Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study

goetzpartners’ view on world-class indirect procurement
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Executive Summary

For indirect procurement an integrated approach is required that takes into account unit cost savings, transaction cost savings and demand management as contributions to company success

- Seven large European corporations with cumulative annual indirect procurement volume of €17 bn participated in the benchmarking study
- Mature organizations handle unit costs, transaction costs and demand management in order to generate bottom-line savings
- Most indirect procurement initiatives are related to transaction costs, while generation of unit cost savings has become a routine task, and importance of demand management is increasing
- Key success factor for reduction of unit costs is the implementation of a consistent strategy on category level
- Indirect procurement departments focus on process automation (IT), outsourcing activities (internal & external) and process standardization to optimize transaction costs
- Management of indirect procurement demand is not the focus of indirect procurement functions today

Source: goetzpartners' Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
Study Scope

The scope of study covers eight common indirect procurement categories:

- Professional services: 15% (68%)
- Marketing: 3% (49%)
- IT hardware, software & services: 20% (36%)
- Facility management: 8% (26%)
- Travel: 4% (19%)
- Auxiliary supplies: 4% (10%)
- Fleet: 6% (9%)
- Training: 2% (7%)

Key observations:

- Categories in scope are relevant to all participants.
- Outsourced categories were not included.
- Other categories which are often managed by indirect procurement departments were excluded from the scope:
  - Raw materials and investment in manufacturing equipment, plants and buildings are very specific to each participant.
  - Logistics, subcontracting and maintenance, repair and operations, due to proximity to the participants' core business.
- Data in scope has been normalized to this definition of indirect procurement.

Source: goetzpartners' Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
Participants in the Study

Seven large European corporations with cumulative annual indirect procurement volume of €17 bn participated in the benchmarking study.

**Indirect procurement volume/revenue [%]**

- 17% (1 participant)
- 8% (2 participants)
- 7% (4 participants)
- 4% (5 participants)

**Industry sectors**

- TIME (Telecommunication, IT, Media and E-business)
- Industrials
- Automotive

- 1 participant
- 2 participants
- 4 participants

**Indirect procurement organization size [FTEs]**

- 0 to 150 FTEs: 5 participants
- 150 to 300 FTEs: 1 participant
- > 300 FTEs: 1 participant

**Key observations**

- Seven large European corporations across industry sectors with annual revenues > €10 bn were benchmarked with in-depth face-to-face interviews on indirect procurement strategy, organization, processes & IT, and budgeting & controlling.
- The indirect procurement volume of the participants represents between 4% and 17% of their revenues.
- While size, global presence and market environment varies greatly, the participants are facing the same challenges and have similar topics on their agendas regarding indirect procurement.

Source: goetzpartners’ Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
goetzpartners' Indirect Procurement Maturity Model

Mature organizations handle unit costs, transaction costs and demand management in order to generate bottom line savings.

**Areas**
- Negotiation
- Supplier portfolio
- Maverick buy
- Total Cost of Ownership
- Unit cost benchmarking

**Typical KPIs**
- Unit cost savings
- # of suppliers
- Maverick spend

**Areas**
- Organization
- IT-Systems
- End-2-end processes
- Human Resources
- Benchmarking

**Typical KPIs**
- Costs per PO
- # of HC
- # of POs

**Areas**
- Policies & enforcement
- Budget & volume control
- Bottom line savings

**Typical KPIs**
- Indirect procurement spend
- Quantity of goods procured, e.g. # of air miles

---

**Demand management**
Objective: reduction of indirect procurement volume

**Transaction costs**
Objective: reduction of organization and process costs

**Unit costs**
Objective: reduction of costs of material and services

Source: goetzpartners' Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
Participants' Indirect Procurement Initiatives

Most indirect procurement initiatives are related to transaction costs, while generation of unit cost savings has become a routine task, and importance of demand management is increasing.

- **Number of top indirect procurement initiatives**
  - **Dimension 1/unit costs**: 7 initiatives. Potential for bottom line savings mostly tapped.
  - **Dimension 2/transaction costs**: 20 initiatives. Potential for bottom line savings significant and partly untapped.
  - **Dimension 3/demand management**: 3 initiatives. Potential for bottom line savings mostly untapped.

