

BEYOND THE CONTRACT

The Contract Manager Who Cannot Deliver — Why Programme Management Lost Its Core Discipline

A Practitioner's Perspective on the Erosion of Delivery Capability in Outsourced Programme Environments



Giovanni Leonardi

August 2005

The Contract Manager Who Cannot Deliver – Why Programme Management Lost Its Core Discipline

Programme · No. 36

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

“The programme manager who can recite every SLA threshold but cannot tell you whether the programme will actually deliver its intended benefits is not managing a programme at all – they are administering a contract.”

1. The Quiet Displacement

There is a pattern emerging across organisations that have committed to large-scale outsourcing, and it is one that few senior leaders seem willing to name. The programme managers who once held delivery together – who understood the dependencies, who knew which workstreams were genuinely on track and which were being managed through optimistic reporting – are being steadily replaced by a different kind of professional. The replacement looks similar on paper. They carry the same title. They attend the same governance boards. But they are doing fundamentally different work.

What has happened, in organisation after organisation, is that the act of outsourcing has redefined what programme management means in practice. Where once it meant orchestrating delivery across complex, interdependent workstreams, it now increasingly means managing contracts, tracking service levels, and administering commercial relationships. The shift is subtle enough that it often goes unnoticed until something breaks – until a programme that appeared green on every dashboard fails to deliver anything of value.

2. How the Substitution Happens

The mechanism is not difficult to trace. When an organisation outsources significant portions of its delivery capability, the internal programme management function loses its direct relationship with the people doing the work. The programme manager no longer walks the floor, no longer has informal conversations with developers or testers or business analysts about what is really happening. Instead, they have a contract. They have a set of service level agreements. They have a monthly governance meeting with the vendor's account director.

This is not, in itself, unreasonable. Contracts exist for good reason, and someone must manage them. The problem is what gets lost in the translation. The skills required to manage a vendor relationship are genuinely different from those required to manage delivery. Commercial acumen, negotiation capability, an understanding of contractual mechanisms – these are valuable competencies. But they are not the same as the ability to read a programme's real health, to understand where technical debt is accumulating, to sense when a workstream is heading for trouble before the metrics confirm it.

The outsourcing model does not merely change who does the work — it changes what the programme manager's job actually is. And most organisations have not recognised that this constitutes a fundamental shift in the competency model for the role.

What happens in practice is a gradual, often unconscious selection process. The programme managers who thrive in the new environment are those comfortable with commercial governance, with contract interpretation, with the formal machinery of vendor management. Those whose strength lay in delivery leadership — in the messy, intuitive, relationship-dependent work of making complex programmes actually produce results — find themselves increasingly marginalised. They lack the vocabulary of the new regime. Their instinct to get close to the work is frustrated by contractual boundaries that define such proximity as interference.

3. The Structural Forces That Sustain the Pattern

This would be less concerning if it were simply a transitional difficulty — a temporary misalignment that organisations would naturally correct. But several structural forces conspire to make it persistent.

The first is the measurement problem. Outsourcing creates an abundance of contractual metrics — SLA compliance rates, defect counts, resource utilisation figures — that give the appearance of rigorous oversight. A programme board reviewing these numbers can reasonably believe it has visibility of delivery health. The metrics are precise, regularly reported, and professionally presented. What they do not capture is whether the programme is actually delivering against its intended outcomes. They measure the vendor's contractual compliance, not the organisation's strategic progress. The programme manager whose world is defined by these metrics is, in effect, measuring the wrong thing with great precision.

The second is the incentive structure. In an outsourced environment, the path of least resistance for a programme manager is to manage within the contractual framework. Challenging a vendor on delivery quality requires energy, commercial confidence, and organisational backing. It often means escalating disputes that senior stakeholders would prefer to avoid. It is far easier — and far safer for one's career — to report that SLAs are being met than to argue that the SLAs themselves are measuring the wrong things.

The third is the recruitment cycle. As organisations lose their delivery-focused programme managers — through retirement, frustration, or redeployment — they replace them with candidates whose experience is increasingly skewed towards vendor management. The job descriptions reflect the new reality: they ask for commercial awareness, stakeholder management, experience of managing third-party relationships. They rarely ask whether the candidate has ever actually delivered a complex programme from the inside. The competency model has shifted, and the recruitment process reinforces the shift.

