

DYNAMICS OF EMERGING PRICING
MODELS IN BUSINESS PROCESS
MANAGEMENT

A Perspective on Current Prevalence and Future Adoption

Dinesh Goel, Partner, South & East Asia
Somak Roy, Director, Research

After two decades of outsourcing and offshoring, the benefits from traditional sourcing models are plateauing in terms of cost savings and talent access. The focus is gravitating toward under-exploited benefits of process reengineering/standardization, impact on business metrics such as incremental revenue growth and reduction of working capital.

Enterprises need new sources of value beyond cost savings, and service providers need new sources of competitive differentiation and margin levers. Emerging pricing models – transaction and outcome-based pricing – provide an opportunity for both parties to shift the sourcing conversation to value-based models.



Pricing models have been evolving to adapt to client needs.

Pricing models in Business Process Management (BPM) have been evolving with time, adapting to client needs. While Finance and Accounting Outsourcing (FAO) mostly has seen pricing based on full-time equivalencies (FTEs), the future is likely to have a higher prevalence of transaction-based pricing. The major groups of procurement processes, source-to-procure and procure-to-pay appear amenable to outcome-based pricing and transaction-based pricing, respectively. Transaction-based pricing is the norm in contact center outsourcing. Further, numerous niches within industry vertical BPM are suitable for outcome-based pricing.

That said, the right pricing model can be specific to the engagement, and several cases of alternative pricing models can be found in the horizontal BPM service lines mentioned previously.

More important than prevalence statistics is the fact that in circa 2014, alternate constructs have been a common discussion point in sourcing transactions. Transaction-based pricing and business outcome-based pricing afford benefits that are not possible with FTE-based models. Utility-based pricing helps enterprises better manage peaks and troughs in demand and transfers some of the risks to the service provider. Such pricing offers deeper and more valuable insights into demand and consumption patterns, details that are typically opaque in the FTE-based world. Alternative pricing, by decoupling revenues from the FTE count, incents the service provider to exploit the latent productivity potential with the use of tools and best practices while still meeting the required performance levels.

KEY QUESTIONS ANSWERED

- 1. What is the prevalence of the new models and the likely long term trajectory?** Outside of human resources outsourcing (HRO) and contact center outsourcing, transaction-based pricing is not seen often enough. Outcome-based pricing, however, is already a feature in every service line, albeit in a limited way. There are several niches in the broad spectrum of vertical BPM that should see the rise of outcome-based pricing. As proximity to revenue generation increases for the service provider, so does the likelihood of outcome-based pricing.
- 2. How would an enterprise evaluate the new pricing models for a specific engagement?** The decision depends on availability of data, readiness for the light-touch managed services model of sourcing delivery management, the degree of trust and the depth of relationship with the service provider, and – crucially – the maturity of the service provider. Only a mature service provider can embrace new pricing models, underpinned by their confidence in being able to realize the latent benefits for both the buyer and provider of services.
- 3. What can an enterprise do to ensure realization of the anticipated benefits of the new pricing models?** The most critical aspects include clarity on definition of the output and/or the outcome, devolving the required process control of responsibilities to the service provider and adapting service governance to such a matured managed services paradigm.

THE NEWER PRICING MODELS: TRANSACTION-BASED AND OUTCOME-BASED

For the sake of clarity, it is useful to define key terms at the outset.

Transaction-based pricing (or utility/output pricing): Transaction-based models involve pricing by unit of output, such as invoices processed, customer accounts reconciled, insurance claims processed and checks disbursed. The defining attribute of transaction-based pricing is that output – not input or effort – is the billing resource unit. Implicitly, the service fee is decoupled from FTE counts. It is worth pointing out that there is a subtle contextual difference between transaction- and utility-based pricing, given that the latter is used frequently in the context of a full stack bureau service or business process as a service (BPaaS).

Outcome-based pricing: Outcome-based pricing ties service provider fees to a metric directly relevant to the business, and represents an outcome that is far from certain. Examples of outcome-based pricing would be linking fees to customer churn rate reduction, customer satisfaction, incremental revenues earned and cost savings. Typically, the outcome-based “at-risk” component of the pricing represents no more than 10 to 20 percent of the total fees.



