MSS SUCCESS SPACES
Units 2K–2L, 2nd Floor E.C. Valle Commercial Center M.L. Quezon Avenue Brgy. San Isidro, Angono, Rizal
(02) 7255 5568
0995 846 2495 | 0917 123 1017
info@msscorporation.com.ph
www.MSSCorporation.com.ph

How a Philippine Government Institution Built an Execution-Ready Strategic Plan

An Anonymized Strategic Planning and Balanced Scorecard Case Study

Confidentiality notice: The client's identity, official name, identifying acronyms, individual participants, exact dates, financial information, operational statistics, proprietary targets, internal deliberations, and other sensitive information have been intentionally removed or generalized. This case study focuses only on the nature of the engagement, the strategic planning methodology, the documented outputs, and the value of the process.

Case Study Overview

Strategic planning in a government institution is more complex than simply deciding what the organization wants to accomplish over the next several years.

A public-sector organization must align its strategy with its legal mandate, public accountability obligations, administrative relationships, government regulations, stakeholder expectations, available capabilities, and responsibility to serve the national interest.

This creates a critical strategic question:
How can a government institution become more responsive, efficient, innovative, sustainable, and globally competitive without moving beyond the public mandate assigned to it?

This anonymized case study explains how **Mentor Myron Sta. Ana, Your Strategy Guy**, guided a specialized Philippine government institution through an end-to-end strategic planning and Balanced Scorecard development process.

The client provides alternative dispute resolution services for disputes arising from construction contracts. Its responsibilities require a combination of legal expertise, technical construction knowledge, administrative capability, stakeholder confidence, professional credibility, and efficient public service.

The engagement was not limited to a two-day strategic planning workshop.

It involved:

- Preliminary consultation and project alignment
- Document and mandate review
- Pre-strategic planning questionnaires
- Stakeholder interviews and consultations
- Vision and mission review
- SWOT analysis
- Root-cause analysis
- PESTLE environmental scanning
- Industry and international-practice consultation
- Strategic goal formulation

- Strategy Map development
- Balanced Scorecard development
- Measures and target setting
- Organizational initiative planning
- Action-plan development
- Several rounds of review and refinement
- Presentation to the governing body and top management

The project's formal scope required the consultant to design and facilitate an execution plan and prepare the corresponding strategic and detailed action plans.

The Client's Organizational Context

The client was a specialized national government institution responsible for helping parties resolve disputes connected with construction contracts.

Its public-service environment involved:

- Construction and engineering matters
- Contract interpretation
- Arbitration and mediation
- Legal and procedural requirements
- Technical experts and accredited practitioners
- Government and private-sector stakeholders
- Administrative and financial controls
- Industry development
- Technology-enabled hearings and case management
- Public confidence in fair and timely dispute resolution

Because of the specialized nature of its services, the institution could not develop its strategy solely around administrative efficiency.

It also needed to consider:

- The quality and credibility of its dispute-resolution services
- The competence and availability of specialized professionals
- Stakeholder awareness and experience
- Responsiveness to new forms of dispute resolution
- Technological modernization
- Institutional sustainability
- Alignment with developments in the construction industry
- International practices
- Its contribution to the wider economy and society

The organization therefore needed a strategic plan that connected its mandate with measurable institutional transformation.

The Strategic Planning Challenge

The client already had a formal legal mandate, established processes, existing policies, an organizational structure, a vision and mission, and previous planning references.

The challenge was not the absence of information.

The challenge was turning several sources of information into one coherent, aligned, measurable, and actionable strategy.

Challenge 1: The strategy had to remain anchored in the institution's legal mandate
Government institutions cannot simply pursue any strategic opportunity they find attractive.

Every proposed direction needed to be evaluated in terms of:
- What the institution was legally required to do
- What it was authorized to do
- What could be changed through internal policy
- What required the approval of another government body
- What required legislative or regulatory action
- What could not be pursued under the present mandate

The planning process therefore had to begin with the organization's purpose and authority—not with a generic brainstorming activity.

