

A low-angle, upward-looking photograph of several modern skyscrapers with glass facades. The buildings are illuminated from within, creating a warm, golden glow that contrasts with the clear blue sky. The perspective makes the buildings appear to converge towards the top of the frame, creating a sense of height and scale.

Deloitte.

Three steps to sustainable
and scalable change

Part 3: Redefining functional
service delivery to achieve
organizational scalability and
efficiency

Updated April 2016

Due to ongoing demand, this report has been updated to reflect changes in the marketplace. The third update discusses how to determine a more optimal distribution of work for employees under a service delivery model framework, including the split between transactional and knowledge-based tasks, and the impact that work fragmentation can have on service delivery effectiveness. The new sidebar, “Global Business Services,” discusses some of the differences between Global Business Services (GBS) and traditional shared services, common advantages of GBS, and how GBS is expected to evolve, including the impact of Robotic Process Automation (RPA) and enabling analytics on shared services.

About the series

Creating sustainable and scalable improvements to a company's cost structure is like building a skyscraper. The first step is choosing or clearly defining the right business model, which provides a blueprint for the effort. The second step is determining how decisions will be made. This serves as a strong foundation. The third and final step is mobilizing resources and putting the decisions into action, which is analogous to actually constructing the high rise. When improving their cost structure, many companies try to jump directly to the construction phase. However, the results are generally disappointing and, even if they are acceptable, they are usually hard to sustain.

Deloitte's three-part series, "Three steps to sustainable and scalable change," takes a detailed look at what is typically necessary to produce cost structure improvements that can withstand the test of time

Part 1

"Rethinking a company's business model," provides fresh and practical views to help companies choose or confirm the right business model. This can serve as a blueprint to guide the overall effort.

Part 2

"Aligning operational governance with the business model," presents a framework for aligning and improving the way decisions are made and executed. This step can provide the foundation for lasting improvements; yet, in our experience, it is the one step companies are most likely to overlook.

Part 3

"Redefining functional service delivery to achieve organizational scalability and efficiency," explains how to construct an effective service delivery model. It identifies ways companies can deploy their resources to create a cost structure and generate performance improvements that are able to satisfy the specific needs of the business.

These three steps can help companies make sustainable and scalable improvements to its cost structure.

A function's service delivery model defines how work adds value and relates to the business. Is work unique to local markets or generic enough to be consolidated and centralized? Is it knowledge-based or transactional in nature? During times of business contraction and growth alike, companies should re-examine this balance to adapt to changing business priorities and imperatives, and to produce significant net cost savings and higher effectiveness. Ultimately, maximum value for minimum cost is the power of an effective service delivery model.

When corporate executives consider making organizational changes, they usually move straight to restructuring or realigning resources. There are two key steps, however, that should be considered before a single resource is redeployed:

First, you need to confirm, change, or adjust your company's business model. By business model, we mean the way a company organizes or structures itself to go to market, interfaces with stakeholders, and reacts to external events. The business model serves as the blueprint for a corporate transformation or restructuring effort.

Second, as with a construction project, the foundation needs to be laid. In a business this is the operational governance that conforms to the business model. Operational governance establishes how decisions

are made and defines the roles and responsibilities of corporate and the business units or divisions. In general, it's how key decisions are made.

With the blueprints in hand and foundation in place, you're now able to build the new structure – that is, change how your organization deploys its resources. The objective, and likely the biggest challenge, is to align the way work gets done with the business model and to drive structural cost reduction, along with sustainable and scalable change.

The service delivery model – a construct for change

Since there are varied types of work and ways to perform them, a service delivery model (SDM) serves as a way to help you tell the work types apart and evaluate their ultimate impact on company performance. An SDM starts with the notion that there are four different types of work for each functional area, described in the pages below. How that work is organized and managed will be different for each of the four types.

Eliminating, or at least significantly reducing, random allocation of resources is at the heart of what an SDM is designed to help you do. This means aiding you in understanding the various ways work gets done and answering questions about what, where, who, how, and why (figure 1).

Figure 1: What Service Delivery Model (SDM) analysis evaluates

SDM analysis helps you evaluate each function	
What	What type of work, key processes, and activities are involved?
Where	Which geographic aspects of the operations are involved?
Who	Which resource in the total delivery model will handle the work?
How	Which activities accomplish the work? What technology platforms support it?
Why	What's the rationale for the value in the approach deployed?

Source: Deloitte Consulting LLP


Depending on the company’s strategy and business model, SDMs will differ widely both between companies and across functions – from the traditional SG&A functions, such as human resources, information technology, finance, and marketing, to line operations or operational support functions, including production planning, research, engineering, or safety and environmental protection.

a basic two-by-two SDM matrix (figure 2) – can assist you in defining work according to how it adds value and relates to the business. Work adds value by meeting defined service levels or efficiency requirements; for example, through processing transactions at the lowest possible cost or through more strategic ways that require management involvement and knowledge-transfer activities.

