

BEYOND HUMAN ORCHESTRATION

The Programme Manager Is Over. Transformation Leadership Is Not.

A manifesto for redesigning authority before AI agents redesign delivery by default

Giovanni Leonardi

July 2026



The Programme Manager Is Over. Transformation Leadership Is Not.

Transformation · No. 375
July 2026

“Autonomy without redesigned authority is not transformation; it is unmanaged delegation at machine speed.”

At 08:03, the old job is already gone

At 08:03 on Monday, before the delivery leads have joined their first call, a group of AI agents has reconciled the integrated plan against overnight changes, compared supplier milestones with invoice evidence, identified two dependency conflicts, drafted three recovery options and rebuilt the steering summary. The work spans 26 workstreams and four regions. It once consumed most of a programme office's Monday and produced an answer by Thursday. Now it has taken eleven minutes.

This is not the future of programme management. It is the end of the bargain on which programme management has rested.

For decades, organisations have paid highly capable people to collect, reconcile, chase, translate and present information. We called this orchestration. We wrapped it in governance language and promoted its best practitioners into leadership roles. Yet much of the value sat in the friction: plans could not speak to finance, risk logs aged between meetings, decisions disappeared into minutes, and no one trusted the status without a human interpreter.

AI agents attack that friction directly. They do not merely produce a better status report. They can observe, reason across defined sources, initiate actions and pursue a goal through several steps. When they enter the delivery chain, coordination ceases to be scarce. That makes the traditional programme manager economically and organisationally indefensible.

The role does not disappear because machines become leaders. It disappears because coordination was mistaken for leadership.

Stop defending coordination as a profession

The programme manager does not disappear when coordination becomes autonomous; the programme manager disappears when coordination is all the role contains.

That distinction matters. The emerging argument is too often framed as a contest between human judgement and artificial intelligence. It is the wrong contest. No serious transformation should hand moral accountability, political judgement or enterprise consequence to a machine. But neither should it preserve an expensive human relay system merely because that system once sat close to power.

The old bargain and the new reality are different:

Old programme bargain	Agentic delivery reality
Collect status	Establish what counts as trustworthy evidence
Own the integrated plan	Define objectives, constraints and decision rights
Escalate exceptions	Decide which exceptions require human judgement
Prepare governance packs	Make consequences visible before decisions are taken
Chase actions	Hold named humans accountable for outcomes

The work on the right is not a polished version of programme administration. It is a different profession: transformation leadership. Its material is authority, consequence, trade-off and intent.

Automation will faithfully reproduce bad management

The most dangerous mistake in 2026 is to deploy agents as another productivity layer. An organisation gives each function an assistant, connects them to plans and documents, celebrates faster reporting, and leaves the operating model untouched. The agents then automate every ambiguity the organisation refused to resolve.

Consider a composite £180 million transformation with a mandate to recover eight weeks and remove £12 million of forecast cost. Delivery agents are instructed to optimise schedule recovery within approved tolerances. They resequence testing, defer a data-remediation activity and recommend releasing two contractor teams. On the dashboard, the programme improves: six weeks recovered, £8.4 million removed, all within the thresholds encoded in the plan.

The apparent success conceals the mechanism of failure. The deferred remediation raises the volume of manual customer corrections. Releasing the contractors removes the only people who understand a fragile interface. The testing sequence makes the launch date achievable by shifting risk into the first month of operations. No agent has broken its instruction. The organisation has simply converted incomplete executive intent into rapid, coherent action.

Autonomy without redesigned authority is not transformation; it is unmanaged delegation at machine speed.

The governance question is therefore no longer, What can the agent do? It is, Who has the authority to set the objective, who can see the consequences, and who carries the decision when the measures conflict?

The strongest objection is also the case for change

Defenders of the programme manager make a serious point. Large transformations are political systems. Plans are incomplete, incentives conflict, and important knowledge remains tacit. Current agents can be brittle, overconfident and difficult to audit. Remove the experienced human orchestrator, the argument runs, and the programme loses the person who knows whom to call, when to challenge the number and how to read the silence in a steering meeting.

All of that is true. It does not justify preserving the role as designed. It proves that the valuable part was never the coordination. It was judgement under conditions of incomplete authority.

We should retain that judgement and strip away the administrative camouflage around it. A leader who can only understand a programme by personally assembling its status is not controlling complexity; that leader is trapped inside it. A leader who understands incentives, tests evidence, frames choices and accepts consequence becomes more valuable when agents absorb the machinery around those acts.

Human oversight cannot mean a person approving hundreds of machine-generated actions. That is theatre at a scale no human can perform. Oversight must be designed into the system: bounded objectives, explicit prohibitions, traceable reasoning, consequence thresholds, independent challenge and a reliable means to stop action.

Our new contract with transformation

We should stop asking how AI can help programme managers and start deciding how transformation must be led when agents perform the coordination. Five commitments follow.

1. Retire the programme office as an information factory. If its principal output is a pack, a consolidated plan or an action log, it is maintaining friction that agents can remove.
2. Name a human owner for every consequential objective. Agents may pursue goals; they cannot inherit accountability. Ownership must remain legible when work crosses functions and when objectives collide.
3. Design authority before deploying autonomy. Define what an agent may decide, recommend, initiate and never do. Set thresholds by consequence, not merely by financial value or schedule variance.
4. Govern the chain, not the individual tool. The risk emerges when one agent's output becomes another agent's instruction. Controls must follow the full sequence from evidence to decision to action.

5. Promote judgement, not coordination. The future leaders of transformation will be those who can frame intent, expose trade-offs, challenge machine-produced confidence and intervene decisively when the measures cease to represent the outcome.

These commitments require fewer status collectors and more leaders willing to make their assumptions explicit. They also require executives to surrender a comforting fiction: that a green dashboard is evidence of control.

End the role before the role ends badly

The programme manager will not vanish in one reorganisation. For a time, the title will remain while the work hollows out. Agents will prepare the pack, maintain the plan, draft the decisions and chase the actions. The human will sit above the machinery, adding a final layer of approval and calling it accountability. That is not a stable destination. It is delay disguised as governance.

We should choose the ending. Retire the role built around scarce coordination. Preserve and elevate the judgement that complex change still demands. Build an operating model in which agents move quickly inside clear boundaries and humans remain unmistakably responsible for purpose, consequence and intervention.

The age of autonomous delivery does not reduce the need for transformation leadership. It exposes how little of what we called programme management was leadership at all.