ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 2| February2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

A MULTI-OBJECTIVE OPERATIONS RESEARCH FRAMEWORK FOR OPTIMIZING THE PROJECT MANAGEMENT EVALUATION (PME) CELL

Qazi Shoeb Ahmad[1], Salahuddin[2]
[1]*Department of Statistics & Operations Research, College of Science, Qassim University, Buraydah 52571, Saudi Arabia*
[2]*Department of Mathematics, AMET University, Kanathur, Chennai-603112*

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra25896
DOI No: 10.36713/epra25896

ABSTRACT
This research paper presents a detailed operations research framework aimed at changing the Project Management Evaluation (PME) Cell from an administrative unit into a strategic decision-support centre. By analysing the functional description of the PME Cell, we identify key challenges in project selection, resource allocation, and strategic focus. To tackle these issues, we suggest using a Multi-Objective Linear Programming (MOLP) model, a technique that goes beyond single-objective optimization. This framework allows the PME Cell to maximize strategic value and financial return while reducing project risk, all within strict budget and resource limits. The paper describes the mathematical formulation of the MOLP model, the solution method using the Weighted Sum approach, and how to interpret the Pareto-optimal solution set. Through clear diagrams, we show the system layout, model structure, and improved workflow for the PME Cell. The findings indicate that this operations research technique offers a strong, clear, and effective method for achieving the PME Cell's goals. This leads to better project budgeting, cost accounting, and overall organizational success.

KEYWORDS: *Project Management Evaluation Cell, Operations Research, Multi-Objective Linear Programming, Pareto Optimality, Resource Allocation, Analytical Hierarchy Process, Scalarization.*

1. INTRODUCTION
In an ever-changing and highly volatile organization, successful project management is imperative in actualizing the set strategic objectives. This set of projects is accompanied by a document in which the framework is clearly outlined. Establishing a Project Management Evaluation Cell, which should be the nerve centre of project budgeting, cost accounting, and resource monitoring, is clearly outlined. Therefore, a wide range of responsibilities is clearly given, including dossier work, cost calculation, cooperation with various departments, and assistance in the management of annual and five-year planning.

Even though the functions outlined are all-encompassing, there is a great dependency on the ability to make decisions that are "optimal" with respect to prioritization challenges and resource availability hurdles. The process of budgeting and resource allocation using conventional approaches utilizes data on "previously precedented" approaches and judicious decisions, and one perceives the possibility of suboptimal decisions leading to failed strategic linkages and resource wastage inefficiencies. The key issue with the functions carried out by the PME Cell, as illustrated by function #4 "Assist Management in preparing annual plan, five-year plan" and function #5 "Assist Management in the allocation of resources," is the balancing act carried out with respect to project prioritization challenges resulting from the costs, benefits, and risks posed by each project on its own profile.

The premise of this paper rests in its suggestion that in order for excellence to be achieved in an organization, it is not enough for the PME cell to simply be provided with administrative processes but instead a highly potent analytical mind. The suggestion in this paper recommends that a Multi-Objective Linear Programming (MOLP) model be integrated with other important operations research techniques to elevate the competence within the PME cell so that it serves in providing management with an array of scientifically determined optimal solutions in pursuit of multiple goals with potentially conflicting objectives.

The purpose of this research will be, after deconstructing the functional needs of the PME Cell, to build and describe the MOLP concept according to its needs and, finally, to show how this "technique of excellence" may actually be implemented so as to revolutionize the way project management will be handled.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW
The idea of a centralized body for overall Project Oversight, as along the lines of the PME Cell, has been well discussed and developed as a concept within Project Management. Discussing this, the idea of a Project Management Office (PMO) as a centralized body for Project Management Oversight was developed by Kerzner (2017) as being important for Project Management Evolution and maturity. The evolution towards being a driver for the organization and its strategy, however, for the PME Cell initially developed as a supportive body.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 2| February2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

The discipline of "Operations Research" has a successful history of application in the field of "Project Management." "Program Evaluation and Review Technique" (PERT) and "Critical Path Method" (CPM) are the core "Operations Research" models for "project planning" (Moder, Phillips, & Davis, 2015). "Linear Programming" models have been successfully applied in "project scheduling" as well as "resource budget planning" (Hillier & Lieberman, 2014); however, single-objective models are not appropriate in practical situations.

