

BEYOND THE PROJECT PLAN

The Programme Management Vacuum — Why Projects Without Programmes Disappoint

A Practitioner's Perspective on the Missing Discipline in Complex Delivery



Giovanni Leonardi

June 2001

The Programme Management Vacuum – Why Projects Without Programmes Disappoint

Programme · No. 8

Originally written June 2001 | Re-edited and re-rendered for the WhereBeyond Edition, 2025

“The organisations that continue to run projects without programmes will continue to produce the results they are producing now: individual project successes that add up to collective strategic failure.”

The Vacuum Nobody Names

There is a pattern I have seen in every large organisation I have worked with over the past several years, and it is this: dozens of projects, each with its own plan, its own budget, its own steering committee – and no coherent mechanism connecting them to one another or to the strategic outcomes they are collectively supposed to deliver.

We do not lack projects. We lack programmes. And the distinction matters far more than most organisations realise.

A project delivers an output – a system, a process, a capability. A programme delivers an outcome – a change in how the organisation operates, performs, or competes. The gap between the two is where the value is supposed to be created, and it is precisely the gap that most organisations leave unmanaged.

Projects as Islands

The way most organisations govern their project portfolios tells you everything you need to know about how they think about change. Each project is treated as a self-contained unit of work. It has a business case, a plan, a team, and a set of deliverables. It reports upward through a governance structure that tracks time, cost, and scope. And it is judged, ultimately, on whether it delivers what it promised, on time and on budget.

What it is not judged on – almost ever – is whether it contributes to something larger. Whether the output it produces connects meaningfully to the outputs of the three other projects running in parallel. Whether the dependencies between them have been identified, let alone managed. Whether the combined effect of all this activity adds up to the strategic shift the organisation was pursuing when it commissioned the work in the first place.

The result is a landscape of islands. Each project is internally coherent but externally disconnected. The finance system replacement delivers a new platform. The process redesign project delivers new workflows. The training project delivers new materials. But no one is accountable for ensuring that the new workflows work on the new platform, or that the training materials reflect the redesigned processes, or that the combined effect is an organisation that actually operates differently.

Why the Vacuum Persists

The absence of programme management is not an oversight. It is a structural consequence of how organisations are built and how they think about accountability.

Most organisations are structured around functions — finance, operations, IT, HR. Projects tend to be commissioned and governed within these functional boundaries. A programme, by definition, cuts across them. It requires someone with the authority and the mandate to coordinate work across functional lines, to resolve conflicts between competing project priorities, to make trade-offs that no individual project manager has the standing to make.

This is uncomfortable territory. It challenges established hierarchies. It creates ambiguity about who is in charge. It requires a kind of leadership that is neither purely technical nor purely managerial, but something more integrative — and the organisations that need it most are typically the ones least equipped to provide it.

The programme management vacuum is not a gap in methodology. It is a gap in organisational courage — the willingness to create a layer of accountability that cuts across the boundaries everyone has spent years building.

The Consequences in Practice

The practical consequences of the vacuum are visible in every troubled portfolio I have encountered. They include:

- Duplicated effort, where two or more projects solve the same problem independently because no one has visibility across the full landscape of work.
- Unmanaged dependencies, where Project A assumes Project B will deliver a particular output by a particular date, but the assumption was never formally agreed and no one is tracking it.
- Benefits that exist only on paper, because the business case for each project claims a share of the same efficiency saving, and no one has checked whether the total exceeds what is physically possible.
- Change fatigue, where the same business units are hit by multiple projects simultaneously, each demanding time, attention, and adoption, with no coordination of the cumulative burden.
- Strategic incoherence, where the collection of projects in flight bears no discernible relationship to the organisation's stated strategy — because the connection was never made explicit and no one has the mandate to enforce it.

What Programme Management Actually Requires

Programme management is not project management at scale. This is the most common and most damaging misconception. A programme manager is not simply a senior project manager overseeing a collection of projects. The role is fundamentally different.

A programme manager is accountable for outcomes, not outputs. They must hold the strategic intent of the programme — the "why" — while the project managers hold the

delivery detail — the "what" and the "how." They must be comfortable with ambiguity, because the path from current state to desired outcome is never fully known at the start. They must be politically astute, because programme-level decisions inevitably involve trade-offs between functions, between projects, and between the short-term and the long-term.

This is a discipline that barely exists as a recognised profession in most organisations. There is no established career path for it. There is no widely adopted body of knowledge that commands the same authority as project management methodologies. The people who do it well have typically learned by doing — and there are not enough of them.

The Cost of Waiting

The organisations that continue to run projects without programmes will continue to produce the results they are producing now: individual project successes that add up to collective strategic failure. The systems will be delivered, the milestones will be met, the status reports will be green — and the organisation will be no closer to the outcomes it set out to achieve.

We have become very good at delivering things. We remain remarkably poor at delivering change. The space between the two is where programme management should live — and where, in most organisations, nothing lives at all.

The vacuum will not fill itself. It requires a deliberate decision to create the role, fund the capability, and grant it the authority it needs to be effective. That decision is overdue.