Slide 1: Digital Transformation Delivery & Governance Maturity Review

Speaker Notes (What I Say)
Thanks for the time. This is a focused executive readout on how our digital programs are governed and delivered—based strictly on the interview insights from Sherif, and the critical analysis we prepared. The message is straightforward: Tawuniya's governance and controls are strong, which fits our regulatory reality, but the same structure can create decision latency, reactive risk handling, and weaker benefits capture. Today I'll show where the model works, where it strains, and the few leadership decisions that unlock faster delivery without weakening compliance.

Slide 2: Executive Summary

Speaker Notes (What I Say)
Sherif's interview describes a delivery system optimized for assurance: approvals at key gates, monthly steering, and strong control dashboards updated weekly. That's a real asset in insurance. The issue is that digital delivery also needs rapid adjustments—customer, regulator, and leadership feedback changes execution plans. When everything routes upward, throughput slows. Separately, risk management exists but is semi-formal and often reactive—especially around integration and vendor performance—driving late schedule pressure and cost escalation. Finally, we track delivery well, but long-term value measurement is weaker. The leadership opportunity is targeted: speed decisions inside guardrails, strengthen proactive risk, and institutionalize benefits ownership.

Slide 3: Organizational Context

Speaker Notes (What I Say)
I'll skip the basics you already know and go straight to what matters for delivery outcomes. Sherif frames the portfolio as customer-facing channels plus internal digitization and RPA—delivered under strong regulatory oversight. That context naturally favors centralized approvals and milestone assurance. At the same time, digital initiatives compete with operational and regulatory work for the same people and vendors, so contention isn't accidental—it's structural. Add vendor dependency and the volatility rises, particularly at integration points. So the executive question becomes: how do we keep the assurance model that protects Tawuniya, while increasing decision throughput and reducing dependency-driven execution risk?

Slide 4: Current PM Practices

Speaker Notes (What I Say)

The practices described are coherent: scope starts with business outcomes, then is refined with IT and digital to ensure feasibility and regulatory compliance. Larger programs use a master plan with dependencies and checkpoints, which the PMO integrates across vendors and internal capacity. Where complexity shows up is in the hybrid reality: execution plans evolve as feedback arrives, and timelines are revised through iterative planning. That's not wrong—progressive elaboration is expected—but it creates a throughput risk if every adjustment triggers heavy escalation. So the model's success depends less on planning discipline—which is already strong—and more on decision rights clarity and governance cycle time.

Slide 5: Strengths to Preserve

Speaker Notes (What I Say)

There's a lot here we should protect. Central approvals across key gates reduce exposure and keep strategic alignment tight—especially valuable in regulated insurance. The master planning discipline provides an anchor for dependencies and regulatory checkpoints. Controls are also a differentiator: weekly dashboards that track schedule, cost, KPIs, and flag deviations early. The PMO's bridging role matters because it reduces noise for executives and accelerates escalation when needed. And importantly, there's movement toward outcomes through OKR experimentation. These are foundations—so the recommendation set is not "change everything." It's "remove friction where it slows delivery, and strengthen where risk and value leak."

Slide 6: Critical Gaps vs Best Practice

Speaker Notes (What I Say)

Four gaps consistently emerge from the interview. First, risk: registers exist, but depth and consistency vary; integration and vendor risks can be handled reactively when they hit, which Sherif links directly to schedule pressure and cost escalation. Second, governance latency: centralized gates and monthly steering create delays when rapid sequencing decisions are needed in hybrid delivery. Third, benefits: delivery tracking is strong, but long-term value measurement and ownership are weaker—so we risk optimizing "go-live" rather than outcomes. Fourth, vendor dependency: accelerating delivery by adding vendors can raise cost and integration risk. Finally, uneven learning and cross-functional alignment slows maturity gains across projects.

