The end-to-end vision
Driving an effective end-to-end process improvement strategy

Insights from: BP, GSK, AstraZeneca, NelsonHall, Horses for Sources, University of Exeter and Genpact
A clear view

According to a recent study by the Chartered Institute of Management Accountants, *Finance Transformation, The Evolution to Value Creation*, the number one change required to improve finance function contribution is an increase in cross-functional collaboration and business partnering. NelsonHall’s recent study of finance and accounting process satisfaction among businesses in continental Europe found that, while they are largely satisfied with their capabilities in running day-to-day financial processing, less than half are satisfied with the way their finance department supports business goals. According to Katharina Grimme, research director at NelsonHall, some organisations are now looking to introduce business-oriented metrics into their operations. There are two possible goals for doing so: to improve service delivery, or to achieve better business value. For a number of reasons, those who have adopted business process outsourcing are better positioned for the introduction of business-oriented metrics.

In this supplement, *FDE* will glean insight from experts and executives driving process strategy from leading global companies and will look at current problems that companies have in their back-office processing operations, specifically those that cut through the finance function such as order-to-cash and source-to-pay. We will then look at the importance of companies adopting an end-to-end, business outcome and customer centric approach and finally look at how companies can go about successfully improving process both in-house and in collaboration with an external partner.

**Steve Dunkerley**
Project director and associate editor, *FDE*
stevedunkerley@globaltrademedia.com
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Problems with process

As enterprises grow organically or through acquisition they can remain tied into legacy systems or conflicting processes. For businesses operating multiple subsidiaries or units across a number of global locations processes are often duplicated. The first step towards gaining control is assessing why this happens and what the consequences of such neglect are.

For Genpact COO Tiger Tyagarajan, companies are not structured to effectively think in terms of processes with departments separated by invisible walls, blocking the flow of information.

“Businesses do not apply a standard framework or science to processes and they have very few benchmarks and targets for the metrics to run these processes. They neglect to manage, measure, control and remove waste and variation from their sub-processes. The repercussions include ineffective processes that drain available cash but more importantly, impact customer satisfaction – a key measure of success, more so now in today’s turbulent economic climate.

A clear example of where this ‘siloied’ behaviour creates extensive damage is the order-to-cash (OTC) process – the sequential steps from acquisition of a customer’s order up to the customer’s money reaching the supplier’s bank account. The OTC process is at the core of any business and yet it is the most difficult to track as a process and even the smallest error can make the process ineffective, quickly draining available cash. One of the common OTC errors is when a customer does not pay the full amount when billed for such things as unbudgeted discounts, discrepancies on prices, shortages of orders or damaged goods. Between 6% and 12% can be avoided. Around 50% can be reduced by re-engineering the OTC process. This could translate to a business impact of $50–70 million for a typical CPG company of $5 billion.

While processing a certain number of invoices within a certain time frame is important, it is not as important as ensuring the invoices are at the right price, at the right cost, agree with what was contracted, capture discounts and are paid at the right time. Yet the number of invoices processed is what companies typically measure and are measured on.

By concentrating on transactional metrics, we often end up missing the bigger picture of how effective a process is in achieving its potential. If one doesn’t have an end-to-end view one doesn’t know where the leakage is.”

SEP business impact – order-to-cash

Order-to-cash (sales fulfilment, accounts receivable and collections): In the consumer packaged goods industry, Genpact’s SEP cuts preventable deductions (such as spoilage, pricing errors, fines and fuel surcharges) by 50% to 75%. For a $5 billion company, this translates into $50–70 million business impact. SEP uses analytics to identify root causes of deductions, identify and prioritise improvement areas, and apply upstream process fixes including reducing packing issues at the warehouse and inconsistencies in receiving at the client site.
End-to-end thinking

There are clearly problems with the way processes are managed in today’s enterprise and one of the issues is that processes continue to function as silos. Why is this and what is the solution?

Irene Ng, University of Exeter

Professor Ng, who is also a service fellow at the Advanced Institute of Management and a visiting fellow at the University of Cambridge, argues that a large part of the problem is down to the nature of modern education.

“Our scientific educations have taught us to be reductionist in that the division of a complex problem into separate components is acceptable and that the elements of the whole are the same when examined independently of the whole as when they are examined as a whole. Think about the way we go through our lives; the whole ‘plug and play’ mentality has made us troubleshoot systems by taking out bits at a time, looking at them, changing them, fitting them back and expecting things to work. This is fine if the linkages between the components are weak but disastrous if the linkages are more important than the components.