Segmenting the types and nature of functional work

In addition to helping you understand the basic parameters of the work, a visual depiction of the SDM – in the form of

Figure 2: The SDM organizational matrix



Source: Deloitte Consulting LLP

In terms of how work relates to the business, a company should allocate resources based on whether the work is or should be generic – and, consequently, delivered company-wide – or whether it’s specific to a business unit or division, and therefore should be delivered locally.

As mentioned above, there are generally four different types of work for each function, depicted by the quadrants in the SDM matrix: site support, transaction processing, center of expertise (sometimes called knowledge-based work or center of excellence), and business partner. Each quadrant calls for a different skill set or capability, and each should be managed differently. For example, consider

how the finance function might separate functions into quadrants:

- Inventory accounting typically maps to site support (Quadrant 1 in figure 2) and financial analysis to business partner (Quadrant 4) because both tend to be specific to the business units or divisions.
- Accounts payable, however, fits in the generic transaction processing quadrant to help optimize efficiencies (Quadrant 2), and tax planning goes in the other generic quadrant of center of expertise that includes specialist activities (Quadrant 3).

Using this framework, you can analyze the current distribution of work and explore other approaches that might improve efficiency and effectiveness. This method of segregating the activities within a functional or operational area involves looking at individual activities, their nature, and what the service requirements are for these activities to support the business appropriately. Think of it as applying special magnets to the work activities to accomplish the segregation.


To determine the optimum distribution of work, a first step is to identify those activities that absolutely must be delivered on site to be effective. This can be called "inextricable" work since it requires on-site knowledge or relationships to effectively meet service requirements (figure 3). All work that is not inextricable should be considered for consolidation and standardization.

Figure 3: Applying magnets to determine optimal SDM

By analogy, when making adjustments, there are two large magnets that pull on functional activities

The inextricable local work magnet:

- Identifies all of the work that must be performed at a specific business unit/division site to maintain responsiveness to customers, facilitate a quick turnaround time, or to meet location/physical proximity requirements.
- Shows work that can stay local, however the rest can be consolidated, where it can be much more efficient.




The consolidation magnet:

- Pulls everything that is not site-specific or business unit/division-specific to be consolidated and standardized to produce scale.



Source: Deloitte Consulting LLP




Next, it's important to identify whether activities are transactional or knowledge-based. On the surface, many activities seem to contain mostly one or the other. For example, one would expect for IT to be overwhelmingly transactional. However, our experience shows that activities can sometimes show a more even split.

Case in point: A company with 100 offices recently acquired another company and wanted to harmonize the local office network. Through a survey, the company collected information on the number and types of activities required for each role. It revealed that each

activity required both transactional and knowledge-based tasks, but more importantly, that few activities showed a significant majority of one type or the other (figure 4). In this example, roles are made up of multiple activities, and activities are made up of multiple tasks.

Based on our experience, further analysis can often reveal that between 60 and 80 percent of the work volume is transactional in nature. This can create an opportunity to improve efficiency by either streamlining or automating activities and expanding shared services.

Figure 4: Share of transactional vs. knowledge-based activities for a specific company



Source: Deloitte Consulting LLP

We often find many roles contain multiple types of work. In some cases, we find roles that contain all four types: site support, transaction processing, center of expertise, and business partner. We examined this fragmentation at the company mentioned above and found many roles that required up to 5 different activities, instead of only 1 or 2 (figure 5). Roles that are highly fragmented spread effort among multiple activities, typically making it difficult for employees to excel at any one. This inefficiency can lead to reduced employee satisfaction and underdeveloped competencies when looking at the functional organization as a whole.

While it may be impossible or undesirable to fully separate transactional from knowledge-based work, designing roles that encourage specialization in just one type of work can improve a company's efficiency and effectiveness, and in some cases, employee satisfaction. Increased specialization in a particular type of work usually produces more effective and efficient service.

Extending the basic two-by-two SDM matrix

The two-by-two matrix described above works well in many situations, but companies with global operations may need a more encompassing approach – one that adds a third dimension (figure 6).


Figure 5: Example of work fragmentation for a specific company



Source: Deloitte Consulting LLP

Figure 6: Redefining the SDM for a global company

For global companies, a third layer of aggregation may be necessary for an effective SDM



Source: Deloitte Consulting LLP

How does it work? Consider the case of a consumer products company with operations in more than 70 countries. The company's existing SDM included some consolidation of back-office operations, but this was not a fully developed or coordinated solution. Company executives sought a more effective geographic vision and SDM to help them meet a wide range of delivery needs.

