

BEYOND THE GREEN CELL

The Programme Reporting Paradox

A Practitioner's Perspective on Status Reporting and the Gap Between Signal and Reality in Programme Delivery



Giovanni Leonardi

February 2007

The Programme Reporting Paradox

Programme · No. 72

Originally written February 2007 | Re-edited and re-rendered for the WhereBeyond Edition, 2025

“The report is green because green is what keeps the programme alive; the outcome is red because the outcome is decided by forces the report was never able to see.”

1. The Colour on the Page and the Truth on the Ground

Across programmes of every size, the weekly status report has become the main instrument through which senior leaders come to believe they understand what is happening beneath them. And on the overwhelming majority of those reports, the headline indicator is green. Yet the outcomes these same programmes were commissioned to deliver arrive late, arrive diminished, or fail to arrive at all — with a regularity that ought to trouble anyone who takes governance seriously. The dashboard reads green; the outcome turns out red. This is the reporting paradox, and it deserves to be understood not as an occasional embarrassment but as a recurring feature of how large organisations attempt to steer complex change.

The argument here is that the paradox is not, at root, a problem of dishonest managers or inattentive boards. It is a structural consequence of the way we have chosen to govern programmes: through periodic, colour-coded summaries that quietly reward the appearance of control and penalise the admission of doubt. Once the incentives are seen clearly, the steady migration of every uncomfortable amber toward a reassuring green stops looking like deception and starts looking like the rational behaviour of people responding faithfully to the signals their organisation sends them.

What the paradox finally reveals is uncomfortable: the reporting system is not a window onto the programme but a part of it, shaping the very reality it claims only to observe.

2. Known Locally, Lost Globally

Anyone who has sat through enough steering committees knows the scene. A programme has been reporting green, or at worst a settled amber, for months. The milestone dates hold on the plan. The budget line tracks within tolerance. Then, within the space of two or three reporting cycles, the same programme lurches to red: a go-live slips by a quarter, a benefits case is quietly rebased, a supplier relationship that everyone privately knew was strained finally breaks in public. Nobody is surprised, exactly — and that is the point. The trouble was visible to those close to the work long before it was visible on the report.

The pattern that recurs across complex programmes is not that problems are invisible. It is that problems are known locally and lost globally. The information exists somewhere in the delivery structure — in a team lead's private assessment, in a test manager's growing unease, in the gap between what a supplier promises in a meeting and what they commit to in writing. What fails is the transmission of that information upward without distortion. By the time reality reaches the board, it has passed through enough hands, each with its own reason to soften the edges, that the signal has been smoothed into something that no

longer alarms. The distance a piece of bad news must travel to reach a sponsor is, in most organisations, precisely the distance over which it is diluted.

3. How Green Is Manufactured

It is tempting to describe all this as lying, but that word does the situation a disservice and, worse, points to the wrong remedy. Very little programme reporting involves anyone stating something they know to be false. The green shift is achieved almost entirely through legitimate-seeming judgement calls, each defensible on its own terms. Consider the ordinary devices by which an amber becomes a green:

- A slipping milestone is redefined as one that was always going to move, and the baseline is adjusted so that the variance disappears.
- A risk that has, in truth, already materialised is kept in the register as a risk — something that might happen — rather than being promoted to an issue that has happened.
- A dependency that is late is reported against the date it was re-planned to, not the date it was originally promised, so the delay is absorbed silently into a new normal.
- Scope quietly contracts, so that the programme remains on track to deliver a thing that is no longer the thing that was funded.
- Bad news is reported at a level of aggregation high enough that a serious problem in one workstream is averaged away by the calm of the others.

Each of these moves can be justified in the room. Baselines should be re-planned when assumptions genuinely change; risks are distinct from issues; aggregation is what a summary is for. The distortion does not live in any single judgement. It lives in the fact that every judgement, across dozens of them, tilts the same way — toward reassurance — because the organisation has made reassurance the safer thing to report.

The green shift is rarely a lie. It is the cumulative result of many small, individually defensible judgements, every one of which happens to tilt in the same comforting direction.

4. The Incentives Beneath the Colour

Why does every judgement tilt the same way? Because of what happens to the person who reports honestly. In most organisations, the manager who raises a red is inviting scrutiny, a flurry of help that often amounts to interference, and a quiet mark against their name as someone whose part of the programme is in trouble. The manager who holds green is left alone to get on with the work. When the reporting system punishes the messenger and rewards the reassurer, it should surprise no one that reassurance is what flows upward, cycle after cycle, until the day it can no longer be sustained.

There is a deeper force at work too. A colour-coded status report is, by design, a compression of an enormously complex reality into a single symbol. That compression is what makes it usable by a busy board — and it is also what makes it treacherous. A great deal of the most important information about a programme is precisely the information that does not compress: the erosion of trust between two teams, the accumulating fragility of a design decision taken under time pressure, the slow divergence between

what the business thinks it is getting and what is actually being built. None of that fits in a red-amber-green cell. So it is left out, and what is left out is disproportionately the set of things that later turn a programme red.

