

Why Local Government Transformation Portfolios Lose Strategic Alignment — and How to Reclaim It

A Practitioner's Perspective on Governance, Stakeholder Alignment, and Delivery in Complex Public Sector Programmes

Giovanni Leonardi

December 2025



Why Local Government Transformation Portfolios Lose Strategic Alignment — and How to Reclaim It

*Transformation · No. 430
December 2025*

1. The Problem Nobody Wants to Name

In local government transformation, the pattern is as predictable as it is damaging: portfolios begin with clear strategic intent, only to lose alignment as delivery progresses. The result is not failure in the traditional sense — budgets are spent, outputs are delivered, and governance frameworks remain intact. Yet the outcomes that mattered most — improved service delivery, cost efficiency, citizen engagement — fail to materialise. The root cause is not poor execution, but a systemic inability to maintain strategic alignment across a fragmented stakeholder landscape, underpinned by governance structures that prioritise compliance over clarity.

This misalignment is not a symptom of complexity, but of culture. Local government transformation portfolios operate in environments where accountability is diffuse, political cycles are short, and the distance between strategy and delivery is vast. The problem is not that leaders lack vision, but that the mechanisms to translate vision into sustained action are either absent or misapplied. The consequence is a portfolio that delivers things — new systems, restructured teams, revised processes — but not the change that was intended.

The uncomfortable truth is that most transformation portfolios in local government are not failing to deliver; they are failing to align. And in the absence of alignment, delivery becomes an end in itself.

2. Why It Happens — Three Structural Reasons

2.1.1. Governance as a Checklist, Not a Compass

In regulated environments like local government, governance is often treated as a compliance exercise rather than a strategic tool. Boards and steering groups meet, risks are logged, and reports are filed — but the fundamental question of whether the portfolio is still moving toward its original intent is rarely asked with rigour. Governance frameworks become bloated with process, obscuring the single most important function they should serve: maintaining strategic direction.

The pattern is consistent: governance structures are designed at the outset, then left to run on autopilot. As programmes evolve, new risks emerge, dependencies shift, and political priorities change — but the governance framework does not adapt. The result is a portfolio that is technically compliant, but strategically adrift. The irony is that the more

robust the governance appears on paper, the harder it becomes to challenge its underlying assumptions.

2.2.2. Stakeholder Alignment as a One-Time Event

Transformation in local government involves a vast and fragmented stakeholder landscape: elected members, senior officers, service directors, frontline staff, unions, citizens, and external partners. Alignment is not a one-time achievement, but a continuous process — yet most portfolios treat it as a box to be ticked at the start.

The problem is compounded by the short-term nature of political cycles. Leaders may set a strategic direction, but as elections approach or priorities shift, the narrative around the transformation evolves — often without corresponding adjustments to the portfolio's objectives. Meanwhile, middle managers and frontline staff, who are critical to execution, are left interpreting a moving target. The result is a portfolio that is strategically coherent at the top, but operationally fragmented at the point of delivery.

2.3.3. The Illusion of Progress

In complex transformation portfolios, progress is often measured in outputs rather than outcomes. Milestones are met, budgets are spent, and reports are green — but the underlying change that was intended never materialises. This is not a failure of delivery, but of measurement. Local government transformation portfolios are particularly vulnerable to this illusion, because the outcomes they seek — improved citizen satisfaction, cost efficiency, service integration — are difficult to quantify and take time to materialise.

The consequence is a portfolio that appears successful on paper, but fails to deliver meaningful change. The illusion of progress is reinforced by governance structures that prioritise short-term metrics over long-term impact. By the time the gap between delivery and outcomes becomes apparent, the portfolio is too far down the road to pivot — and the original strategic intent has been lost in the noise of execution.

3. What Good Looks Like — The Three-Level Fix

3.1.1. Governance: From Compliance to Clarity

Governance in transformation portfolios must be reimaged as a dynamic, strategic tool — not a static compliance framework. This requires three shifts:

- Strategic Anchoring: Governance frameworks must explicitly link every decision to the portfolio's original strategic intent. This means asking, at every meeting, not just what is being delivered, but why it matters. Boards should be structured to challenge alignment, not just progress.
- Adaptive Design: Governance cannot be set in stone at the outset. As the portfolio evolves, the governance framework must evolve with it — shedding redundant processes, adding new oversight where risks emerge, and ensuring that the right questions are being asked at the right time.