4. What Gets Lost

The consequences of this substitution are real but slow to manifest, which is part of why the pattern persists. Programmes continue to run. Governance boards continue to meet. Reports continue to be produced. The machinery of programme management continues

to operate. But beneath the surface, something essential has been hollowed out.

The delivery-focused programme manager brought a particular kind of intelligence to the role — an ability to synthesise information from multiple sources, to weigh formal reports against informal signals, to maintain a mental model of how the programme's many moving parts related to each other. This is not a skill that can be easily codified or contracted out. It depends on proximity to the work, on relationships built over time, on a deep understanding of the organisation's capabilities and constraints.

*“The programme manager who can recite every SLA threshold
but cannot tell you whether the programme will actually
deliver its intended benefits is not managing a programme at
all — they are administering a contract.”*

In its place, organisations get something that looks like programme management but functions differently. The contract-focused programme manager is not incompetent — they are simply solving a different problem. They are optimising the commercial relationship with the vendor, which is a legitimate and necessary activity. But it is not the same as ensuring that the programme delivers its intended outcomes. The gap between these two activities is where value is destroyed.

5. The Compounding Effect

What makes this pattern particularly damaging is that it compounds over time. As delivery capability erodes within the programme management function, the organisation becomes more dependent on its vendors — not just for the execution of work, but for the understanding of what needs to be done. The vendor's programme managers and delivery leads increasingly hold the real picture of programme health, because they are the ones closest to the work. The internal programme manager becomes, in effect, a relay point for information that they lack the context to critically evaluate.

This dependency is self-reinforcing. The less the internal programme manager understands about delivery, the more they must rely on the vendor's reporting. The more they rely on the vendor's reporting, the less incentive there is to develop or maintain delivery understanding. The organisation's ability to hold its vendors genuinely accountable diminishes with each iteration of this cycle, because accountability requires the capacity to form an independent view of what is happening — and that capacity is precisely what has been lost.

6. The Recognition Problem

Perhaps the most troubling aspect of this pattern is how difficult it is to surface within organisational governance. The programme managers affected by it are often highly competent professionals who are performing well against the expectations set for them. They manage contracts effectively. They maintain vendor relationships. They produce clear, well-structured reports. By every formal measure, they are doing their jobs.

The problem is that the job, as defined, no longer encompasses the thing that matters most: ensuring that the programme actually delivers. This is not a failing of individual programme managers — it is a systemic consequence of how organisations have restructured their delivery models without rethinking their programme management capability.

Senior leaders who commission outsourcing arrangements rarely consider the second-order effect on their programme management function. They think about cost reduction, about access to specialist skills, about focusing on core competencies. They do not think about what happens to the people who must hold the programme together when the delivery capability has been distributed across multiple vendors, each with their own commercial incentives and their own version of the truth.

7. What Would Need to Change

Addressing this pattern requires organisations to make several uncomfortable acknowledgements. The first is that programme management in an outsourced environment is a genuinely different discipline from programme management in an internally delivered one, and that the competency model must reflect this difference — not by abandoning delivery skills, but by insisting that they remain central even when the delivery model changes.

The second is that contractual metrics, however precise, are not a substitute for delivery intelligence. Organisations need programme managers who can look beyond the SLA dashboard and form an independent view of whether the programme is on track to deliver its intended benefits. This requires investment in skills, in access, and in the organisational mandate to challenge vendors on substance rather than merely on contractual compliance.

The third, and perhaps most difficult, is that the current trajectory is not self-correcting. Left to itself, the substitution of contract management for delivery management will continue, because all of the structural incentives point in the same direction. Reversing it requires deliberate intervention — in recruitment, in role design, in the expectations that governance boards set for their programme managers, and in the value that organisations place on delivery understanding as distinct from commercial management.

The organisations that will navigate outsourcing most successfully over the coming years will be those that recognise this distinction earliest and act on it most decisively. The contract must be managed, certainly. But someone must also manage the delivery. And the uncomfortable truth that many organisations have yet to confront is that these are increasingly not the same person.