**Key observations**

- Generation of unit cost savings is the primary objective of all indirect procurement organizations. It has become a routine task of indirect procurement. Initiatives in this dimension are mainly focused on long-term savings.
- Most initiatives are in the area of transaction costs. Main focal points are harmonization of IT landscape, efficient organization, and standardization of processes.
- Only a few indirect procurement organizations consider demand management as one of their objectives. Hence, only a few related initiatives are observed. Surprisingly, this also applies for indirect procurement organizations with a direct reporting line to the CFO. This leaves room for improvement and significant untapped potential in most corporations.

Source: goetzpartners' Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
Dimension 1/Unit Costs: Key Optimization Levers

Key success factor for reduction of unit costs is the implementation of a consistent strategy on category level

Top initiatives related to unit costs:

- Increase supplier competition (Sourcing) [3]
- Use systematic baseline for negotiation (Negotiation) [2]
- Increase volume in scope (Pooling) [2]

Key success factors:

- **Reduction of variety**
  - Optimize variety in the procurement portfolio to realize economies of scale, and to reduce process costs and logistic costs
- **Simplifying/Redesign-to-cost**
  - Simplify by reducing over-specifications with functional specs or
  - Redesign with functional and value analysis to reduce identified cost drivers
  - Use standard parts
- **Sourcing**
  - Increase competition between suppliers
  - Identify and qualify new suppliers
  - Transfer to emerging procurement markets in consideration of total costs of ownership
- **Pooling**
  - Bundle by supplier portfolio adjustment and/or
  - Coordinate different factories/facilities to achieve economies of scale

Reallocation:

- Analyze strengths and weaknesses (SWOT analysis) of current suppliers
- Reallocate volumes in supplier portfolio to achieve economies of scope

Negotiation:

- Use a proven open and structured negotiation methodology with transparency on costs and market
- Include supplier know-how to achieve competitiveness

Supplier relations:

- Partner with suppliers to achieve competitive advantages in quality, innovation, costs or time-to-market via supplier development and cooperation/integration

Contracting:

- Reduce working capital with payment terms
- Optimize forecast for frame contracts

Selected observations:

- Fleet category is not managed yet by indirect procurement in all organizations
- Highest potential: up to 30% savings achievement in professional services esp. marketing and IT
- Participants stated that a systematic negotiation approach resulted in higher savings even in mature categories

Source: goetzpartners’ Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
Dimension 1/Unit Costs: Unit Cost Savings & Number of Suppliers

Current savings achievements among study participants indicate that unit costs are almost optimized with an explicit effort on the reduction of number of suppliers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit cost savings [%]</th>
<th>Number of suppliers [in 1,000]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6% to 8%</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% to 6%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% to 4%</td>
<td>20 to 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key observations:

- Definition of unit cost savings varies: most common baselines are last year for repeat buying or best offer prior to negotiation for spot buying. The most advanced and sophisticated baseline for performance evaluation of indirect procurement is a bottom-up calculation of costs per product or service.
- Constant benchmarking of unit costs with other companies is common to stay alert and prevent missing any trends.
- Number of suppliers varies greatly – to an extend that cannot be justified by the size, complexity or global reach of the corporation. Pooling demand across stakeholders and regions is an untapped potential for some organizations.
- The average indirect procurement volume per supplier is about €300,000.

Source: goetzpartners' Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
Dimension 1/Unit Costs: Maverick Spend

Main objective for unit cost optimization is to increase negotiating strength through reduction of maverick spend

**Key observations**

- Reduction of maverick buy has been identified in most organizations as a key lever to reduce costs and volume. The increase of indirect spend under management is on the agenda of every indirect procurement organization, yet with different focus:
  - Increase negotiating strength with suppliers,
  - Post-merger integration of acquired organizations,
  - Reduce compliance risk
- Yet, most organizations emphasize efficiency in indirect procurement and deliberately accept maverick spend in smallest regions and sub-categories. This applies to all stages with supplier interaction: RFQ, offering, negotiation
- Early involvement of indirect procurement to pool demand and alter specifications is stated numerously as success factor
- The transparency on global spend per category is a challenge for most of the participants

**Source:** goetzpartners' Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
### Dimension 1/Unit Costs: Selected Findings

Some important KPIs seem neglected; external bundling is not seen as a key success factor

#### External bundling of demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes - ongoing</th>
<th>Yes - trial</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main categories in scope of external bundling:
- Office supply
- Marketing
- Travel
- Fleet
- IT
- Consulting

- Most companies have experimented with external bundling of demand, yet evaluations tend to be critical. An alignment of objectives, a win-win situation and the harmonization of specifications are required for a successful bundling partnership. In general, bundling is only reasonable in categories with a high degree of standardization.