Challenge 2: Several strategic reference points had to be aligned
The institution's leaders had to consider:
- Its legal mandate
- Existing vision and mission
- Quality commitments
- Previous organizational initiatives
- An existing dispute-resolution roadmap
- The broader national construction industry roadmap
- Industry trends
- Legal developments
- Technological developments
- International practices

The new plan needed to integrate these references instead of becoming another disconnected document.

Challenge 3: Different stakeholders held different perspectives
The institution's future could not be planned exclusively by its administrative personnel.

The strategic planning process required perspectives from people involved in governance, management, operations, legal practice, construction, dispute resolution, professional accreditation, and industry representation.

The consulting methodology therefore included written inputs, interviews, consultation meetings, and facilitated discussions with internal and external stakeholders.

The formal project framework required the collection of insights from senior officials, institutional leaders, construction arbitration practitioners, and professionals familiar with global practices before strategy formulation.

Challenge 4: Broad aspirations had to become measurable commitments
Statements such as the following may sound strategic:

- Become globally competitive
- Improve stakeholder service
- Strengthen institutional capability
- Modernize the organization
- Improve financial management
- Promote the institution
- Build employee capability

However, they cannot guide execution unless leadership also determines:

- What specifically must be accomplished
- How progress will be measured
- What level of performance is expected
- What initiatives will produce the result
- Who will own the implementation
- When progress will be reviewed
- What support will be required

Challenge 5: Public-sector success had to be measured beyond finances
Financial stewardship was important, but it could not be the institution's only definition of success.

The planning framework also needed to cover:

- Stakeholder value
- Service quality
- Process efficiency
- Institutional capability
- Employee development
- Technology
- Industry credibility
- Public and social impact

MSS SUCCESS SPACES
Units 2K–2L, 2nd Floor E.C. Valle Commercial Center M.L. Quezon Avenue Brgy. San Isidro, Angono, Rizal
(02) 7255 5568
0995 846 2495 | 0917 123 1017
info@msscorporation.com.ph
www.MSSCorporation.com.ph

Objectives of the Engagement

The consultancy and facilitation engagement was designed to help the institution:

1. Revisit its legal mandate and institutional purpose.
2. Evaluate the relevance of its vision and mission.
3. Review past organizational decisions and present conditions.
4. Identify strategic strengths and weaknesses.
5. Analyze external opportunities and threats.
6. Determine the root causes of strategically important weaknesses.
7. Gather insights from key internal and external stakeholders.
8. identify long-term strategic priorities.
9. Formulate aligned and measurable strategic objectives.
10. Develop a multi-perspective Strategy Map.
11. Translate the Strategy Map into a Balanced Scorecard.
12. Establish measures, targets, and organizational initiatives.
13. Prepare implementation and action-planning foundations.
14. Obtain governing-body and executive-management approval.
15. Establish the basis for cascading, monitoring, evaluation, and performance management.

The Strategic Planning Consultancy and Facilitation Process

Phase 1: Project Discovery and Alignment

The engagement began with an initial consultation involving the strategic planning secretariat and the consulting team.

This stage clarified:

- The nature of the institution
- The expected outputs
- The people who needed to participate
- The planning documents that needed to be reviewed
- The stakeholders who needed to be consulted
- The intended planning horizon
- The required decision-making and approval process
- The anticipated Strategy Map, Balanced Scorecard, and action-plan deliverables

The accomplishment report documents an initial meeting with the strategic planning secretariat before the formal planning sessions began.

This prevented the consultancy from becoming a generic workshop based on standard templates.

Phase 2: Pre-Strategic Planning Assessment
A customized pre-strategic planning questionnaire was developed to identify critical issues and assess the relevance of the institution's existing direction.

The questionnaire covered areas such as:

- Respondent role and organizational context
- Legal mandate
- Vision and mission
- Strategic priorities
- Performance measures
- Organizational structure
- Workforce capacity
- Institutional capability
- Current outcomes
- Long-term direction

Its declared purpose was to identify strategic issues, realign the organization's mission and vision with its environment, and establish short- and long-term direction.

