

BEYOND GREEN DASHBOARDS

Why the Dashboard Says Green and the Business Says Nothing Changed

The Category Error at the Heart of Transformation Measurement

Giovanni Leonardi

August 2024



Why the Dashboard Says Green and the Business Says Nothing Changed

Transformation · No. 390

Originally written August 2024 | Re-edited and re-rendered for the WhereBeyond Edition, 2025

"Green delivery status against flat operating metrics is not success in progress. It is failure with good reporting."

1. The Quarterly Review

The quarterly transformation review is fourteen slides in when the chief financial officer asks the question that no one in the room has prepared for. The programme is eighteen months old, three-quarters of the way through its roadmap. Every workstream is green or amber-green. The new platform is live in two regions. Training completion sits at eighty-seven per cent. The change network reports high engagement scores. By every measure the programme tracks, it is succeeding.

"What has actually changed?" she asks. "In the business. In the numbers we report to the board. What is different now that wasn't different a year ago?"

The silence that follows is not the silence of people who do not know the answer. It is the silence of people who have never been asked to frame their work in those terms.

This moment — or something very like it — plays out with striking regularity across transformation programmes of every size and sector. It is not a failure of reporting. It is not a failure of execution. It is a category error: the programme is measuring one thing, and the organisation needs to know another, and the two have been quietly treated as the same. The error is so deeply embedded in the way we govern transformation that it has become invisible — part of the furniture of programme management rather than a defect in its design.

2. The Two Ledgers

Every transformation programme maintains, in effect, two separate ledgers. The first is visible, governed, obsessively tracked: milestones delivered, features deployed, processes redesigned, people trained, budget consumed. This is the ledger of programme health — the operational vital signs that tell you whether the machinery of delivery is functioning. It answers the question: are we doing what we said we would do, on the timeline we committed to?

The second ledger tracks what the transformation was for: the operating metrics that should move if the transformation succeeds. Cycle time from order to fulfilment. Cost-to-serve per customer segment. Error rates in the process that was redesigned. Revenue per relationship. Time to decision. These numbers live in the business, not in the programme. They existed before the transformation started and will persist long after the programme closes.

The first ledger is almost always well maintained. The second is almost always absent — not because anyone decided it was unimportant, but because the architecture of programme governance was never designed to hold it.

3. Why the Gap Is Structural

It would be comforting to treat this as a problem of discipline — programmes that simply forgot to track the right things. But the gap is structural, and understanding why it persists is the first step to closing it.

Programmes are measured on delivery because delivery is what programmes control. A programme director can manage scope, sequence work, escalate dependencies, and hold vendors to contract. What she cannot do is make the sales team adopt the new pricing engine in a way that lifts revenue per transaction, or ensure that the redesigned procurement process actually reduces cycle time once it sits in the hands of line managers with their own priorities. The operating metrics belong to business-as-usual leaders who were not party to the programme's business case and may not even know what was promised in their name.

Benefits realisation frameworks have tried to bridge this divide for years. We are fluent in the vocabulary — benefits maps, realisation plans, SROs, tracking schedules. But the frameworks share a persistent weakness: they treat benefits as a downstream phase, something that begins when the programme delivers its outputs and the business "embeds" the change. In practice, this means the programme governs what it can see — outputs and milestones — and defers the measurement that matters to a future that no one quite owns.

The result is a governance structure with a blind spot at its centre. The programme board receives detailed, RAG-rated reports on delivery performance. It does not receive a live view of the operating metrics the transformation was supposed to move. When a workstream turns red, there is a mechanism to intervene. When an operating metric fails to shift despite green delivery, there is no equivalent signal — because no one is looking.

This is not negligence. It is the natural consequence of measuring a programme by what it produces rather than what it changes.

4. The Climate of Measurement Fatigue

There is a further complication particular to this moment. We have lived through several years in which organisations launched transformation programmes at a pace and scale many had not previously attempted. The pandemic compressed digital timelines. The

subsequent period brought AI-driven ambitions layered on top of programmes still embedding. The sheer volume of change has produced a weariness around measurement itself — not with the concept, but with the overhead: the reporting ceremonies, the dashboards that multiply without illuminating, the surveys and scorecards that consume management bandwidth while adding little to anyone's understanding of what is actually working.

In this climate, the suggestion that programmes need more measurement meets justified scepticism. Line leaders already reporting into multiple governance structures, attending steering committees, and completing adoption trackers are not eager to take on additional metrics obligations. Programme teams under pressure to deliver are reluctant to add measurement workstreams that complicate an already crowded plan.

The answer, then, cannot be more measurement. It has to be different measurement — and specifically, measurement that replaces some of the activity tracking currently filling programme dashboards with the small number of operating metrics that actually determine whether the transformation is succeeding.

5. The Operating-Metric Contract

The mechanism that makes this real — not as a framework, but as a practical discipline — is what I think of as the operating-metric contract. It is simple in concept, difficult in practice, and transformative in effect.