Analysis of the company's situation resulted in three recommended levels of aggregation (the original two-by-two matrix approach, as well as a geographic layer added on):

- Local delivery to accommodate truly unique work that is inextricable from local sites.
- Regional delivery to provide geographic, time-zone, and language coverage, and to leverage opportunities for labor rate arbitrage.
- Single-point delivery¹ to consolidate certain generic work in a single location to increase efficiency and coordination, as well as to enable backup redundancy and promote more effective business continuity risk management.

In addition to adding a third layer to the SDM matrix, companies with enterprise IT infrastructures may want to look beyond individual functional areas and apply the SDM to end-to-end processes. These might include record-to-report, purchase-to-pay, hire-to-retire, or, as in the case of the global consumer products company, forecast-to-stock.

Through its SDM analysis, the company discovered that it could aggregate many existing transactions within its forecast-to-stock process. For instance, several processes performed at the local level could actually be redesigned for delivery at a regional level. Likewise some activities, such as re-packs that were being performed in country-level warehouses, could actually be performed within international manufacturing centers. Only a few "inextricable" work activities, such as customer returns and inspections, remained at the local level to comply with local regulations. Figure 7 shows the resulting SDM with local work and two different levels of aggregation and consolidation.

Figure 7: SDM for a global forecast-to-stock process

	Transactional	Knowledge-based
Local	<p>Site support – Country/warehouse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receive, store and deploy finished goods • Determine discrepant material disposition <p>Site support – International manufacturing centers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand planning • Schedule production, supply planning • Purchase materials and services • Execute production • Palletizing process • Plant maintenance • Manage lots/batches 	<p>Business partner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vendor managed inventory • Product exit strategy • Monitor and manage supply chain KPIs
Regional	<p>Transaction processing/Shared services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statistical forecasting • Sourcing and procurement of primary transport • Manage purchased finished goods • Create and maintain purchase requisitions • Manage inventory, storage and movement 	<p>Knowledge centers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supplier quality assurance • Export • Customer returns • Manage material disposal and waste
Single-point	<p>Transaction processing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procure and manage subcontracting • Purchase materials and services from global vendors • Manage procurement contracts and requests for quotation • Manage master data (vendor and item data) 	<p>Knowledge centers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor and measure supply chain KPIs • Capacity planning • Global sourcing strategy

Source: Deloitte Consulting LLP

A closer look at the SDM components

To gain a better understanding of how SDM analysis can be used to break down types of work and the value they provide, take a closer look at the components of the SDM framework originally presented on page 8.

Site support

Site support work includes processes or activities specific to each business unit or division. This work tends to be so unique it is considered inextricable – it must be performed at the business unit or division to maintain responsiveness to customers, facilitate a quick turnaround time, or meet location or physical proximity requirements. It requires local interaction or data capture and manual processes. Examples include inventory accounting, in-store promotions, on-site technology support, and photocopying. This typically cannot be consolidated across the globe or even regionally.

However, decentralized business models, incomplete or ineffectively integrated mergers or acquisitions, management preferences, and legacy differences in systems, processes, and policies often cause companies to keep work local even when it clearly could be consolidated or centralized. Any of these factors can be the source of inertia that holds back the rationalization and realignment of functions. Ultimately, local site support work should be kept to a minimum, leaving truly unique work at the business units, divisions, or other local sites. By applying an SDM analysis to each function, you can take existing, widely dispersed work and consolidate it into a shared services center – or even outsource it – where it likely can be managed far more efficiently. This also allows you to redefine policies and processes and consider more automation of the work.

Transaction processing

Work that is not sensitive to location and is not knowledge-based falls into the category of transaction processing. Typically these activities are process-intensive, such as payroll, accounts payable, collections, and the IT help desk. Although much of this work could and should be consolidated because it is ruled-based, many companies still spread it across their organizations among divisions and business units. In an SDM analysis, it often shows up in the site support quadrant disguised as site-specific work.

The SDM analysis can help you distinguish transaction processing work from that which really should stay local. Everything else should be a candidate for consolidation at the corporate levels, in shared services centers, or through

an outsourcing provider. The analysis also can help you address process issues involving local site support work and transaction processing in parallel, with the objective of minimizing site support activities and maximizing the degree of standardization wherever possible.

While work consolidation, policy and process standardization, and automation are the main levers for this quadrant, don't forget service-level definition. Establishing service levels is key to achieving the proper balance between cost and service performance, moving to either point of the spectrum according to your specific needs.