Slide 7: Theory–Practice Alignment & Divergence

Speaker Notes (What I Say)

The intent aligns well with recognized practice. PMBOK emphasizes tailoring and progressive elaboration, and Tawuniya clearly does that: strong front-end definition, then iterative refinement as feedback arrives. Governance and controls are also aligned—visibility and escalation are mature. Where divergence matters is practical, not academic: ISO 31000 expects proactive, structured risk treatment; Sherif describes variability and reactive handling, especially for integration and vendor performance. Hybrid governance is another divergence: iteration is happening, but decision rights are not explicitly pushed down, so teams depend on steering intervention. Finally, value delivery models increasingly treat outcomes as success; today we're stronger on delivery outputs than sustained benefits capture.

Slide 8: Implications for Project Success & Maturity

Speaker Notes (What I Say)

This is where leadership decisions pay off. In the short term, the current model supports predictability at governance milestones—no question. The risk is scalability as the portfolio grows: dependency chains and vendor reliance multiply coordination costs and increase volatility. When risk is detected late, options narrow, so mitigation becomes expensive—often through vendor augmentation or compression—which can introduce additional integration risk. Another implication is decision quality: if early risk intelligence is uneven, steering decisions can be made with incomplete signals. Finally, if too many choices require escalation, organizational learning slows because teams don't get fast feedback loops and repeatable local solutions. The result is maturity that plateaus despite strong controls.

Slide 9: Strategic Recommendations — Structural & Governance

Speaker Notes (What I Say)

The first set of recommendations is about throughput—without weakening assurance. Tiered decision rights means we keep the gates, but clarify what teams can decide between gates under defined guardrails. That directly reduces avoidable escalations and protects steering time for truly strategic trade-offs. Next, define change thresholds so iterative delivery doesn't trigger approval churn; not every re-plan should require the same governance effort. Then formalize a hybrid governance playbook—one consistent way of running stage-gate plus iterative execution—so ambiguity doesn't become friction. Finally, set decision SLAs and elevate the PMO role from reporting to orchestrating dependencies and value, which Sherif already implies is needed.

Slide 10: Strategic Recommendations — Delivery, Risk & Capability

Speaker Notes (What I Say)

This second set targets the two leak points Sherif highlights: risk and vendor dependency, plus the value gap. Move from risk documentation to risk sensing—consistent depth early, focused on integration complexity and vendor performance, with early warning indicators that surface issues before they become schedule crises. Then benefits: assign clear benefits owners and measure outcomes beyond go-live—adoption, operational impact, and sustained value—so governance decisions optimize the right thing. The OKR direction is promising; the move is to make it governance-standard, not a pilot. Finally, capability: selective internal capability building reduces structural dependency and lowers cost/integration volatility over time, while keeping vendors where they truly add advantage.

Slide 11: Risks & Implementation Considerations

Speaker Notes (What I Say)

Implementation risk is manageable if we treat this as an operating-model change, not a documentation exercise. The biggest resistance will be perceived loss of control from governance bodies—so we position tiered rights as “controls with speed,” anchored by explicit guardrails and unchanged regulatory gates. The second risk is overcorrecting toward agility; we avoid that by accelerating decisions between gates, not removing gates. Capability building needs sequencing—start where vendor dependency repeatedly drives late risk and cost. Metrics and OKRs can create noise unless benefits ownership is explicit. Finally, none of this sticks without sponsorship: steering leadership needs to endorse decision SLAs, escalation rules, and the PMO’s expanded mandate.

Slide 12: Conclusion & Value Proposition (incl. Selected References)

Speaker Notes (What I Say)

To close: the story is not that Tawuniya lacks governance—quite the opposite. The story is that governance and controls are strong, and now we evolve them to fit hybrid digital delivery at scale. The leadership decisions are clear: push decision rights down with guardrails, so governance stops being the critical path; strengthen proactive risk sensing so integration and vendor risks don’t surface late; and institutionalize benefits ownership so “success” means outcomes, not just delivery. Finally, reduce structural vendor dependency through targeted capability building. The value proposition is practical: faster throughput, fewer late-stage shocks, and clearer evidence of business value—while preserving the compliance posture executives must protect.