

BEYOND FULL PIPELINES

The Pipeline Illusion — Why a Full Portfolio Means an Overloaded Organisation

How the Appearance of Strategic Activity Masks the Reality of Organisational Gridlock



Contents

1. Executive Summary	3
2. The Portfolio Review That Should Have Been a Warning	3
3. The Arithmetic Nobody Wants to Do	3
4. Why Organisations Keep Filling the Pipeline	4
5. The Three Costs of Overload	5
6. The Capacity Question That Nobody Asks	6
7. The Structural Forces That Sustain the Pattern	7
8. What an Honest Portfolio Would Look Like	8
9. The Courage the Discipline Demands	8

The Pipeline Illusion — Why a Full Portfolio Means an Overloaded Organisation

Portfolio · No. 14

Originally written September 2006 | Re-edited and re-rendered for the WhereBeyond Edition, 2025

“This is the pipeline illusion: the belief that a full portfolio represents strategic momentum, when in practice it represents strategic paralysis dressed in the language of activity.”

1. Executive Summary

Every organisation that manages a portfolio of change faces the same temptation: to fill the pipeline to capacity and beyond, on the assumption that a full portfolio is a productive portfolio. This essay examines why that assumption is not merely wrong but structurally damaging — creating an illusion of strategic activity that masks a reality of fragmented delivery, exhausted resources, and quietly degrading quality. It traces the forces that sustain the pattern: the political economy of project approval, the absence of honest capacity models, and the institutional reluctance to confront the gap between what an organisation has committed to and what it can actually deliver. The argument is not that organisations should do less for the sake of doing less, but that the failure to make genuine choices about what to pursue — and what to stop — produces a kind of organisational gridlock in which nothing moves at the speed or quality the business case promised.

2. The Portfolio Review That Should Have Been a Warning

The quarterly portfolio review runs to its familiar rhythm. Forty-seven initiatives are presented across six strategic themes. Each carries a green or amber status. The pipeline is full, the investment is committed, and the executive team expresses satisfaction that the organisation's strategic ambitions are being pursued on all fronts.

What nobody says — what the format of the review is designed not to surface — is that the same three hundred people are spread across most of those forty-seven initiatives. That the average programme manager is accountable for components of four separate programmes simultaneously. That the infrastructure team, nominally shared across the portfolio, has a backlog that extends eleven months beyond its current capacity. And that at least a dozen of those initiatives have effectively stalled, not because they lack funding or executive sponsorship, but because the people who need to do the work are trapped in a web of competing priorities that makes sustained progress on any single one of them nearly impossible.

This is the pipeline illusion: the belief that a full portfolio represents strategic momentum, when in practice it represents strategic paralysis dressed in the language of activity.

3. The Arithmetic Nobody Wants to Do

The roots of the illusion lie in a failure of arithmetic — or, more precisely, in an institutional reluctance to perform the arithmetic honestly.

Most organisations that have adopted portfolio management can tell you, with reasonable precision, how much money they have committed to change. Capital budgets are tracked, business cases are approved against defined investment thresholds, and finance teams maintain line-of-sight to the total spend. The financial dimension of portfolio capacity is, if not always well managed, at least visible.

The same cannot be said for the dimension that actually determines whether anything gets delivered: people. The capacity of an organisation to absorb and execute change is fundamentally a human constraint, and it is here that the illusion takes hold. When a new initiative is approved, the business case will typically identify the resources required — so many business analysts, so many developers, so many subject matter experts for so many months. What it will almost never do is answer the question that matters: are those people actually available, and if so, what are they being taken away from?

The answer, in the majority of organisations, is that they are not available — not in the sense of being genuinely free to dedicate sustained attention to the work. They are nominally allocated, which is a different thing entirely. A business analyst who is twenty per cent allocated to five programmes is not working on five programmes. She is context-switching between five sets of requirements, five sets of stakeholders, and five sets of deadlines, and the result is that none of the five receives the quality of thought that any one of them would receive if it had her full attention.

