

BEYOND STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

Portfolio as Strategy Execution Mechanism — The Unrealised Potential

A Practitioner's Perspective on Why Portfolio Management Has Failed to Bridge the Strategy-Delivery Gap

Giovanni Leonardi

September 2019



Contents

- 1. Executive Summary** 3
- 2. The Original Promise** 3
- 3. The Evidence of Failure** 4
 - 3.1 The Alignment Fiction 4
 - 3.2 The Demand Funnel Problem 4
 - 3.3 The Resource Allocation Disconnect 5
 - 3.4 The Temporal Mismatch 5
- 4. Why the Approaches Have Not Worked** 5
 - 4.1 Strategic Portfolio Shaping 5
 - 4.2 Benefits Realisation Management 6
 - 4.3 Portfolio-Level Roadmaps 6
- 5. What Would Actually Work** 6
 - 5.1 Genuine Decision Authority 7
 - 5.2 A Different Relationship with Strategy 7
 - 5.3 Continuous Portfolio Recomposition 7
- 6. The Organisational Cost of Inaction** 8

Portfolio as Strategy Execution Mechanism — The Unrealised Potential

Transformation · No. 232

Originally written September 2019 | Re-edited and re-rendered for the WhereBeyond Edition,
2025

“Portfolio management was supposed to be the mechanism through which strategy became action — the translation layer between boardroom intent and organisational reality. In most organisations, it has become something far less: a reporting function that documents the gap between the two.”

1. Executive Summary

The promise of portfolio management has always been strategic: it is the mechanism through which an organisation translates its strategy into a coordinated set of investments, programmes, and projects that collectively deliver the intended outcomes. This is the proposition set out in every portfolio management standard, every maturity model, and every consulting engagement that positions portfolio management as a strategic discipline.

The reality, after more than a decade of portfolio management adoption across sectors, is that this promise remains largely unrealised. Most organisations have a portfolio function, and most can produce a list of their active initiatives mapped to strategic objectives. But the act of mapping is not the act of translating. The gap between strategic intent and portfolio composition — between what the board says it wants and what the organisation is actually spending its change capacity on — persists in virtually every organisation I have observed, and it persists for reasons that go deeper than process maturity.

This paper examines the structural conditions that have prevented portfolio management from fulfilling its strategic promise, the approaches that have been tried, what has worked and what has failed, and what a more effective model of strategy-to-portfolio translation would require.

2. The Original Promise

The concept is elegant and, on its face, compelling. An organisation defines its strategy. The strategy identifies a set of priorities, capabilities, and outcomes that the organisation must achieve. The portfolio function translates these into investment themes, allocates

resources accordingly, selects and prioritises the initiatives that best advance the strategic objectives, and provides governance oversight to ensure that the portfolio remains aligned as conditions change.

In this model, portfolio management is not an administrative function. It is the primary execution mechanism for strategy. It sits at the junction between strategic planning and operational delivery, ensuring that the organisation's finite change capacity is directed toward the work that matters most. The portfolio board is not a project oversight committee — it is, in effect, the strategy execution committee.

This is the model that standards bodies have articulated, that consulting firms have sold, and that portfolio management practitioners have aspired to implement. After years of effort across hundreds of organisations, it is worth asking honestly: has it worked?

3. The Evidence of Failure

The evidence suggests that in most organisations, portfolio management has settled into something considerably less ambitious than its strategic promise.

3.1 The Alignment Fiction

Virtually every portfolio office can produce a strategic alignment map — a matrix showing which initiatives contribute to which strategic objectives. These maps are produced, reviewed, and presented to governance boards with great regularity. But in practice, the mapping exercise is performed after the portfolio is already composed. Initiatives are approved through a variety of channels — sponsor advocacy, regulatory mandate, technology obsolescence, political necessity — and then tagged with the strategic objectives they most plausibly support.

This is alignment by label, not alignment by design. The portfolio was not constructed to execute the strategy. It was constructed through a series of individual investment decisions, each driven by its own logic, and then retrospectively mapped to the strategic framework. The alignment map creates an appearance of strategic coherence that the underlying decision-making process does not support.