Transaction processing activities, the quadrant into which the vast majority of most companies' activities fall, should add value through economies of scale that allow low-cost execution while meeting defined service needs, whether delivered regionally or through single-point delivery. Shared service centers also tend to be more easily scaled upward or downward than decentralized operations. They allow you to adjust your related SG&A spending faster in response to business and environmental changes.

To obtain additional savings, consider pursuing opportunities to offshore or outsource the shared service center. Outsourcing should be considered both selectively and more comprehensively. Time-to-value in consolidating transaction processing, along with your company's ability to execute consolidation strategies, may determine the attractiveness of outsourcing.

Center of expertise

An effective center of expertise (COE) leverages a company's core strengths by centralizing resources for any type of specialist activities or expert services that are not transaction-based. These expert areas require knowledge-intensive competencies and are able to drive policies and program design for the corporation. These typically include, for example, compensation and benefits design, internal audit, treasury and tax planning, architectural planning, engineering standards, product pricing, and knowledge management.

Companies often have underdeveloped or overly distributed COEs that are a loose network of resources assembling around a process or activity. For example, business units will have their own dedicated internal auditors instead of consolidating this service centrally in order to apply the knowledge across the company. The challenge is to connect these loose networks to define a community or working group and standardize the group's efforts to facilitate the ease of operations and a more coordinated impact in defining common policies or deploying leading practices.

Another common challenge with decentralized COEs is that employees with specialized knowledge often become distracted by transaction-related duties. This dilution of the specialized capabilities can lead to sub-scale performance in both types of work. Dilution can also prevent proper alignment and leverage of the employee's expertise.

At the other extreme, some companies that have established COEs can over-centralize, thereby becoming more of an administrative or transactional function. Functions that have a stranglehold on the company as they too vigorously pursue "functional excellence" can lose touch with value creation.

Ideally, COEs should manage enterprise-wide knowledge work, as well as related policies and programs. This means deciding what activities require a concentration of expertise; determining whether these activities can be consolidated across the globe or, at a minimum, regionally; and assessing what changes to the organization and talent pool are warranted. The goal is to organize experts and related resources and information so they can be shared, compared, and leveraged across all business units and divisions.

Since highly-leveraged knowledge work maps to the COE quadrant, it may also be the best point of entry for new information about, and benchmarking of, best practices from outside your company. In this way, the COE can recommend actions intended to create greater value in that function across the organization.

Although COE activities can carry a high price tag for the specialized knowledge they require, the expense can be offset by applying that knowledge to many different parts of the company. The new structure can provide high synergies, lower costs, and organizational flexibility.



Business partner

Business partner activities are characterized by several factors. First, this type of work tends to be non-transactional and knowledge-based, which moves it from the left side of the matrix to the right. Second, and perhaps most important, business partner work requires local management involvement or relates to decision support. This aspect moves the activity from the bottom of the matrix to the top and distinguishes it from COE work.

Business partners typically support local management teams using three competencies. First, business partners use local knowledge to advise on and support site-specific decisions. Second, business partners use relationships with site leaders to influence those decisions. Finally, business partners help local teams understand how their policies and practices fit into the larger corporate design. Examples of business partner activities include employee relations, and business and product planning and forecasting.

Similar to the site support quadrant, this work focuses on maintaining responsiveness to customers, improving turnaround time, and meeting unique location and physical proximity requirements by supporting local decision making or local management.

However, the business partner quadrant is typically the weakest part of an SDM because business partners often become mired in transactional activities. As a result, they may not be able to truly reflect or hold capabilities needed to perform as a business partner. They may also lack the necessary resources, tools, and training to allow them to earn a true advisory role to their leaders. Plus, because the work is distributed, there may be several employees in different business units exploring the same issue, such as engineering standards or ways to account for inventory.

Instead, activities that do not require site-specific input and management involvement should be pushed out of the business partner quadrant. For example, breaking down knowledge-based activities into smaller tasks may reveal activities that could move to the transaction processing quadrant – for instance, the data collection aspect of financial planning analysis. Other work might move to a COE so it can be leveraged by all business units and divisions.

Business model, operational governance, and SDM alignment – achieving sustainability

When you are architecting or redefining your company's SDM, an inevitable question arises: What is the most efficient and effective way to perform a given function in light of your business model and associated strategies?

Looking to the four typical types of business models – which range from decentralized (holding company) to centralized (integrated operating company) – to guide the deployment of resources enables you to use a systematic approach for improvement, as introduced in Part 1 of this series, “Rethinking a company’s business model.” There are clear implications under the holding company or integrated operating company, as well as the two models in between – strategic guidance and strategic control (figure 8). Work is distributed out to the sites in a holding company and consolidated for an integrated operating company, with a mixture in between on the business model spectrum.