Systems thinking is important in understanding value and outcomes because it radically changes the way we think and we really have to start thinking in this way. The world we are currently operating in is becoming more complex, where components cannot be analysed on their own, but must be considered within their whole, as the interactions between components are key to achieving system level outcomes. Our world is evolving towards complex systems where offerings are interconnected. The nature of the interdependencies is being changed by technologies moving towards convergence, resulting in the involvement of multiple stakeholders and multiple customers all contributing resources into the system and paying for different facets of the system and deriving different benefits.”

Tiger Tyagarajan, Genpact

Tyagarajan fleshes out this idea of systems thinking and describes it as taking an end-to-end approach to business processes.

“At a fundamental level all businesses are a set of inter-related processes. Everyone has core enterprise level processes that cut across their organisation such as order-to-cash and source-to-pay among others that lend themselves to standardisation easily. Once a standardised framework has been established it is easy to set measurements against it to determine benchmarks and gain intelligent insights.”

Pascal Henssen, Genpact

Henssen highlights that the boundaries of traditional end-to-end processes can be shifted, creating new opportunities.

“For Genpact there is a fundamental difference between purchase-to-pay (P2P) and source-to-pay (S2P). P2P is looking at the process from the moment a PO or requisition is raised to the point of payment. Source-to-pay includes true end-to-end business processing including spend analytics, category management, sourcing, running e-auctions, and supplier negotiations. Genpact
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is an industry leader in the sourcing part as well as the administrative P2P part. For some of our clients we do spend analytics to identify the unmanaged spend. We also manage categories and have people who do sourcing activities on behalf of clients. For some clients this is limited to so-called low-dollar sourcing which means negotiating and making sourcing decisions on purchases below a certain threshold that would typically be below the client’s sourcing team’s radar and drive hard savings in that area. And for some customers we are involved in tactical sourcing where we drive savings on bigger ticket items.

Besides bringing real savings that impact the customer’s profitability directly, it also enables us to look at the true end-to-end process of source-to-pay. We have learned that many improvements in the P2P process start with changing processes, behaviours and policies in the sourcing process. And when providing both services to the customer it is even easier to find and drive improvements.

**Philip Whelan, BP**

*The opportunity for enterprises to adopt an end-to-end approach to process has been enhanced by technological developments, most notably Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP). ERP has helped an increasing number of enterprises move processes into a shared services environment either as an internally owned captive operation or via a third party provider. For BP’s downstream business in Europe, Whelan oversees a hybrid model consisting of a global network of captive shared services centres in Chicago, Budapest and Kuala Lumpur in addition to outsourced operations based in India and Poland. The operating framework is designed to align the outsourcers to report and be managed by a central business service centre to ensure proper alignment and delivery of business impact.*

“I think that ERP advances as well as other technology aspects have been key enablers in the end-to-end story. However, there is also another emerging story which is the market evolution with more mature buyers being prepared to think outside of the box, not just consider outsourcing solutions but captives and indeed a hybrid of both. This thinking has allowed companies to start looking across processes from the perspective of a value stream map and then define their strategy in a manner that optimises the delivery proposition for the key elements of each process. Those delivery elements will consist of cost to deliver, desired quality, repeatability of the process and cycle time. Without ERP advances, it would be very difficult for companies to actually deliver the end-to-end process design desirable. I think the majority of companies think in end-to-end terms today – the reality is that it’s not a new concept for most – but what is new is the way in which companies are trying to optimise the process from a people, technology and delivery model perspective.

In terms of utilising third party outsourcers, we are very focused regarding where we deploy, at what level and with whom. In our opinion, sustainability of the work done by such groups is best advanced by having longer term strategic relationships so that the consultant develops an intimate understanding of our business over time which supports more optimal advice and work performance.”

**SEP business impact – source-to-pay**

Source-to-pay (procurement, supply chain management and accounts payable): For a $5 billion manufacturing company, Genpact’s SEP methodology can reduce purchase spending by $50 million to $150 million over three years and deliver an increase of one to three percentage points in margins. SEP helps clients improve performance on key metrics such as concentration of spending, usage level of electronic auctions, and vendor scoring.
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BPO v shared services

One option enterprises have in order to drive “end-to-end” process improvements is to consolidate operations into internal shared service centres (SSCs) or “captives.” The key issue here is whether a DIY approach can deliver as much impact as having a specialist business process outsourcing (BPO) company manage these types of services.

