



BEYOND COMPLIANCE READINESS

Brexit Is a Regulatory Programme Before It Is a Settled Regulation — The Transformation Nobody Wanted

Tracing how political uncertainty exposes the operating assumptions organisations never governed

Giovanni Leonardi

September 2017

Brexit Is a Regulatory Programme Before It Is a Settled Regulation — The Transformation Nobody Wanted

Programme · No. 199

Originally written September 2017 | Re-edited and re-rendered for the WhereBeyond Edition, 2025

“Brexit has therefore become a regulatory programme before it has become a settled body of regulation.”

1. The programme began before the requirements existed

In September 2017, one of the strangest programme briefs in British business contains three simultaneous instructions:

- prepare for a material change in the legal and commercial environment;
- avoid committing to a scenario that negotiations may make irrelevant;
- do not alarm customers, employees or investors by appearing to expect the worst.

This is not the usual transformation mandate. There is no desired future state, no executive enthusiasm and no agreed catalogue of requirements. The initiating event happened at the ballot box in June 2016. The formal two-year withdrawal process began in March 2017. Much of the detail that organisations need remains subject to political negotiation.

Yet waiting is also a decision. Contracts renew. Systems are changed. Warehouses are planned. People are hired. Data crosses borders. Products move through supply chains whose regulatory assumptions have been stable for decades.

Brexit has therefore become a regulatory programme before it has become a settled body of regulation.

2. Nobody owns the whole consequence

The phrase “Brexit programme” suggests a single change. In practice, it is a collection of consequences distributed across functions that do not share one line of accountability.

Legal teams examine contracts and jurisdiction. Tax specialists consider structures and registrations. Supply-chain leaders look at customs, lead times and inventory. Human

resources considers workforce status and mobility. Technology teams inspect reference data, reporting logic and interfaces. Commercial leaders monitor customer behaviour. Finance models currency and working capital. Regulatory specialists interpret sector obligations.

Each function can be diligent while the enterprise remains unprepared.

A contract may permit continued supply, but the product may face a different conformity route. The product may remain saleable, but customs delay may break the promised service. Inventory may protect service, but working-capital cost may invalidate the margin. A new legal entity may preserve market access, but systems may not distinguish transactions correctly by the required date.

The programme exists in the space between these partial truths.

That is the first reason Brexit resembles transformation rather than ordinary compliance. Compliance usually begins with a known obligation and asks how to meet it. Brexit begins with changing possibilities and asks which operating assumptions are no longer safe.

3. The target state keeps moving

Most programme methods assume that uncertainty falls over time. Discovery clarifies requirements, design converts them into a target state, and delivery progressively closes the gap.

Here, political progress can change the target faster than the organisation can deliver against it.

The range of plausible outcomes includes transition arrangements, new trade terms, sector-specific provisions and a withdrawal without an agreed future relationship. Businesses cannot treat these as equally likely or fund each as a complete programme. Nor can they select one preferred scenario and call the uncertainty managed.

This creates a distinctive planning problem: the organisation must invest in no-regret capability while preserving options for decisions that cannot yet be justified.

No-regret work often includes:

- mapping regulatory and contractual exposure;
- identifying critical data that systems do not currently hold;
- locating single points of failure in supply and authorisation;
- defining decision lead times;
- preparing entity, licence or registration options;
- testing whether operational processes can distinguish scenarios;
- agreeing triggers for expenditure and execution.

This work is valuable under several outcomes. It creates visibility and shortens later response without pretending that the future is known.

In a regulatory programme with an unsettled destination, readiness is not a completed plan; it is the ability to make the next irreversible decision at the last responsible moment.

4. The roots lie in invisible assumptions

The deeper difficulty is not simply that organisations depend on European arrangements. It is that many of those dependencies have disappeared into normal operations.

When a rule remains stable for long enough, it stops looking like a rule and starts looking like the nature of the process.

