

BEYOND GREEN DASHBOARDS

Transformation Fatigue Is a Portfolio Design Choice, Not a Culture Problem

Why Change Absorption Must Be Measured and Managed Like Any Other
Finite Resource

Giovanni Leonardi

February 2018



Transformation Fatigue Is a Portfolio Design Choice, Not a Culture Problem

Portfolio · No. 86

Originally written February 2018 | Re-edited and re-rendered for the WhereBeyond Edition, 2025

*“The overload is an emergent property of the portfolio
— visible only when someone maps the aggregate
demand onto the people who must absorb it.”*

1. The Green Dashboard and the Exhausted Organisation

The quarterly portfolio review follows a familiar choreography. The CIO presents thirty-two active initiatives, colour-coded by status. Twenty-six are green, four amber, two red. The reds have recovery plans. The ambers have owners. The board moves through the pack in under an hour and leaves satisfied that the transformation agenda is on track.

Three floors below, a different picture is forming. The operations director responsible for payments processing has just counted the change events landing on her teams in the next ninety days: a core-platform migration entering user-acceptance testing, a regulatory remediation programme requiring revised procedures across forty control points, a workforce restructuring that will relocate two-thirds of her senior analysts, and an enterprise data-quality initiative that needs her people to validate and cleanse three years of transaction records. Each programme has its own change lead, its own communications plan, its own set of workshops and training sessions. None of them knows what the others are asking of the same three hundred people in the same quarter.

When the feedback surfaces — declining workshop attendance, delayed sign-offs, a spike in voluntary attrition among mid-career staff — the diagnosis arrives quickly: change fatigue. And the prescribed remedy is always the same. Stronger sponsorship. Better engagement. More compelling narratives. A town hall.

This is the wrong diagnosis, and it produces the wrong treatment.

2. The Constraint We Refuse to Count

What we are observing in these situations is not a deficit of leadership or a failure of communication. It is the entirely predictable output of a portfolio that has been designed as though human absorptive capacity were infinite.

Consider the discipline we apply to money. Every portfolio governance framework worth its name tracks financial commitment with some precision: the capital allocated to each initiative, the phasing of spend, the aggregate drawdown against an approved envelope, the impact on operational run-rate. We would not dream of sanctioning a new programme without first confirming that the funding exists. Yet we routinely sanction programmes without asking the equivalent question about the people who must absorb the change: do they have the capacity — the time, the cognitive bandwidth, the organisational stability — to take this on, given everything else that is already landing on them?

Change absorption is a finite resource. It is consumed every time a team must learn a new system, adopt a revised process, adjust to a restructured reporting line, or comply with an updated control framework. It is replenished slowly — through practice, through stability, through the ordinary rhythm of work that is not being disrupted. And it is shared across every initiative that touches the same group of people, which means it is inherently a portfolio-level resource, not a programme-level one.

No single programme in the payments director's quarter has over-asked. Each has planned its change activities responsibly within its own boundaries. The overload is an emergent property of the portfolio — visible only when someone maps the aggregate demand onto the people who must absorb it. And in most organisations, nobody does.

We manage what we measure. We have chosen not to measure this.

3. Why the Culture Explanation Is So Durable

The most serious challenge to this argument is a legitimate one: that organisational culture genuinely affects how much change people can absorb, and that some organisations navigate heavy transformation better than others because of the trust, resilience, and adaptability their leaders have built. This is true, and it would be dishonest to dismiss it.

But culture sets the ceiling of absorptive capacity. It does not abolish the ceiling. A high-trust, well-led workforce can absorb more concurrent change than a demoralised one — but it cannot absorb an unlimited amount, and it will still break if loaded beyond its limit. The portfolio question is never "does culture matter?" but rather "are we loading above our ceiling, whatever that ceiling may be?"

The culture diagnosis endures because it is structurally convenient. It locates the cause of fatigue in the organisation's character rather than in the portfolio's architecture, which means it requires no programme to be cancelled, deferred, or descoped. Every initiative remains individually justified. The aggregate load remains unexamined. Instead, we invest in change-readiness assessments, stakeholder engagement strategies, and leadership alignment workshops — palliative measures that address the symptoms of overload while leaving the overload itself entirely intact.