Before the programme begins — or, more realistically, at the earliest point when the business case is firm enough to name specific outcomes — the programme sponsor and the relevant line leaders agree on a small set of operating metrics that the transformation is expected to move. Not benefits in the abstract. Not strategic objectives restated as KPIs. Specific, measurable, already-tracked numbers that live in the operating rhythm of the business.

The contract has four elements:

1. The metrics themselves — typically three to five, never more. These are chosen not for their aspirational quality but for their directness: if this transformation works, these numbers will move, and if they do not move, we have delivered activity without impact. For a supply-chain transformation, this might be average order-to-delivery time, inventory carrying cost as a percentage of revenue, and supplier defect rate. For a customer-experience programme, it might be first-contact resolution rate, cost per interaction, and net revenue per customer.
2. The baseline — each metric is measured as it stands before the programme begins, using the same methodology that will apply throughout. This is less straightforward than it sounds. Operating metrics are often measured inconsistently across regions, divisions, or systems. The act of agreeing a baseline forces a conversation about data quality and definitional consistency that is itself valuable — and that frequently reveals the organisation's confidence in its own numbers is lower than it believed.
3. The trajectory — not a fixed target but a trajectory with checkpoints. What should we expect to see at six months, twelve months, eighteen months? The trajectory acknowledges that operating metrics lag delivery and that early movement may be

modest, but it makes explicit what progress looks like at each stage and what flatness or regression would signal.

4. The ownership — and this is the hardest element. Each metric is owned not by the programme but by a line leader, who is accountable for the operating conditions that allow the metric to move. The programme delivers the capability; the line leader creates the environment — the process changes, the management attention, the behavioural reinforcement — in which the capability produces results. Joint accountability, clearly divided.

The contract is then embedded in programme governance. At every steering committee, alongside the delivery RAG and the milestone tracker, the board sees a single page: where each operating metric stands against its trajectory, who owns it, and what the gap — if any — tells them.

6. What This Changes — and What It Costs

The effect of this discipline, where I have seen it applied, is not subtle. It changes the character of steering committee conversations. When a workstream is green on delivery but the associated operating metric is flat, the discussion shifts from are we on track? to why isn't this working? — and that second question is almost always more productive than the first. It surfaces adoption failures earlier. It identifies where capability has been delivered but the operating context has not adapted to absorb it. It makes visible the gap between doing the work and achieving the result.

It also protects programmes from the particular failure mode in which a transformation delivers everything on its plan and is declared a success while the business experiences no meaningful change. This is not a rare outcome. In my experience, it is the modal outcome for large programmes that govern themselves exclusively on delivery metrics. The programme closes, the team disperses, the benefits case is quietly retired or rolled into a broader strategic narrative, and the operating metrics that were supposed to justify the investment continue on their previous trajectory, undisturbed.

But the operating-metric contract is also genuinely difficult, and the objections to it deserve honest engagement rather than dismissal.

The strongest objection is attribution. Operating metrics are moved by many forces — market conditions, competitive dynamics, organisational changes unrelated to the programme, seasonal effects, regulatory shifts. How can you attribute a movement in cost-to-serve or cycle time to this programme when a dozen other factors are in play? The objection is valid, and the honest answer is not to claim clean attribution but to accept contribution. The contract does not say the programme caused this change. It says: if the transformation is working, this metric should be moving in this direction, and if it is not, we need to understand why. The diagnostic value is what matters, not the attribution precision.

A second objection is political. Line leaders who agree to own an operating-metric trajectory are accepting a form of accountability they did not previously carry. If the metric does not move, the spotlight falls on them as much as on the programme. This is uncomfortable — and it is precisely the point. The current arrangement, in which

programmes own delivery and no one owns outcomes, is comfortable because it distributes accountability so widely that it effectively disappears.

A third objection is practical. Many organisations do not have the data infrastructure to track operating metrics reliably, consistently, and at a frequency that makes them useful for programme governance. This is true more often than anyone would like to admit, and it is itself a finding: if you cannot measure the thing the transformation is supposed to change, your confidence in the business case should be correspondingly modest.

7. Writing the Definition of Done

We have, across many industries and many years of practice, built sophisticated machinery for governing the delivery of transformation programmes. We know how to track milestones, manage dependencies, escalate risks, and report status with rigour and precision. This machinery is valuable and necessary. But it answers only half the question — and, arguably, the less important half.

The question a transformation programme exists to answer is not did we deliver what we planned? but did the business change? The honest recognition that more organisations are now reaching is that our governance structures have been optimised for the first question while leaving the second largely unexamined.

The operating-metric contract is not a framework and it is not a methodology. It is a discipline — a small, specific commitment to measuring the thing that matters alongside the thing that is easy to measure. It does not require new technology, new reporting platforms, or new governance bodies. It requires a conversation at the start of a programme that most programmes do not have, and a line of sight in every steering committee that most steering committees do not maintain.

Green delivery status against flat operating metrics is not success in progress. It is failure with good reporting. The sooner we write our definition of done in numbers the business already recognises, the sooner we will know whether our transformations are transforming anything at all.