ENTERPRISE AGILE ENABLEMENT · V2.0

SteerCo Pack — Leadership Reporting

Board-facing reporting pack for quarterly steering decisions in a federated enterprise Agile rollout.

For executive sponsors, transformation boards, portfolio governance, and enterprise delivery leaders

Companion to Executive Brief · Implementation Plan · Workshop Kit

June 2026

Confidential working document · Keep the narrative focused on enterprise outcomes, constraints, and explicit sponsor asks

Contents

STEERCO PACK

Leadership reporting for enterprise rollout

Quarterly cadence · 5-slide discipline · leadership decisions only

1. How to use this pack

A useful SteerCo is a decision forum, not a recital of delivery activity. Use this pack to make systemic blockers, rollout adoption, regulatory capacity, and leadership asks visible in a way that drives action rather than passive reassurance.

CADENCE

Quarterly at minimum, monthly during pilot

Run a lighter monthly version during pilot launch, then a fuller quarterly pack once the rollout moves into wave expansion. Keep pre-reads tight and decisions explicit.

FORMAT

Five slides, one handout, one decision log

The slide deck keeps the room focused. The handout captures fillable fields and sponsor actions. The decision log records commitments and dates outside the narrative deck.

Rule	Why it matters
Lead with the decision required	Senior leaders listen differently when they know exactly what is being asked of them.
Show trend, not isolated anecdotes	Enterprise adoption becomes visible only through movement over time across BUs, ARTs, and shared services.
Report at enterprise level first	Sprint details and local team wins belong below SteerCo unless they expose a systemic issue.
Separate activity from adoption	Training completed, ceremonies held, and tools configured are not proof that the operating model is working.
End every pack with named owner and due date	Without action ownership, SteerCo becomes commentary rather than steering.

CHAIR'S OPENING SENTENCE

"This pack is here to help us decide, unblock, and govern capacity across the federation. If a data point does not change a leadership action, it does not belong in this forum."

2. The four questions every SteerCo must answer

QUESTION 1

Are we delivering the right outcomes against the chosen operating model?

Leaders need to know whether the rollout is producing the intended business and delivery outcomes, not merely whether ceremonies are occurring. Tie reporting to the operating model choice: for example, whether cross-entity planning improved, whether PI objectives were met, and whether shared services are flowing more predictably.

Show: outcome trend, pilot objectives met, value milestones, adoption to target model.
Avoid: local team morale updates or lists of completed training sessions.

QUESTION 2

Where are dependencies, governance, or architecture slowing flow?

SteerCo exists to resolve blockers beyond team control. Make visible where work is ageing between BUs, countries, platforms, architecture forums, or risk gates. Focus on blockers that require sponsor authority or enterprise reprioritisation.

Show: top impediments, age in days, owner, next escalation point.
Avoid: generic risk heatmaps with no action owner.

QUESTION 3

Is regulatory and change capacity being managed honestly?

In regulated federations, delivery credibility collapses when compliance work is hidden in shadow tracks. SteerCo must see whether reserved regulatory capacity is realistic, whether audit evidence is inside the flow, and whether urgent mandates are displacing product work without acknowledgement.

Show: reserved versus consumed capacity, backlog visibility, deadline risk, evidence readiness.
Avoid: vague confidence statements without capacity data.

QUESTION 4

Is adoption real across the federation, and what decision is needed next?

Real adoption means more ARTs, clusters, or domains are operating to the agreed model with measurable improvements. The forum must understand which wave is ready next, where local exceptions are multiplying, and whether sponsor intervention is required to keep the backbone intact.

Show: in-scope adoption percentage, exception count, next-wave readiness, sponsor actions.
Avoid: labelling everything green because local teams are trying hard.

> *A good SteerCo pack answers four questions in order: outcomes, blockers, capacity honesty, and adoption reality. Everything else is supporting evidence.*

3. Five slide mock-ups for a federated rollout

Use these as design references, not as a fixed script. The bullet content below assumes a multi-country pilot moving into wave expansion with a central CoE and federated ART model.

SLIDE 1 · EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Rollout status, top risk, decision required

- Wave 1 pilot now operating in Retail Lending and Payments across UK, Germany, and Poland; first PI completed with 71% objective attainment against a 65% baseline.
- Shared services planning cadence is stabilising, but architecture decision lead time remains the top systemic blocker at 18 working days average.
- Decision required today: approve two additional platform architect allocations and confirm Q3 expansion into Wealth Servicing and Group Data.

SLIDE 2 · ROLLOUT FOOTPRINT

Where the operating model is live and what comes next

- Wave 1: 4 ARTs, 27 teams, 3 countries, 2 shared service hubs, and one regulatory overlay for liquidity reporting obligations.
- Wave 2 readiness review shows sponsor coverage in Wealth Servicing and Insurance Ops, but country-level PO capability in Spain is still amber.
- Local exceptions reduced from 14 to 6 after standardising PI cadence, dependency board usage, and escalation routines.

