

Position your PMO to better support your COO webinar

Question and Answers

Monday 3

February 2020

Questions	Answers
How do we get this initiative driven (pulled) at Board level rather than pushed by PMO as a great idea? What is the role of the COO?	It can be pushed forwards by a PMO if you have a reliable Innovation Culture. Most do not (that is another subject - see here - https://www.apm.org.uk/blog/innovation-management-within-the-transformation-programme/). How does this get picked up by Board / COO - simple - you understand their difficulty in delivering strategy / business agility and understand their perception of efficiency / effectiveness of the strategy delivery ecosystem - engage them on their concern - then position BIG as a means to remove that difficulty. Any Director will have a perception of this, and each may have their domain perspective. COO perhaps has the wider perception and larger remit to enable change.
So its about strategy realisation? How is this different from focussing on benefits realisation?	Yes. Benefits may not be anything to do with strategy. Some benefits may be. Benefits delivery is the means to an end, benefits of what you do may help you realise strategy. Delivering the strategy will lead to organisation level benefits (not necessarily benefits emergent from projects). Perhaps its just language - but I see benefits as lower level (form programmes / projects) than strategic outcome (a result of projects / programmes PLUS BAU success)
Are there real world examples of Boards and PMOs working this way with business integrated governance?	Business Integrated Governance is a summation and integration of existing P3 practices based on some additional knowledge provided by the Core P3M Data Club to glue those things together more effectively with data. It provides a holistic approach to strategy delivery, not a parochial one. This approach is new, a paradigm shift in how to approach P3M improvement and how you do that WITH your business not TO it. We are in the same position as we were with Portfolio Management 5 years ago - lots of anecdotal good / bad practice - but no case studies - yet. Lots of examples of P3 elements of BIG - but not the whole 9 yards (and that's the problem. Think of BIG is the result of benefits from many change components, operational effectiveness and the strategic outcomes we attain out of those.

<p>How do you see this application differ between large and SME size companies?</p>	<p>In concept - no difference. In reality - Larger organisations I would hope and expect to have data strategy and capability. Smaller organisations - perhaps not (which is why we re running a Data Model PoC to enable the data infrastructure to be made available at a near micro level). Larger organisations will have more stakeholder groups to coordinate and more support functions to knit together to enable this to happen. Smaller organisations should be able to suffer less politics getting the transformation needed to benefit. BIG is not a boiler plate - it is a set of concepts to sensibly apply at the right level, depth and time - hence large or small - those engaging will apply the concepts the right way.</p>
<p>Does this not blur the identity between delivering change within a business environment vs managing/reporting on the entire operation business environment e.g. a business services function designed to "run a Business"</p>	<p>Yes. And that is absolutely necessary. 1. You use the same resources to Run and Change. 2. You have the one source of funding to deploy between Run and Change. 3 You make choices on what to spend funds / resources on between Run and Change. 4 Run the business has to adopt and needs to be coordinated with. 5 Benefits may be coordinated from programmes, but they emerge within Run. 6. The border between Run and Change is an arbitrary one and can create tribalism - you have work carried out by an accountable person that consumes resources for expected outcome / benefit - bet that project or BAU workstream. Lets Understand Run and change - but lets not separate them at birth and not let these twins know each other</p>
<p>For business agility we have set up front how much % of effort we anticipate spending on run / grow or transform change.</p>	<p>How so? Possibly yes. There are lots of factors that need to be addressed for business agility. How you split between Run and Change depends on your targets and the projected benefits / strategic outcomes attainable. The business needs to manage the Run and Change Portfolio. You may start with a target split based on business viability - but Innovation opportunities / threats may tweak that.</p>
<p>It seems this can work if your PMO reports to a COO, CFO, or any person who has a technical background on the senior directorate who is interested. Our CFO was formerly a CEO of a tech company and it seems to work very similarly. Your thoughts? Also, we use SharePoint with Project Server to control governance across all our projects - reporting to the PMO and then the CFO - it seems to work.</p>	<p>I would not talk technical to and CFO or CEO. I would connect on their aspirations / issues, empathise and connect with their problems / challenges, and over a vision for how we connect strategy to delivery that is efficient and effective, and provides the key additional expectations including measurable then improved business agility. "It seems to work" sounds hung together with string - not designed, operational, and embedded in culture?</p>