Both efficiency and the corporate footprint tend to increase along the spectrum, from left to right. Typically, the greatest savings are ultimately realized through the integrated operating company model. Integrated operating companies often have a cost advantage in SG&A expenses


when compared to more decentralized companies.

Even a moderate shift from strategic guidance to the strategic control business model can yield several percentage points in savings, which is significant. This does not include the potential savings attainable by simply optimizing, as opposed to redefining, service delivery in each of the company’s key functional areas.

Although it is tempting for a company to consolidate work to keep costs down and possibly operate as if it were an integrated operating company, the savings will not likely materialize unless there is alignment between the SDM, business model, and operational governance (who decides what and how decisions are made – see Part 2 of this series, “Aligning operational governance with the business model”). If the SDM and governance are in conflict with the business model, the solution will not likely be sustainable. Additional savings outside of personnel-related efficiencies are also typical through operational governance realignment (e.g., policy redefinition to achieve standardization and redefine expectations or requirements, such as demand management).



Figure 8: The SDM shifts according to the business model



Source: Deloitte Consulting LLP

Along with the organizational differences, work gets distributed differently between corporate and operating units under each of the business models. Using Figure 8 as a guide, consider how the different business models and the distribution of work in an SDM are related:

Holding company. In the typical holding company model, all work is performed locally in the business units with minimal synergies and considerable redundancy. Each business unit has its own HR, IT, finance, marketing, engineering, and operational support functions. This business model tends to have the smallest corporate headquarters footprint, so the SDM mapping on the two-by-two matrix will be top-heavy, with most of the work residing in the site support and business partner quadrants.


Strategic guidance. Moving slightly toward more centralization, companies using the strategic guidance model consolidate some work – mainly transactional – into shared service centers, or more typically “consolidation,” or through outsourcing to take advantage of synergies. This model attempts to help business units and divisions retain knowledge-based functions and processes, but still relies on much of the work to be done at local sites in a distributed manner. It still has a small corporate footprint and, consistent with the name, corporate typically exercises only guidance on the strategy of each business unit.

Strategic control. Companies under the strategic control model typically use consolidation to balance even more work between corporate and the business units. Transaction-based processes are often consolidated in shared service centers and some knowledge-based functions move to corporate. Because of a strong corporate center that exercises control, much of the work is done centrally – so the corporate footprint is larger than in the strategic guidance model.

Integrated operating company. Combining shared service centers and a strong corporate center enables an integrated operating company to realize significant synergies because of consolidation of all transaction-oriented work in shared services centers and specialist, knowledge-based work at the corporate level. This business model typically has the largest corporate footprint, so the SDM mapping on the two-by-two matrix will be bottom heavy, with most of the work residing in transaction processing and center of expertise quadrants.

The SDM should depend on the business model and it should be supported by key operational governance considerations (figure 9). Moving to the right on the business model spectrum toward strategic control and integrated operating company typically results in corporate picking up more responsibilities across all types of work. For example, shifting from strategic guidance to strategic control means pulling transaction-oriented work, such as accounts payable, from the divisions and business units and consolidating it in a shared services center. Conversely, moving to the left on the business model spectrum toward strategic guidance or holding company means that more work will be localized in the business units and divisions.

Figure 9: Typical reporting of staff² and core³ functions under different business models



Source: Deloitte Consulting LLP

Redefining the SDM can lead to significant, simultaneous changes across the organization. First, roles will change for many people in the organization as work is arranged to achieve an optimum distribution. Not only will some individual jobs change, but also entire units, functions, or departments as they align to an improved way of doing things. Often, organizational capabilities may be insufficient to operate under a new SDM and, as a result, there is a combined challenge and opportunity to improve the overall organizational capability and culture.

The organization structure will change as the modified roles are grouped together and employees take on new responsibilities. This extends all the way from corporate to the business units and the field.

With all of this change, you shouldn't assume that the organization will have adequate capabilities in key performance areas. For example, as the focus turns to a single type of work, organizations typically adjust their work processes and measurement activities. So a new


organizational structure will likely demand that you devote time and effort to building new capabilities.

Since business units relate to one another differently, you may also need to change how decisions are made. As a result, you'll likely need to adjust your governance processes and decision forums along the way.

The SDM is at the center of all these adjustments. It serves as a focal point and a basis for management consensus – inside and outside the function. That's why companies that use SDM effectively require that functional service delivery and related governance are part of every function's annual strategic planning process.

Figure 10 shows how adjustments in SDM can lead to changes in organization structure – in terms of both governance and service delivery, and at both headquarters and in the field. The SDM helps guide optimum placement of activities based on the business model and objectives that your company is pursuing.