A business may not describe the absence of customs declarations inside the single market as a capability. It experiences that absence as normal movement. A regulated service may treat access across jurisdictions as part of the product rather than as a permission. A data architecture may route customer information without recording the legal basis at each boundary. A workforce model may assume mobility because managers have never needed to design an alternative.

Brexit makes these assumptions visible by threatening to remove them.

This is why the discovery phase produces so much discomfort. It does not merely catalogue new regulation. It exposes how little the organisation understood about the regulatory infrastructure beneath its own operating model.

The transformation nobody wanted is therefore also the diagnosis nobody commissioned.

5. A composite exposure map

Consider a composite manufacturer serving industrial customers across the United Kingdom and continental Europe. It sells 4,800 product variants, operates six distribution sites and uses 19 principal systems across orders, product data, finance, transport and service.

Its initial Brexit risk register contains 63 entries. Most are high-level: customs delay, exchange-rate movement, labour availability, product compliance.

A cross-functional dependency exercise turns those 63 risks into 214 operating assumptions.

Among them:

- 1,120 product records do not contain the origin information needed for reliable customs treatment;

- 38 per cent of service parts are replenished through a same-week cross-border route;
- three major customer contracts promise delivery times that contain no allowance for border processing;
- two systems infer tax treatment from warehouse location rather than legal counterparty;
- 74 specialist employees work across sites under mobility arrangements that local managers have never recorded centrally;
- the product-change process does not identify which approvals are jurisdiction-specific.

None of these findings predicts the political outcome. Each reveals a dependency that must be governed under several outcomes.

The programme estimates that reconstructing product-origin data will take nine months because evidence sits across supplier declarations, old specifications and purchasing records. A decision made in early 2018 would therefore already be late for some plausible 2019 requirements.

The exposure map changes the executive conversation. The question is no longer “What will Brexit mean?” in the abstract. It becomes “Which decisions have lead times longer than the remaining political certainty?”

That is a programme question.

6. The case for treating it as compliance

There is a serious argument against the transformation label.

Organisations already have regulatory-change functions, lawyers, policy teams and risk committees. Calling Brexit a transformation may encourage central bureaucracy, speculative spending and a large programme office that competes with people who understand the rules. It may also turn political uncertainty into an excuse for every function to request delayed investment.

Much of the eventual work could be narrow: contract amendments, registrations, reporting changes, supply-chain controls and customer communications. These are compliance and operations activities, not reasons to redesign the enterprise.

This objection should be respected. Brexit is not permission to attach a strategic ambition to every mandatory change. The programme must not become a container for unrelated modernisation.

But the compliance-only view fails where consequences interact.

A regulatory team can interpret an obligation. It cannot decide how much inventory the business should hold, whether a customer promise should change, where a legal entity should sit, which system release should be displaced or how much stranded cost the board is willing to accept.

Those are enterprise trade-offs. They require an integrated programme even when nobody wants to call the result transformation.

7. Scenarios are useful only when they change decisions

Scenario planning has become the default response to uncertainty, but it can become theatre.

Teams produce three columns labelled soft, hard and no deal. Each contains a list of risks. The document demonstrates awareness while leaving decisions untouched.

A scenario earns its place only if it changes one of four things:

Decision effect	Question
Timing	Must action begin sooner under this scenario?
Scale	Does capacity, funding or inventory change materially?
Design	Does the operating solution differ?
Reversibility	Would acting now close an option that may be needed later?

The programme should work backwards from decision dates.

For each material decision:

- define the latest date at which it can be taken;
- identify evidence needed;
- state which scenarios require it;
- estimate cost of early action;
- estimate cost of late action;
- identify an interim step that preserves options;
- name the executive who will decide.

This replaces broad political debate with controlled organisational choice.

8. Governance must absorb political uncertainty without reproducing it

Brexit programmes are vulnerable to two governance failures.

The first is false certainty. Leaders select one planning assumption because budgets and plans require a number. Over time, that assumption hardens into the official future even though external evidence has not justified it.

