In the federated structure, there is no enterprise architecture and systems integration (EASI) function. If this does exist, it is generally regulated to serve an individual business function or business unit.

Finally, the relationship managers are focused on individual functions, such as sales, marketing, or accounting, in a traditional model. They generally lack a holistic view of the interrelated processes that make up customer relationship management (CRM), enterprise resource planning, or supply chain management.

In a service-oriented federated IT structure, depicted in Table 2.2, the EASI function is added at the shared services layer.

The responsibilities of the relationship managers are broadened to include multiple functions. For instance, instead of certain managers focusing on just sales or marketing, they would now own all of the functions related to CRM. They become process relationship managers (PRMs) tasked with designing and delivering an end-to-end
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Business Unit 1</th>
<th>Business Unit 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship management</td>
<td>Process relationship managers</td>
<td>Process relationship managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application development</td>
<td>Application development</td>
<td>Application development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process relationship managers</td>
<td>Application development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared services</td>
<td>Enterprise architecture and systems integration</td>
<td>Program management office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3  Service-Oriented Centralized IT Organizational Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Business Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Function shared services</td>
<td>Process relationship managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprise architecture and systems integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program management office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

business-process vision. The change in responsibilities allows them to recognize the horizontal nature of the business processes.

In this example, everything the CRM team works on affects the customer’s experience with the company’s products and services. The PRM is in the best position to relay service-oriented business requirements to the EASI team. For instance, a PRM can collaborate with the EASI team to design a service ensuring that new customer data is available not only to the sales system but also to the marketing and customer-service systems.

In the service-oriented centralized IT organizational structure, shown in Table 2.3, the business unit–specific application development and relationship management functions are eliminated in favor of a more command-and-control structure. In this structure, all systems and budgets reside at the shared service level. While CIOs may gain greater cost control and production efficiency with this structure, they risk losing connectivity to the business.

It’s clear that IT organizations are undergoing a significant shift brought about by the economic downturn, globalization, cloud computing, mobilization, and consumer technology. CIOs need an organizational structure and governance framework that is flexible and adaptive to the changing landscape. The right structure will help them to effectively partner with their business peers and deliver value-added products and services.

Define a Project Methodology

Similar to the governance framework needed to partner with the business, a set of processes and forums within IT is also necessary to
portfolio diagrams to illustrate projects according to asset classes. See Figure 2.1 for an example.

PPM is not separate from the governance framework we already discussed. In fact, PPM complements it by providing you with a companywide view of technology investments. As the governance bodies meet to identify and prioritize projects within their function (e.g., sales, marketing, or finance), portfolio management practices help you consolidate the information into a database for reporting and analysis. Individual projects across functional areas invariably compete for the same IT resources, so having reports that roll up estimated funding, resource, and time requirements can give you a great view of the pressure points.

Once you have categorized the projects into the four IT asset classes, you can assess the projects based on three dimensions:

1. **Benefit proposition.** What is the return on the investment?
2. **Risk.** What is the likelihood of completing the project on time and within budget? Do you have the funding and skilled resources? Is the project introducing new technologies, or is it leveraging the existing architecture?
Table 5.1  SU Program Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Measured By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide training services to new and existing employees on business</td>
<td>Level of employee satisfaction with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>software and related processes.</td>
<td>services—surveys and the number of tickets reported to the help desk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide first line of technical support to employees on business software</td>
<td>Level of employee satisfaction with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and process-related questions and issues.</td>
<td>services—surveys and the number of tickets reported to the help desk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist local management on system job roles that should be provisioned to</td>
<td>Number of incidents in which an employee does not have an accurate job role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new employees by IT.</td>
<td>assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to system user groups and process leadership committees to</td>
<td>Number of change requests submitted by SU and number approved by governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>request and decide on system and process changes.</td>
<td>bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively participate in performing UAT for new system functionality.</td>
<td>Number of defects discovered in production that could have been discovered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help to communicate the availability of new process and system features.</td>
<td>and reported during UAT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Maintenance

One of the challenges companies face with SU programs is that they often fade out shortly after the implementation of an enterprise system. In order to be successful, you need to come up with methods to maintain the program.

Approximately 60 percent of (SAP) shops claim to have an SU program in place. But these programs often fade away or never really work, for a few simple reasons, according to Michael Doane, a longtime SAP consultant who now runs Doane Associates. Doane’s firm focuses on helping companies develop SAP centers of excellence, of which a super user program is one component.

“Super users retire, quit, or simply can’t hold the role anymore, and no one replaces them,” Doane said. “Another reason is the pressure of managers who never really buy in to the system and often tell those employees to get back to their ‘real jobs’ finally take their toll. The programs fail because of neglect and lack of continuity.”