

BEYOND REPORTING SURVIVAL

The Crisis Did Not Kill PMOs — It Exposed Which Ones Never Mattered

Why portfolio decisions, not reporting discipline, determined which programme offices became essential



The Crisis Did Not Kill PMOs — It Exposed Which Ones Never Mattered

Programme · No. 129

Originally written August 2009 | Re-edited and re-rendered for the WhereBeyond Edition, 2025

“A smaller PMO with the right mandate can exert more control than a larger office with ownership of every template.”

The meeting that decided the PMO's fate

The chief executive did not ask for the red-amber-green report. He asked a simpler question: if cash expenditure had to fall by £12 million before year-end, which initiatives should stop on Monday?

The programme management office had 52 pages of status, fourteen staff and no answer.

That scene has repeated across organisations throughout this recession. Some PMOs have been reduced, absorbed or abolished with surprising speed. Others have moved closer to the executive committee and become indispensable. The difference is not maturity, methodology or the sophistication of the reporting pack. It is whether the PMO helps the organisation make hard choices when plans are no longer reliable.

The crisis did not suddenly make programme management irrelevant. It exposed which offices had been administering certainty and which had been governing change.

Fair-weather PMOs sold information that nobody needed

In easier conditions, a reporting PMO can look useful. It collects returns, challenges missing fields, consolidates milestones and produces a common view. The work is orderly, visible and difficult to criticise. Yet much of its value depends on three hidden conditions:

- Funding remains broadly available.
- The portfolio remains broadly stable.
- Senior leaders can tolerate delay between learning something and acting on it.

All three conditions have weakened. Capital is scarce, revenue assumptions are moving and cost decisions are being made in weeks rather than annual planning cycles. A monthly report that explains the portfolio as approved may be accurate and still be irrelevant.

This is why some PMOs have become easy targets for cost reduction. When the organisation asks what would stop if the office disappeared, the uncomfortable answer is often: the pack would arrive later, templates would be completed less consistently and project managers would have to arrange their own meetings. Those are inconveniences, not strategic consequences.

The harsh lesson is that standardisation is not the same as control. A consistent report can make thirty projects comparable without making the portfolio decidable.

The PMOs that survived changed the question

The essential PMO does not begin with “How is every project performing?” It begins with “What must the organisation decide now?”

That shift sounds modest, but it changes the office's work. Instead of treating every approved initiative as a permanent fact, it treats the portfolio as a set of competing claims on cash, scarce people and management attention. Instead of escalating variance after it appears, it identifies the assumptions whose failure would change a decision. Instead of protecting the governance timetable, it shortens the distance between evidence and choice.

A composite example shows the mechanism. One organisation entered 2009 with 46 active initiatives carrying £37 million of remaining expenditure. Its seven-person PMO produced a monthly pack organised by project, with each manager reporting progress, risk and forecast. When a £10 million reduction was imposed, the pack offered no basis for choosing: 39 initiatives were amber, benefits used different definitions and stopping costs were absent.

The office rebuilt the view in ten working days. It did not launch a new methodology. It assembled four figures for every initiative:

- cash required over the next six months;
- unavoidable cost if stopped;
- operational or regulatory consequence of stopping;
- benefit still realistically recoverable, with a named owner.

The resulting discussion reduced 46 initiatives to 13 protected commitments, 17 controlled completions and 16 stops or deferrals. £11.4 million of planned cash was released. More importantly, scarce testing and finance staff were no longer spread across almost every project. The remaining programmes moved faster because prioritisation became a resource decision, not a ranking exercise.

A PMO becomes essential when removing it would make the organisation materially worse at deciding where its next pound and next capable person should go.

That is the survival test. It is not whether the office owns standards. It is whether it turns fragmented delivery evidence into choices the leadership can actually make.

The strongest defence of the traditional PMO

There is a serious argument for preserving the reporting discipline. Volatility increases the need for common definitions, independent challenge and a reliable record. Without them, anxious executives may cancel work on instinct, project sponsors may protect favoured initiatives and short-term cash savings may destroy larger benefits. A crisis is not a licence to abandon method.

That defence is correct. But it does not rescue the PMO that mistakes method for purpose.

Common reporting is valuable only when it supports comparison and action. Independent challenge matters only when it reaches the assumptions behind the forecast. Governance

records matter only when they make accountability visible. The administrative foundations should remain, but they must become lighter and subordinate to decision support.

The distinction is practical:

Administrative PMO	Decision PMO
Collects every status field	Collects evidence that could change a choice
Reports project variance	Shows portfolio consequence
Escalates against timetable	Escalates against decision urgency
Tracks approved benefits	Tests whether benefits remain recoverable
Protects process consistency	Protects the quality of trade-offs

The first office asks project managers to explain the past. The second helps leaders alter the future while there is still time.

Independence matters more when the answer is unwelcome

The crisis has also revealed a structural weakness. Many PMOs sit too close to the programmes they report on. Their survival depends on sponsor satisfaction, so they soften challenge precisely when challenge is most needed. A forecast built on exhausted contingency remains amber. A benefit without an operational owner remains in the business case. A programme is described as “strategic” long after the strategy has become unaffordable.

An effective office needs authority to test three things without seeking permission from the initiative being tested:

- The remaining case: would the organisation approve the next tranche of spending if none had yet been committed?
- The resource claim: are the named people genuinely available, or merely allocated in a plan?
- The consequence of delay: what cash, benefit or operational exposure accumulates while a decision waits?

This does not require a large central function. In fact, several of the strongest offices are becoming smaller. They retain experienced analysts who can interrogate a forecast, portfolio practitioners who can model choices and a leader able to put an unwelcome recommendation before senior management. They stop performing work that merely compensates for weak project discipline.

A smaller PMO with the right mandate can exert more control than a larger office with ownership of every template.

Survival is the wrong ambition

The weakest response to the downturn is for a PMO to prove how busy it is. Activity figures, compliance rates and reporting timeliness defend the institution while avoiding the question being asked of it.

The right ambition is not survival. It is consequence.

If the office can show which commitments are unavoidable, which benefits remain credible, where the same scarce specialist has been promised three times and what must stop to release cash, its relevance will be self-evident. If it cannot, no maturity model will save it.

We should not mourn every PMO that disappears. Some were built for a world in which the portfolio changed slowly and governance meant documenting adherence to plan. That world has gone, at least for now.

The offices that matter are doing something harder. They are converting uncertainty into explicit choices, forcing strategy to meet affordability and making delay visible as a cost. The crisis has made their role more demanding, but also clearer.

A PMO is not essential because it knows what every project is doing. It is essential because, when the organisation can no longer do everything, it helps leadership decide what must still be done.