

BEYOND THE HEADCOUNT

The Virtual PMO — Governance Without a Standing Team

A Practitioner's Perspective on Lightweight PMO Models and Their Hidden Costs



Giovanni Leonardi

August 2006

The Virtual PMO – Governance Without a Standing Team

Programme · No. 56

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

“The virtual PMO is not a model for how to do programme governance cheaply – it is a model for how to distribute the cost of governance so that nobody can see it.”

1. The Appeal

The virtual PMO is an idea with obvious attractions. Instead of establishing a standing team with dedicated headcount, budget, and office space, the organisation distributes PMO functions across existing roles. Programme managers take on governance coordination alongside their delivery responsibilities. Business analysts double as benefits trackers. Project coordinators consolidate status reports across programmes in addition to their project-level duties. A senior leader – typically a portfolio director or a head of transformation – provides strategic oversight, but has no dedicated team to draw upon.

The appeal is primarily financial. A standing PMO of five to eight people represents a significant overhead, and its value is perpetually questioned. A virtual PMO costs nothing incremental – the people are already on the payroll, already in the organisation, already doing related work. The only investment required is coordination, and coordination, the argument goes, is free.

The argument is wrong, but it is wrong in ways that take time to become visible.

2. How the Virtual PMO Works in Practice

The virtual PMO typically emerges in one of two scenarios. Either the organisation has never had a PMO and wants the benefits of one without the cost, or the organisation had a PMO, disbanded it during a cost reduction, and is trying to maintain its functions through redistribution.

In both cases, the operating model follows a common pattern. A set of PMO functions is identified – portfolio reporting, governance support, standards maintenance, risk aggregation, dependency management – and each function is assigned to a named individual who has another primary role. The virtual PMO coordinator, usually a senior programme manager, convenes the group periodically to ensure consistency and address cross-cutting issues.

For the first three to six months, this works passably well. The people involved are typically experienced and motivated. They produce reasonable portfolio reports, maintain a working governance calendar, and manage the most visible cross-programme dependencies. The quality is uneven – some functions are done well by people who care about them, others are done poorly by people who regard them as a distraction from their primary work – but the overall effect is sufficient to satisfy executive governance.

The deterioration begins when the primary roles start to compete with the virtual PMO responsibilities.

3. The Hidden Costs

The prioritisation cost. When a programme manager is simultaneously responsible for delivering a programme and consolidating portfolio reports, the programme will win every time. This is not a failure of commitment – it is a rational response to incentives. The programme manager is measured on programme delivery, promoted for programme delivery, and held accountable for programme delivery. The portfolio reporting is a task they have agreed to do, but it is not what they are evaluated against. When the programme enters a difficult phase – and every programme enters a difficult phase – the virtual PMO work is the first thing to slip.

The consistency cost. A standing PMO develops institutional knowledge: how to interpret programme data, which programme managers report accurately and which optimistically, where the real dependencies sit versus where the registered dependencies sit. This knowledge accumulates in the team over time and informs the quality of the analysis. A virtual PMO has no institutional memory. Each participant brings the perspective of their own programme or function, but nobody holds the portfolio-level view continuously. The analysis is episodic rather than cumulative.

The accountability cost. When a governance function is everybody's secondary responsibility, it is nobody's primary accountability. If the portfolio report is late, who is accountable? If a cross-programme dependency is missed, who owns the failure? If the governance forum is poorly prepared, who takes the blame? In a standing PMO, the answers are clear. In a virtual PMO, they are diffuse. The diffusion of accountability does not make governance failures less likely – it makes them more likely and harder to address.

The capability cost. PMO work requires specific skills – portfolio analysis, governance facilitation, benefits tracking, stakeholder management at the executive level. These skills develop through practice in a PMO context. A virtual PMO provides no development path for these skills, because nobody is working in the function full time. The virtual PMO does not build PMO capability in the organisation; it borrows capability from other functions and returns it undeveloped.

The virtual PMO is not a model for how to do programme governance cheaply – it is a model for how to distribute the cost of governance so that nobody can see it.

4. What the Virtual PMO Actually Reveals

The prevalence of the virtual PMO model reveals something important about how organisations value programme governance. An organisation that will fund programme managers, business analysts, project coordinators, and technology teams but will not fund a standing PMO is an organisation that values delivery over governance. It believes that the work of managing programmes is important, but the work of governing them – ensuring portfolio coherence, managing cross-programme risks, enabling investment decisions, tracking benefits – is not important enough to dedicate people to.

This belief is rarely stated explicitly. The language is always about efficiency, about leveraging existing resources, about avoiding unnecessary overhead. But the underlying calculation is clear: governance is less important than delivery. The virtual PMO is the organisational expression of that calculation.

The calculation is understandable. The consequences of poor delivery are immediate and visible — a late programme, a failed system, a missed regulatory deadline. The consequences of poor governance are slow and diffuse — a portfolio that drifts out of strategic alignment, benefits that are never realised, resources that are allocated to the wrong programmes. By the time the consequences of poor governance become visible, the connection to the governance failure is no longer obvious.

5. When the Virtual Model Can Work

The virtual PMO is not always the wrong choice. There are circumstances where it can function adequately:

- Small portfolios. An organisation running three to five programmes simultaneously may not need a standing PMO. The portfolio is small enough for a single senior individual to hold the cross-programme view in their head, and the governance overhead is manageable as a secondary responsibility.
- Mature programme management. An organisation where programme managers are experienced, disciplined, and self-governing needs less from a central function. The virtual PMO provides coordination and consistency without the oversight that less mature organisations require.
- Temporary arrangements. An organisation between PMO leaders, or an organisation that is designing a standing PMO and needs interim governance, can use a virtual model as a bridge. The key is that it is understood as temporary, not as a permanent cost-saving measure.

Outside these circumstances, the virtual PMO is a false economy. It creates the appearance of governance capability while actually reducing it. The organisation saves the cost of five to eight people and loses the capability to govern its portfolio effectively. The trade-off is almost never worth it, but it is invisible to the executives who make it because the costs of poor governance are invisible too — until they are not.

6. The Honest Question

The question an organisation should ask is not can we do PMO work virtually? but how important is programme governance to us, and what are we willing to invest in it? If the answer is that governance is a core organisational capability, then it deserves dedicated people, budget, and leadership — the same investment the organisation makes in any other core capability. If the answer is that governance is a secondary concern, then the virtual PMO is an honest reflection of that priority, and the organisation should accept the consequences with open eyes.

What the organisation should not do is claim that governance is a priority while refusing to fund it. The virtual PMO makes that contradiction sustainable, and that is precisely why it is popular.