#### KPIs in use [among top 5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred supplier coverage</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier performance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash/Payment terms</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of supplier competition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability of supply chain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Active management of supplier relations is considered important in most organizations. Yet only some of them name supplier-related KPIs, e.g. preferred supplier coverage, among their top KPIs.
- Return on capital employed – being a fundamental KPI in most corporations – is apparently neglected in most indirect procurement organizations: payment terms and management of cash as KPIs are rarely mentioned.
- Maverick spend and number of suppliers were not explicitly mentioned among top 5 KPIs.

Source: goetzpartners' Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
Dimension 2/Transaction Costs: Key Optimization Levers

Indirect procurement departments focus on process automation (IT), outsourcing activities (internal & external) and process standardization to optimize transaction costs

**Top initiatives related to transaction costs**

- Leverage IT for process automation: 8
- Outsource activities incl. shared services: 3
- Standardize procurement processes: 3
- Develop human capital: 2
- Reduce fixed production overheads: 2
- Roll out organization globally: 2

**Key observations**

- Standardization and further development of the IT landscape is on the agenda of all indirect procurement organizations.
- Most initiatives aim at increased automation, i.e. reducing of transaction costs. Other drivers for increased effort in this area include the harmonization of IT systems across regions and businesses, as well as achieving transparency.
- Outsourcing and the creation of company-wide shared service organizations for routine tasks have been mentioned frequently. The more complex the organization, the more it will value increased specialization and outsourcing of routine tasks in indirect procurement.

**Key success factors**

- Standard processes and integrated IT solution
- Balance between central and local procurement, with central governance and leadership
- Clear responsibilities and good level of internal communication
- Clear definition and separation of strategic, operational, and tactical procurement with respective localization of roles
- Systematic analysis and implementation of outsourcing potential

Source: goetzpartners' Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
Dimension 2/Transaction Costs: Organization

Most indirect procurement organizations are center-led or centralized with an identified challenge on the regional set-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Org. structure of indirect proc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center-led</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional spread of indirect procurement organization [FTEs]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APAC excl. China, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East, Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key observations

- All indirect procurement organizations are centralized. The degree of centralization varies with a favorite for center-led structures responsible for strategy and standards.
- Ideal mix of central vs. regional is a key challenge. Proximity to regional demand stakeholders remains crucial to success. Most organizations follow the rule: as much centralization as possible, and as little regional presence as necessary.
- Large portion of indirect procurement staff is still based in European HQs; relocation of procurement functions to low-cost countries is a significant lever to reduce costs.

Source: goetzpartners' Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
Volume procured per FTE varies significantly, which reveals untapped potential for many organizations.

**Key observations**

- The multitude of initiatives in IT, processes and outsourcing clearly indicates that transaction costs are top priority.
- This would suggest the use of process-related KPIs such as costs per PO. Surprisingly, only a few organizations have similar KPIs readily available. Most rely on more simple and also fundamental KPIs such as total costs and HC.
- For a few of the participants, the cost of the indirect procurement organization is still at a quite high level. In addition, the large spread of volume procured per FTE clearly reveals untapped potential for many organizations.

Source: goetzpartners' Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
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Dimension 2/Transaction Costs: Low Cost Countries and Outsourcing

Relocation of operational and strategic functions to low-cost countries and outsourcing are still areas for further savings

**Key observations**

- The creation of internal shared service centers is common. Often, all operational tasks are assigned to shared service centers in low-cost countries. In general, the advantages of shared service centers increase with
  - the footprint, i.e. number of locations and countries
  - the complexity of the organization, i.e. number of business units
  - the number of purchase orders
- Only few companies choose to outsource indirect procurement activities: ordering and IT procurement activities are most common. Outsourcing of other activities was not observed

Source: goetzpartners' Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
Two efficient ways of organizing indirect procurement appear:

- **Most common is the split into strategic, tactical and operational procurement functions. This allows specialization and close regional coverage.**

- **Alternatively, strategic and operational procurement functions are combined. This allows deep knowledge and close contact to the supplier base. It is more suitable for departments with a focused regional footprint.**

While strategic procurement is always company wide, some companies have operational and tactical on location or cross-location level.

