

# Stakeholder Insight Summary

Showcase example | client and personal names redacted

 **Regional insurer** | Claims modernisation programme

## EXECUTIVE TAKEAWAY



Stakeholders broadly agree on the outcome, but not on where ownership, decision authority and service readiness should sit.

## STAKEHOLDER MAP (INFLUENCE VS INTEREST)



## COMMON THEMES

	<b>Repeated decisions</b> Key choices are revisited across forums, causing delay and frustration.	IMPORTANCE ● High
	<b>Late operational input</b> Operational perspectives join late, leading to rework and missed risks.	IMPORTANCE ● High
	<b>Architecture seen as a gate</b> Architecture reviews are perceived as blocking rather than enabling.	IMPORTANCE ● Medium
	<b>Supplier ambiguity created by internal ambiguity</b> Changing requirements and unclear direction create supplier uncertainty.	IMPORTANCE ● Medium

## KEY TENSIONS



## WHAT STAKEHOLDERS NEED

- 1  **Clearer ownership**  
Define who owns what, and where decisions are final.
- 2  **Live dependency view**  
A single, visible view of dependencies and impacts.
- 3  **Proportionate governance rhythm**  
Fewer, better forums focused on decisions.
- 4  **Earlier architecture engagement**  
Engage architecture early to enable, not gate.

## STAKEHOLDER VOICES

-  *We do not need another large diagnostic.*  
 SENIOR OPERATIONS LEADER
-  *The same issues are revisited in different forums.*  
 PROGRAMME LEAD

YWNBM

# Stakeholder Insight Summary

## Claims Modernisation Decision Recovery

**PURPOSE** A synthesised view of what leaders and delivery stakeholders see, where perspectives differ, and what needs resolution.

Engagement	Detail
Client	[REDACTED] UK general insurer
Context	Claims-service modernisation programme
Service	Bearings Check
Document status	Illustrative customer-facing output
Date	September 2026

*Names, organisations and commercially sensitive details have been anonymised. The content is fictionalised for demonstration purposes.*

## What stakeholders consistently report

Interviews across operations, technology, programme delivery, data, risk and supplier management indicate broad agreement on the underlying issue. People do not describe a lack of effort. They describe a system in which important choices are made too late, ownership is unclear at the point of escalation, and governance does not always help the right people resolve the decision.

Shared insight	Illustrative evidence	Implication
The programme is active but decision-constrained.	"We have plans and meetings. What we do not have is a single place where the difficult cross-functional decisions are closed."	Improve decision flow, not the volume of status reporting.
Operational readiness is late to the table.	"The release plan is clearer than the operating model for claims handlers."	Bring service readiness into the decision path before build commitments become fixed.
Architecture is often engaged as a late review.	"Teams ask for assurance after they have already made the key local choices."	Reposition architecture as early decision support for material dependencies.
Supplier challenge is weakened by internal ambiguity.	"We are asking suppliers for certainty while our own decision is still open."	Clarify internal accountability before formal supplier escalation.

## Where perspectives differ

Topic	Perspective A	Perspective B	What needs resolving
Pace versus readiness	Delivery teams emphasise the need to protect planned increments.	Operations and risk leaders emphasise service and control readiness.	Agree mandatory readiness decisions and the evidence needed before release commitments.
Governance	Programme teams experience governance as repeated challenge and delay.	Risk leaders view current forums as necessary because decision evidence is weak.	Separate decision forums from assurance and reporting activity.
Data ownership	Technology teams view data as an integration dependency.	Data and operations teams view it as business ownership and service quality.	Name accountable owners for critical claims data decisions and products.
Supplier accountability	Programme teams experience supplier delay.	Supplier management sees incomplete client decisions and requirements.	Establish a shared client-supplier dependency and decision view.

# Stakeholder implications

## Executive sponsor and co-sponsors

The sponsor group needs a concise, evidence-based view that distinguishes normal programme complexity from issues requiring executive intervention. They are likely to support a focused intervention if it does not pause delivery and produces decisions, not a long diagnostic report.

## Programme and delivery leadership

Delivery leaders need a working decision and dependency system that uses live programme evidence. They will resist additional workshops that duplicate existing forums, but are likely to engage where sessions resolve live blockers and reduce rework.

## Operations, risk and data

These stakeholders need visible ownership of claims-service outcomes, controls and critical data. Their confidence will increase when concerns are converted into decisions, owners, evidence requirements and dates.

## Technology, architecture and suppliers

Technology stakeholders need clearer boundaries between local design choices and enterprise decisions. Supplier management needs a fact base that separates vendor delivery issues from unresolved client decisions.

## Leadership working session agenda

Session segment	Purpose	Output
1. Confirm the pattern	Test the diagnosis against stakeholder evidence.	Shared statement of the material problem.
2. Prioritise the decisions	Identify the limited number of decisions that need leadership intervention.	Ranked decision list.
3. Clarify owners and evidence	Agree accountable owners, contributors and evidence needs.	Draft Decision and Ownership Map.
4. Set the 90-day route	Sequence actions around dependencies and review points.	Mobilisation and Learning Plan.

**FACILITATION PRINCIPLE** The session should work through live decisions and evidence. It is not a general discussion of programme health.