Strategic alignment in most organisations is an exercise in retrospective labelling — initiatives are tagged with the strategic objectives they most plausibly support, long after the real investment decisions have been made.

3.2 The Demand Funnel Problem

The way initiatives enter the portfolio is itself a barrier to strategic execution. In most organisations, the demand funnel is bottom-up: business units, functions, and technology teams generate proposals based on their own priorities, pain points, and ambitions. These proposals are assessed individually against strategic criteria and, if they score well enough, approved.

The problem with this model is that it optimises for individual initiative quality rather than portfolio-level strategic fit. Each proposal may be sound in isolation, but the resulting portfolio is the sum of local optimisations, not a deliberate expression of strategic priority. The strategic objectives that are well served by bottom-up demand — typically operational efficiency and technology modernisation — accumulate initiatives naturally. The objectives that require top-down orchestration — market entry, capability transformation, operating model change — are chronically under-invested because nobody in the demand funnel owns them end to end.

3.3 The Resource Allocation Disconnect

Even where the portfolio is notionally aligned to strategy, the resource allocation often tells a different story. Strategic priorities are expressed in terms of objectives and outcomes. Resource allocation is managed in terms of budget lines, headcount, and team availability. The translation between the two is, in most organisations, opaque at best.

A common pattern: the board approves a strategy that identifies digital transformation as the top priority. The portfolio office maps forty per cent of the portfolio to digital objectives. But the actual resource allocation — the people, the skills, the leadership attention — reveals that the bulk of the change capacity is consumed by regulatory compliance, infrastructure refresh, and operational improvement. The digital initiatives exist in the portfolio, but they are starved of the resources they need to deliver at pace because the resource allocation mechanism does not enforce the strategic priority.

3.4 The Temporal Mismatch

Strategies are typically set on a three-to-five-year horizon and refreshed annually. Portfolios are governed on a monthly or quarterly cycle. Individual initiatives operate on their own delivery timelines. These three temporal rhythms are poorly synchronised, and the gaps between them create persistent drift.

When the strategy is refreshed, the portfolio is rarely recomposed from scratch. Instead, existing initiatives are re-mapped to the new strategic framework, new initiatives are added at the margin, and the governance process continues. Over successive strategy cycles, the portfolio accumulates layers of strategic intent — initiatives that were aligned to the previous strategy, or the one before that, still consuming resources because nobody has made the decision to stop them.

4. Why the Approaches Have Not Worked

Organisations have not been passive in the face of these challenges. Several approaches have been tried, with varying degrees of success.

4.1 Strategic Portfolio Shaping

Some organisations have attempted top-down portfolio composition — defining investment envelopes by strategic theme and constraining the demand funnel to fit within them. The logic is sound: if the strategy says that forty per cent of change

investment should go to customer experience, then the portfolio should reflect that allocation.

In practice, this approach has struggled against three forces. First, the investment envelopes are typically set at a level of abstraction that is too high to guide individual investment decisions. Second, the demand that does not fit within an envelope does not disappear — it finds alternative funding routes, is reclassified to fit a different theme, or is escalated through political channels. Third, the enforcement mechanism is weak: portfolio offices can recommend but rarely have the authority to reject proposals that a senior sponsor is determined to advance.

4.2 Benefits Realisation Management

The theory is that if the portfolio tracks benefits as well as outputs, the strategic alignment will take care of itself: initiatives that deliver strategic benefits will be prioritised, and those that do not will be stopped. In practice, benefits management has proved extraordinarily difficult to operationalise. Benefits are hard to define precisely, harder to measure, and hardest of all to attribute to specific initiatives when multiple programmes contribute to the same outcome. The result is that benefits management adds complexity to governance without materially improving the strategy-to-portfolio link.

4.3 Portfolio-Level Roadmaps

Some organisations have attempted to bridge the gap by creating portfolio-level roadmaps that sequence initiatives against strategic milestones. This is perhaps the most promising approach, because it forces a conversation about sequencing, dependencies, and capacity that individual initiative approval does not. But roadmaps are static artefacts in a dynamic environment. They require continuous maintenance, and the maintenance effort is considerable. In most organisations, the roadmap is produced once, presented to the board, and then gradually diverges from reality as individual initiatives are accelerated, delayed, or added outside the planned sequence.