Enterprises need
new efficiency
levers.

The defining feature of the aforementioned models is that they are decoupled from a fixed capacity of FTEs; also, the governance involves managing results and milestones, not service provider resources. These models hold promise for both enterprises and for service providers. After decades of outsourcing, enterprises need new efficiency levers. Third- and fourth-generation outsourcing is not driven by cost savings alone. A third- or fourth-generation outsourcer is already managing per-FTE costs effectively through offshoring. The objective, then, would be to focus more on building variable capacity and leveraging capabilities of the service provider for higher business impact.

From the service provider perspective, FTE-based pricing precludes the possibility of earning margins significantly above industry averages. On the contrary, in an industry that is witnessing increased competitive intensity, FTE-based pricing can result in the race to the bottom. Non-linear pricing* incents the service provider to apply its best practices and tools to both achieve high margins and expand the benefits “pie” for both parties.

Also, in a mature and competitive market, service providers require new levers for growth and new sources of differentiation. **The ability to assume additional risk – the vehicle for which is often the pricing model – is one of the key ways of differentiating in a crowded market.**

*Non-linear pricing: Headcount decoupled from growth in business/outcomes

THE CURRENT STATE OF PRICING

Our analysis and research informs the following as the current state and outlook for the major services segments:

FAO: The dominant model in finance and accounting outsourcing (FAO) continues to be FTE-based pricing. The prevalence of transaction-based and outcome-based pricing is about 10 – 15 percent and 5 percent, respectively. Going forward, we expect growth in the adoption of transaction-based pricing. Change is likely to be gradual, though, countering inherent challenges such as processes in FAO being dissimilar across enterprises or supporting technologies being highly specific to the enterprise. A few processes in FAO are high in volume and rule-based (e.g., account payable invoice processing, cash application in account receivable), lending themselves well to transaction-based pricing.

Procurement: The dominant model is FTE-based. Source-to-procure is slightly different and has higher adoption of outcome-based or gain-share arrangements. The focus for both parties is to reduce the spend by improvising procurement practices such as consolidation of suppliers and undertaking specific actions based on performance/volume insights using data analytics.



HRO: Pricing constructs for HRO processes are fairly standardized, using pricing per employee for the scope of services outsourced. HRO is rather a mature segment of BPM services and is more often than not offered by service providers as a platform-based service.

In talent management, payroll and benefits administration, the most common pricing unit is the participating employee. In recruitment process outsourcing, it is the “hire.” In effect, “per participating employee” is pricing by a standard bundle of transactions. The construct might be different in specific HRO functions such as learning management, where pricing is by course delivered. Gainsharing happens in the context of self-service: Cost savings from self-service are shared between the client and the service provider, with such an arrangement currently seen in about 25 – 35 percent of HRO engagements.

Contact center services: Contact center pricing is rarely FTE-based. Transaction-based pricing (such as per call, per email) and time unit-based pricing (minutes on the phone) are typical. ISG has observed few instances of gainsharing.



Pricing constructs for contact center outsourcing are unlikely to change.

The choice between time unit-based pricing and transaction-based pricing depends on what the client wants to manage and what behavior the client desires from the service provider. With transaction-based pricing, service providers have a tendency to reduce the call duration, which can be detrimental to customer satisfaction. Transaction-based pricing is not advised without at least 12 months of historical data.

Contact center outsourcing is another mature segment, with many enterprises in the third and fourth generation of outsourcing. Pricing constructs have not really changed, and change is unlikely in the near term. However, niches within contact center outsourcing are amenable to outcome-based pricing. When the contact center doubles as a sales or overdues recovery channel, for example, the pricing framework tends to be outcome-based. In such cases, it is common to base a percentage of fees on revenues earned or amount of overdues collected through the contact center channel.