The mathematics of this are well understood in other disciplines. Manufacturing has long recognised that running a production line at ninety-five per cent utilisation does not produce ninety-five per cent of maximum output — it produces queues, bottlenecks, and exponentially increasing wait times. Operations research has shown this rigorously: as utilisation approaches full capacity, the relationship between load and throughput becomes non-linear, and small increments in demand produce disproportionate increases in cycle time. The same principle applies to knowledge work and to the organisations that perform it, though we have been remarkably slow to acknowledge it. An organisation running its change capacity at a hundred per cent utilisation — let alone a hundred and twenty or a hundred and fifty per cent, which is common — is not operating at peak efficiency. It is operating in a state of chronic overload in which the time to complete any individual piece of work stretches far beyond what the business case assumed, and the quality of that work degrades in ways that will not become visible until much later.

The financial capacity of a portfolio is governed with rigour. The human capacity — which ultimately determines whether anything is delivered — is governed with assumptions, optimism, and percentage allocations that bear no relationship to how people actually work.

4. Why Organisations Keep Filling the Pipeline

If the consequences of portfolio overload are so predictable, why does the pattern persist? The answer lies in the political economy of project approval, which creates powerful incentives to say yes and almost no mechanism for saying no.

Consider the dynamics of a typical investment committee. A senior leader brings forward a business case for a new initiative. The case has been through multiple rounds of review. It

aligns with at least one strategic priority — most well-crafted business cases can be made to align with something. The benefits have been quantified, or at least estimated with sufficient precision to clear the organisation's hurdle rate. The sponsor has political capital, organisational standing, and a compelling narrative about why this initiative matters now.

Against this, what does the portfolio function bring to the table? A capacity model, perhaps, that shows the organisation is already overcommitted. A prioritisation framework that would rank this initiative below several others already in flight. A recommendation, delivered with appropriate caveats, that the initiative should be deferred until capacity is freed.

The outcome is rarely in doubt. The initiative is approved, sometimes with a reduced scope or a deferred start date that everyone understands to be nominal. The capacity model is adjusted — not by adding capacity, but by reducing the estimated effort, by assuming efficiencies that will not materialise, or by quietly double-counting resources that are already committed elsewhere. The portfolio grows by one, and the illusion thickens.

This is not a failure of individual judgement. It is a structural problem rooted in how costs and consequences are distributed:

- The cost of approving an initiative that subsequently struggles is diffuse and delayed — it shows up as slippage, as quality problems, as change requests, as the gradual erosion of benefits that were always optimistic to begin with.
- The cost of rejecting an initiative is immediate, visible, and politically concentrated: a disappointed sponsor, a strategic theme that appears unsupported, a signal that the organisation lacks ambition or capability.
- The information asymmetry compounds the problem — the portfolio function sees the aggregate picture, but the investment committee sees each case individually, and individually each case is defensible.

Given these incentives, rational actors will consistently choose to approve.

5. The Three Costs of Overload

The damage done by portfolio overload operates on several levels, each less visible than the last.

Dimension	What the Portfolio Shows	What the Organisation Experiences
Time	Baselined plans with milestone dates	Programmes stretching from eighteen months to thirty, eroding time-sensitive benefits
Quality	Gate reviews and stage approvals	Requirements that are adequate rather than thorough; testing compressed to fit available windows
Trust	RAG statuses and progress reports	Programme managers building private contingency; sponsors inflating benefit estimates to survive negotiation

The first cost is delay, and it is the most measurable. When resources are fragmented across too many initiatives, each initiative takes longer than it should. A programme that was baselined at eighteen months stretches to twenty-four, then thirty. The business case, constructed on the assumption of an eighteen-month delivery, begins to erode — not because the underlying logic was wrong, but because the benefits were time-sensitive and the competitive or regulatory advantage they were meant to deliver has a shelf life that the extended timeline is quietly consuming. In financial services, where a significant proportion of the current portfolio is driven by regulatory deadlines, this erosion carries real consequences: a compliance programme that misses its window does not simply deliver late — it delivers into a different enforcement landscape.