Indirect procurement organizations become increasingly specialized:
- Financial functions are usually run by finance & controlling.
- Logistics are usually bundled for direct and indirect material in the logistics department.

### Structure of the indirect procurement organization [FTEs in %]

- **Strategic**
  - Min: 14%
  - Median: 18%
  - Max: 48%

- **Tactical**
  - Min: 18%
  - Median: 20%
  - Max: 65%

- **Operational**
  - Min: 20%
  - Median: 68%
  - Max: 65%

### Geographical reach of procurement functions

- **Strategic procurement** 100%
- **Tactical procurement**
  - Company wide: 43%
  - Cross-location: 43%
  - Single location: 14%
- **Operational procurement**
  - Company wide: 43%
  - Cross-location: 43%
  - Single location: 14%
Increased automation and integrated IT systems are prerequisites to lower process costs

### Key observations

- The share of catalogue orders is very diverse and ranges from 25% to 90%.
- Same applies for e-RFP/e-RFQ. No participant uses P-cards.
- The IT landscape along the indirect procurement process is generally very heterogeneous. Most common standard systems in use are SAP and Ariba. Many companies rely on own IT solutions for specific process steps.
- This applies especially for contract and supplier management. External market places/procurement platforms have been adopted only by some organizations.

### IT tools in use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT tool</th>
<th>Standard system</th>
<th>Company own system</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e-RFQ/auction</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand management</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract management</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier management</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External market place/proc. platform</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue management</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requisition approval</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing approvals</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: goetzpartners’ Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
Management of indirect procurement demand is not the focus of indirect procurement functions today

**Top initiatives related to demand management**

- **Budget control**: 2
- **Policy enforcement**: 1

**Key observations**

- Management of indirect procurement volumes still has a long way to go; only a few organizations have demand management as the primary objective of indirect procurement.
- Two approaches can generally be used for the active management of indirect procurement volume: budget control and enforcement of policies. Ideally, both are applied in an integrated manner.
- While budget control poses certain requirements on budgeting processes and IT systems, policies have the power to steer indirect costs for relatively little effort. However, this lever is often not pulled: indirect procurement is often not involved in the content of policies; the responsibility for creation and maintenance frequently lies with other departments – e.g. HR, IT. The simple requirement to involve indirect procurement has the potential for substantial bottom-line savings.

**Key success factors**

- Stakeholders’ budget at category level
- Link between procurement categories and general ledger accounts (P&L elements)
- Early involvement and integration of procurement savings in budgeting/forecasting process
- World-wide policy deployment and enforcement
- IT solution that provides required transparency on global spend and costs
- Indirect procurement volume as KPI for indirect procurement
- CXO backing

Source: goetzpartners’ Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
Interlink of indirect procurement, demand stakeholders and finance & controlling is not sufficient for volume control today

**KPI on total indirect procurement volume**

- Yes: 71%
- No: 29%

**Indirect proc. involvement in stakeholders' budgeting**

- Always: 43%
- Sometimes: 43%
- Never: 14%

**Stakeholders' involvement in indirect proc. planning**

- Yes (for all categories): 57%
- Partially: 43%

**Key observations**

- While indirect procurement is usually responsible for reduction of unit costs and transactions costs, only a few are explicitly tasked to reduce indirect procurement volume. Some even explicitly exclude quantity and total procurement volume from their area of responsibility.

- Budgeting processes of indirect procurement and demand stakeholders are not as interlinked and harmonized as desired. Indirect procurement is not systematically involved in demand stakeholders' planning process and vice versa.

- In addition, the fundamental KPIs of demand stakeholders and indirect procurement differ: while the business measures costs, indirect procurement considers spend.

- The disconnect is also apparent in the IT landscape: many indirect procurement organizations use Excel-based solutions and other own tools for their budgeting process. Only a few have standard solutions in place.

- Procurement categories and P&L costs are insufficiently linked in most companies – a prerequisite for a control of indirect procurement volume which is also meaningful to the businesses.

