Effective project sponsorship – turning the vision into the reality of success

The third article by **Bob Buttrick** on the project sponsor looks at who the project sponsor is accountable to and the impact this may have on undertaking the role.

Who is a project sponsor accountable to?

If you don't know who you are accountable to, you are not accountable!

Some organisations are mature in respect of how their project management accountabilities coexist with other formal leadership roles. Others are not. In small organisations (or autonomous, small business units within larger organisations), the accountability for overall leadership and direction is usually obvious. It will be the CEO and his/her leadership team. There will only be tens of projects under way at anyone time: a number which should be relatively easy to handle. That management team will set the direction, decide what projects to initiate when (ie, prioritise) and which ones to kill. It will also monitor overall progress toward attaining the required benefits within whatever constraints (eg, money, resources) they impose. In such cases, the project sponsor would be accountable to the CEO/leadership team.

The problem comes when an organisation is so large that a single, senior leadership team cannot cope with the hundreds or even thousands of on-going projects. In these organisations, projects are therefore often corralled into portfolios (sometimes called business programmes). Each portfolio is the accountability of a senior director who is tasked with realising the benefits represented by a 'slice' of the company's business plan. This person will ensure that the sum of the benefits coming from the projects will add up to the total benefits required. He or she will have to initiate new projects, terminate troublesome projects, delay some, advance others, in response to the ever-changing business environment. The 'portfolio team', in effect, has to act like a CEO except, rather than direct the whole organisation, they direct only part of it; consequently the constraints on them will be more onerous. In these cases, the project sponsor will be accountable to the individual/management team which has accountability for the portfolio the project belongs to. Where does this leave the CEO? The CEO and leadership team, rather than deciding the minutiae of every project, direct the company by setting business targets for each portfolio owner and allocating suitable budgets and resources. The portfolio owners then deal with how they will achieve those targets through their projects. Ideally, each portfolio owner will be a member of the CEO's leadership team.

> Projects are vehicles through which change is managed

Let's remind ourselves what all projects are for. They are vehicles through which change is being directed and implemented, taking the company from where it is now, to its (hopefully) prosperous future. Oversight of these is a very significant task for a leadership team. If they aren't doing this who is!?

What can go wrong at a portfolio level?

As a project sponsor, it is essential for you to understand how the portfolios of projects are directed in your organisation as it will affect how you undertake your role. Precisely how each company organises its portfolio management is a matter for the leadership team. It really does come down to 'How do they want to direct their business?'. Unfortunately two situations commonly arise:

1. **Abdication.** The leadership team consider projects to be mere 'technical detail' and leave it to lower-level line managers to choose what to do, based on their own perspectives. Every now and then, however, they will initiate major change projects on top of what is already going on (frequently involving external consultants and ignoring whatever project policies they already have). Such organisations also tend to think of 'portfolio management' as a finance problem (as it is related to budgeting and authorising funds) but I have yet to see anywhere where the finance function has made a good job of this! (I am open to persuasion if any reader can give an example.) Project sponsors in such organisations have a really tough time as it is not clear who they are accountable to. Consequently many give up on their role, playing 'figurehead' only, and leaving everything to the project manager.
2. **Functional slicing.** The CEO already has a leadership team comprising the heads of function (manufacturing, sales, marketing, finance, technology etc.) and therefore divides up the projects based on which function is doing most of the work. Hence we have 'IT projects' and 'Marketing projects'. The problem here is threefold:

a. Projects cross functional boundaries, so surely the remit for directing them should also cross functional boundaries – but by splitting along functional lines, the CEO has deepened the divisions;
b. By corralling projects based on what is to be done, rather than why it is to be done, you have no way of holding anyone accountable, in any coherent way, for the benefits … and benefits is what this is all about.
c. Further, any functional head has an effective veto over anything requiring his resource, merely by refusing to provide that resource. Project sponsors in these organisations have to exercise all their influencing skills to take any vaguely cross-functional project forward. As with 'abdication' above, many give up. The organisation has simply made it too difficult to do the job. Again, the project manager is left holding the baby.

If portfolio management and project sponsorship are to be effective, it is intuitive that executives need to be aligned with whatever portfolio management strategy is being used. However, converting this logical statement into behaviour can be a challenge. If executives, do not have true alignment with their 'how we want to run the company' portfolio strategy, you will soon find new that projects are being championed and introduced on top of the current commitments and too much time is spent by the portfolio owners defending their position rather than delivering on it. This will usually mean taking the top team from its comfortable 'head of department' role into a higher-order business leadership. After all, does it really make sense that the only person placed to deal with cross-functions issues is the CEO?

> Does it really make sense that the only person to deal with cross-functional issues is the CEO?