The second cost is quality, and it is harder to measure and therefore easier to ignore. When a business analyst is splitting her attention across five programmes, the requirements she produces for each are adequate rather than thorough. When a test team is running concurrent test cycles for three releases, the depth of testing contracts to fit the available time rather than the complexity of the system. When a programme manager is governing four workstreams simultaneously, the governance becomes a matter of status collection rather than genuine problem-solving — the fortnightly checkpoint becomes a ritual of reporting rather than a forum for decision. None of these compromises shows up as a defect in the moment. They manifest later — as rework during implementation, as post-deployment incidents, as benefits that fail to materialise because the solution was built to the letter of the requirement rather than the spirit of the need.

The third cost, and the most corrosive, is the erosion of organisational trust in the portfolio process itself. When the portfolio is consistently overcommitted, people learn to discount the dates, the resource plans, and the commitments that emerge from it. Programme managers build in private contingency because they know the official plan is fiction. Business sponsors learn to inflate their benefit estimates because they know the investment committee will negotiate them down. Finance learns to discount the projected returns because the track record of delivery to plan does not support them. The portfolio becomes a document that everyone produces and nobody believes — a ritual of compliance rather than a tool for making genuine choices about where the organisation should invest its finite capacity for change.

6. The Capacity Question That Nobody Asks

Beneath the pipeline illusion lies a deeper problem: most organisations have no honest answer to the question of how much change they can absorb at any given time.

This is not a technical problem. It is a problem of institutional honesty. Building a credible capacity model requires answering uncomfortable questions:

- How much of people's time is genuinely available for change work, once business-as-usual demands, unplanned operational incidents, and the accumulated drag of previous change are accounted for?
- How much overhead does context-switching impose — not in theory, but in the observed productivity of teams that are split across multiple programmes?
- What is the real throughput of a team that has been running at full stretch for eighteen months without respite?
- What is the organisation's actual track record of delivering to plan, as distinct from its aspirational estimates at the point of business case approval?

These questions have answers, but the answers are rarely welcome. They tend to show that the organisation's genuine capacity for change is perhaps half to two-thirds of what the current portfolio assumes. They imply that a significant number of initiatives currently in flight should be paused or stopped — which means confronting sponsors, writing down investments, and admitting that the organisation has made commitments it cannot keep.

“The portfolio is not a set of strategic choices. It is an accumulation of individual approvals, each defensible on its own terms, that collectively exceed the organisation's ability to deliver.”

It is worth pausing on that point, because it reveals the deepest layer of the illusion. The pipeline is not full because the organisation has carefully assessed its capacity and chosen the optimal set of initiatives to pursue. The pipeline is full because nobody has the authority, the information, or the political courage to make it smaller. The portfolio is not a strategic instrument. It is the residue of a series of individual decisions, each rational in isolation, whose aggregate effect is irrational.

7. The Structural Forces That Sustain the Pattern

Several structural features of how organisations govern their portfolios actively sustain the overload pattern, even when individuals within the system can see the damage it causes.

The annual planning cycle is one. In organisations that plan their change portfolio on an annual basis — and the majority still do — the approval window creates a rush of business cases, all competing for a share of the annual investment budget. The incentive is to get as many initiatives approved as possible during this window, because anything not approved will wait another year. The result is a portfolio that is overcommitted from the first day of the fiscal year, with no credible mechanism for rebalancing as the year progresses and reality diverges from the plan. The mid-year portfolio review, where it exists, tends to be a stocktake rather than a genuine reprioritisation — a moment to acknowledge what has slipped, rarely a moment to stop what should not continue.