Pascal Henssen, Genpact

Prior to his current role as a BPO leader, Henssen led GE’s Shared Services in EMEA. With a considerable track record on both sides of the fence, Henssen argues that it is difficult for a company to achieve true success without engaging in a third party.

“When it comes to a shared services environment, I have seen limited success with captive organisations driving end-to-end initiatives. I can think of only a couple of examples where an SSC had the maturity, leverage and external views to drive true end-to-end thinking and success. It is not impossible, and one of our pharma customers has done an excellent job of creating a successful SSC that is able to drive change and that I would consider close to world class. But even that SSC utilises a BPO for labour arbitrage and for getting continued best practice sharing and benchmarking.

The reason is that the SSC is not truly run like a business and measured that way. There is still a lack of true customer satisfaction metrics, relevant benchmarking and scale to make the necessary investment in both IT and people. For example, we have a sizable practice organisation that develops best practices and new products to bring to our clients. I have never seen that in an SSC. Genpact recognises that labour arbitrage is just table stakes: transformation and business outcomes are needed to win in the market place.”

Paul Blackburn, GSK

Blackburn describes how, after comparing internal shared services with outsourced delivery, GSK went for the latter.

“In 2000 we established internal UK shared services. However, as it was located in an expensive part of the UK, in 2004 we looked at what we could do if we retained the SSC ourselves in terms of process efficiency benchmarked with what we could do with a third party BPO provider and came to the conclusion that we could never match what we could do with Genpact and therefore lifted and shifted our shared services to that third party. If you move processes to a third party you need to get the basics right by ensuring that they run them efficiently, effectively and that they pass scrutiny from auditors. With your third party having access to a large volume of data and information around those processes, they are well placed to identify opportunities that can create value and prevent value leakage.”

Virtual captives

One of the key concerns about outsourcing is that handing over processes to a third party entails a loss of control. To tackle this issue, Genpact has developed a ‘virtual captive’ model, which has the look and feel of being an in-house operation.

“One of the things that attracts us to Genpact is the virtual captive model Genpact operates. It feels like an AZ office and that the people at Genpact are part of AZ, which gives us an unquantifiable benefit in terms of dedication to improve process,” says AstraZeneca’s David Powell.

For Genpact’s Tiger Tyagarajan, the model is far-reaching and flexible. “Virtual captives are well-positioned to build best-in-class processes because they work with multiple customers across the globe. They know what is possible and how good a process can be. Most importantly, the teams behave as one end-to-end team when dealing with clients and providers alike,” he says.
Outcomes-based contracting

Service level agreements have traditionally been used to guarantee quality in outsourcing deals, penalising a provider if they do not meet the expectations of the client. As structures become more complicated new models such as gain-sharing and the more radical outcome-based contracting are beginning to be explored.

Phil Fersht, Horses for Sources
According to Fersht, an increasing number of clients are looking for contracts with gain-share built into them from the start.

“Once at the table, buyers are asking ‘what else can you give me?’ Quite simply, there are a good number of providers today pushing services within a similar price-band and with sufficient track record of adequate delivery. Furthermore, most large enterprises have already experienced offshoring and outsourcing to varying degrees for at least several years now, and are smart enough to realise outsourcing provides an opportunity to deliver more than simply cost savings. Consequently, the ability to provide outcome-based pricing that is based on business improvements is now a critical component among a third of buyers, and an important consideration for most of the rest.”

David Powell, AstraZeneca
Powell, who drives the optimisation of AstraZeneca’s financial transaction processes, has been using a gain-share model with Genpact to drive a more intelligent approach to the relationship.

“The idea is that we will share some of the gain with them based on what they deliver to improve the process. We have designed accountability into our relationship with Genpact so that they are motivated to drive end-to-end processes rather than throwing everything at the part of the process they are executing themselves. The way they have designed it, they should be motivated to help AstraZeneca improve our own parts of the process, not just their part.”

Irene Ng, University of Exeter
Ng explains that outcome-based contracting (OBC) takes this concept a step further as the firm is tasked to deliver outcomes rather than merely assets or activities.

“It’s not really easy to implement OBC. Imagine English lessons being paid by how many English words come out of the student’s mouth. There is the determination challenge – which outcomes, there are measurement challenges – how do I measure those outcomes? Then there is the revenue challenge; how do I pay for them? Finally, there are major skill challenges because the teacher, for example, needs skills in psychology, or counselling to get the student to be motivated to learn, rather than just teach.”

Karen Mansell, AstraZeneca
Mansell is similarly cautious about the level of integration between client and provider that would be needed for an OBC deal to work.

