Operational Excellence

Finding the Right Formula for High Performance
During the recent recession, when the pressure was on to improve capital efficiency, many companies focused solely on the execution of their business—the people, processes, technologies, and organizational designs needed to extract the most business value from their capabilities and assets. While this approach did produce benefits, there was an opportunity to seek a larger prize.

Take, for example, the case of an integrated paper manufacturer that was seeking to improve the performance of its 105 distribution centers. In addition to thinking about ways to strengthen execution, executives at the company asked counterintuitive questions related to structure—questions about the company’s operating model and asset footprint such as “Do we even need 105 distribution centers? Why should we try to make a particular center more productive if we don’t really need it?”

These questions led executives to reduce the company’s distribution network to about 60 centers, then improve the efficiency of those remaining facilities by emphasizing efficient execution—for example, reducing SKUs and increasing inventory turns. The result? A smaller asset footprint, improved productivity at each center and a return on assets that nearly doubled. All of these gains have positioned the company for strong growth as it exits the recession.

During the global downturn, many businesses cut costs and boosted efficiencies to survive. Now they face a question that involves far more than just survival: how to use the money liberated by cost-cutting and efficiency strategies to fuel new growth. Those that pursue operational excellence—making savvy choices about operating structure as well as about execution—will be best positioned for future success.
This example clearly illustrates Accenture’s perspective: companies that pursue operational excellence must simultaneously seek the right mixture of structural and executional changes to experience game-changing transformation. Further, our experience shows that operationally excellent companies iteratively apply a disciplined three-step approach that enables them to continually hone their competitive edge no matter what market discontinuities may be affecting their industry (Figure 1):

1. They understand their competitive essence—the one area or process in which they must perform better than anyone else in their industry to profit from discontinuities and deliver a distinctive value proposition to their customers.

2. They define their operational excellence strategy—determining the right blend of structural and executional changes they must make to deploy and sustain their competitive essence.

3. They choose the right change journey to implement the structural and executional moves they want to make.

In the remainder of this paper, we’ll explore this approach in more detail. First, though, it’s helpful to take a closer look at why operational excellence is more important today than ever before.
Why Operational Excellence Matters

Operational excellence is a valuable differentiator because it generates competitive strength as well as the cost and cash benefits often associated with the notion of well-managed operations.
Operational excellence enables a company to achieve significant and measurable performance improvements by focusing on the levers that enhance flexibility and speed to market, quality and reliability, and customer value.

However, operational excellence is not simply about doing the same things better. It stems from the way the business is set up, or structured, and how the work is executed on a day-to-day basis to leverage what the company does best. In addition, operational excellence is a journey, not a destination: companies must revisit decisions about structure and execution regularly to achieve the flexibility and leanness needed to respond to a changing business environment.

The challenge is that market discontinuities—changes reshaping the business landscape, such as technological advances, shifts in consumer preferences and the rise of new competitors—regularly outstrip executives’ abilities to respond. The questions tumble out: “Do we have the right capabilities and assets to win in our chosen markets?” “Do we have the right people, processes, technologies and organizational design to extract maximum business value from our capabilities and assets?” “Are our organizational structure and executional tactics reinforcing each other—or working at cross-purposes?”

Market discontinuities can also take the shape of overarching, huge-scale changes positive or negative—such as global economic recession or recovery. Consider a global mining company that predominately mines silver and gold. In today’s market, these commodities are selling at extreme highs. However, this wasn’t always the case, nor will it necessarily be so in the future. In this type of environment, managers at the company should base structure and execution decisions on how best to maximize mineral assets (structure) and production (execution) at different points on the price curve (Figure 2). They should aim for flexibility – the ability to speed up production during points of high prices and to shift to efficiency of production during times of low prices.

As the economy recovers, investors will likely move funds from commodities back to equity instruments, driving the cost of precious metals downward (all other factors being equal). The mining company’s management team will need to ask questions such as:

- What is the process and model for positioning our assets?
- When a mine is dormant, what do we do with high-cost equipment? Can we lease it to others?
- What is the right mix of regional versus centralized support?
- When is it time to invest in new equipment versus sustaining older equipment?