Vertical BPM: This is a very diverse segment, with industry-specific processes spanning banking, insurance, financial services, logistics, travel and transportation, and others. There are numerous niches within vertical BPM in which outcome-based and utility-based pricing are common. Any process related to revenue collection and recovery is likely to feature outcome-based pricing. *(Please refer to the case study on the airline industry).*

LONGEVITY OF THE FTE-BASED MODEL

The FTE-based model has the virtue of simplicity and is an easy model for assessing the benefits of a new sourcing arrangement. Further, it is easier to benchmark the cost in such a model because there is enough data available for a range of skillsets and experience levels across regions. The FTE model, for all its limitations, has the advantage of simplicity and is widely understood.

Regulations and other security norms can sometimes result in the client tightly controlling the environment, including PC configuration, security and access to service provider resources. The engagement then becomes primarily about labor arbitrage and access to talent for process transformation and standardization.

Finally, what often goes in favor of the FTE model is the fear that the service provider will make disproportionate margins on the account. Ironically, the shift to value-based thinking is not common among sophisticated outsourcing organizations.

WHEN IS OUTCOME-BASED PRICING VIABLE?

For outcome-based pricing to be viable, service providers need greater end-to-end control of the process, right through to the outcome. Such pricing also requires the service provider to have mature operations. A service provider willing to stake a significant percentage of fees on a business outcome needs to have a track record of delivering the required results. This is typically underpinned by sophisticated tools for risk assessment and effort estimation, as well as domain expertise. The service provider also needs to be at a stage of evolution where new margin and growth levers are necessary.



Direct linkage with revenues is hard to come by.

An extreme in the rarefied world of outcome-based pricing is pricing tied to a financial metric, such as incremental revenues. Percentage of revenue-based pricing is rarely seen in the horizontal BPM service lines – FAO, HRO, contact center and procurement. Direct linkage with revenues is hard to come by. Outcome-based pricing, particularly incremental revenue-based pricing, is more common in vertical BPM. *(Please refer to the case study on revenue recovery).*

WHEN IS TRANSACTION-BASED PRICING VIABLE?

In ISG's experience, the following factors indicate high applicability of the transaction-based model of pricing in BPM services.

When the service is amenable to disaggregation into a finite set of standard transactions: As would be obvious, a necessary requirement for transaction-based pricing is that the service must comprise a manageable set of well-understood and clearly defined transactions. For example, it is much easier to define units of work in accounts payable and customer service than in financial planning and analysis, record to report or investment research or analytics.

When the enterprise needs to scale rapidly: Sometimes a rapidly growing enterprise lacks the resources to scale rapidly, so the service provider takes on a high measure of risk and, crucially, also undertakes the task of upfront investments. Transactions of this nature often involve the entire technology stack, including applications and infrastructure. Typically, the enterprise is focused significantly more on value than on minimizing service costs. In such cases, transaction-based pricing has more in common with outcome-based pricing because a successful transaction represents a complex orchestration of hardware, software and service.

When FTEs are a relatively small proportion of total costs: Transaction-based pricing tends to be the dominant construct when FTE costs are a relatively small fraction of total costs. A few common examples from banking are ATM maintenance, mail and scanning (per item; outbound email; and cash-in-transit deliveries. Each business process listed above involves a fixed cost per unit with a unit rate for variability. Of course, low FTE costs often indicate a high level of automation.

A distinction needs to be made between pricing per transaction without changing the underlying operating model and pricing based on the utility model. An essential precondition for the utility model is standardization of services across multiple clients. Typically such transactions are bundled with the underlying information technology system as well. Such a framework offers true variability in capacity to each client and is based on a shared resources model (with the required data security, etc., as necessary). As would be expected, utility pricing affords a better per-transaction price point.



Price is a function of cost, volume and risks.

It is useful to remember that notwithstanding the nature of the model (whether mainstream or alternative), price is a function of cost, volume and risks. If the delivery model is dedicated to a single client, the cost and the risk of volume fluctuations would be built into the price. It is therefore imperative to look for a shared service delivery model and a shared delivery platform for true variable capacity assuming the inherent real and perceived data risks are acceptable.