“OBC has great potential, but the partnership needs a deep level of trust in order to work. OBC relies on high visibility to measure outcomes. Outsourcers must share responsibility for their clients’ balance sheet, while clients become far more dependent on their service providers. Client and service providers need a deep understanding of each other’s business. You have to know what you will gain in order to have a fair risk/reward profile. There needs to be a lot of synergy.

Suppliers have to open up about their costs, and there must be a lot of work on benchmarks, management policies and how to approach joint development. Buyers, too, must adapt as if you have a true partnership, you will want your supplier to improve, even if the supplier then sells those improved services to other customers. That can be hard for some companies to get their heads around. If you are considering outcome-based sourcing, you must know what you want at the start and have very clear criteria for the business case, or your supplier relationship will suffer greatly.”
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Process improvement strategy

An outcome-centric approach to outsourcing, be it through gainshare initiatives or a fully blown outcome-based contract, needs to be highly collaborative and maintain a focus on desired outcomes. With this type of collaborative foundation, a Lean Six Sigma process improvement strategy, which relies on the voice of the customer as a starting point, is now far more relevant and suitable to leverage in an outsourcing arrangement. GSK is one of a number of companies that has partnered with Genpact on Lean Six Sigma initiatives to drive end-to-end process effectiveness.

**Paul Blackburn, GSK**

Blackburn explains the importance of developing a partnership in the process improvement aspect of GSK’s outsourcing arrangement with Genpact and the need for his organisation to be equally committed to making the relationship work.

“Although we tap into Genpact’s investment in process improvement initiatives such as Lean Six Sigma, it means nothing unless GSK are committed as a business partner with our service provider. Genpact have a Lean Six Sigma rating on all of our processes. They have charts up on the wall and they have improvement themes during the year and at the moment we are on a major drive with them to improve the efficiency of a number of our processes. Genpact are a integral part of GSK’s strategic priority to simplify and we’ve come up with a game plan with them to simplify our processes more and make them more effective in terms of their operational efficiency and reliability.

We don’t just measure our BPO provider on outputs, we work in partnership with them to help their people develop and improve their quality, we don’t leave them alone in that respect. However, in order for us to get significant improvements in the entire process, GSK’s got to change. We can’t improve our effectiveness without a change in GSK. Ultimately, if GSK’s not up for it then our service provider can’t do much about it.”

**Pascal Henssen, Genpact**

Henssen argues that in order for co-creation to work best, there needs to be less emphasis on SLAs and more emphasis on desired business outcomes.

“Involving the customer in Lean Six Sigma is crucial. There are two parts of Genpact’s approach that ensure alignment with the customer. It starts by making sure goals are aligned. The only way to do that is to make sure that the SLA metrics in the contract are only considered hygiene and that the service provider and the client jointly agree on objectives for the end-to-end process and targets for the combined teams – preferably business outcome metrics that affect key customer priorities like cashflow, profit, customer satisfaction and compliance.

If you start with the customer goals, it ensures the Lean Six Sigma projects you engage in are aligned to them. Second, we actually often involve customers in our projects. If we do a Lean workout, it is often with upstream and downstream stakeholders from the customer in the team. When we define a Six Sigma project, we will discuss with the customer what we require from them. More often than not, opportunities to improve the process will require upstream changes on the customer side, be...
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Genpact’s end-to-end SEP methodology can deliver two to five times more impact than traditional efficiency efforts.

Philip Whelan, BP
While BP runs a hybrid (captive shared services and BPO) operation, the business outcome approach when utilising process improvement methodologies such as Lean Six Sigma is as much of a priority as if process were managed by a third party.

“Within BP our goal is to ensure a standard model for measurement of customer satisfaction whether it is internal or external customers. Our model supports the view that the drivers of satisfaction at the customer end are the same and our customers care more about the quality and outcome of service than whether it is provided by an OSP or internal captive. Our process model determines best fit in terms of which processes we outsource and the customer impact is a key driver in this respect. In this way we ensure that mission critical services are retained in-house for quality and customer assurance reasons but we are agnostic in terms of the expectation of service delivery for those processes. For example, we expect the captive or OSP to set and maintain the same standard of service performance.

The important aspect for our business shared services centre in the context of Lean Six Sigma is understanding these as being more about management approaches and not just tools. The key to driving transformation at a process level is understanding the desired outcome and how this outcome will benefit your customers and potentially provide a competitive advantage. The application in particular of Lean Six Sigma is indeed very powerful as it brings the rapid response of a kaizen event together with the analytical approach of Six Sigma to generate an optimal solution in the shortest possible cycle time.