The three-step approach toward operational excellence can help executives in this industry—and in every other industry—begin generating informed responses to such questions. Let’s examine each step in turn.
The Operational Excellence Approach

1. Understand Your Competitive Essence
2. Define Your Operational Excellence Strategy
3. Choose the Right Change Journey
1. Understand Your Competitive Essence

To parry the threats and seize the opportunities presented by market discontinuities, every company should have a strong grasp on its competitive essence—something the organization does better than competitors to drive value for customers. Competitive essence is the mechanism by which the organization fulfills its promise of value to customers and creates economic profit. Apple, for instance, fulfills its value proposition of innovative, intuitive and “cool” products through a competitive essence comprising user intimacy and leadership of multimedia convergence. Walgreens’ value proposition centers on convenient locations and a reputation as a trusted advisor. It fulfills these promises through superior site selection and world-class pharmacy operations. IKEA’s value proposition is all about providing innovative yet functional and affordable products—which it accomplishes by being a differentiated low-cost provider and developing designer products at mass-market pricing. And Southwest Airlines—renowned for its value proposition of providing low-cost, convenient point-to-point service—does it all by sticking to a simple and effective operating model featuring high employee empowerment.

Competitive essence stems from a firm’s market focus and position, its distinctive capabilities and its performance anatomy (including key mindsets such as willingness to invest in skills development). In short, it constitutes what a company’s “famous for”—specifically, its efficiency, its products or services or its relationships (Figure 3). A company’s competitive essence is difficult for rivals to imitate. Clearly communicated by senior leaders, it should be easily summarized by everyone in the organization. For instance, when President John F. Kennedy famously asked a janitor at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration what he did, the man replied: “I help men get into space.”

By understanding their company’s competitive essence, managers can ensure that actions they take to parry emerging threats or capture new opportunities support—rather than erode—what their company’s famous for.

---

**Figure 3: Competitive essence: “What we're famous for”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We deliver value through producing products &amp; services: We are a Value Chain</th>
<th>We deliver value through solving problems or exploiting opportunities: We are a Value Shop</th>
<th>We deliver value through mediating and facilitating exchanges: We are a Value Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We are famous for: <strong>Our Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>We are famous for: <strong>Our Products &amp; Services</strong></td>
<td>We are famous for: <strong>Our Relationships</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Buy</td>
<td>Apache Corp.</td>
<td>Masstrcard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB InBev</td>
<td>Bechtel</td>
<td>UPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHP Billiton</td>
<td>Harrah’s Ent.</td>
<td>American Airlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merck &amp; Co.</td>
<td>AMGEN</td>
<td>eBay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinal Health</td>
<td>Joy Global</td>
<td>NYSE Euronext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intel</td>
<td>Thomson Reuters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nike</td>
<td>Boeing Corp.</td>
<td>Apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; Johnson</td>
<td>IDEO</td>
<td>Cisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sony Corp.</td>
<td>Macquarie Bank</td>
<td>Google</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirque de Soleil</td>
<td>Boston Scientific</td>
<td>Symantec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson Musical</td>
<td>Pixar Animation</td>
<td>Vivendi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon</td>
<td>Walt Disney</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive Insurance</td>
<td>Young &amp; Rubicam</td>
<td>NetJets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMG World</td>
<td>AECOM Tech.</td>
<td>U Notre Dame [custom EMBA]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAA</td>
<td>BlackRock</td>
<td>Sotheby’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordstrom</td>
<td>Schlumberger</td>
<td>Viad Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayo Clinics</td>
<td>HSBC Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goldman Sachs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
2. Define Your Operational Excellence Strategy

Understanding your organization’s competitive essence helps you formulate an operational excellence strategy—a plan for deploying and sustaining your competitive essence.

Your operational excellence strategy comprises decisions about two elements affecting your ability to deploy and stay true to your competitive essence: (1) structure and (2) execution. In brief, we think of structure as the “what,” “who” and “where” of a business’s operating model and assets. That is, what capabilities and assets will your business need to leverage and sustain its competitive essence? Who will carry out those capabilities and manage those assets? Where will the capabilities be carried out and the assets located? Execution is the “how” of your operating model and assets; specifically, how will you deploy people, processes, technology and organizational design (such as governance structures) to extract the most value from your operating model and assets?

**A Closer Look at Structure**

The questions about what capabilities and assets you need, who will perform and manage them and where they will be performed and located constitute one way to think about your company’s operating model and asset footprint. A clearly defined operating model indicates the way a business organizes its capabilities to execute its business strategies. The operating model is designed and developed based on external and internal priorities—from regulatory trends and long-term supply-chain costs to changing skill sets within the company’s workforce and improved technology capabilities. It is built through strategic decisions about customers, products and routes to market, and it delivers the capabilities you need to deploy your company’s competitive essence.