The second is permanent deferral. Every decision is postponed until negotiations clarify the position. The programme remains intellectually honest and operationally unready.

Good governance holds a portfolio of assumptions with explicit confidence and expiry.

A monthly executive forum should decide:

- which assumptions remain valid;
- which external developments change the scenario weight;
- which decision deadlines have moved;
- which no-regret work proceeds;
- which contingent action is authorised;
- which options are retired;
- which risks are consciously accepted.

The programme office should maintain a decision calendar, not merely a risk register. The risk register says what may happen. The decision calendar says when the organisation loses the ability to respond.

“Uncertainty is not the absence of information; it is the condition in which delay can become commitment without anyone approving it.”

9. The human consequence is not a workstream

Regulatory programmes often treat people as one line of implementation: communications, training, workforce policy.

Brexit makes that treatment especially inadequate. Employees may face questions about residence, mobility, identity and family that the organisation cannot answer fully. Commercial teams may worry about customers they have served for years. Local managers may be asked to prepare contingencies that appear to question the future of their sites.

A programme that communicates only confirmed facts will leave a vacuum. A programme that reassures beyond the evidence will lose trust.

The more honest approach separates:

- what is known;
- what remains subject to negotiation;
- what the organisation is doing now;
- which decisions have not been taken;

- when the next update will occur;
- where individual questions can be handled confidentially.

This is not cosmetic change management. Uncertainty alters behaviour before regulation alters process. Valuable employees may leave, suppliers may reprice and customers may shift demand because of what they fear rather than what has legally changed.

The programme must treat those behavioural responses as part of the operating environment.

10. Transformation intent meets mandatory reality

Voluntary transformation usually begins with an ambition: grow, simplify, digitise, integrate, improve service. Mandatory transformation begins with the need to remain viable under changed conditions.

The contrast is revealing.

In voluntary programmes, organisations often overstate ambition and understate constraint. In Brexit programmes, they may understate transformation and overstate the possibility of containing the work inside compliance.

Both errors come from the same habit: separating the formal programme from the operating model it must change.

A regulatory trigger can require deep transformation even when the strategic intent is merely continuity. Legal entities, data flows, supply chains, customer propositions, controls and workforce arrangements may all need to change so that the business can continue to do what it already does.

Continuity is not the absence of transformation. Sometimes it is the outcome that demands the most of it.

11. The roots of readiness

Brexit did not create fragmented data, undocumented dependencies or slow decision rights. It revealed them.

Organisations with strong product data, clear accountability, adaptable contracts and visible supply chains can wait longer before committing. Organisations without them must act earlier and with less confidence.

That is the central lesson available in 2017, before the destination is settled.

Regulatory resilience is built from capabilities that appear mundane in stable times:

- knowing which rule supports which process;
- knowing which data proves compliance;

- knowing who owns a cross-functional decision;
- knowing how long change takes;
- knowing which obligations sit inside contracts and systems;
- knowing which options remain reversible.

These capabilities do not eliminate political uncertainty. They reduce the amount of organisational uncertainty added to it.

12. The transformation nobody wanted

Brexit is likely to be described for years through political outcomes, trade arrangements and legal change. For practitioners inside organisations, its more immediate significance is methodological.

It is a programme initiated without a chosen end state, driven by external authority, constrained by negotiation and required to preserve continuity while assumptions move.

That combination exposes the limits of conventional planning. It also exposes the weakness of organisations that understand their operations only through functional ownership.

The right response is neither a speculative transformation empire nor a narrow compliance checklist. It is a regulatory programme built around exposure, options, decision lead times and integrated consequence.

The programme cannot know every requirement in advance. It can know which assumptions the business depends on, which decisions are becoming irreversible and which capabilities will be valuable across several outcomes.

That is what readiness means at this stage: not predicting the agreement, but ensuring that uncertainty outside the organisation does not become avoidable disorder within it.