



**CASE STUDY //**

# Network analysis and integration

Complete





## This case study was done at a FTSE250 Telecoms firm.

This case study briefly explores an example of some of the problems we solved for a FTSE 250 Telecoms firm of 2000 individuals.

This organisation had been formed out of multiple mergers and acquisitions, had branched out into new markets, and now faced challenges understanding how they could best leverage their resources.

Different parts of the business were heavily silo'ed, making it challenging to form cross-collaborative relationships and provide an integrated experience to their customers

The Network Analysis helped them to understand how to integrate talent better to drive greater efficiency and profit. To do this we explored questions from the three areas:

**Divisions:** Were key departments and teams working effectively with one another?  
What was the reliance of different Go To Market teams on centralised resources?

**Teams:** How well did the Executive Team unlock the contributions of each of its members?  
Did the Executive Team integrate well with the rest of the organisation?  
How efficiently could Change Management Teams drive change through the business?

**People:** How over-leveraged were employees throughout the organisation?  
How under-leveraged were employees throughout the organisation?  
Where was the hidden talent in the firm?  
How were successful sales people in the firm leveraging relationships differently from unsuccessful sales people?

### Were key departments and teams working effectively with one another?

**Findings:** Key business units were not communicating – 10% not at all, and 8% relying on a single employee.

**Actions:** These gaps were recognised as a business risk and were plugged.

### How reliant were the 'go to market' (GTM) teams on centralised resources?

**Findings:** Combining network and utilisation data highlighted the reliance of GTM teams on centralised resources. One GTM team generating slightly higher revenue had double the internal workload being generated and were thus less profitable – information otherwise hidden from the business.

**Actions:** This completely changed how the business strategy around GTM resources.



## How well did the Executive Team unlock the contributions of each of its members?

**Findings:** In the information networks, 6 out of 18 leaders representing geographic dispersed teams were not integrated into team information and idea networks, meaning that they were consistently under-represented in group decision making and strategic conversations. This was linked to several important oversights in strategic decisions by the team.

**Actions:** The executive teams physically rotated their executive events from London to different areas of the country to allow different offices to host the team. This improved visibility of geographic businesses as well as better integration of members into the team. The team also committed to leadership development to build stronger relationships to improve the power of the team.

## Did the Executive Team integrate well with the rest of the organisation?

**Findings:** The Executive Board itself was siloed with only 25% of information was coming from the business (the rest from inside the board). This was linked to exit interview feedback where people were feeling disengaged and unheard by the leadership.

**Actions:** The executive team rotated events to improve connectivity with the business (see above). It also initiated a formal procedure for anonymous "upward feedback" to get more direct information from the business.

## How efficiently could management teams communicate with their connections and use this to drive change?

**Findings:** A 34 person "change management" team responsible for communication and behaviour change was reaching just 9% of the business. This limited its ability to transmit information and enforce sustainable change.

**Actions:** Analysis discovered an extra 5 people to add to the team that doubled this coverage to 18%.

## Where was the hidden talent in the company?

**Findings:** We compared the leadership team's hand-picked Talent Pipeline (that had taken several months to assemble) to the results from the Network Analysis. There was an 85% overlap between the Talent Pipeline and the key talent identified by the Network Analysis.

**Actions:** The Network Analysis identified an additional group of hidden talent that was missing from the Talent Pipeline. These were added to the Pipeline and recruited for leadership development programmes, for which we provided individualised network reports and feedback.



---

## How were successful sales people in the firm leveraging relationships differently from unsuccessful sales people?

**Findings:** For the sales teams, sales ranking correlated with innovation networks, with the best sales people being shown to have higher tendency to look for ideas from teams different to their own.

**Actions:** We provided one-off feedbacks to each member of the sales teams to review their personal networks and build their connectivity with new parts of the organisation. This then led to a series of initiatives driven by the sales department around "Cross-Product Teams".

## How overleveraged were employees across the organisation?

**Findings:** Top 20% of talent were receiving almost 80% of requests, reducing their effectiveness and leading to several cases of burnout and absenteeism.

**Actions:** This resulted in restructuring of the most severely affected teams and a series of wellbeing workshops for key talent.

## How underleveraged are employees throughout the organisation?

**Findings:** 2.5% of employees (50 individuals) had no impact on key functional networks, meaning that talent was being underutilised.

**Actions:** It led to re-examination of roles and feedback, which resulted in cost savings.



 Complete