SLIDE 3 · FLOW AND DEPENDENCIES

Systemic blockers above team level

- Top blocker 1: architecture review queue creates 18-day average wait for cross-border API changes; owner is Group Architecture Director; decision needed on delegated thresholds.
- Top blocker 2: shared testing environment freezes create 9 blocked days per PI for two ARTs; remediation plan funded but not yet scheduled.
- Top blocker 3: portfolio approval forum still sits mid-PI, causing scope churn after planning; propose move to pre-PI intake gate from next quarter.

SLIDE 4 · REGULATORY AND ADOPTION HEALTH

Capacity honesty and model adoption trend

- Regulatory capacity reserved at 28%; actual consumption averaged 31% due to one unplanned ECB response, now visible inside the pilot backlog rather than via side channels.
- Adoption to target model is green in 3 of 4 pilot ARTs; amber in one ART due to incomplete RTE handover and inconsistent dependency hygiene.
- Audit evidence pack is now generated from in-flow artefacts for 82% of required controls, up from 46% at diagnosis.

SLIDE 5 · DECISIONS AND ASKS

What leadership must do before the next PI

- Approve Wave 2 entry for Wealth Servicing and Group Data with Spain deferred until PO capability is green.
- Mandate a delegated architecture path for low-risk API changes under an agreed threshold to reduce approval lead time by at least 30%.
- Confirm sponsor attendance for the next PI planning event and require each BU head to name one local exception they will retire next quarter.

MOCK-UP RULE

If a slide contains more than three bullets, it is probably carrying detail that belongs in the appendix or the working team review. SteerCo should see signal, trend, and action.

4. Metric dictionary

Use a consistent metric dictionary across quarters so the meaning of green, amber, and red does not drift with politics. Every metric should support one of the four SteerCo questions.

Flow and rollout metrics

Metric	Definition	Level	Formula / source	Good signal	Bad signal
% in-scope ARTs operating to target model	Share of scoped ARTs using the agreed cadence, roles, forums, and artefacts	Enterprise	CoE assessment against target model checklist	Rising quarter on quarter	Flat despite rollout activity
PI objective attainment	Proportion of committed PI objectives achieved	Programme	Completed objectives / committed objectives	Stable trend with honest stretch	Volatile or inflated commitments
Dependency resolution lead time	Average working days to resolve cross-team or cross-BU blockers	Programme	Dependency board timestamps	Downward trend	Ageing blockers carried across PIs
Blocked days from shared services	Time delivery teams wait for platform, testing, or architecture support	Programme	Blocker log / Flow item ageing	Declining across waves	Concentrated in one shared function
Regulatory capacity reserved	Capacity intentionally allocated to regulatory change	Programme	Reserved points / total planned capacity	Visible and forecastable	Unstated or politically suppressed
Regulatory capacity consumed	Actual capacity spent on regulatory work	Programme	Completed regulatory effort / total actual effort	Close to reserved trend	Consistently exceeding plan
% compliance items in backlog	Share of compliance work visible inside normal delivery flow	Enterprise	Compliance backlog count / total compliance items	Approaching 100%	Shadow workstreams persist
Architecture decision turnaround	Elapsed time between request and decision for architecture reviews	Enterprise	Architecture workflow timestamps	Within agreed SLA	Queue growth and missed PI windows
Release readiness hit rate	Share of planned releases leaving PI with agreed quality and control evidence	Programme	Ready releases / planned releases	Improving with adoption	Late controls or failed go-live checks
Escaped defects in regulated change	Defects reaching production on regulated items	Team / programme	Production defect log filtered to regulatory scope	Low and stable	Repeated control failures

Governance and adoption metrics

Metric	Definition	Level	Formula / source	Good signal	Bad signal
Lead time from idea to active development	Time from approved demand to delivery team start	Enterprise	Portfolio intake timestamp to in-progress date	Shorter and more predictable	Long waiting before work starts
Sponsor action closure rate	Share of SteerCo actions closed by agreed date	Enterprise	Closed actions on time / total actions raised	High and transparent	Repeated carry-over of the same asks
Local exception count	Number of approved deviations from the target model	Enterprise	Exception register maintained by CoE	Declining after wave stabilisation	Growing without retirement plan
Wave readiness score	Composite readiness for next rollout wave	Enterprise	Sponsor, capability, dependency, and governance checklist	Evidence-backed green	Subjective optimism without proof
RTE role readiness	Whether named RTEs can run PI, dependency, and escalation routines independently	Programme	Observed readiness assessment by CoE	Increasing internal self-sufficiency	Persistent external dependency
Portfolio churn after PI planning	Material scope changes imposed after PI commitment	Enterprise	Count of major post-PI interventions	Rare and justified	Frequent replan requests
Cross-country coordination reliability	Planned versus achieved hand-offs across countries or hubs	Programme	Committed hand-offs met / planned hand-offs	Rising reliability	Missed hand-offs creating rework

METRICS THAT SHOULD NOT LEAD STEERCO

Training attendance, raw velocity, number of ceremonies held, tool adoption percentages, or maturity scores without operational definition. These may help local teams, but they do not steer an enterprise rollout.

