

**Governance as a PMO - I just need to do what each programme board asks me, right?**  
**webinar - Question and Answers**  
**Wednesday 8 September 2021**

Delegate questions	Answers
How will BIG work given the Feudal nature of most programmes (as you alluded to earlier)? i.e. when each director has their own priorities which to each director are the most important for their own KPIs..., so any system / process / org is fine as long as their own pet project gets priority...	The concept in BIG is that we have clarity on strategic objectives and local priorities. We want to reduce the risk of the feudal nature. So the balance of corporate and local needs can be clear and therefore debated - and should the strategic priority be threatened by a local initiative - that can be seen, evaluated and corrected. We should not have a feudal system in a BIG organisation.
Who runs the company-wide governance system? Business Support or the PMO?	Business Support - under the COO (or wherever this is best in a given organisation) - with a PMO being one of the components of Business Support. The Webinar on Business Support goes into more details... <a href="https://corep3m.club/club-workshops">https://corep3m.club/club-workshops</a>
Is there a specific PMO webinar/video for BIG in addition to this one?	Yes - several! Presentations on each of the components - video and slides - <a href="https://corep3m.club/club-workshops">https://corep3m.club/club-workshops</a> (if you access them - please give us FEEDBACK and CONTRIBUTION - that's all we ask :-) Overview presentation - with voice over - <a href="https://1drv.ms/p/s!AscRj7Bfp6vQgt0hKNqE7h7SWI_orw?e=TWMaHd">https://1drv.ms/p/s!AscRj7Bfp6vQgt0hKNqE7h7SWI_orw?e=TWMaHd</a> And of course - <a href="https://www.praxisframework.org/en/integrated-governance/big-intro">https://www.praxisframework.org/en/integrated-governance/big-intro</a>
The P in PMO is just a name. The duties performed and outcomes for the business is what matters. So depending on industry the P can be Project, Programme, Portfolio, Product, People, etc....	I would say make the name more relevant. PMO is not the best name for support which crosses change, BAU and products / assets. Business Support is more correct, and drops any baggage around 'project' at the door.
<b>Delegate comments</b>	
My company is going through exactly this right now. Major programme operating in isolation.	What are you going to do about it then?
I've been trying to articulate this vision in my org. and this webinar is music to my ears!	:-)
I don't think a PMO is essential, instead should be created if the benefit of having a PMO is identified by the organisation. There are examples as well, where PMOs can cause more issues than the expected benefits.	I don't know if a PMO is essential either. Try this - 1. What is the governance operation? 2. What is the information need? 3. Where is that information? 4. How will it be compiled? 5. What is the process that delivers it? What assistance is needed in the above based on the capability you currently have and the capability you see as needed?
Re: Accountability - completely agree, I call it the "exploding firework diagram" as the links between Sponsors, funders, clients etc go everywhere...	I challenge you to produce the accountability map for your organisation - and maintain it.....:-)

Connecting Strategy - Delivery absolutely, but the challenge I face is that making this link reveals fundamental misalignments in Strategy which the board don't accept exist :-)	This is exactly why BIG has come about!
The APM definition of a PMO is correct but the business may want to tailor their PMO to do just what they need. So it's a changing set of outcomes from one year to the next until the PMO has been bedded in. That's my view	I think I agree - but PMO is a subset of support....
Those decision points and accountabilities are within the governance model. This is one of the first things I do before adding projects and programmes.	:-)
Every project outcome and program objective must align with the business strategy. This is how it is done in a Portfolio Management Office.  One can not allow a free for all. If you do you will not focus budget to achieve best outcome for the money	I would say the business strategy needs to define projects and programmes which deliver it and other non strategic projects and programmes need to be questioned as regards relevance...with admittedly a balance needing to be struck between direct strategic and tactical need.
We keep talking about enterprises missing their strategy goals but we need to ensure (upward management) that the strategies are achievable. Unobtainable goals will always be missed so we need question what is expected; manage expectations	Implement BIG and you have a framework to manage that through - although goals will always have levels - stretch, acceptable, consequence
I'm not sure adding Business Support to an already complex enterprise hierarchy is the answer, I would first look at the accountability and the results of the functional managers and directors. Another manager questioning driving an unsuccessful function does not add value as C-suite management should understand their team performance metrics	That's not the perspective I'm promoting. Step 1 is to understand current state - so what is possible with functional managers and directors. Of course - adding any unsuccessful function is not the intent. But where are you looking from? What function are you looking out of and who is pulling team performance metrics - that is the seed of a Business Support capability!
excellent - the material is really useful. Thanks	Please use the public stuff - all we ask is for contribution / feedback!!!
brilliant thank you!	For a readiness review - <a href="https://forms.office.com/r/6nygZ93PSV">https://forms.office.com/r/6nygZ93PSV</a>
all this sounds very familiar!	:-)
My company is going through exactly this right now. Major programme operating in isolation.	What are you going to do about it then?