Figure 10: The SDM's impact on organizational structure and placement of activities



Source: Deloitte Consulting LLP

Given the transformational changes that are likely when you refine your SDM, consider making the SDM analysis and subsequent actions a dedicated program with an authoritative leader. Apply effective change management practices to prepare your organization and to effectively lead it through the transition.

Global Business Services


For over 20 years, companies have used shared services and outsourcing to help reduce costs and improve service delivery. This has left some companies operating multiple shared services centers and managing outsourcing vendors independently. Recognizing the opportunity to improve, many companies are integrating the locations, governance, and business practices of their shared services and outsourcing operations by implementing Global Business Services (GBS). GBS organizations combine these activities under a single coordinated leadership, service, and investment umbrella, enabling companies to gain not only traditional shared services benefits like quality improvement and cost reduction, but also other demonstrated benefits like reduced risk due to global locations and providers. As a result, for many companies, GBS represents a new, more capable and robust platform than traditional shared services for driving economies of scale, skill, business insight and results.

Industry-leading GBS organizations often share common characteristics and behaviors. Deloitte⁴ describes these attributes as necessary to drive the sustainable performance improvements most organizations seek. They include:

- **Multi-function:** GBS organizations typically include multiple business functions, like HR and IT, and have significant interaction across those functions
- **Multi-region:** GBS organizations support most, if not all regions in which the company does business
- **Multi-location:** GBS organizations typically have multiple locations, but often fewer than if not managed under the GBS umbrella
- **Multi-sourced:** GBS organizations combine shared services and outsourcing in a variety of ways depending on business need
- **Multi-business:** GBS organizations support more than one business unit, if not all of them, across the company

However, not all GBS organizations share each of these attributes across the board. Figure 11 shows the percentage of companies surveyed whose GBS organization exhibit these attributes.

Figure A: GBS attributes




Source: Deloitte Consulting LLP Shared Services Survey Results 2015

The characteristic most core to GBS operations is multi-function. GBS organizations bring together multiple functions, including traditional transactional functions, like HR and IT, to help increase economies of scale, control, and information sharing. However, with increased scale and reach, GBS organizations tend to be better equipped to add knowledge-based functions like procurement, customer care, and risk management. Multi-sourced is the least common characteristic among respondent GBS organizations, however we still consider it a key design element and expect it to become more common as organizations grow more agnostic to outsourcing⁵.

GBS organizations are typically able to gain substantial benefits over traditional models. For example, placing procurement and finance under one GBS organization enables end-to-end purchase-to-pay processing, enhancing visibility to sourcing and creating the potential for significant spend reductions⁵. In addition, GBS organizations often can better support a company's growth strategy. During mergers, acquisitions, and divestitures, GBS models can help reduce the cost of operations and provide quick access to data to support management decisions.

In general, GBS is a more robust version of the traditional shared services concept. As a result, GBS organizations are typically able to achieve the same benefits associated with traditional shared services models, including better service levels, greater focus on the core business, and improved control, but on a global scale. Figure 12 shows the results of a recent survey of companies with a GBS organization and the specific benefits they have achieved. And by incorporating knowledge-based functions, GBS can support business decisions, rather than just operations. This helps position the GBS organization as not just a business partner, but a producer of competitive advantage for the company.

Figure B: Common benefits of GBS organizations



Source: Deloitte Consulting LLP Shared Services Survey Results 2015

GBS is a result of natural maturation and integration of key components of functional service delivery and is now a common component of the modern global corporation’s operating model landscape. It has become a core building block of company business models and not only can create meaningful value on its own, but can also enhance the value of other business model elements.

GBS and the Way Ahead

GBS is expected to continue to experience a growth in role, sophistication, and impact with big data analytics. Continued aggregation under single leadership will likely enhance scale, learning and cross-pollination, and dissemination of analytical techniques and insights. The broad GBS knowledge work may also ultimately experience the lifecycle of centralized creation followed by fragmentation upon specialization to meet local business needs. In fact, there might be some “swinging of the pendulum back the other way” as companies rationalize and pull back some transactional operations that were outsourced since they may provide more value if integrated more closely with core operations and the functional knowledge work.

GBS capabilities will evolve with technology. For example, continuous improvement work will likely become more data-driven as the mining of transaction data expands in capacity and reach. A virtuous cycle will play out where good robotics provides data that enables better analytics. Robotic Process Automation (RPA) can enable the average customer from the business unit to obtain immediate support especially in the initial phases of the process. RPA can reduce the need for labor intensive human hours to navigate the process, enabling dramatic cost savings, reduced process cycle time, better quality, improved audit and compliance analytics, and movement of operations up the value chain⁶. GBS employees can specialize as a result to provide the most efficient and effective services possible. GBS will continue to move to a leaner, more efficient operating model going forward in part due to automation.