5. Quarterly narrative templates

These paragraph templates are intended to be read or lightly edited by leadership. Keep them evidence-based, short, and aligned to the operating model decision already made.

Q1 diagnosis narrative

During Q1 we completed the diagnosis across the in-scope federation, confirming that the primary constraints are cross-entity dependency management, inconsistent architecture decision timing, and limited visibility of regulatory work in normal delivery flow. Based on that evidence, leadership selected the target operating model of ________________, with ________________ retained as fallback. Our immediate objective for Q2 is to mobilise a pilot slice that proves the model under real dependency and compliance conditions rather than through isolated team-level coaching.

Q2 pilot narrative

In Q2 the pilot established the first production use of the chosen operating model across ________________. The most important outcome is that shared planning, escalation, and compliance visibility are now being exercised in one federated slice rather than discussed abstractly. The pilot is surfacing genuine system constraints, particularly ________________, which are appropriate for SteerCo action. Our ask for Q3 is to remove the top blocker and approve the next wave only where sponsor coverage and role readiness are demonstrably in place.

Q3 wave expansion narrative

Q3 focused on expanding from pilot into the next viable wave while protecting the integrity of the operating model. Adoption is improving across the original slice, and a reduced exception count indicates that the backbone is becoming more stable. Expansion is recommended for ________________ because readiness evidence is strong, while ________________ should remain deferred until local leadership capacity and governance alignment improve. The board should view this quarter as controlled scaling, not enterprise-wide rollout by declaration.

Q4 institutionalise narrative

By Q4 the priority shifts from proving the model to institutionalising it. Internal CoE capability, local RTE effectiveness, and repeatable reporting are now more important than additional external intervention. Our focus is to retire temporary exceptions, embed governance fully inside the delivery flow, and confirm that sponsor actions continue to close on time. The next decision for leadership is whether the enterprise is ready to treat the operating model as standard practice, with annual review, rather than as a transformation experiment.

6. Escalation ladder and RAG dashboard guidance

Escalation ladder: team → RTE → CoE → SteerCo → sponsor

Use the ladder below to keep issues at the lowest effective level for as long as possible. Escalation should be fast, evidence-based, and tied to a decision or unblock, not to frustration alone.

Team: Resolve delivery issues within the squad or immediate collaboration group within the sprint or flow cadence.

v

RTE: Take cross-team dependency, PI, or planning conflicts that exceed team authority or timing.

v

CoE: Intervene when the issue exposes a pattern, role gap, exception request, or governance design flaw.

v

SteerCo: Escalate blockers requiring enterprise reprioritisation, cross-BU alignment, funding, or mandated policy.

v

Sponsor: Use for deadlock, political conflict, or time-critical decisions that only executive authority can settle.

ESCALATE WHEN

The next level can actually act

Escalation should include issue statement, business impact, age, attempted resolution, requested decision, and deadline. Without those five pieces, issues often bounce between forums.

DO NOT ESCALATE WHEN

The issue is still vague or ownerless

SteerCo should not become a dumping ground for unresolved local hygiene issues. If the owner or requested action is unclear, send it back one level with a timebox.

Red / amber / green adoption dashboard

What to show

- Adoption by in-scope ART, cluster, or BU against the target model
- Trend over time, not a single-quarter snapshot
- Top blockers linked to each amber or red status
- Exception count and retirement plan
- Regulatory capacity honesty and PI predictability trend
- Named owner and next action for every non-green area

What not to show

- Abstract maturity scores with no link to operating-model behaviours
- All-green dashboards created to avoid difficult sponsor conversations
- Large tables of team-level velocity or ceremony compliance
- Raw training counts presented as evidence of adoption
- Risk heatmaps that do not state requested action and owner
- Separate compliance status outside the main delivery picture

RAG RULE OF THUMB

Green means operating to target with manageable local friction. **Amber** means the model is still viable but one or more blockers need leadership attention this quarter. **Red** means the target model is not operating credibly in that slice and either sponsor intervention or a fallback decision is required.

7. One-page SteerCo handout template

Print this page separately for the chair, sponsor, and presenter. Fill it in by hand or type into the blank lines before each forum.

SteerCo overview

Date: ______________ **Chair:** ______________ **Presenter:** ______________

Current quarter: ______________ **Target operating model:** ______________

Decision required today:

____

Four-question summary

Question	Summary
Are we delivering the right outcomes?	
Where are blockers slowing flow?	
Is regulatory capacity honest?	
Is adoption real, and what is next?	

Top metrics and RAG

Metric	Status	Trend	Comment
% in-scope ARTs operating to target model			
PI objective attainment			
Dependency resolution lead time			
Regulatory capacity reserved vs consumed			
Sponsor action closure rate			

Actions and owners

Action	Owner	Due date

Next escalation if unresolved: ________________

> *A strong SteerCo handout is readable in one minute, supportable in ten minutes, and actionable for the next quarter.*