The limitation of single objective models has, in fact, introduced Multi Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) and Multi Objective Optimization (MOO). The Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) is excellent in ranking projects on multiple, qualitative, as well as quantitative factors (Saaty, 2008). AHP, however, does not in itself provide assistance in considering problems with regard to bounded resources. MOLP is developed to provide solutions to problems with multiple, conflicting objectives in a bounded environment (Steuer, 1986). The entire process of Pareto Optimality, which is based on MOLP, presents a number of non-dominated solutions with which a basic clarity on the optimal trade-offs is provided. The present paper argues MOLP to be providing solutions to problems based on "excellence" in addressing the multi-dimensional issues faced by PME Cell in its most straightforward manner.


3. SYSTEM ANALYSIS OF THE PME CELL

The PME Cell acts as a central hub that liaises with top management, project teams, and other administrative divisions. Its six major functions can be condensed into three key roles:

1. Information & Documentation Hub: The upkeep of project folders and records concerns Function #2.
2. Analytic & Support Unit: To perform all supporting tasks of the cost calculations and to prepare plans accordingly-Functions #3 & #4.
3. Coordinating & Allocating Centre: Resource allocation and reconciliation of financial data multiline-functions #5, #6, & #7.

The third role is the most critical and complex since it has a direct impact on organizational strategy. The document seems to indicate that the current process is essentially procedural-the PME Cell collects information, and management decides. Our proposed framework aims at embedding analytical rigor directly into this process.

Figure 1: Conceptual Architecture of the PME Cell System



This diagram illustrates the PME Cell's central position. Our proposed MOLP model will be embedded within the PME Cell, processing inputs from various sources to generate superior outputs for management and project teams.

4. THE EXCELLENCE TECHNIQUE: MULTI-OBJECTIVE LINEAR PROGRAMMING (MOLP)

The Excellence Technique: Multi-Objective Linear Programming (MOLP)

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 2| February2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

In order to improve the role of the PME Cell, we propose the use of Multi-Objective Linear Programming (MOLP). The underlying problem being addressed by the PME Cell is not merely "minimize cost" or "max profit." It is a complex process of balancing a variety of basic, yet often competing, organizational goals.

• Conflict 1: Strategic Value vs. Financial Return: Several projects could have strategic value but relatively low financial return, or high financial return but relatively low strategic value to the organization.
• Conflict 2: Return vs. Risk. A riskier project to achieve higher returns can also lead to financial loss.
• Conflict 3: Project Goals and Resource Constraints. Sometimes, an ideal project portfolio may demand more resources (budget, manpower, machinery) than are actually obtainable.

However, this detail cannot be handled by a single-objective LP model. MOLP is used for this very reason. An MOLP model "is used for situations where a decision problem has an objective function to be optimized, but also other important objective functions which are to be optimized simultaneously." Thus, the solutions are generally expressed, as noted above, but to the decision-makers, rather than a specific "solution" to the decision problem, a set of solutions, known as the Pareto optimal set or Pareto front, is presented, which enables the decision-makers to finally make a decision, even given the trade-offs involved, in a well-informed manner.

5. DEVELOPING THE MOLP MODEL FOR THE PME CELL

The MOLP model will help us to solve the central purpose of the PME Cell - resource allocation and project plans (Functions #4 & #5).

5.1. Decision Variables

Let the projects to consider for the period, i.e., the planning period, which in this case will be the next fiscal year, consist of $'n'$ projects for which the decision to fund has to be taken keeping the planning period in mind. Let the level of fund allocation to the j^{th}project, i.e., 'x_j', where 'j' varies from '1' to 'n', be a proportion of the fund requested for the 'jth' project, i.e., '0 ≤ x_j ≤ 1', where 'x_j' = '0' means the project is to be abandoned, and 'x_j' = '1' means the 'jth' project is to be funded.