The questionnaire gave participants time to reflect before the facilitated sessions.

It also enabled the consultant to identify:

- Areas of agreement
- Conflicting interpretations
- Information gaps
- Strategic concerns
- Issues requiring deeper discussion
- Matters that required leadership decisions

Phase 3: Stakeholder Consultation
The planning process incorporated perspectives from both inside and outside the institution.

Consultations included people representing:

- Governance
- Executive leadership
- Management
- Administrative operations
- Legal practice
- Construction and engineering expertise
- Accredited dispute-resolution professionals
- Industry organizations

- External practitioners

The engagement also gathered perspectives on global best practices and the future of construction dispute resolution.

The objective was not to allow outside professionals to dictate the institution's strategy.

Their insights were used to help the organization examine:

- International developments
- Emerging forms of alternative dispute resolution
- Changes in construction contracts
- Professional competency requirements
- Technology-driven service delivery
- Industry expectations
- Risks to institutional relevance
- Opportunities for partnerships and capability development

The accomplishment report confirms that consultative interviews were conducted to obtain inputs from accredited and international practitioners.

Phase 4: Revisiting the Mandate, Vision, and Mission

The planning team reviewed the institution's organizational identity before identifying new strategic goals.

This included examining whether the existing vision and mission were:

- Clearly defined
- Relevant to current conditions
- Appropriate to the institution's mandate
- Meaningful to employees and stakeholders
- Aspirational but credible
- Consistent with the wider industry environment
- Supportive of organizational transformation

The discussion did not focus only on improving the wording.

Participants examined whether the statements could answer:

- What public value does the institution create?
- Who are its stakeholders?
- What kind of institution does it intend to become?
- What type of service experience should it provide?
- What capabilities must it develop?
- How should it conduct itself?

This helped the planning team establish a clearer strategic foundation before proceeding to goals and performance measures.

Phase 5: Reviewing the Past and Present
The planning process required the institution to examine how previous decisions contributed to its present condition.

Participants reflected on:

- What had been accomplished
- What remained incomplete
- What had not been attempted
- What had failed
- What had worked
- What practices had become outdated
- What should have been done differently
- Which lessons should influence the next planning period

The organizational assessment also examined current:

- Capacities
- Competencies
- Systems
- Processes
- Resources
- Leadership arrangements
- Technology
- Workforce readiness
- Change readiness

This prevented the strategy from being based only on future ambition.

A realistic strategic plan must connect the organization’s desired future with its actual starting point.

Phase 6: Strategic SWOT Analysis
A structured SWOT analysis was conducted covering:

- Internal strengths
- Internal weaknesses
- External opportunities
- External threats

However, the process did not assume that every item identified belonged in the strategic plan.
Participants were instructed to focus on issues that were:

- Organization-wide

- Long-term
- Material to the mandate
- Significant to stakeholders
- Relevant to the planning horizon
- Appropriate for leadership attention
- Capable of affecting institutional success

The strategic-goal worksheet defined a strategic goal as a major, long-term, organization-wide result rather than an issue affecting only one person, section, or unit.

This distinction was important.

Many planning sessions fail because they treat a long list of complaints, activities, and minor operational concerns as though all of them were strategic priorities.

Phase 7: Root-Cause Analysis
Identifying a weakness does not explain why it exists.

For the most significant internal weaknesses, participants were guided through root-cause analysis.

This included examining possible causes involving:
- Leadership and management
- Workforce quantity and quality
- Competencies
- Policies
- Procedures
- Systems
- Technology
- Resources
- Facilities
- Information
- Performance measures
- Organizational culture
- Time and workload
- External restrictions

The Five Whys method was used to help participants move beyond visible symptoms.

The accomplishment report confirms that the institution’s representatives were guided in identifying root causes that needed to be addressed through organizational strategy.

This reduced the risk of developing initiatives that addressed only the surface of a problem.

