

BEYOND THE REBRAND

The Oldest Problem Under the Newest Label

A Practitioner's Essay on Whether the Newest Label for Oversight Conceals the Oldest Problem in Change Management

Giovanni Leonardi

November 2018



The Oldest Problem Under the Newest Label

Transformation · No. 223

Originally written November 2018 | Re-edited and re-rendered for the WhereBeyond Edition,
2025

“The organisations that renamed first and restructured later found themselves with a Transformation Office that could not transform, and a PMO capability they had already dismantled.”

1. The Rise of the Transformation Office

Something has shifted in the language of organisational change. The Programme Management Office — that staple of large-scale delivery for the better part of two decades — is being quietly retired in a growing number of organisations, replaced by a function with a more ambitious name: the Transformation Office, or sometimes the Transformation Management Office. The rebranding is widespread enough to constitute a trend, and trends in organisational design are worth examining, because they reveal what leaders believe has changed — or what they wish had.

The stated rationale for the shift is usually some version of the following: the PMO was designed for a world of discrete programmes with defined start and end points; the challenge now is continuous transformation, and the function that supports it must evolve accordingly. The Transformation Office, in this telling, is not merely a PMO with a new name — it is a fundamentally different function, with a broader mandate, a more strategic orientation, and a closer relationship with the executive team.

The question this essay explores is whether that telling is accurate. Is the Transformation Office a genuine evolution — a function that has learned from the PMO's limitations and built something structurally different? Or is it, in most of its incarnations, a rebranding exercise that preserves the same operating model, the same reporting orientation, and the same structural weaknesses, while claiming a more strategic identity?

The answer, as with most things in organisational life, is that it depends — but the evidence tilts more toward rebranding than evolution, and the reasons for that tilt are instructive.

2. What the PMO Was Supposed to Be

To assess whether the Transformation Office represents an evolution, it is worth recalling what the PMO was originally designed to do. The function emerged in the late 1990s and early 2000s as organisations began to recognise that their growing portfolios of

programmes needed some form of centralised coordination. The PMO was meant to provide three things: standards and consistency across programme delivery; consolidated visibility for senior leadership; and a capability centre that could raise the overall competence of programme management across the organisation.

In practice, the PMO almost always defaulted to the second of these — consolidated reporting — at the expense of the first and third. The reasons for this are structural, not personal: reporting was what senior leaders asked for first, it was what the PMO could deliver without challenging existing power structures, and it consumed enough capacity to leave little room for anything else. The PMO became, in most organisations, a reporting factory: useful for producing governance packs, but rarely influential in the decisions those packs were meant to inform.

This is the inheritance the Transformation Office is meant to transcend. The question is whether it does.

3. The Case for Evolution

The strongest version of the evolution argument rests on three claims, and each deserves serious consideration.

The first is that the scope has genuinely expanded. Where the PMO tracked programmes, the Transformation Office is responsible for the coherence of the entire transformation agenda — the strategy that drives it, the portfolio of initiatives that delivers it, the benefits that justify it, and the organisational changes that sustain it. This is a genuinely broader mandate, and in the organisations where it is taken seriously, it produces a function that looks and feels different from a traditional PMO. The Transformation Office in these settings is involved in strategy formulation, not just strategy execution; it has a voice in portfolio prioritisation, not just portfolio reporting; and it owns the benefits realisation discipline, not just the benefits tracking spreadsheet.

The second claim is that the operating model has changed. The PMO was typically a support function, staffed by analysts and coordinators, reporting to a programme director or a head of delivery. The Transformation Office, in its evolved form, reports to the Chief Transformation Officer or directly to the CEO. It is staffed with more senior people — strategists, change leaders, and business architects alongside the traditional planning and reporting roles. Its governance relationships are with the executive committee, not the programme board.

The third claim is that the temporal frame has shifted. The PMO existed to support programmes, which have defined endpoints. The Transformation Office exists to support transformation, which increasingly does not. Organisations that face continuous disruption — from digitisation, from regulatory change, from shifting customer expectations — need a standing function that manages change as an ongoing capability, not a temporary intervention. The Transformation Office, in this view, is the organisational infrastructure for perpetual adaptation.

4. The Case for Rebranding

The rebranding argument is less elegant but better supported by observable evidence across a wider range of organisations.

The test of whether a Transformation Office is genuinely different from the PMO it replaced is simple: look at what the team actually does on a Tuesday afternoon. If the answer is consolidating status reports from programme managers, the rebrand has not changed the function – it has only changed the letterhead.

