021.9422578.

- [19] J. Gomes and M. Romão, "Improving Project Success: A Case Study Using Benefits and Project Management," *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 100, pp. 489–497, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2016.09.187.
- [20] Z. A. Al-Sai, R. Abdullah, and M. H. Husin, "Critical success factors for big data: a systematic literature review," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 118940–118956, 2020.
- [21] C. Pollard and A. Cater-Steel, "Justifications, strategies, and critical success factors in successful ITIL implementations in US and Australian companies: an exploratory study," *Inf. Syst. Manag.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 164–175, 2009.
- [22] S. Prasad, R. Shankar, R. Gupta, and S. Roy, "A TISM modeling of critical success factors of blockchain based cloud services," *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 434–456, Sep. 2018, doi: 10.1108/jamr-03-2018-0027.
- [23] R. Octavianus, "The Analysis of Critical Success Factor Ranking for Software Development and Implementation Project Using AHP," pp. 313–318, 2018.
- [24] T. Yaghoobi, "Prioritizing key success factors of software projects using fuzzy AHP," *Journal of Software: Evolution and Process*, vol. 30, no. 1, Sep. 2017, doi: 10.1002/smr.1891.
- [25] T. L. Saaty, "How to make a decision: The analytic hierarchy process," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 9–26, Sep. 1990, doi: 10.1016/0377-2217(90)90057-i.
- [26] A. Maceika, A. Bugajev, O. R. Šostak, and T. Vilutien, "Decision Tree and AHP Methods Application for Projects Assessment: A Case Study," pp. 1–33, 2021.
- [27] J. Recker, *Scientific Research in Information Systems*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-30048-6.
- [28] K. D. Goepel, "Implementation of an Online Software Tool for the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP-OS)," *International Journal of the Analytic Hierarchy Process*, vol. 10, no. 3, Dec. 2018, doi:10.13033/ijahp.v10i3.590.
- [29] A. Ribeiro and L. Domingues, "Acceptance of an agile methodology in the public sector," *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 138, pp. 621–629, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2018.10.083.
- [30] N. Poluektova, T. Klebanova, and L. Guryanova, "Risk Assessment of Corporate Infocommunication Systems Projects Using Bayesian Networks," *2018 International Scientific-Practical Conference Problems of Infocommunications. Science and Technology (PIC S&T)*, pp. 31–34, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1109/infocommst.2018.8632150.