Phase 8: PESTLE Environmental Scanning

The external environment was analyzed through PESTLE:

- Political
- Economic
- Social
- Technological
- Legal
- Environmental

Participants were asked to identify external developments that could:

- Create opportunities
- Threaten the institution's relevance
- Affect service delivery
- Require new competencies
- Change stakeholder expectations
- Influence legal jurisdiction
- Encourage new forms of dispute resolution
- Affect infrastructure and construction activity
- Require digital transformation
- Require greater attention to sustainability

The process required participants to distinguish between:

- External conditions the institution could influence
- External conditions it could only prepare for
- Developments that were strategically significant
- Developments that were merely interesting but not actionable

The accomplishment report confirms that external opportunities and threats were finalized using a structured PESTLE tool.

Phase 9: Strategic Filtering and Goal Formulation

The consolidated SWOT and PESTLE findings were converted into possible strategic responses.

Participants examined whether each proposed goal would:

- Strengthen or protect an existing advantage
- Address a significant internal weakness
- Take advantage of an external opportunity
- Prepare for or reduce an external threat
- Contribute directly to the mandate
- Affect the entire institution
- Produce long-term public value

- Require organization-wide alignment

This allowed the planning team to remove items that were:

- Routine
- Department-specific
- Too narrow
- Not controllable
- Not measurable
- Not relevant to the planning horizon
- Better handled through normal operations

The remaining priorities became the basis of the Strategy Map.

Phase 10: Developing the Strategy Map
The institution's strategic goals were organized using an adapted Balanced Scorecard framework.

The Strategy Map included five perspectives:

1. **Financial Perspective**
2. **Customer and Stakeholder Perspective**
3. **Internal Process Perspective**
4. **Organizational Capacity and Learning Perspective**
5. **Social Impact Perspective**

The additional Social Impact Perspective reflected the organization's public-sector character.

A government institution must consider not only resources, stakeholders, processes, and people, but also its contribution to the public, the industry, and national development.

The planning agenda required the finalized SWOT inputs to be translated into strategic goals under these five perspectives.

Phase 11: Formulating S.M.A.R.T.E.R. Objectives
Each strategic goal was translated into objectives that needed to be:

- **Specific**
- **Measurable**
- **Attainable**
- **Relevant**
- **Time-bound**
- **Evaluable**
- **Recorded**

This required participants to move from broad statements such as:

- Improve service quality
- Modernize the organization
- Strengthen stakeholder engagement
- Build employee capability

Toward objectives that clarified:

- The result to be produced
- The area of performance affected
- The method of measurement
- The expected level of progress
- The timeframe
- The accountable organizational owner

The planning agenda explicitly required strategic objectives to be supported by measures and targets.

Phase 12: Building the Balanced Scorecard

The Strategy Map identified the institution's desired direction.

The Balanced Scorecard added the measurement and implementation structure.

It connected:
Strategic Goals → Strategic Objectives → Measures → Targets → Organizational Initiatives

This helped participants understand that a Balanced Scorecard is not merely a list of Key Performance Indicators.

A properly developed Balanced Scorecard explains:

- What the organization wants to accomplish
- What conditions must change
- How progress will be measured
- What level of performance is expected
- What actions will produce the result
- How different perspectives influence one another

The final strategic plan described the scorecard as the connection among strategic goals, objectives, measures, performance indicators, and organizational action items.

Phase 13: Organizational Alignment

Different groups and operational units were asked to determine how they would contribute to the institution-wide strategy.

MSS SUCCESS SPACES
Units 2K–2L, 2nd Floor E.C. Valle Commercial Center M.L. Quezon Avenue Brgy. San Isidro, Angono, Rizal
(02) 7255 5568
0995 846 2495 | 0917 123 1017
info@msscorporation.com.ph
www.MSSCorporation.com.ph

They were not allowed to create isolated departmental wish lists.

The entire planning body reviewed and aligned:

- Strategic goals
- Strategic objectives
- Measures
- Targets
- Initiatives
- Implementation responsibilities
- Resource considerations
- Interdependencies

The facilitated alignment process allowed participants to ask:

- Does this initiative support the institution's strategy?
- Does it duplicate another unit's responsibility?
- Does it require support from another group?
- Is the proposed measure realistic?
- Is the target controllable?
- Is responsibility clearly assigned?
- Could one initiative negatively affect another strategic objective?