Crafted effectively, the operating model enables your organization to take advantage of opportunities presented by market discontinuities, such as accelerated growth openings in emerging economies. It also positions your organization to benefit from its global scale while remaining locally responsive, and to spread leadership talent across the enterprise to support growth in new markets. The right operating model takes full advantage of rapidly developing global talent, skills and cultural differences. And it mitigates the rising risks inherent in an increasingly interconnected global economy.

A company’s asset footprint consists of tangible and intangible ingredients that combine to create competitive advantage, value for customers and cash flow for the organization. Examples of such ingredients include a company’s IT systems, its network of sources for raw materials, its outsourcing suppliers and its configuration of manufacturing facilities. The asset footprint must be keyed to the company’s operating model to extract the most value from both of these structural elements. For example, if the firm’s operating model is set up to enable global, regional and local operations, IT systems must be configured to support decision-making at all three of these levels as well as proximity to customers. And manufacturing facilities must be located strategically, to lower costs, drive growth and maximize capacity.

**A Closer Look at Execution**

Execution is strategy in motion and getting that motion right is just as vital as the strategy and structure itself. While structure set the direction towards how value will be created; execution is the engine that delivers the value. Our experience has shown that achieving execution excellence requires the activation of five powerful and mutually reinforcing enablers.

1. **Focus**
   Identifying, targeting and prioritizing a series of synchronized actions across the enterprise to generate rapid impact as well as support long term transformation.

2. **Simplicity**
   Eliminating the complexity (at organizational, offering and process levels) that is not valued by customers and / or destroys shareholder value.

3. **Speed**
   Measured at the enterprise level – literally delivering customer value in the absolute least amount of cycle time through agile and waste-free processes; responding swiftly and flexibly to changes in the global business environment and market demand.

4. **Discipline**
   Sustaining momentum and direction of proactive transformation through a performance management system, while establishing repeatable, reproducible processes that deliver certainty of outcome while optimizing returns on capital.

5. **Journey**
   Understanding that achieving execution excellence requires a series of architected actions, not a single step, that aggregate toward a desired future state; mapping out the required route, understanding current maturity, gaps to performance and specific actions to remedy. This enabler serves as a foundation for the other four enablers.

**Combining Structure and Execution**

In any company, structure and execution are not independent of one another. Rather, they interact in ways that can help—or hurt—the enterprise’s ability to compete. Companies that create the right formula for mixing their structural and executional moves catalyze a strategic advantage that’s
far more powerful and enduring than any one of those moves would have created on its own.

But to arrive at the right formula, business leaders must know how their company’s structure and execution interact to enable the firm’s competitive essence—or how they must interact to sustain that essence in the face of market discontinuities. Take the integrated paper manufacturer described at the beginning of this paper. This company understood that improving execution of its distribution processes in terms of efficiency and productivity would enable it to eliminate some of the assets sitting on its balance sheet (namely, a large number of distribution centers). The result was not only a reduction in structure-related problems (such as extra inventory) but also a higher return on assets, which reflected an improved bottom line. Simply put, the company began making more money with fewer assets. By hitting on the right structure and execution formula for its unique situation, the firm achieved an advantage over competitors that proved not only sustainable but also impossible for rivals to copy.

To position your company to achieve the strongest growth, you need to look at the structure.execution equation through a “both/and” lens rather than an “either/or” one. The “either/or” perspective—ignoring structure in favor of execution, or vice versa—can be dangerous. For instance, suppose you head up a well-established business-to-business service provider that sells to companies in many places around the world, but you don’t have local operations in these various geographic locations. You believe there is significant potential to grow your business further. Even better, some of your larger clients in other countries are practically begging you to open up in-country offices and facilities—promising to buy extensively from you if you do so.

The opportunity seems ripe, and you’re determined not to miss out. You begin establishing executional elements you see as crucial to getting operations up and running swiftly in these countries. For example, you hire a small local staff, install IT systems such as customer databases and set up order-fulfillment processes. But soon after your new operations have begun, problems crop up. These troubles include illegal actions on the part of local managers, delays in delivering services and the discovery that some of the technologies you put in place aren’t needed after all.

Your mistake? You invested heavily in execution before thinking about how best to structure your operations and assets in your target countries. If you had researched the nuanced differences between how business is done in your target countries and in your home country, you would have recognized the importance of attending to structure—the what, who and where of your capabilities and assets—before working out executional details. (see “Successfully Managing the Structural Side”)
Successfully Managing the Structural Side

One global consumer packaged goods producer that has excelled at managing the structural side of the operational excellence formula continuously reworks its operating model to maintain its structural advantage over rivals.