Source: goetzpartners' Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
Dimension 3/Demand Management: Budget Interlink

Indirect procurement categories and related savings do not appear directly in budget structure

**Key observations**

- Budgets of businesses are usually not broken down into categories; overall G&A budgets are common for OpEx, while investment proposals with limits of authority are usually in place for CapEx. Demand stakeholders can deliberately shift volume between CapEx categories as long as the overall CapEx target is met; the same applies to OpEx.
- Indirect procurement savings are not considered systematically in demand stakeholders' budgets in the majority of companies. Main reasons are the disconnected budgeting processes, IT systems and the demand stakeholders' hesitation to accept the indirect procurement savings.
- The businesses often challenge the correctness of indirect procurement savings. Possible explanations for the perceived misfit are different fundamental KPIs (spend vs. costs), different perspectives (origin of spend vs. recipients of allocations), different baselines, and rivalry over project success.
- Joint agreement on baselines for savings calculation preempt company internal conflicts. If necessary, savings have to be signed off by an independent finance & controlling organization or by the businesses themselves.

Source: goetzpartners' Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
Selected Best Practices

The analysis of the participants allows a limited number of best practices to be identified

**Demand management**
- Savings in unit costs and volume as shared KPIs of indirect procurement and demand stakeholders
- Savings confirmed by demand stakeholders
- Savings taken into account systematically in course of the budgeting process
- Budgets agreed between indirect procurement, demand stakeholders and finance & controlling

**Transaction costs**
- Clear centralized organizational structure, with sufficient regional coverage and proximity to demand stakeholders
- Operational procurement – with standardized processes – outsourced in single order center in a low-cost country
- Strategic sourcing partially relocated to European low cost countries
- Central and standardized IT landscape supporting full aggregation of spend and savings data on daily base

**Unit costs**
- Requirement of a minimum of two negotiated offers throughout the entire process until sourcing decision
- Negotiation toolbox which allows additional savings in mature categories
- Independent department for bottom-up calculation of unit costs as benchmark for procurement performance and basis for negotiations

Source: goetzpartners' Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
Conclusion

Reduction of transaction costs will remain on the agenda of indirect procurement for the next decade, while the importance of demand management will increase constantly

- Contribution of indirect procurement to company results is getting increased attention from top management
- Mode of operation of indirect procurement has to shift from being reactive to being a strategic partner
- An integrated approach is required for indirect procurement that takes into account unit cost savings, transaction cost savings and demand management as contributions to company success
  - Dimension 1: Large corporations have focused on unit cost reduction for many years. Therefore unit cost saving potentials seem low unless levers such as reduction of maverick buying, advanced negotiation or constant external cost benchmarking have not been used systematically until today
  - Dimension 2: Transaction costs will remain on top of the agenda for the next decade with automation and IT systems as key drivers
  - Dimension 3: The importance of demand management will increase. Budget and volume control shows the largest savings potential. This topic is challenging as it requires cross-functional alignment and systems support

Source: goetzpartners' Indirect Procurement Benchmarking Study
About goetzpartners

goetzpartners is a leading independent European consulting company that combines M&A (mergers and acquisitions) advisory and management consulting under one roof. With this unique service offering, goetzpartners advises companies across their entire value chain, thus creating sustainable value for them. The Group is represented with offices in Munich, Düsseldorf, Frankfurt, London, Madrid, Moscow, Paris, Prague, Shanghai and Zurich, and maintains international cooperation ventures. goetzpartners Corporate Finance focuses on consultancy concerning corporate acquisitions, disposals and mergers. goetzpartners Management Consultants concentrates mainly on the fields of strategy, operational excellence and business transformation. goetzpartners was classed as “Hidden Champion” 2012 in the fields of Corporate Finance and Management Consulting.

Service Line Supply Chain Management

goetzpartners supports its clients to analyze both strategic and operational areas of improvement and then facilitates the operational implementation of optimization potentials. With our proprietary goetzpartners supply chain model, we offer our clients a clear and structured means of identifying and implementing optimization potentials along the product lifecycle, starting with issues such as integration of procurement and logistics into the new product development process to direct bottom-line cash and savings-generating issues, such as procurement cost optimization or working capital optimization.
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