The documented agenda required organization-wide critique and agreement before finalizing the Balanced Scorecard and action plans.

Phase 14: Action Planning
The strategic objectives were translated into organizational initiatives and implementation plans.

Action planning required the organization to clarify:

- The initiative or action
- The expected output
- The responsible group
- Supporting groups
- Performance indicators
- Implementation timing
- Resource requirements
- Monitoring arrangements
- Risks and dependencies

This helped establish the bridge between strategy formulation and execution.

A strategic plan without action ownership remains a statement of intention.

Extending the Engagement to Protect the Quality of the Plan

The initial planning sessions successfully produced the major strategic goals and objectives.

However, the measures, targets, and organizational initiatives required additional time and discussion.

Rather than rushing the participants to complete a complicated Balanced Scorecard within the original schedule, the consultant recommended continuation and refinement sessions.

Additional facilitated work was conducted to:

- Complete missing measures
- Validate performance indicators
- Refine targets
- Develop organizational initiatives
- Check alignment across perspectives
- Complete action-plan elements
- Resolve inconsistencies
- Improve the usability of the final plan

The project records state that the initial sessions were sufficient for developing the Strategy Map's goals and objectives but not for completing the measures, targets, and multi-year organizational action plan.

Further finalization sessions were conducted to complete remaining measures, targets, and organizational initiatives.

This illustrates an important principle:
A credible strategic management system should not be rushed merely to satisfy the original workshop schedule.

Final Presentation and Leadership Approval

After the strategy had been consolidated, refined, and documented, the completed multi-year strategic plan was presented to the institution's governing body and top management.

The plan was approved, with recommendations to proceed with:

- Departmental action planning
- Individual performance alignment
- Execution of the organizational strategy
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Performance management
- Quarterly progress reviews
- Annual organizational performance reviews

The documented final presentation records the approval of the strategic plan and the recommendation that it be treated as a living management document supported by cascading and regular performance reviews.

Documented Outputs of the Engagement

1. A reviewed organizational mandate and direction
The institution revisited the relationship among its legal mandate, vision, mission, services, and desired future.

2. A consolidated strategic situation analysis
The planning team produced an organization-wide assessment covering internal strengths, internal weaknesses, external opportunities, and external threats.

3. Root-cause findings
Strategically important weaknesses were examined beyond their visible symptoms.

4. A PESTLE environmental scan
The organization analyzed political, economic, social, technological, legal, and environmental developments.

5. A five-perspective Strategy Map
Strategic goals were organized across financial, stakeholder, process, organizational-capacity, and social-impact perspectives.

6. S.M.A.R.T.E.R. strategic objectives
Broad aspirations were translated into more specific and evaluable organizational commitments.

7. A Balanced Scorecard
The strategic plan connected goals and objectives with measures, targets, and initiatives.

8. Organizational initiatives and action plans
The strategy was supported by defined implementation responsibilities and coordinated organizational actions.

9. Governing-body and executive approval
The completed strategic plan was presented to and approved by institutional leadership.

10. A basis for cascading and performance management
The final recommendations required the strategy to be translated into departmental and individual responsibilities supported by regular review.

The Documented Value of the Engagement

MSS SUCCESS SPACES
Units 2K–2L, 2nd Floor E.C. Valle Commercial Center M.L. Quezon Avenue Brgy. San Isidro, Angono, Rizal
(02) 7255 5568
0995 846 2495 | 0917 123 1017
info@msscorporation.com.ph
www.MSSCorporation.com.ph

The available project records establish the development and approval of the strategic plan and its supporting Balanced Scorecard framework.

They do not contain a complete, independently verified post-implementation impact evaluation.

For this reason, this case study does not claim unverified improvements in service volume, financial performance, stakeholder satisfaction, case outcomes, employee productivity, or institutional efficiency.

