

and the shared services and in the worst cases the shared services function can be viewed as a hindrance.

To resolve this, we need to separate out the delivery of shared services from the identification of what is common. I've found the best way to achieve this is not to remove budget from the business units (often a political bone of contention) but instead to introduce a co-ordination function. The role of the co-ordination function is to encourage compliance to policy (doctrine) often via a spend control mechanism and to enable sharing between the business units through the use of maps. This doesn't require some big bang overhaul but usually the formalisation of an existing structure e.g. Office of an executive function or an architectural board can be converted into this role. When spend control is used then a policy limit (e.g. £100K) should be set above which any project must be mapped and the map sent to the co-ordination function. The function can then analyse the map, make recommendations and introduce elements of transparency and challenge within the organisation. As more maps are gathered then the function can also identify patterns for common services. This should become a relatively quick process lasting a few hours from initiation to recommendation.

It's through such a function that other forms of doctrine such as cell based structure, use of Pioneer-Settler-Town Planner along with more context specific gameplay can be introduced into the business units. I've summarised this in figure 63, adding in the co-ordination function (*point 1*). I've also noted that your shared service (*point 2*) should be elevated to a business unit and not just limit itself to provision of