

BEYOND THE SOFTWARE

PMO Technology — When Tools Became the Point Instead of the Means

A Practitioner's Commentary on the Tooling Obsession in Programme Management Offices



PMO Technology – When Tools Became the Point Instead of the Means

Programme · No. 32

Originally written October 2005 | Re-edited and re-rendered for the WhereBeyond Edition, 2025

“The organisation did not need a better tool – it needed a better conversation about what its programmes were actually trying to achieve.”

The Procurement as Strategy

There is a pattern I have seen repeated so often that it has become almost a diagnostic. An organisation decides it needs to improve its programme management capability. It commissions a review. The review identifies gaps in governance, reporting, resource management, and cross-programme visibility. The organisation's response, with impressive consistency, is to procure a tool.

Not to address the governance gaps. Not to develop the people. Not to redesign the decision-making processes. To buy software. The logic is seductive: the tool will enforce the standards, automate the reporting, provide the dashboards, and consolidate the data. The tool becomes the strategy. The PMO's establishment programme becomes, in effect, a software implementation programme. And twelve months later, the organisation has a tool that nobody uses properly, that produces reports nobody reads, and that has cost more than the PMO's entire annual budget.

The problem is not the tools. The enterprise project management tools on the market are, for the most part, capable products. They can consolidate plans, aggregate risks, produce portfolio dashboards, and manage resource demand. The problem is the assumption that capability can be installed rather than built.

What Tools Cannot Do

A tool can store a risk register. It cannot make a programme manager think rigorously about risk. A tool can consolidate programme plans into a portfolio view. It cannot make an executive act on what that view reveals. A tool can track dependencies between programmes. It cannot make the owners of those dependencies talk to each other. A tool can automate RAG status reporting. It cannot prevent programme managers from gaming the status.

The capabilities that matter in programme management are human capabilities: judgement, communication, challenge, decision-making, political navigation. No tool addresses these. When an organisation invests in tooling before investing in these capabilities, it automates dysfunction. The reports are produced faster, but they contain the same comfortable fictions. The dashboards are more visually appealing, but they display the same lagging indicators. The data is more accessible, but nobody has the analytical skill to interpret it.

The Hidden Cost

The tooling obsession carries a cost beyond the licence fees and the implementation budget. It consumes the PMO's attention and credibility at precisely the moment when both should be directed at establishing the PMO's value.

A new PMO that spends its first six months implementing a tool is a PMO that has spent its first six months doing something its stakeholders do not care about. Programme managers do not lie awake at night wishing they had a better project management tool. They lie awake wishing their governance forums would make decisions, their resource problems would be resolved, and their dependencies would be managed. A PMO that arrives offering a software rollout when the organisation needs governance reform has misread the room comprehensively.

The credibility cost is real. A PMO that is associated with a painful tool implementation inherits the resentment that all tool implementations generate. The PMO becomes the team that made everyone learn a new system, attend training sessions, and enter data into yet another platform. This is not the reputation a new PMO needs.

What the Tool Discussion Actually Reveals

When I hear an organisation debating which PMO tool to buy, I hear a different conversation underneath. The tool discussion is usually a proxy for a governance discussion that nobody wants to have. What information do we actually need to make portfolio decisions? is a governance question. Who should see programme data, and at what level of detail? is a governance question. How do we want to manage cross-programme dependencies? is a governance question. These are difficult questions because they involve authority, access, and accountability. A tool selection process is easier because it involves features, demonstrations, and procurement.

The organisation that resolves the governance questions first will find that its tool requirements are modest. A spreadsheet and a disciplined reporting cycle will outperform an enterprise tool in an organisation with strong governance every time. The organisation that buys the tool first will find that the governance questions remain unanswered, and the tool becomes an expensive filing system.

The organisation did not need a better tool – it needed a better conversation about what its programmes were actually trying to achieve. Until that conversation happens, no tool will help, and the search for one will remain what it has always been: a sophisticated form of avoidance.