Robotic Process Automation and Analytics are key developments that will enable the evolution of the next generation of leading-practice GBS organizations.

Potential Impact of Robotics and Artificial Intelligence:

- Automate routine, time-consuming tasks
- Improve efficient use of GBS resources due to automation
- Enable a greater focus on data- and value-driven process improvement
- Enable GBS to deliver higher-level, judgment-based services to the business

Potential Impact of Enabling Analytics:

- Use disparate sources of data to generate progressively deeper insights
 - Report historical information
 - Investigate root causes
 - Identify correlations
 - Predict outcomes
- Achieve better integration with Global Process Owners due to a more quantitative approach and work elimination

Effectively deploying resources

Appropriately deploying resources using a rationalized SDM is key to scalability. By consolidating work that lends itself to standard operation and assigning only essential work to local units, you can increase efficiency and help functional and operational organizations “scale up” in response to business growth. In this way, functional costs do not necessarily grow at the same rate as revenue. And in times of business contraction, bringing better balance to functional SDMs can help you in your efforts to produce significant net cost savings and increased effectiveness.

The view from the top of your skyscraper

The metaphor used throughout this series of discussions about structural change is the building of a skyscraper. The first part, choosing the right business model, created the blueprint for the effort. The second part, designing effective operational governance, laid the foundation and

the final part, developing an effective SDM, is analogous to actually constructing the high-rise. While the efforts involved in refining your SDM and making the subsequent organizational changes can be substantial – some might say monumental – the expected benefits should be just as significant in terms of cost savings and operational performance, impact and effectiveness. Aligning these SDM efforts with your business model and related strategies, and your operational governance and related strategies, is key to producing a solution that is both scalable and sustainable. Once the new SDM is in place, construction is complete and your skyscraper is now a fully-functioning building, ready to deploy resources and deliver services. Being at the top of the skyscraper should give you a clear view in all directions and the clarity to make more informed, and valuable, business decisions.

Evaluating your Service Delivery Model

Is it time to redefine your SDM? The following questions can help you decide.

- Does your organization have minimal functional redundancy or fragmentation?
- Are expenses by function equal to or lower than your peer companies?
- Are the roles and responsibilities of your corporate office clear?
- Do all key decision makers understand their role in the larger organization and when/how they should interact with corporate counterparts?
- Do business units have a voice for significant decisions which impact them?
- Are shared services and COE capabilities prevalent in your company?
- Are functional service levels consistent across functions throughout your company?
- Is outsourcing or offshoring optimized in your organization?
- Are there few and well defined executives titles/ roles for key functions in the company?
- Are you taking deliberate steps to advance your service delivery or are you passively adjusting with the market?
- Does your company currently have a Global Business Services organization?

If you answered “no” to many of the above questions, it is worth reconsidering your current SDM.

Endnotes

- 1 Commonly referred to as “global” delivery. This term is potentially inaccurate as differences in language and time zones prevent many activities from serving every country across the world. We use “single-point” to better describe the concept of activities that can be delivered from a single location, instead of many regional or local locations.
- 2 Staff function: Includes administrative or support functions (e.g., HR, Finance)
- 3 Core function: Includes non-SG&A functions and/or functions related to the main purpose of the enterprise
- 4 Global Business Services: Better together (Deloitte LLP, 2013)
- 5 Deloitte Consulting LLP Shared Services Survey Results 2015
- 6 “Automate this: The business leader’s guide to robotic and intelligent automation” (Deloitte Development LLC, 2015)

Authors and contacts

Authors

Omar Aguilar

Principal
Deloitte Consulting LLP

Rick Ferraro

Director
Deloitte Consulting LLP

Contributor

Kevin Pitchford

Manager
Deloitte Consulting, LLP

U.S. Contacts

Omar Aguilar

Principal
Deloitte Consulting LLP
215.246.2382
oaguilar@deloitte.com

Jean-Emmanuel Biondi

Principal
Deloitte Consulting LLP
404.631.2503
jebiondi@deloitte.com

David Brainer

Principal
Deloitte Consulting LLP
513.784.7230
dbrainer@deloitte.com

Ted Choe

Principal
Deloitte Consulting LLP
312.486.1466
techoe@deloitte.com

Thomas Compernelle

Principal
Deloitte Consulting LLP
312.486.4775
tcompernelle@deloitte.com

Rick Ferraro

Director
Deloitte Consulting LLP
703.251.3685
rferraro@deloitte.com

Mark Hopkins

Principal
Deloitte Consulting LLP
702.893.3106
mahopkins@deloitte.com

Caleb Longenberger

Principal
Deloitte Consulting LLP
513.929.3386
clongenberger@deloitte.com

Mike Puleo

Director
Deloitte Consulting LLP
212.618.4919
mpuleo@deloitte.com

Faisal Shaikh

Principal
Deloitte Consulting LLP
214.840.7321
fshaikh@deloitte.com

Hanif Sidi

Principal
Deloitte Consulting LLP
312.486.3707
hsidi@deloitte.com

Faisal Yousuf

Principal
Deloitte Consulting LLP
312.486.3046
fyousuf@deloitte.com

Global Contacts

Omar Aguilar (Global Leader)