For example, three decades ago, the company was configured around a multi-local model—decentralized, independent operations set up to maximize profits locally. Today, it’s set up to offer “global localization”—tapping the best of both global and local expertise through a networked business model designed to address the imperatives of spurring growth, acquiring and retaining talent, securing resources and managing volatility and risk. As a result, it has sustained superior economic returns (Figure 4). In effect, the company has gone “super global and super local,” leveraging multi-tier products in all categories, low-cost operations in all areas and innovation rooted firmly in consumers’ needs.

Figure 4: Globalization is one factor forcing operating models to change

Performance

Vertically Integrated Businesses

1980s

Multi-Local Model
- Decentralized, independently run markets
- Key goal: local profit maximization

Regional/ Functional
- Regional management units on top of OpCos
- Regional integration of supply chain/back office
- Key goal: Cost-cutting to deliver competitive advantage

1995

Global Brands
- Market Teams
- Global Supply
- Global F&A
- Global IT
- Global HR

Front End Businesses

1995

Leveraging Regional Shared Services

2000

Global Model
- Global operating model and business functions
- Standardized global processes
- Global brands & innovation
- Key goal: Revenue and cost synergy through leveraging global

2006-2007

Global Localization
- Simplified around category, market and business service outcomes
- Super local and super global
- Key goal: Total system profit maximization
Finding the Right Formula

So how do you arrive at the right formula for structural and executional moves? Which side of the equation should you start with, and how much emphasis should you put on each? While the point about the importance of making both structural and executional changes may seem obvious on the surface, many managers have difficulty thinking about how to define the best blend for their organization. To complicate matters, every company will have its own formula that’s right for its situation.

Of course, if you had infinite resources, you would tackle the full range of all structural and executional improvements that are possible to make. But few (if any) companies have unlimited resources. Thus you need to decide where to start, and where to focus. We’ve developed a few guidelines that can help.

Certain circumstances call for starting with structural changes and then moving to executional moves. Specifically, if your company is about to go under, you’ll likely want to initiate structural modifications that deliver results quickly—such as outsourcing noncritical, high-cost activities that are not your company’s core competencies, or centralizing support functions across multiple locations that have similar operations.

Likewise, if your company wants to expand internationally and aims to set up operations in countries where consumers and markets behave differently than they do in your home country, then you’d also want to start with structural decisions. For instance, if you’re a retail business seeking to grow in an emerging market by serving unfamiliar types of customers, you may need an entirely new set of capabilities to serve those customers in those new locations. To illustrate, you might need to reduce the number of product categories you offer if customers in those locations can’t afford your higher-end products. You may need to change your pricing strategies. And perhaps you’ll want to beef up your salespeople’s negotiation and margin-analysis skills if the customers in those new locations is to bargain rather than simply agree to a price stated by the seller.

Moreover, the people who perform the capabilities you need may be different from those who perform them in your home country. For example, you may decide to outsource some capabilities rather than keep it in-house. And where you locate your human capital assets might be different depending on your company’s circumstances. As just one illustration, suppose there’s a huge growth opportunity for your company in Brazil, with relatively low associated risks, and market conditions in Brazil are similar to those in your home country. In this case, you may want to establish just a few pricing staff in Brazil, and continue relying mainly on your pricing department at headquarters to manage this capability for the Brazil business.

In short, businesses that are in serious trouble or that want to set up operations in places that differ markedly from their home country will need to make structural changes before establishing executional moves.

On the other hand, if your business is running relatively smoothly or you want to expand into markets where customers and markets behave in familiar ways, you may decide to start with executional changes to lay the groundwork for operational excellence, and then move to structural changes. Attention to execution can quickly deliver three important advantages: simplicity, speed and discipline. (see “Starting with Execution”)

You can improve your company’s execution through several means, including Lean Six Sigma programs, performance management, cultural engagement (embedding skills such as change leadership, decision making and problem solving at the right levels in your organization), value chain analysis, analytics and complexity management. (see “Managing Complexity”).

Characteristics of the industry you compete in—such as capital- or labor-intensity, growth within the industry and maturity of the industry—can also offer clues about whether structure or execution should figure the most heavily in your operational excellence strategy. Accenture’s analysis of multiple industries suggests a range of possible general scenarios for companies’ structure/execution formula.