The first and most common indicator is that the team composition has not changed. The same people who ran the PMO are now running the Transformation Office. Their skills, their instincts, and their relationships are rooted in programme reporting and governance administration. They may have new titles, but they are doing the same work. This is not a criticism of the individuals – it is an observation about what happens when an organisation rebrands a function without investing in the different capabilities the new mandate requires.

The second indicator is that the mandate, while broader on paper, is not supported by authority. The Transformation Office is told it owns the transformation agenda, but it has no authority over the business units that must change, no budget for the capability-building that transformation requires, and no seat at the table where strategic decisions are actually made. The mandate is aspirational; the operating reality is administrative.

The third indicator is that the governance relationships have not moved. The Transformation Office still reports to the same level as the old PMO. It still serves the same governance forums. The executive committee still receives a monthly pack that looks remarkably similar to the one the PMO used to produce, with the same RAG statuses, the same milestone summaries, and the same carefully constructed narratives about progress. The label on the cover page has changed; the content has not.

The fourth indicator is the most telling: the organisation's relationship with the function has not changed. Programme managers still see it as an overhead that demands data and produces reports. Senior leaders still see it as the team that keeps the governance machinery running. Business units still see it as someone else's problem. The Transformation Office, in these organisations, has inherited not just the PMO's infrastructure but its organisational identity – and that identity is extraordinarily sticky.

5. Why the Rebrand Happens Anyway

If the Transformation Office is, in many cases, a PMO with a new name, why do organisations make the change? The reasons are revealing.

The first is signalling. Renaming the PMO as a Transformation Office signals to the organisation, to the board, and to external stakeholders that the organisation takes transformation seriously. It is an act of branding, not restructuring – and in organisations

where perception matters (which is all of them), that branding has value regardless of whether the underlying function has changed.

The second is executive recruitment. The title Chief Transformation Officer attracts a different calibre and type of candidate than Head of PMO. Organisations that want to recruit senior, strategic leaders to drive their change agenda find that the Transformation Office framing opens doors that the PMO framing does not. The irony is that the senior leader recruited on the promise of strategic influence often arrives to find a function that is, in practice, a reporting team – and the tension between the mandate they were promised and the reality they inherit becomes a source of frustration and, eventually, departure.

The third is organisational politics. In some organisations, the PMO has become so associated with bureaucracy, overhead, and low-value reporting that it cannot be reformed under its existing name. Rebranding it is a way of escaping the accumulated resentment. The Transformation Office starts with a clean slate, free from the institutional memory of failed reporting cycles and ignored governance packs. This can be genuinely useful – but only if the organisation uses the clean slate to build something different, rather than simply restarting the same cycle.

6. The Structural Question

Beneath the labelling debate lies a more fundamental question: what does an organisation actually need from a centralised change function, and is it willing to design and resource one that meets that need?

The answer to the first part is, in my experience, reasonably consistent. Large organisations undergoing sustained transformation need a function that can do four things: maintain strategic coherence across a portfolio of change initiatives; provide honest, analytical assessment of portfolio health to decision-makers; own the benefits realisation discipline from business case to post-delivery measurement; and build the organisation's capability to manage change as an ongoing competence.

None of these are new insights. They are, in fact, the things the PMO was supposed to do but rarely did. The Transformation Office will succeed where the PMO failed only if it addresses the structural reasons for that failure: mandate ambiguity, authority gaps, the gravitational pull of reporting, and the political dynamics that neutralise oversight functions.

The organisations that renamed first and restructured later found themselves with a Transformation Office that could not transform, and a PMO capability they had already dismantled. The organisations that restructured first – that redesigned the mandate, recruited different capabilities, changed the governance relationships, and invested in the authority the function needed – built something genuinely different. Some of them called it a Transformation Office. Some of them, notably, kept calling it a PMO.

“The name matters less than the mandate. And the mandate matters less than the willingness to enforce it.”

7. What This Tells Us

The Transformation Office phenomenon is, in miniature, a case study in how organisations approach change: with more enthusiasm for the symbolic act than for the structural one. Renaming a function is easy. Redesigning its mandate, investing in different capabilities, restructuring governance relationships, and giving it genuine authority over the change agenda — these are hard, because they require leaders to cede some control over information flows, to tolerate uncomfortable truths, and to invest in a function whose value is measured in the quality of decisions made, not in the volume of reports produced.

The practitioner's takeaway is pragmatic. If you are being asked to stand up a Transformation Office, or if you are inheriting one, the first question to ask is not about the name. It is about the mandate, the authority, the governance relationships, and the capabilities. If those are genuinely different from what the PMO had, you have something to work with. If they are not, you are running a PMO with a longer title, and you should plan your approach accordingly — building the case for structural change from the inside, one governance cycle at a time.

The label is the easy part. The structure is the work.