The separation of funding from capacity is another. In many organisations, the investment committee controls the money while the operational functions control the people. An initiative can be funded without any binding commitment that the people needed to deliver it will actually be available. The business case assumes they will be; the operational reality is that they are already committed to other work. The gap between the two is papered over with resource plans that allocate people in percentages — the twenty per cent here, thirty per cent there model that looks precise on a spreadsheet and bears no relationship to how human beings actually work. No experienced practitioner believes these numbers, yet the entire edifice of portfolio planning rests on them.

The absence of a stop mechanism is perhaps the most important. Most portfolio governance frameworks have a well-developed process for starting initiatives — business case development, investment committee approval, initiation gates, stage reviews — but almost no equivalent process for stopping them. Once an initiative is in flight, it acquires institutional momentum: committed budgets, assigned resources, reporting obligations, stakeholder expectations, and the sunk-cost psychology that makes it emotionally harder

to stop something the more that has been invested in it. Stopping an initiative requires an active decision, a write-off of sunk costs, and a direct conversation with a sponsor who will resist. The path of least resistance is to let it continue at reduced pace, consuming resources it should release, occupying portfolio space it should vacate, and delivering — if it delivers at all — a diminished version of what was originally promised.

8. What an Honest Portfolio Would Look Like

The alternative to the pipeline illusion is not a smaller portfolio for its own sake. It is a portfolio that reflects genuine choices — a portfolio in which every initiative that is in flight has the resources, the attention, and the organisational commitment it needs to deliver at the quality and pace the business case requires.

Such a portfolio would be uncomfortable to look at. It would contain fewer initiatives than the current one — perhaps significantly fewer. It would leave some strategic themes without active investment, at least for the current period. It would require senior leaders to accept that not everything they want can happen simultaneously, and to make visible trade-offs between competing priorities rather than pretending that all of them can be pursued in parallel.

It would also, in all likelihood, deliver more actual value than the overloaded portfolio it replaces. Not because the initiatives it contains are inherently better, but because they would each receive the concentrated attention that complex change demands. Programmes would run at realistic pace with dedicated teams rather than fragmented resources. Quality would improve because people would have the time to think properly about what they are building. Benefits would materialise closer to plan because the timeline would reflect genuine capacity rather than optimistic assumption. And the portfolio process itself would regain credibility, because the commitments it made would bear some relationship to the outcomes it delivered.

The shift requires something that the current governance model in most organisations is not designed to produce: a portfolio-level view of capacity that is treated with the same rigour as the financial budget. Just as no responsible organisation would approve expenditure that exceeds its financial means, no responsible portfolio function should approve change that exceeds its delivery capacity. The two disciplines are logically identical — the only difference is that one has decades of established practice behind it and the other is still, in most organisations, an aspiration dressed as a spreadsheet.

9. The Courage the Discipline Demands

We are fluent in the mechanics of portfolio management — the frameworks, the scoring models, the governance structures, the reporting templates. We are far less fluent in the discipline that underpins all of them: the willingness to say no. Not no to bad ideas, which is relatively easy, but no to good ideas whose only flaw is that there is not enough organisational capacity to pursue them alongside everything else the organisation has already committed to.

This is ultimately a question of leadership, not methodology. The tools exist. The capacity models can be built. The prioritisation frameworks can be applied with reasonable confidence. What is missing, in organisation after organisation, is the institutional courage to use them — to present the executive team with an honest picture of what the

organisation can actually deliver, and to hold the line when the pressure to approve one more initiative becomes, as it always does, irresistible.

The pipeline illusion persists because it is comfortable. A full portfolio looks like ambition, like strategic coverage, like an organisation that is doing everything it needs to do. The reality beneath it — the stalled programmes, the exhausted teams, the quietly degrading quality, the benefits that will never materialise at the scale the business case promised — is visible only to those close enough to the delivery to see it. The challenge for portfolio management as a discipline is to make that reality visible to those who have the authority to act on it, and to do so with enough clarity and conviction that the comfortable illusion of a full pipeline gives way to the harder, more productive truth of a portfolio built on genuine choices.