Decision-making is a natural task for executives; they are bound to make decisions (either formally or informally) which impact on the portfolio and consequently the direction of the company and the ability of the resources to deliver. Informal decisions (which can be very manly and macho!) typically have an adverse impact on the organisation achieving its goals as:

- they redirect money and resources often to 'pet projects', not necessarily those with greatest leverage;
- they send a message that the 'formal process' is for inconsequential projects only (ie, yours, rather than mine); this leads to lip-service compliance which looks like bureaucracy and will become bureaucracy, ie, waste
- more projects are created, using the same resource and thus slowing down delivery in ALL projects.

What is key is to make sure we tap into the decision-making ability of executives and make sure it is directed at the appropriate issues and at the right level using the formally agreed approach. This is not about mindless adherence to bureaucracy or process but about simplicity and clarity. The portfolio owners should deal with benefits-focused 'herds of projects' and the project sponsors should focus on the viability of the individual projects and programmes they are sponsoring. Good portfolio design should ensure there are few interdependencies between portfolios and any differences can be escalated to the CEO/leadership team.

This is not about mindless adherence to bureaucracy.

Good projects can be killed!

Good portfolio management may also mean that good projects are not progressed or may even be terminated. What counts for the business is that the complete portfolio delivers what is required in terms of business advancement and benefit realisation. It is the mix and balance of the portfolio that counts, not necessarily the performance of individual projects. The dangers of doing 'just one more' project are now well known. Project sponsors need to be aware of this and, while acting as strong advocates for their projects, must realise when the company interest does not coincide with their own interest and accept the decision. I expect most of us are aware of organisations where projects simply refuse to die, and we all know how wasteful that is.

If an organisation moves into 'tough times', when trading conditions are poor due to lack of funds or revenue streams drying up, the likelihood of projects being terminated increases. An organisation where the executives are fully aligned with portfolio management will find it far easier to decide which projects to terminate, which to reduce in scope and which should continue. The terminated ones are likely to stay 'terminated' and resource can be concentrated on fewer projects. Similar 'cleansing' of the project pipeline happens when organisations that are financially successful but lacking resources realise they simply cannot undertake all the work they set themselves. If there is no effective portfolio management, the back-stop frequently used by companies is for the finance function to take a lead, often resulting in blanket budget reductions (usually 10% to 15%!) and then leaving it to the functions to fight their own corners and, as we know, functionally aligned decisions on cross-functional matters simply do not work. As a Project sponsor, you may be caught in this fire fight and, not surprisingly, in such situations many project sponsors 'go missing' even though this is not the behaviour one would expect of a business leader!

If there is no effective portfolio management, the back-stop frequently used by companies is for the finance function to take a lead.

So, your situation is opaque?

In some organisations, the top-level tie-in for cross-functional projects is somewhat opaque. If this is your situation, you will need to do some detective work to determine who you are accountable to with respect to the project (not necessarily your line director or the CEO) and what, precisely, your accountabilities are. It is extraordinary how many organizations spend so much effort designing their products and services while paying scant attention to their overall organization design and accountabilities. As projects are cross-functional, the person you are accountable to may not necessarily be your own line director.

Ask yourself:

- Why is this project being done? Who benefits?
- Who asked me to undertake the role?
- What authority does he or she have to ask me to do this?
- What resources does he or she have to contribute?
- What level of interest or supervision will they exert?
- Where does this project sit relative to others?
- Who else may think they can legitimately direct me on this role?
- Who has the authority to terminate the project?

Then, be as clear as you can on what your role is, what people can expect of you and what you want from them in return. It usually does no harm to confirm this in writing – what you need is clarity of objective and purpose. If your organisation has an HR-run personal objectives system, make sure the role is included as one of your objectives and try to understand where it sits in relation to your other objectives

The CFO solves the portfolio overspend problem at a stroke

Summary

- Projects are vehicles through which change is directed and managed, taking an organisation from 'today' to 'tomorrow'. Some are short term, others long term.
- Small organisations can often direct all their projects in a single 'herd'. Larger organisations need to spread the workload by splitting them into portfolios or business programmes
- These business programmes work best if they are benefit-oriented rather than delivery oriented. A project belongs to a portfolio due to the benefits it creates rather than the deliverables it produces.
- Portfolio management is sometimes either abdicated or left to functions to undertake. In both cases, the project sponsor role is tough to undertake and it is in such organisations that sponsorship is seen as weak or missing, despite it being a critical business leadership role.
- Good portfolio management can mean killing good projects. It is the health of the whole company that counts, not just of individual parts.
- Understand who you are accountable to and, whatever the top-level approach in your organisation, be clear on what you expect from 'the top' and what they can expect from you.

This article is an adaptation from the FT Executive Briefing, The Role of the Executive Project Sponsor; ISBN O 273 65945 6. With permission, Pearson Education. All rights reserved. Robert Buttrick 2003.

For more details see www.projectworkout.com or briefingzone.com