5. What Would Actually Work

The pattern across all these failed or partially successful approaches is consistent: they treat the strategy-to-portfolio link as a process problem when it is, fundamentally, an authority problem. The portfolio function can map, track, report, and recommend. What it cannot do, in most organisations, is decide.

“Portfolio management was supposed to be the mechanism through which strategy became action — the translation layer between boardroom intent and organisational reality. In most organisations, it has

become something far less: a reporting function that documents the gap between the two.”

A portfolio function that genuinely executes strategy would need several things that most organisations have been unwilling to provide.

5.1 Genuine Decision Authority

The portfolio board would need the authority to reject initiatives that do not fit the strategic portfolio composition, regardless of sponsor seniority. It would need the authority to stop initiatives that are no longer strategically relevant, even if they are performing well operationally. And it would need the authority to redirect resources from lower-priority to higher-priority work without negotiating with every affected business unit.

This is, in effect, a power shift. It moves investment decision-making from individual sponsors and business units to a central portfolio governance function. Organisations resist this shift because it concentrates authority, reduces local autonomy, and requires a level of trust in the portfolio function that has not been established.

5.2 A Different Relationship with Strategy

The portfolio function would need to be involved in strategy formulation, not just strategy execution. If the portfolio is to be the execution mechanism for strategy, then the strategy must be formulated with explicit attention to execution feasibility — the organisation’s change capacity, its capability gaps, its dependency constraints, its resource availability. Strategies that are set without reference to delivery reality produce portfolios that are misaligned from inception.

This means the head of portfolio management sitting in the strategy conversation, not receiving its output. It means strategic objectives being tested against portfolio capacity before they are finalised. It means the strategy being expressed, at least in part, in terms of portfolio investment choices rather than abstract aspirations.

5.3 Continuous Portfolio Recomposition

The annual strategy refresh followed by portfolio re-mapping is too slow and too disconnected. A strategy execution model requires continuous portfolio recomposition: a standing process that assesses the portfolio’s strategic fit on an ongoing basis, identifies drift, and makes adjustment decisions in something closer to real time.

This does not mean constant upheaval. It means a governance rhythm that treats the portfolio as a living expression of strategic intent, subject to deliberate adjustment as conditions change, rather than a static list of approved initiatives that is reconciled to the strategy once a year.

Current Model	Strategy Execution Model
Strategy set, then portfolio mapped to it	Portfolio capacity informs strategy formulation

Current Model	Strategy Execution Model
Bottom-up demand, individually assessed	Top-down investment themes, demand channelled
Alignment by labelling	Alignment by construction
Annual portfolio-strategy reconciliation	Continuous portfolio recomposition
Portfolio office recommends	Portfolio board decides
Benefits tracked per initiative	Outcomes tracked at strategic-theme level

6. The Organisational Cost of Inaction

The unrealised potential of portfolio management as a strategy execution mechanism is not an abstract concern. It has measurable consequences. Organisations that cannot translate strategy into coordinated delivery waste change capacity on work that does not advance the strategic agenda. They under-invest in the capabilities they need most. They disperse scarce talent across too many initiatives. And they create a persistent credibility gap between what the board announces and what the organisation actually does — a gap that erodes trust in both the strategy process and the portfolio function.

The irony is that portfolio management was invented precisely to solve this problem. The discipline exists because organisations recognised that they needed a mechanism to connect strategic intent with investment reality. Two decades on, the mechanism exists in form but not in substance. The portfolio office produces the maps, the dashboards, and the governance reports. The strategy-to-delivery gap persists.

The portfolio function has been given the responsibility for strategy execution without the authority to exercise it. Until organisations are willing to close that gap, portfolio management will remain a reporting discipline with strategic aspirations.

Closing the gap requires more than better frameworks or more mature processes. It requires a fundamental decision about whether portfolio management is an administrative function that tracks and reports on investment decisions made elsewhere, or a strategic function that makes those decisions. Most organisations have not yet made that choice. The portfolio's unrealised potential will persist until they do.