THE PATH TO NONCONVENTIONAL PRICING CONSTRUCTS

It is indisputably clear from ISG research about nontraditional models that such constructs take time and do not typically begin when the contract is signed. Engagements typically begin with the conventional FTE-based models and can shift to transaction-based pricing when the relationship has evolved to a trusted partnership and adequate data has been obtained on cost and volumetrics. Cost, baseline and target values of cost and performance metrics need to be measured before outcome-based pricing constructs can be agreed upon. Finally, the alternative pricing model experiment is best started small, with process areas most amenable to such pricing, and then gradually expanded in scope.

ALTERNATIVE PRICING MODELS: CASE STUDIES

This section presents three WNS cases of alternative pricing models, each covering the business need for a non-FTE model, the transition and benefits accrued. WNS, a leading BPM service provider, has been at the forefront of developing newer pricing models with its clients and consider those models to be an important element of its future way of doing business.

Alternative pricing models in BPM

WNS experience with outcome-based pricing in the airline industry

Airline ticket pricing is more often than not prone to errors, both by agents and the airlines' internal ticketing offices. Ticket pricing needs to conform to a plethora of rules, with each of those rules prone to its own set of errors. An agent could fail to charge the right amount of tax and fuel surcharge or sell the ticket at a discounted price even when the rules defining the discount are broken. For example, buyers could be charged the discounted price even when they fail to conform to the allotted time between reservation and booking; the customer could be assigned to business class while being charged for economy class; a buyer could be charged a discounted price even though a ticket was booked after the time window when the discounted price was valid; or the agent might charge more commission than is due.



Detecting the difference between the right ticket price and the price charged.

Therefore, a reconciliation process is necessary to ensure that the right fare has been charged. Tickets need to be audited because there might be a difference between the right ticket price and the price charged by the agent due to violating one or more of the pricing rules.

WNS conducts similar auditing operation for more than 10 airlines, including a few of the largest airlines in the world, and processes more than 200 million transactions a year.

The reconciliation process typically begins with the WNS-proprietary VERIFARE® solution, which takes in ticket price data using a standard format and decides whether the ticket warrants manual auditing. When the reconciliation does not match, agents are charged the difference and are sent a debit memo. The agent has 30 days to honor the debit memo or dispute the charge. WNS manages the entire process, from the beginning until the agent pays the debit memo, including dispute resolution.

The engagement initially started as a FTE-based model that later transitioned to an outcome-based pricing framework. WNS accrues revenue only if the airline recovers money through the fare audit process. The service provider receives a percentage of the amount recovered. The entire amount is at risk. There are no fixed fees or any other non-outcome-based pricing metric.

In addition to auditing services, the team makes use of its privileged position to serve as a custodian of transactional data to provide analytics.

WNS experience with outcome-based pricing at Travelocity

The Travelocity case study is a story of transforming an offline channel from customer service management to sales, and from a cost center to a profit center. The company's challenge was managing its sales operations more efficiently in a growth environment to increase revenues.

As a long-time BPM partner, WNS evaluated Travelocity's existing model and observed that the online channel was the primary source of customer acquisition and revenue generation. Since most of Travelocity's revenues came from the online channel, it was imperative for the organization to leverage its shared services to explore revenue-generating possibilities by linking offline business with the online channel.

To counter this dependence, WNS proposed an offline channel through its proprietary sales center of excellence (CoE) model. WNS, in collaboration with Travelocity, decided to transform the customer acquisition process by integrating best practices from online and offline sales channels while applying customer intelligence derived from their buying behavior. A “cross-sell opportunities” model was created by analyzing customer service records to ensure that Travelocity was making available the right offer to the right customer at the right time and at the right price.

For the first few years, the model worked on FTE-based pricing. Then it gradually evolved to a transaction-based model (price per interaction; i.e., per call, chat and email). Now a portion of the fee is based on outcome. In some Travelocity business units, pricing is entirely governed by outcome.



Outcome-based pricing improves a client's overall business performance.

As the shared services function was transformed into a revenue channel, the cross-sales ratio grew from 3 percent to 8 percent, offline sales increased by 50 percent, sales conversion went up by a factor of 1.5 and revenue per call went up by 20 percent. Customer satisfaction improved by almost 50 percent. WNS transformational initiatives spanning technology, web analytics and operational improvements played a significant role in Travelocity's overall business performance.