We have all watched the resulting theatre. The change team produces more elaborate stakeholder maps. The communications become more frequent and more polished. The executive sponsors record video messages. And the operations manager — the one with four concurrent programmes landing on her teams — simply stops attending the

workshops, not because the narrative is unconvincing but because she does not have a free afternoon until the middle of next quarter.

4. Treating Absorption as a Portfolio Constraint

The alternative is to treat change absorption as what it actually is: a depletable resource that must be planned, allocated, and governed at portfolio level, with the same rigour we apply to capital.

This requires three mechanisms that most portfolio governance processes do not yet incorporate.

4.1 Change calendars by business area

The first requirement is visibility. Not a programme-level milestone plan, but a portfolio-level view that shows, for each operational unit, the change events arriving in each period: system deployments, process changes, restructurings, regulatory compliance deadlines, training requirements, data migrations. When this view is assembled — and in my experience, it rarely exists until someone deliberately constructs it — the overloading becomes immediately, often shockingly, apparent. A single business unit may have six or seven significant change events converging in the same quarter, commissioned by programmes that have never coordinated their timing because no mechanism required them to.

The change calendar is not a complex artefact. It is an exercise in collation: gathering the landing schedules from each programme and mapping them onto the organisational units that must absorb them. Its value lies not in sophistication but in the fact that it makes visible a reality that the programme-by-programme view structurally conceals.

4.2 Load caps

Visibility without constraint is merely informative. Once the change calendar reveals the concurrent demand on each area, the portfolio needs a governance rule that limits it: a cap on the number of significant change events that may land on a single business area in a given period.

This is conceptually straightforward and politically arduous. Enforcing a load cap means that some programmes must be resequenced, their scope adjusted, or their timelines extended — not because of a technical dependency or a funding shortfall, but because the receiving organisation cannot absorb them alongside everything else. This is precisely the trade-off that portfolio governance exists to make, and precisely the one it most consistently avoids.

The cap itself need not be expressed with false precision. The discipline is in the existence of a limit, not in its decimal places. An initial rule — no business area absorbs more than three major change events in a single quarter without explicit board approval — is crude, arguable, and vastly better than the current default of no limit at all.

4.3 Sequencing for absorptive capacity

Traditional portfolio sequencing is governed by two considerations: technical dependency and strategic priority. A programme is scheduled first because another programme requires its output, or because the board has designated it as the most urgent. What is absent from this logic is the absorptive dimension: the recognition that even a strategically critical programme will fail to land its benefits if it arrives at a moment when the receiving organisation has nothing left to give.

Sequencing for absorption means asking not only "what must come first?" and "what matters most?" but "what can the organisation actually take on next?" It treats the workforce's change bandwidth as a scheduling constraint on the same level as budget and dependency — because, in practice, it is.

5. The Conversation We Would Rather Not Have

These three mechanisms are not technically demanding. They require no new technology, no specialist methodology, no external consultancy. They require something harder: the willingness to accept that the portfolio itself — not the organisation's resilience, not its leaders' communication skills, not its culture — may be the primary cause of the fatigue it is experiencing.

Transformation fatigue is not something that happens to a portfolio. It is something a portfolio does — by treating the organisation's absorptive capacity as infinite when it is demonstrably finite.

The conversation this demands is an uncomfortable one. Telling a programme sponsor that their initiative must wait three months — not because the funding has been cut, not because the technology is unready, but because the people who must adopt the change are already absorbing as much as they can — is a message that most governance boards would prefer not to deliver. It challenges the assumption, deeply embedded in the way we run portfolios, that every justified programme should proceed as soon as it is ready.

But it is precisely this conversation that separates a portfolio which delivers sustained, realised benefit from one that delivers a succession of technically complete programmes whose benefits never fully materialise because the organisation could not absorb them at the pace they arrived. We have spent the better part of this decade professionalising portfolio management — building the governance structures, the reporting cadences, the prioritisation frameworks. What we have not yet done is extend that discipline to the one resource that determines whether any transformation actually lands: the finite, countable, depletable capacity of human beings to change how they work.