5.2. Objective Functions

We propose three loosely competing goals, in recognition of the strategic nature of project management.

1. Maximize Strategic Value (Z_1): Each project is given a "Strategic Value Score" (Sj), usually obtained by comparing the project with the overall goals of the organization via a qualitative approach such as the AHP method.

Maximize Z1 = Σ (Sj * xj) for all projects j=1 to n

2. Maximize Financial Return (Z_2): Each project j has an associated "Net Present Value" or "Financial Return Score" denoted by R_j.

Maximize Z_2 = Σ (Rj*xj) for all projects j=1 to n

3. Minimize Project Risk (Z_3): The projects are given a 'Risk Score' (K_j), with higher values implying higher risk (for example, technical and/or market risks) for each individual project j.

Minimize Z_3 = Σ(Kj*xj) All projects j = 1 to n

5.3 Constraints

The model is also constrained by the real-world limitations faced by the organization.

1. Totally Budget Constraints: The sum of the allocation does not exceed the available budget B. Let C_j be the full budget for the j-th project.

Σ(Cj * xj) <= B

2. Resource Constraints. The organization has certain constraints due to limited availability of key resources. Let A_{jr} denote the amount of resource r needed by project j. Let T_r denote the total amount of resource r.


Σ (A_{jr} * x_j) ≤ T_r for all resources r

3. Policy Constraints: There can be certain guidelines set by management, such as defining an investment limit in particular categories of projects. For example, investment in R&D projects should be at least 20% of the total investment.

∑ (C_j * x_j ≥ 0.20 * B, j ∈ R&D category.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 2| February2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

Figure 2: Structure of the MOLP Model for the PME Cell



6. SOLUTION METHODOLOGY AND INTERPRETATION

A method to handle multiple objectives in an MOLP problem: One straightforward method to solve MOLP problems is to apply a method called Weighted Sum Method.

1. Assigning Weights

The weights w1, w2, w3 of the objective function would be assigned by the company with the help of the PME cell, which would show the relative importance of each objective for the company for the planning period for which the strategy would be formulated.

The weights would always add up to 1, i.e., w1 = 0.5, w2 = 0.3, w

2. Scalarization: The different objectives are now combined into a single objective function, Z, called the composite function. Observe that the objective function to be minimized (the Z_3 function) is subtracted.


Maximize $Z = w_1Z_1 + w_2Z_2 - w_3*Z_3$ Maximize $Z = \sum [(w_1S_j + w_2R_j - w_3*K_j)$

3. Solving: The combined function Z is now a standard linear programming calculation, which can be easily solved using an optimization technique or a solver-based software program, such as those using Excel Solver, LINGO, or CPLEX.

4. Generating Pareto Front: In order to have a complete picture, instead of solving the model once by the PME Cell just once, it changes the values of the weights (w_1, w_2, w_3) and solves the problem several times. In this way, it obtains different optimal solutions at various points on the Pareto front.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 2| February2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

Figure 3: Conceptual Diagram of a Pareto Front



The diagram demonstrates the trade-off between two objectives (for example, Strategic Value and Financial Return). The points A, B, and C are Pareto optimal. The point D is dominated by points like B because even for the same level of strategic value return, B offers more financial return.

The new, elevated role of PME Cell, in conjunction with their previous role, would be to feedback upwards into management what's called that trade-off or that range of trade-offs, that so-called 'Pareto Front'. So, we can say, 'You know, we have done our analysis, and these are the best possible project portfolios we can get. If we want to improve our strategic value, i.e., we want to improve our value up here over our value down here, we have to accept less return.' Or, 'If we want more of that return down there, we have to accept less of that value up there.' That changes dramatically how one thinks about making decisions. One can stop making decisions on one's gut feel.

7. ENHANCED PME CELL WORKFLOW WITH MOLP

The integration of the MOLP model fundamentally enhances the PME Cell's workflow for planning and allocation.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 2| February2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

Figure 4: Enhanced Workflow for Annual/Five-Year Plan Preparation



The above workflow illustrates a recursive, data-driven process: the PME Cell is not merely a link in the chain but the analytical firepower driving the entire planning and allocation cycle and thus directly fulfilling its mandate in a far more sophisticated manner.