<p>A lot of the work you have described step deeply into portfolio management. I am uncertain PMO's have the skills or authority to command a portfolio management position. How would you overcome this major obstacle? You will get nowhere getting a PMO analyst to advice about objectives and Benefit delivery...in my view due to the disparity of authority.</p>	<p>I don't know what the current role of your PMO is. Whether or not it has the ability to lift up this sort of message was a discussion point on one of the slides. Yes, this model includes portfolio management. What has your organisation designed your business support functions to do, and has it done that ensuring they work together (not usually - which is half the problem). What a PMO analyst can do is a function of who you have employed, the remit they have, the support you give them and the culture you have. Sounds like you need looking at from a BIG perspective!!!</p>
<p>I am pitching to my Director, who is Operations Director, to introduce PMO in our organisations, which will mean Project Management Team I lead will no longer be part of his Team. What would be your advice for me in terms of delivering this most effectively so I get his buy in, before I reach to other stakeholders in the business to support me in this initiative?</p>	<p>What is the BIG vision you have (in response to the challenges you face the current state you are at and the opportunities and threats you see)? Then we can have a conversation about how you engage with your stakeholders about what support function sits where, doing what. More here - https://www.chasemanagementservices.co.uk/444300982+B15+B5</p>
<p>What would be your plan to achieve your goal if hired in an organisation to improve project management methodology. Where the Project Management in general is missing as a culture and the leadership is weak and does not support transparency? what would you do.</p>	<p>Improving project management methodology is a low level goal for me - it is a means to an end, not an end in itself. The BIG process is essentially: What is your organisation structure? What work needs to go through it? What is the appropriate governance model? What data / MI does that imply we need? What are the people, tools, processes and support arrangements needed to enable that to happen? What is the vision that builds into? What is the roadmap to achieve that vision? What enablers do we need in place first? THEN we can talk about adoption support, operational support, sustainment. That's what I would do. More here - https://www.chasemanagementservices.co.uk/444300982</p>
<p>In your experience, in order for this approach to work, how much do you find have to step into and support the ability of the Exec to articulate strategic objectives?</p>	<p>There are many problems with strategic objectives. Not usually in there being some - but in how they are communicated to the business, how the business shows response to them and how the business shows accomplishment (not just progress) towards them - i.e. Portfolio Management. However - we don't always really keep on top of the change opportunities threats, imperatives and goals behind the objectives and targets that comprise our strategy. Hence - strategic objectives change based on circumstances - and we are not all that good at re-communicating and we don't have data to enable rebalance very easy (poor agility) - so the ongoing drive of objectives into and through a business is hard. So yes - we need articulation of strategy - but a process behind strategy that is reliable and can deal with change, and connects clearly into the delivery model - to task and to complete.</p>

<p>For businesses that have multiple operational teams (IT, managed services, software/apps support, non IT services etc) where they operate on hourly / daily this can be different to other business areas such as engineering / projects (daily / monthly forecasting) metrics does the data model consider this difference in MI and how this affects the reporting / information flow and alignment?</p>	<p>Team leaders worry about hourly and daily. Managers operate weekly and monthly. Governance tends to operate monthly quarterly. So we don't need the details to be pin point up to date at the BIG level. We need to picture for when we operate our governance cycles or deal in exception. We leave managers and team leads to execute, and track performance / learn historically and look forwards when we need to make decisions about what next. So the challenge is to harmonise on frequencies using common data models, not to maintain perfect alignment in the weeds.</p>
<p>An observation that I have had is that Benefits are not discussed enough in project which leads to people focusing on outputs rather than outcomes - would you agree and do you have any suggestions of how benefits can be supported more by the PMO?</p>	<p>IMO benefits should be more talked about in the management teams / business units in which they are being realised more than in a PMO. Why is benefit realisation not on Business Unit Management Meeting agendas very often? Yes we talk about programmes delivering benefits - but it is the business change manager (business) and sponsor (business) who are on the pointy chair - not the PjM. That is part of the BIG model.</p>
<p>What happens when your company is small enough that your PMO and change team are</p>	<p>A lot more gets done?</p>