The documented transformation was the organization's movement from:

Before the Engagement	After the Facilitated Process
Several planning references	One consolidated strategic direction
Broad institutional aspirations	Defined strategic goals
Internal concerns and opinions	Structured strategic analysis
Visible weaknesses	Root-cause considerations
External developments	PESTLE-informed strategic responses
SWOT as a list	SWOT used for strategic decision-making
Differing stakeholder viewpoints	Facilitated consensus and alignment
General goals	S.M.A.R.T.E.R. objectives
Operational and financial concerns	A five-perspective Strategy Map
Disconnected measures	A strategy-linked Balanced Scorecard
Activities	Organizational initiatives
Workshop discussions	A documented strategic plan
Organizational strategy	A basis for cascading to departments and individuals
Planning as an event	Planning connected to monitoring and review

---

Key Lessons for Government Agencies and Public Institutions

1. Begin with the mandate
A public institution must understand what it is required, permitted, and capable of doing before setting new strategic priorities.

2. Conduct meaningful pre-work
Strategic planning becomes more productive when participants review relevant documents, complete questionnaires, and provide inputs before the planning proper.

3. Involve the right stakeholders
A credible strategy should reflect governance, leadership, operational, technical, professional, customer, and industry perspectives.

4. Separate strategic issues from routine concerns
Not every operational challenge belongs in the strategic plan.

Strategic issues should be long-term, organization-wide, and significant to the institution’s mandate and stakeholders.

5. Do not stop at SWOT
SWOT analysis creates value only when it leads to decisions about what the institution will protect, improve, pursue, avoid, or prepare for.

6. Analyze root causes
Strategies based only on symptoms may produce activity without solving the real problem.

7. Adapt the Balanced Scorecard to the institution
A public-sector organization may need to include social impact or public value as a distinct strategic perspective.

8. Give measures and targets enough time
Developing meaningful performance measures and realistic targets commonly takes longer than identifying strategic goals.

9. Align units before implementation
Departmental plans should be examined for duplication, conflict, dependency, and contribution to the organizational strategy.

10. Approval is only the beginning
The strategy must still be cascaded, implemented, monitored, reviewed, and adjusted.

Why Engage a Strategic Planning Consultant in the Philippines?

A qualified **Strategic Planning Consultant in the Philippines** does more than provide templates or write a strategy document for the organization.

The consultant helps leadership:

- Clarify the real strategic questions
- Review mandates and planning references
- Structure stakeholder consultation
- Consolidate competing viewpoints
- Separate strategic issues from operational concerns

- Identify root causes
- Analyze external developments
- Facilitate difficult conversations
- Formulate measurable objectives
- Build a Strategy Map
- Develop a Balanced Scorecard
- Align departments and organizational units
- Translate strategy into action
- Establish monitoring and review mechanisms

An external consultant also provides neutrality.

This is valuable when internal personnel must participate honestly in discussions involving organizational weaknesses, leadership decisions, policies, resources, responsibilities, and performance gaps.

The Role of a Strategic Planning Facilitator

A **Strategic Planning Facilitator in the Philippines** manages the planning process and the quality of the conversation.

The facilitator helps participants:

- Share information
- Challenge assumptions
- Clarify disagreements
- Evaluate evidence
- Prioritize issues
- Reach consensus
- Make decisions
- Maintain focus
- Complete the required outputs

The facilitator does not replace leadership.

Leadership owns the strategy.

The facilitator provides the structure through which leadership can develop it.

The Role of a Strategic Planning Trainer

A **Strategic Planning Trainer in the Philippines** helps managers and employees understand the tools they are expected to use during planning and execution.

Training may cover:

- Strategic thinking
- Strategic versus tactical planning
- SWOT analysis
- PESTLE analysis
- Root-cause analysis
- Vision and mission alignment
- Strategy mapping
- Balanced Scorecard development
- Key Result Areas
- Key Performance Indicators
- S.M.A.R.T.E.R. objectives
- Action planning
- Strategy cascading
- Strategy execution
- Performance review

This is especially important when departmental leaders must later translate the organizational strategy into operational and individual performance commitments.