Principal
Deloitte Consulting LLP
+1 215 246 2382
oaguilar@deloitte.com

Anne Gronberg (Finland)

Director
Deloitte Finland
+358207555607
anne.gronberg@deloitte.fi

Yusuke Kamiyama (Japan)

Partner
Deloitte Tohmatsu Consulting LLC
+818043677943
ykamiyama@tohatsu.co.jp

Julian Dolby (Australia)

Partner
Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu
+61 7 3308 7203
jdolby@deloitte.com.au

Laurent Touboul (France)

Partner
Deloitte France
+33 1 58 37 96 08
ltouboul@deloitte.fr

Federico Chavarria (Latin American Country Organization)

Partner
Deloitte Consulting
+50622465300
fechavarria@deloitte.com

Jean-Michel Mollo (Belgium)

Partner
Deloitte Belgium
+ 32 2 749 57 33
jemollo@deloitte.com

Harald Proff (Germany)

Partner
Deloitte Consulting GmbH
+4921187723184
hproff@deloitte.de

Froylan Campos (Mexico)

Partner
Deloitte Consulting Mexico
+52.55.50807046
frcampos@deloittemx.com

Ulisses de Viveiros (Brazil)

Partner
Deloitte Consultores
+55 11 5186 1004
uviveiros@deloitte.com

David Wu (Hong Kong)

Partner
Deloitte Advisory (Hong Kong) Limited
+852 22387248
davidwwu@deloitte.com.hk

Willem Christiaan van Manen (Netherlands)

Director
Deloitte Consulting B.V.
+31882883118
wvanmanen@deloitte.nl

Chris Lynch (Canada)

Partner
Deloitte Canada
+14166016581
jclynch@deloitte.ca

Gupta Gaurav (India)

Senior Director
Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu India LLP
+91 124 679 2328
gugaurav@deloitte.com

Joachim Gullaksen (Norway)

Director
Deloitte AS
+47 905 34 970
jogullaksen@deloitte.no

Ulrik Bro Muller (Denmark)

Partner
Deloitte Denmark
+45 30 93 40 13
umuller@deloitte.dk

Umberto Mazzucco (Italy)

Equity Partner
Deloitte Consulting SRL
+39 0283323053
umazzucco@deloitte.it

Irina Biryukova (Russia)

Partner
Deloitte Russia
+74957870600
ibiryukova@deloitte.ru

Global Contacts (continued)

Eugene Ho (Singapore)

Executive Director
Deloitte Consulting Pte Ltd
+65 6232 7133
eugeneho@deloitte.com

Mat James (UAE)

Partner
Deloitte & Touche (M.E.)
+971 2 408 2424
matjames@deloitte.com

Daryl Elliott (South Africa)

Associate Director
Deloitte South Africa
+27731955829
delliott@deloitte.co.za

Simon Brew (U.K.)

Partner
UK1W
+44 20 7007 8989
sbrew@deloitte.co.uk

Alejandro Requena (Spain)

Socio
Deloitte Consulting, S.L.
+34 963506243
arequena@deloitte.es

Faisal Shaikh (U.S.)

Principal
Deloitte Consulting LLP
+1 214 840 7321
fshaikh@deloitte.com

Ozgur Yalta (Turkey)

Consultancy Partner
Deloitte Danismanlik A.S.
+90 212 366 60 77
oyalta@deloitte.com

About Deloitte

As used in this document, "Deloitte" means Deloitte LLP and its subsidiaries. Please see www.deloitte.com/us/about for a detailed description of the legal structure of Deloitte LLP and its subsidiaries. Certain services may not be available to attest clients under the rules and regulations of public accounting.

This publication contains general information only and Deloitte is not, by means of this publication, rendering accounting, business, financial, investment, legal, tax, or other professional advice or services. This publication is not a substitute for such professional advice or services, nor should it be used as a basis for any decision or action that may affect your business. Before making any decision or taking any action that may affect your business, you should consult a qualified professional advisor.

Deloitte shall not be responsible for any loss sustained by any person who relies on this publication.

Copyright © 2016 Deloitte Development LLC. All rights reserved.
Member of Deloitte Touché Tohmatsu Limited