For example, in capital-intensive industries such as mining and oil and gas, the lion’s share of changes may center on execution, because assets in such industries are not all that portable. In an industry that’s growing fast, a company may want to place greater emphasis on structure, to scale up operations quickly to seize advantage of the growth. Companies that are young and innovative in a fast-growing industry may want to attend just as much to execution as to structure, because establishing repeatable, reliable and certain processes is key to capturing growth opportunities.
Starting with Execution

An auto-parts manufacturer Accenture worked with was struggling with several execution-related problems—including complexity (for example, proliferation of low-volume end items as well as major components), sluggishness (its manufacturing cycle times were twice as long as the industry average) and lack of discipline (revealed as defects in products delivered to customers and high process variability).

To combat these challenges, the company launched a series of execution-related initiatives focused on enhancing speed and agility while ensuring superior service levels and certainty of outcome for customers. The historical manifestations of long manufacturing cycle times, poor responsiveness to market demand and lack of focus on the customer experience had led to flat revenues, poor returns on invested capital and low operating margins — in fact return on capital was negative 2 percent. A holistic diagnostic confirmed the correlation between poor executional and poor financial performance and helped identify a prioritized set of actions and a transformation strategy. The initiative began by rationalizing the customer base and focusing on profitable high-volume product families, not low-volume specialty items. These initial simplification initiatives and a small number of execution improvements helped reduce manufacturing cycle time from 14 days to just 7 but the company didn’t stop there.

The operations diagnostic proved that with a concerted effort it was possible to reduce manufacturing cycle times by another 50 percent, from 7 days to 3, and this became the organization’s single focus. Subsequent execution improvements included rapid set-up at work stations and flexible manufacturing methods, analytically calculating minimum safe batch sizes, improved process flow, visual management, standard work, process stability controls and ultimately implementing pull systems. This strategy led to 99.7 percent on-time delivery and improved process cycle efficiency from 3 percent to 17 percent. Why such a fanatical focus on cycle time? It was found that by reducing manufacturing cycle times from 14 days to 3 these executional improvements could actually affect structural improvements. These structural improvements included reducing the number of warehouses and distribution centers which drove returns in invested capital from 9 percent to 33 percent and Economic Profit from (-2 percent) to +21 percent. The resulting operational excellence enabled the company to deliver on its competitive essence of delivering its customers superior service levels, consistently high quality and reliable delivery times twice as fast and their peers.

This competitive advantage was validated by its increase in market share capture: Over three years, the company’s percentage change from its baseline revenue jumped from 170 percent to 230 percent to 300 percent.

Managing Complexity

A leading international manufacturer of home appliances we worked with had faced several problems that threatened to erode its competitiveness—including shrinking demand owing to a downturn in construction stemming from the global economic recession, volatility in raw materials pricing, and wild fluctuations in exchange rates. It had tried to reduce complexity and increase speed of product development and order delivery by consolidating parts usage. However, the effort had stumbled because of difficulties coordinating across the company’s global product development and procurement groups. Moreover, the company’s numerous global design centers didn’t share the same product development system and processes. Thus executives had trouble controlling the development of new parts and assuring optimal part selection for its products. A spate of acquisitions had only increased the company’s product complexity and parts fragmentation.

Executives didn’t fully grasp the cost of the complexity that had crept into their firm, though they believed that beefing up their executional capabilities could help them save $1 billion over three years. They decided to work with Accenture to launch a complexity management effort. The effort comprised numerous actions. For example, the company rationalized product components by procuring greater volumes of components (such as switches and water valves) that were common to significant numbers of products rather than designing the components anew. It also eliminated minor characteristics that weren’t adding any value to certain components and materials and consolidated components into lower-cost functional equivalents.

Changes in organizational structure that backed up the simplification drive included consolidating suppliers, migrating suppliers to low-cost country sourcing, negotiating additional discounts with consolidated suppliers, and reconfiguring procurement and engineering groups across the global regions where the company does business.

The work paid big dividends—including consolidation of 40-70 percent of parts and savings of $185 million within just several years.
It is not enough to know what structural and executional changes your company must make to achieve the right blend for deploying its competitive essence. How you make those changes matters too. Choosing an appropriate change journey is critical because each company has a different context for change, a unique starting point and its own "corporate DNA"—all of which influence the type of journey that will work best for the organization. The task, then, is to select the appropriate change journey, and to embark on it with wholehearted commitment and full preparation. Accenture has identified three change journey types:

**Continuous Improvement**
- Programs that focus on building excellence in execution

**Targeted Interventions**
- Efforts that span structure and execution in a key functional area

**Transformational Program**
- Top-down projects affecting the entire organization.

Owing to the complexities of markets, customers, business units and departments, most companies try more than one type of journey at the same time. For example, a company may have put in place an organization-wide Lean Six Sigma program for continuous improvement. But executives may decide that it would also be prudent to launch an end-to-end transformational program for a particular business unit that is delivering poor performance.