- **Transparency Over Perfection:** Governance reports should prioritise clarity over completeness. A single page that highlights strategic drift is more valuable than a 50-page document that obscures it. The goal is not to eliminate risk, but to ensure that risks are understood in the context of the portfolio's overall direction.

3.2.2. Data: From Outputs to Outcomes

Measurement in transformation portfolios must shift from tracking what is being delivered to assessing whether it is driving the intended change. This requires:

- **Outcome-Led Metrics:** Every programme within the portfolio should be measured against a small set of outcome-based KPIs that reflect the portfolio's strategic intent. These metrics should be co-designed with stakeholders to ensure buy-in and relevance.
- **Leading Indicators:** Waiting for outcomes to materialise is not an option in fast-moving environments. Portfolios must identify leading indicators — early signals that the intended change is (or is not) taking hold. These might include changes in employee behaviour, citizen feedback, or service integration metrics.
- **Real-Time Insight:** Data must be available in real time, not just at the end of reporting cycles. This requires investment in lightweight, agile reporting tools that surface insights as they emerge — not weeks or months later. The goal is to enable course correction, not just post-mortem analysis.

3.3.3. People: From Stakeholders to Partners

Stakeholder alignment cannot be achieved through communication alone; it requires a fundamental shift in how stakeholders are engaged. This means:

- **Continuous Dialogue:** Alignment is not a one-time event, but an ongoing conversation. Portfolios must create structured, regular forums for dialogue between leaders, middle managers, and frontline staff — ensuring that strategic intent is translated into operational reality.
- **Shared Ownership:** Stakeholders must be treated as partners, not audiences. This means involving them in decision-making, not just informing them of decisions. The goal is to create a sense of collective ownership over the portfolio's success.
- **Cultural Adaptation:** Transformation portfolios must recognise that culture is not a separate workstream, but the foundation of all change. This means investing in capability-building, not just at the leadership level, but across the organisation — ensuring that the skills and mindsets needed to sustain change are embedded in the fabric of the portfolio.

4. The Sector-Specific Complication: Political Cycles and Public Accountability

Local government transformation portfolios operate in a unique context: they must deliver change in an environment where political cycles are short, public scrutiny is high,

and the consequences of failure are visible and immediate. This creates three sector-specific challenges:

- **Short-Term Pressures vs. Long-Term Change:** Political leaders are incentivised to deliver quick wins, while transformation requires sustained effort. Portfolios must balance these competing demands — delivering visible progress to maintain political support, while staying true to the long-term strategic intent.
- **Public Accountability:** Unlike private sector transformations, local government portfolios are subject to intense public scrutiny. This can lead to risk aversion, with leaders prioritising compliance over innovation. The challenge is to create space for experimentation within the constraints of public accountability.
- **Fragmented Authority:** Local government transformation often involves multiple organisations — councils, health services, police, and voluntary sector partners. Aligning these diverse stakeholders around a shared vision is difficult, but essential. Portfolios must create mechanisms for collective decision-making, not just coordination.

The solution lies in designing portfolios that are resilient to political change. This means:

- **Anchoring in Outcomes:** Portfolios must be framed around outcomes that transcend political cycles — such as improved citizen satisfaction or cost efficiency — rather than initiatives tied to a specific administration.
- **Building Institutional Memory:** Knowledge must be embedded in the organisation, not just in individuals. This means investing in documentation, capability-building, and cross-organisational networks that persist beyond the tenure of any single leader.
- **Transparent Governance:** Public accountability should be seen as an asset, not a constraint. Portfolios must embrace transparency — not just in reporting, but in decision-making — to build trust and maintain momentum.

5. Conclusion

The failure of local government transformation portfolios to maintain strategic alignment is not a technical problem, but a cultural one. It stems from governance frameworks that prioritise compliance over clarity, stakeholder engagement that treats alignment as a one-time event, and measurement systems that track outputs rather than outcomes. The solution lies in reimagining governance as a strategic tool, data as a real-time compass, and stakeholders as partners in change.

The question for leaders is not whether their portfolio is delivering, but whether it is still moving toward its original intent. And if not — what are they prepared to change to reclaim it?