

BEYOND THE STATUS REPORT

# Why Transparency Mandates Created More Reporting but Not More Visibility

A Practitioner's Perspective on the Information Paradox in Portfolio Governance



# Why Transparency Mandates Created More Reporting but Not More Visibility

Portfolio · No. 3

Originally written November 2002 | Re-edited and re-rendered for the WhereBeyond Edition, 2025

---

*“The organisation that produces the most reports is not the organisation that sees most clearly — it is often the organisation that has built the most elaborate apparatus for avoiding the conversations that visibility would demand.”*

---

## 1. The Transparency Imperative

---

The events of the past twelve months have produced a governance response that is, on its face, entirely rational. Enron, WorldCom, and a succession of corporate failures have demonstrated what happens when organisations operate in the dark — when boards are denied information, when inconvenient truths are buried in complexity, when the people charged with oversight cannot see what they need to see. The response has been swift and emphatic: more transparency. More reporting. More disclosure. More information flowing upward through governance structures to the people who need it.

The logic is intuitive and difficult to argue with. If the problem was that boards did not know what was happening, the solution is to ensure they do. If programmes were failing in silence, the answer is to mandate regular, structured reporting that makes the status of every initiative visible to those accountable for it. If portfolio decisions were made on incomplete information, the remedy is to provide complete information.

And so organisations have responded. Reporting cycles have multiplied. Dashboard requirements have expanded. Programme managers who once submitted monthly updates now submit fortnightly or weekly ones. Portfolio offices have been established or expanded, their primary function being to collect, consolidate, and present information upward. The volume of governance information flowing through most large organisations has increased dramatically in a remarkably short period.

The question that is not being asked often enough is whether any of this has actually made organisations better informed.

## 2. The Paradox of Volume

---

In my experience, the relationship between reporting volume and genuine organisational visibility is not linear. It is not even consistently positive. Beyond a certain threshold — a threshold that many organisations passed some time ago — additional reporting actively degrades the quality of decision-making rather than improving it.

This is counterintuitive, and it meets resistance when raised in governance forums. But the mechanism is not difficult to understand. Every report requires time to produce. That time comes from somewhere — invariably from the same people who are also responsible for delivering the programme. A programme manager who spends two days of every

fortnight preparing board-quality status reports, risk updates, financial summaries, and benefits tracking returns is a programme manager who is not managing the programme for two days of every fortnight. The opportunity cost is real, even if it never appears in any governance metric.

More fundamentally, the explosion of reporting has not been accompanied by a corresponding increase in the capacity of governance bodies to absorb and act on the information they receive. A programme board that receives a forty-page pack for a monthly meeting does not read forty pages. It reads the executive summary and the RAG status, glances at the financial table, and moves to questions. The remaining thirty-five pages exist to satisfy a completeness requirement, not to inform a decision.

### 3. What Reporting Actually Captures

The deeper problem is one of content, not volume. The standard portfolio reporting model — the model that most organisations have adopted or expanded in response to the transparency imperative — is built around a particular kind of information: structured, quantifiable, and backward-looking. It tells you what the programme spent last month, what milestones were achieved or missed, what risks are on the register, and what the RAG status is. This information is factual, verifiable, and almost entirely useless for the decisions that actually determine whether a portfolio succeeds.

The decisions that matter in portfolio governance are forward-looking and inherently judgemental. Should this programme continue, or should the investment be redirected? Is the benefits case still credible given what has changed since approval? Are the interdependencies between these three programmes being managed, or merely documented? Is the portfolio as a whole still aligned with the strategic intent that justified it?

These questions cannot be answered by the information that standard reporting provides. They require synthesis, interpretation, and a willingness to make judgements that may be uncomfortable. They require someone to say, "The RAG status is green but the programme is in trouble, and here is why I believe that." The transparency mandates have not created the conditions for this kind of conversation. They have, if anything, made it harder — because the existence of comprehensive reporting creates an assumption that the information needed for good decisions is already in the pack.

*Transparency without interpretation is not visibility — it is data. And the distance between data and understanding is precisely where portfolio governance most consistently fails.*

### 4. The RAG Trap

The RAG status deserves particular attention, because it has become the dominant currency of portfolio visibility and it is almost perfectly designed to obscure rather than reveal.