“A status report compresses a complex reality into a single symbol – and the information most likely to sink a programme is precisely the information that will not compress.”

5. What the Paradox Reveals About How Organisations Change

Here is where the reporting paradox becomes more than a governance nuisance and starts to teach us something. The gap between green dashboards and red outcomes is a measure of the distance between how an organisation thinks it changes and how it actually changes.

The formal theory of programme governance holds that change is delivered through a rational control loop: the programme plans, executes, measures, reports variance, and corrects. In that model the report is a feedback signal and the board is the controller acting upon it. It is a comforting picture, borrowed in spirit from engineering, and it quietly underlies almost every methodology on the shelf.

But real organisational change does not proceed as a control loop. It proceeds through negotiation, coalition, improvisation, and the steady accretion of small commitments that later prove difficult to reverse. The important decisions are frequently taken not at the stage gate but in the corridor beforehand. Progress depends on relationships and political capital that no plan records and no report captures. In this world the status report is not really a feedback signal at all – it is a performance, a periodic assertion that everything remains under control, offered by the programme to its sponsors partly to keep flowing the funding and confidence the programme needs in order to survive.

Seen this way, the paradox is not a malfunction. It is the natural product of asking a political, improvisational process to account for itself in the borrowed language of engineering control. The report is green because green is what keeps the programme alive; the outcome is red because the outcome is decided by forces the report was never able to see, and was perhaps never designed to see.

6. The Cost of the Comfortable Lie

None of this would matter greatly if the consequences were confined to the occasional awkward steering committee. They are not. The reporting paradox imposes real and compounding costs.

1. It destroys the option value of early intervention. Problems are cheapest to fix when they are small, and the whole purpose of reporting is to surface them while they are still small. A system that smooths problems until they are large has thrown away the very capability it was built to provide.

- 2. It corrodes trust in the reporting itself. Experienced sponsors learn, over time, to distrust green – to assume the real news lies in what is not being said. Once that happens, the formal report becomes theatre, and the actual governance migrates to back-channels and favoured informants, which are neither systematic nor fair nor reliable.
- 3. It punishes honesty structurally. Every cycle in which the honest amber is treated more harshly than the optimistic green trains the organisation's most capable people to stop telling the truth. The damage long outlasts any single programme.

The third cost is the gravest, because it is cultural and therefore durable. An organisation that has taught its managers that candour is dangerous cannot simply instruct them to be candid next quarter. The lesson has been learned too well, and it will be unlearned only slowly, if at all.

7. Reporting That Tells the Truth

If the paradox is structural, then exhortation will not cure it. Telling people to report honestly while leaving intact every incentive that makes honesty costly is worse than useless; it merely adds hypocrisy to the existing problem. What the few organisations that escape the paradox tend to do is change the structure, not deliver the sermon. A handful of practices recur among them – and, tellingly, not one of them is a piece of technology. The instinct to solve the paradox by acquiring a better reporting tool mistakes the problem entirely: a more sophisticated dashboard renders the green shift in higher resolution, but does nothing to stop it. The distortion lives in the incentives and the compression, not in the software.

Practice	What It Replaces	Why It Works
Report the trajectory, not just the status	A single point-in-time colour	It is far harder to launder a trend than a snapshot; direction reveals what a green cell conceals
Separate the reporter from the reported	The delivery lead grading their own work	Assurance that does not report into the programme has no personal stake in its green
Reward the early red	Punishing the messenger	When surfacing a problem early is visibly treated as competence, problems begin to surface early
Attach a confidence range to key dates	A single confident date	Between March and June, most likely May cannot be quietly re-baselined, because it never pretended to a precision it did not have

What unites these practices is that they attack the compression and the incentives directly. They refuse to let the whole truth of a programme be carried by one symbol, and they make honesty the professionally safe choice rather than the brave one.

8. A Closing Reflection

The programme reporting paradox endures because it is, in a sense, functional. Green dashboards keep programmes funded, keep boards comfortable, and keep the machinery

of governance turning smoothly — right up until the moment the outcome arrives and the comfort proves to have been borrowed against a debt that always, eventually, comes due. The paradox is the interest on that debt.

The organisations that take this seriously are the ones that stop treating the status report as a mirror and start treating it as an instrument that shapes behaviour — because that is what it is. A report does not passively describe a programme; it tells everyone involved what the organisation wants to hear, and people, being people, generally arrange to say it. Change the report and, slowly, you change what people feel able to say. Leave it as it is, and no amount of methodology will close the distance between the dashboard and the outcome. The colour on the page and the truth on the ground will go on leading their separate lives, and we will continue to be surprised, cycle after cycle, by news that everyone close to the work knew all along.