8. DISCUSSION AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

The application of the "MOLP" to the functions of the PME Cell is extremely beneficial:

• Strategic Alignment: The model ultimately forces a quantification of "strategic value" so that the projects being selected are indeed aligned with the organization's goals.

• Transparency and Objectivity: The process is objective and reasoned around a model; the reasoning behind picking a particular project over other alternatives is easily justified through weights and a Pareto front, which avoids political manoeuvring.

• Optimal Resource Utilization: Resources are limited; a budget is fixed for a particular project, and manpower is also limited. This is solved by exploring optimal resource utilization by representing resources within a model.

• Enhanced Risk Management: Risks are not anymore, an after-thought, but as an objective outcome of the portfolio selection process it is minimized.

• Empowerment of the PME Cell: Here, the PME Cell, which is currently a mere administrative body, changes to a proactive body, providing vital analysis to the highest level of management.

Yet, the road to implementation is strewn with hurdles:

• Data Quality: The model's output is only as good as its input. Accurate cost estimates [Cj], risk assessments [Kj] and strategic value scores [Sj] are essential and may be difficult to obtain.

• Weights Definition: Weight assignment to objectives might be politically sensitive and needs strong leadership to achieve consensus.

• Complexity and Training: Personnel in the PME Cell will need training in OR techniques and Optimization Software for effective building, running, and interpretation of the model.

• Model Acceptance: Management, who are accustomed to traditional decision-making, might be sceptical of this "black box" model. The method and its benefits should be plainly communicated if the model is to be adopted.

9. CONCLUSION

This paper has demonstrated that the integration of an MOLP framework represents an "excellence technique" capable of transforming the PME Cell. Beyond the naivety of single-goal optimization, the MOLP model empowers the PME Cell to engage with both the complexity and trade-offs pertaining to modern project portfolio management. The framework ensures a robust, transparent, and analytically superior way to conduct the main functions of project planning and resource allocation as set forth in the source document.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 2| February2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

The proposed model is not intended to replace human judgment but to inform and enrich it instead. This cell presents management with a set of Pareto-optimal solutions and thus equips management with immense clarity regarding strategic choices that can be made, hence data-driven and aligned to organizational priorities. The successful adoption of this framework will thereby elevate the role of the PME Cell in optimizing the use of scarce organizational resources for ultimately achieving strategic objectives.

Future research could consist of further enhancements to this framework. The application of a Monte Carlo simulation can help to overcome issues with uncertainty in relation to certain parameters in the model, such as costs C_j or returns R_j. The application of fuzzy logic to qualitative variables, such as strategic value S_j, could also contribute to further enhanced potential in terms of capturing uncertainty in models like this one. The path to developing an 'excellent' PME Cell is a journey of analytical refinement.

Conflict of interest: There is no conflict of interest regarding this research paper.

REFERENCES

1. *Christensen, D. S., & Kreiner, K. (2015). Project management offices: A review of the literature and a research agenda. International Journal of Project Management, 33(5), 1048-1059.*
2. *Hillier, F. S., & Lieberman, G. J. (2014). Introduction to Operations Research (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill*
3. *Ishizaka, A., & Nemery, P. (2013). Multi-criteria decision analysis: Methods and software. John Wiley & Sons.*
4. *Kerzner, H. (2017). Project Management: A Systems Approach to Planning, Scheduling, and Controlling (12th edition). John Wiley & Sons.*
5. *Moder, J. J., Phillips, C. R., & Davis, E. W. (2015). Project Management with CPM, PERT, and Precedence Diagramming (3rd ed.). Momentum Press.*
6. *Saaty, T. L. (2008). Decision Making with the Analytic Hierarchy Process. International Journal of Services Sciences, 1(1), 83-98*
7. *Steuer, R. E. (1986). Multiple Criteria Optimization: Theory, Computation, and Application. John Wiley & Sons.*