Given the possible journeys, how do senior managers determine which will work best for their companies? Many argue persuasively for discrete incremental efficiency programs while others present equally powerful arguments in defense of wide-ranging, highly public multi-year transformation initiatives. The uncertainties around which journey to choose are compounded by the myriad other priorities competing for C-suite executives’ time and by the array of conflicting advice they continually receive. More than a few executives, concerned about making the wrong decision, default to launching many small programs in a bid to "make something work." Others end up analyzing endlessly. Most, when asked later, concede that they wish they had made firmer decisions earlier.

To select the right type of change journey, executives can ask questions such as "How large is the required change?" "What types of journeys have been successful for us in the past?" "Does the change center more on structure or execution?" Answers to these questions will point to particular types of change journeys as more or less promising. For example, companies seeking to make incremental changes related more to execution than to structure would likely select the continuous improvement type of journey, enabled through programs such as Lean Six Sigma Execution and Capability Building.
Those that want to make larger changes related more to structure than execution may pick the transformational journey type, enabled (for instance) through reinvention of their global operating model (Figure 5).

Below, we take a closer look at each type of change journey:

**Continuous Improvement**
This change journey usually involves a large number of small initiatives led by divisional or geographical leaders. Continuous improvement initiatives yield quick benefits, require small relative investments and tend to become a natural way of doing things. This journey best suits an organization that believes it has defined a solid target operating model and that tends toward decentralization of authority to carry out changes to its operating model.

**Targeted Intervention**
This is the most common type of journey. The aim is to focus on the area that will yield the largest return on investment. There is typically a compelling reason to change—a threat caused by a market discontinuity or a new opportunity for growth—along with a sense of urgency. In this type of journey, an organization decides to make big changes to its operating model, but chooses to do it a piece at a time, often with the goal of de-risking the change initiative. For example, the company may require deep functional change such as creating a new shared services entity, pulling into shared services something that previously had been handled in its geographies or divisions, or improving its profit equation by creating a tax-efficient supply chain. Targeted interventions limit the risks of failure because management has not “bet the company” on a big program that consumes everyone's attention.

**Transformational Program**
Here, the journey involves change on a grand scale, often with complete reinvention of the operating model and big shifts in the organization's structure to sync up with the business strategy. Where there is the right DNA in the company and the right C-level leadership to drive the program, transformation is usually the fastest way to get a big change implemented and to leapfrog the competition. For each company, transformation might mean something completely different. To illustrate, in the chemicals industry, businesses aren’t likely to dramatically change their organizational structure, as their asset footprint (such as hydrocarbon cracking facilities) are constrained to appropriate geographic locations. Thus these companies would rely more on executional changes than structural changes to drive transformation. In other industries, transformation may pivot almost entirely on reconfiguring a company’s operating model and asset footprint.
Next Steps: Accenture's Operational Excellence Diagnostic

As we saw in the examples from different industries discussed above (mining, automotive manufacturing, consumer goods, home appliances), each company will have its own specific challenges, unique to its current circumstances and industry; its own capabilities and assets; and a discrete environment in which it operates.

To help companies get started, Accenture has developed a comprehensive survey-based, online diagnostic tool that is convenient to use and easy to access. The diagnostic factors in not just where your organization is now in terms of the economic cycle but what the underlying foundation for the organization’s operational excellence performance over time is. It identifies the market discontinuities that threaten to reshape your industry’s landscape and helps your organization capture its competitive essence in terms of its market focus and positioning, distinctive capabilities and performance anatomy.

The tool generates a set of information-rich outputs, including graphic representations of the opportunities presented by the market discontinuities in your industry and the sizes of those opportunities. Perhaps most valuable, these outputs start to reveal the structure/execution formula that could best enable you to exploit the most promising opportunities facing your firm. You also see feedback identifying the capabilities most critical to your company’s ability to achieve operational excellence, given the market discontinuities affecting your industry.

Following the approach to operational excellence in not an easy task.
Conclusion

The message is clear: In good times and bad, operationally excellent companies pull ahead—and stay ahead—of the competition by establishing the right structure and building their executional prowess. Most critical, they identify the right mix of structural and executional changes that they must make to remain at the head of the pack in the face of even the most daunting market discontinuities. And they continually review and refresh the formula as needed to adapt to a shifting business landscape.
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