We are focused on building and enhancing our DNA in these areas and it’s a core part of how we drive continuous improvement. One aspect which we pride ourselves on is ensuring a basic understanding of tools but paying more attention to how you select and apply the right tools as opposed to trying to have every employee certified as a black belt.”

Tiger Tyagarajan, Genpact
Lean Six Sigma process improvement projects for Genpact clients are increasingly being delivered by Genpact as part of a more in-depth process improvement programme known as the Smart Enterprise Process (SEP) framework (see diagram above left).

“The duration of a typical SEP engagement roadmap is around two to five years and is suitable for existing and new Genpact clients that require a step change in realising improved business outcomes and aspire to be best-in-class. SEP can be...
applied to 13 different end-to-end processes including order-to-cash, source-to-pay, record-to-report and industry specific processes such as visit-to-cash (hospitals) and application-to-inforce (insurance)

SEP is a very granular framework for managing business process. It couples Genpact’s deep domain knowledge of process, key insights and best practices with execution support including focused IT and technology applications, targeted analytics, reengineering and global delivery services. SEP rests on a solid foundation of running stable operations and driving improvements using Lean Six Sigma and Reengineering and all the metrics and benchmark we have collated over the last 12 years.

Compared with traditional efforts focused on efficiency within individual processes or business units, the end-to-end methodology of SEP can deliver two to five times the business impact. Companies that achieve best-in-class process performance realise markedly improved business outcomes.

For the same process, best-in-class companies can take 8-10 % cost out, companies that are laggard are able to achieve only 1-2 %. The impact is in millions of dollars.

Genpact has put in place a corporate-wide strategy to institutionalise innovation in client processes and has therefore invested heavily in the physical and virtual infrastructure required to drive targeted research projects in the SEP.

We have recently launched process innovation labs, dedicated physical centres to facilitate focused process-related research. Experiments are performed with processes by taking data and metrics, creating benchmarks and running processes, redesigning them and testing them out. As well as the labs, we also have a group of people at Genpact whose job is to find out ways in which processes can be improved; 250 Six Sigma black belts are roaming around our organisations finding opportunities to improve.”

Genpact has won the NASSCOM Innovation Award 2011 for Process Innovation for its Smart Enterprise Processes (SEP™), a unique scientific methodology for business process management.

Genpact COO Tiger Tyagarajan said: “This is a testimony of Genpact’s commitment towards process excellence and innovation for our clients... We’re thrilled that we have a number of clients who have already experienced the significant business impact that SEP provides.”

About Genpact

Genpact is a leader in managing business processes, offering a broad portfolio of enterprise and industry-specific services. The company manages over 3,000 processes for more than 400 clients worldwide. Putting process first, Genpact combines deep process knowledge and insights with focused IT capabilities, targeted analytics and pragmatic re-engineering to deliver comprehensive solutions for clients. Lean and Six Sigma are ingrained in the company’s culture, which views the management of business processes as a science. Genpact has developed Smart Enterprise Processes, a ground-breaking, rigorously scientific methodology for managing business processes, which focuses on optimising process effectiveness in addition to efficiency to deliver superior business outcomes.

Genpact has more than 43,000 highly skilled associates across a global network of more than 39 locations in 13 countries who provide services in areas such as finance and accounting, sales and marketing analytics, customer service, financial services collections and operations, supply chain and procurement services, aftermarket services, and enterprise application and IT infrastructure services.

For more information, visit www.genpact.com.

Genpact’s regional business leaders:

UK: Ahmed Mazhari, SVP
E: Ahmed.Mazhari@genpact.com • M: +44 773 333 2288

Germany, Switzerland, Austria & Nordics: Holger Reimers, VP
E: Holger.Reimers@genpact.com • M: +49 172 888 9000

Benelux & France: Koen De Rijcke, VP
E: Koen.DeRijcke@genpact.com • M: +32 475 974 173
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WE’RE BRINGING SCIENCE TO BUSINESS. BUT THIS IS NO EXPERIMENT.

There’s nothing experimental about 200 million transactions analysed and over 3,000 business processes managed worldwide. Introducing the Smart Enterprise Processes (SEP™) methodology, a framework of insights, best practices, technology, targeted analytics and pragmatic reengineering applied to key processes your company uses to manage its business. It’s this kind of thinking that has helped us to deliver over $2 billion in positive business impact to our clients last year alone. And that’s science you can’t argue with. Making your business more effective. It’s what we do. See what we can do for you at genpact.com.