The appeal of RAG is obvious. It compresses the complex, multidimensional state of a programme into a single, immediately legible signal. Red, amber, green: the traffic light

metaphor is universal, requires no technical knowledge to interpret, and fits neatly into a summary dashboard. For a senior leadership team reviewing twenty or thirty programmes in a single meeting, RAG provides the only feasible mechanism for triage.

But the simplicity that makes RAG accessible is the same simplicity that makes it dangerous. A programme rated green is, by definition, one that the governance body does not scrutinise closely. A programme rated amber triggers concern but not alarm. Only red commands genuine attention — and by the time a programme is rated red, in most governance cultures, the problems are already severe and the options for intervention are constrained.

The incentive structure reinforces this trap. No programme manager wants to be the one presenting a red status. The professional and organisational consequences of declaring a programme in serious difficulty are significant and personal. The result is a systematic bias toward amber and green — a gravitational pull that keeps reported statuses higher than the underlying reality would justify. Everyone involved understands this dynamic. It is discussed in corridors and acknowledged privately. But the governance structure provides no mechanism for correcting it, because the structure itself depends on the reported status being treated as reliable.

## 5. The Portfolio Office Paradox

---

The establishment of portfolio management offices — a development that has accelerated in the current climate — was intended to address precisely these problems. The portfolio office sits above individual programmes, aggregates information across the portfolio, and provides an independent view to senior governance bodies. In principle, it is the solution to both the volume problem and the quality problem: a function dedicated to transforming raw programme data into actionable portfolio intelligence.

In practice, the portfolio office has in many organisations become another layer in the reporting chain rather than a genuine source of insight. It collects the reports that programmes produce, consolidates them into portfolio-level summaries, and presents the result upward. The consolidation adds a step but does not reliably add value, because the portfolio office typically lacks the authority, the access, or the organisational mandate to challenge the information it receives.

A portfolio office that simply aggregates reported RAG statuses into a portfolio heatmap is performing a clerical function, not a governance one. A portfolio office that independently assesses delivery confidence, challenges programme narratives, and advises senior leaders on where their attention should be directed is performing a fundamentally different role — one that requires different skills, different authority, and different relationships with both the programmes it oversees and the governance bodies it serves.

The transparency mandates have created more of the former and almost none of the latter.

## 6. The Information Organisations Actually Need

---

What would genuine portfolio visibility look like? It would look less like a dashboard and more like a conversation. It would be structured around the questions that governance bodies actually need to answer, rather than around the information that programmes find convenient to report.

---

*“The information that matters most for portfolio decisions is precisely the information that standard reporting is least equipped to provide: the judgement calls, the political dynamics, the assumptions that have quietly expired, the interdependencies that nobody is actively managing.”*

---

Genuine visibility would mean knowing not just what programmes spent but whether the expenditure is producing the expected capability. It would mean understanding not just what risks are on the register but what risks are being actively avoided in conversation because they are too politically sensitive to surface. It would mean seeing the portfolio not as a collection of independent initiatives, each with its own RAG status, but as an interconnected system of investments whose collective value depends on how they interact.

This kind of visibility cannot be mandated through additional reporting requirements. It requires a fundamentally different approach to portfolio governance — one that values judgement over data, conversation over documentation, and honest assessment over compliant reporting. It requires governance bodies that are willing to engage with complexity rather than demanding that it be compressed into a traffic light. And it requires a culture in which surfacing bad news early is rewarded rather than punished.

## 7. The Distance Still to Travel

---

The transparency mandates have achieved something. They have made it harder for organisations to operate in complete darkness. They have created structures and rhythms that ensure information flows upward with some regularity. They have established the principle that boards and senior leaders have a right — and a duty — to know what is happening in their programme portfolios.

But they have also created a dangerous illusion: the belief that the existence of reporting infrastructure constitutes the existence of visibility. Organisations that produce comprehensive, regular, well-formatted portfolio reports can reasonably believe they have addressed the governance deficit. They have not. They have addressed the process deficit while leaving the insight deficit untouched.

The gap between reporting and visibility is not one that more reporting will close. It is a gap of interpretation, of judgement, of organisational courage. Until portfolio governance learns to value understanding over compliance — until it invests as heavily in the quality of the questions it asks as it has in the volume of the answers it demands — transparency mandates will continue to produce what they have produced so far: more paper, more process, more activity that looks like governance but functions as administration.

The organisations that genuinely see their portfolios clearly will not be the ones that report the most. They will be the ones that have built the culture, the capability, and the governance structures to make sense of what they see.