The Role of a Strategic Planning Speaker

A **Strategic Planning Speaker in the Philippines** can help organizations build awareness and leadership commitment before a full planning engagement.

A keynote, executive briefing, or management talk may focus on:

- Why strategic plans fail
- How strategic thinking differs from routine planning
- Why strategy execution breaks down
- How leaders create alignment
- How the Balanced Scorecard supports execution
- Why measures must be connected to strategy
- How organizations turn plans into accountability

Speaking interventions can establish a common strategic language before the consultancy or facilitation begins.

MSS SUCCESS SPACES
Units 2K–2L, 2nd Floor E.C. Valle Commercial Center M.L. Quezon Avenue Brgy. San Isidro, Angono, Rizal
(02) 7255 5568
0995 846 2495 | 0917 123 1017
info@msscorporation.com.ph
www.MSSCorporation.com.ph

Frequently Asked Questions

What is public-sector strategic planning?
Public-sector strategic planning is the process of translating an institution's mandate, stakeholder responsibilities, organizational capabilities, and environmental conditions into long-term priorities, measurable objectives, initiatives, and performance mechanisms.

How is government strategic planning different from private-sector planning?
Government institutions must consider legal authority, public accountability, regulatory requirements, inter-agency relationships, social impact, and public value in addition to financial and operational performance.

What should a government strategic planning workshop produce?
Depending on its scope, the process may produce:

- Mandate and direction review
- SWOT analysis
- PESTLE analysis
- Strategic priorities
- Strategy Map
- Strategic goals
- Strategic objectives
- Balanced Scorecard
- Measures and targets
- Organizational initiatives
- Action plans
- Monitoring and review arrangements

What is the role of the Balanced Scorecard in government?
The Balanced Scorecard helps a government institution connect financial stewardship, stakeholder value, internal processes, organizational capability, and public impact with measurable strategic objectives.

Why is social impact important in a public-sector Strategy Map?
A government institution exists to create public value. Social impact helps leadership examine how the institution contributes to citizens, industries, communities, economic development, and national priorities.

Is a two-day strategic planning workshop enough?
A two-day workshop can generate important decisions and foundational outputs when sufficient pre-work has been completed. Complex institutions may require additional sessions for consultation, measurement design, target setting, action planning, documentation, and leadership validation.

Why should a government institution engage an external facilitator?
An external facilitator provides structure, neutrality, process discipline, and independent challenge. This helps participants discuss weaknesses, conflicting priorities, and difficult decisions more constructively.

MSS SUCCESS SPACES
Units 2K–2L, 2nd Floor E.C. Valle Commercial Center M.L. Quezon Avenue Brgy. San Isidro, Angono, Rizal
(02) 7255 5568
0995 846 2495 | 0917 123 1017
info@msscorporation.com.ph
www.MSSCorporation.com.ph

What happens after the strategic plan is approved?
The plan should be cascaded into departmental, team, and individual responsibilities. Progress should then be monitored through regular performance reviews, corrective actions, and updates to the strategy when conditions change.

Looking for a Strategic Planning Consultant in the Philippines?

Your Strategy Guy helps government institutions, private companies, associations, and other organizations develop practical and execution-ready strategies through:

- Strategic planning consultancy
- Strategic planning facilitation
- Government strategic planning
- Balanced Scorecard development
- Strategy Map development
- KPI development and alignment
- Strategic planning training
- Strategic planning resource speaking
- Tactical and operational planning
- Departmental cascading
- Strategy alignment workshops
- Strategy execution training
- Performance review facilitation
- Post-planning advisory support

A strategic plan should not become another document that is approved, distributed, and eventually forgotten. It should become a management system that helps the organization:

- Decide what matters most
- Align people and units
- Measure progress
- Assign accountability
- Review performance
- Adapt to change
- Fulfill its mandate more effectively

Clarify the mandate. Align the institution. Measure what matters. Execute with accountability.