WNS experience with transaction-based pricing at a major utility

WNS is engaged with a major United Kingdom-based utility to manage its back-office processes, which include exceptions related to billing, payment, and relocation processes (gas and electricity services) for more than 2 million customers. The engagement began in 2006 with an FTE-based pricing model. The client was going through a period of significant surge in volume of exceptions, which resulted in a five-fold rise in the number of FTEs servicing the client. The priority at the beginning of the engagement was to stabilize the inflow of exceptions and re-engineer processes, which led to stabilization of exceptions.

Gradually, however, the productivity benefits from process transformation started plateauing. The client wanted to explore new sources of efficiencies and offload some of the risks to the service provider. WNS proposed a transition in the engagement approach to bring about better synergies. This led to the adoption of a transaction-based model in 2009. Under the transaction-based framework, every exception type was assigned a price, a baseline volume and a deadband. The new pricing model yielded a number of benefits, including a 15 percent reduction in cost, which resulted from reduced idle time, resource pooling and cross-skilling. Client satisfaction levels improved significantly as well.

During the next three years, the engagement prospered under the transaction-based model while the scope of the engagement at a relationship level doubled. However, in the context of exception management processes, the transaction-based model has an inherent challenge: The service provider does not have an incentive to reduce exceptions. Hence, in 2014, WNS,



in collaboration with the client, began the process of migrating to a customer account-based model. With the new pricing framework, the service provider has taken on additional risk and is more invested than ever in the client's business. If customer accounts decrease, so would the service provider revenues. In summary, the engagement has evolved toward greater service provider alignment with business value, and the pricing model has been a key vehicle of such an alignment.

IN CONCLUSION

The confluence of several key trends bodes well for the future adoption of newer pricing models. First is the service provider quest for sources of nonlinear revenues. Second is the rise of enabling technologies. The need for nonlinear revenues provides the objective, and technology provides the means. Finally, the maturity of the customer makes the outcome real.

Several contemporary technologies serve the cause of alternative pricing models. At the time of planning, process modeling and analysis techniques enable the service provider to promise outcomes with a reasonable level of risk. Additionally, enabling technologies for automation are numerous and growing rapidly.

In summary, the future belongs to BPM service providers who can combine vertical knowledge, technological sophistication (including analytics and automation capabilities) and an appetite for risk. All of these collectively pave the way for alternative pricing models.



**Opportunities
emerging for
alternative pricing
models.**

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

DYNAMICS OF EMERGING PRICING MODELS IN BUSINESS PROCESS MANAGEMENT

A Perspective on Current Prevalence and Future Adoption

Published January 5, 2015



DINESH GOEL

Partner, South & East Asia

Dinesh is a highly experienced and well-respected sourcing advisor in the outsourcing industry with more than 23 years of experience in management consulting and outsourcing. He works with enterprises to craft sourcing strategies, structure and negotiate complex sourcing transactions and design and implement sourcing governance organizations. Prior to joining ISG, Dinesh worked with Infosys and Accenture, where he led large transition programs and consulted on IT strategy and implementations, business process-reengineering and operational improvement programs. He is a published thought leader and a regular speaker at industry conferences. Dinesh manages the ISG India Business.



ABOUT ISG

ISG (Information Services Group) (NASDAQ: III) is a leading global technology research and advisory firm. A trusted business partner to more than 700 clients, including 75 of the top 100 enterprises in the world, ISG is committed to helping corporations, public sector organizations, and service and technology providers achieve operational excellence and faster growth. The firm specializes in digital transformation services, including automation, cloud and data analytics; sourcing advisory; managed governance and risk services; network carrier services; technology strategy and operations design; change management; market intelligence and technology research and analysis. Founded in 2006, and based in Stamford, Conn., ISG employs more than 1,300 professionals operating in more than 20 countries—a global team known for its innovative thinking, market influence, deep industry and technology expertise, and world-class research and analytical capabilities based on the industry’s most comprehensive marketplace data. For more information, visit www.isg-one.com.

Let’s connect **NOW...**

