



The consulting firm of the future

in partnership with Kimble

KIMBLE
The No.1 Solution for Professional Services

About our sponsor (in their own words)

Kimble is the ultimate Professional Services Automation (PSA) solution for professional services (PS) organizations, enabling them to continuously improve their entire business. In a single PSA product it provides functionality traditionally requiring a combination of separate CRM, PSA, Resourcing, Time & Expense and Financial reporting systems. Kimble understands the data needed to make informed business decisions, and ensures that operational transactions capture this data in an intuitive and process centric fashion. Kimble customers typically grow 25% faster than industry average by providing real-time information that allow business leaders to understand and remedy any underlying issues in their business. This holistic focus on business improvement, as opposed to just operational support, is unique in the market, and is essential for PS organizations to improve the quality of their business and realise their objectives. Kimble customers include many of the leading independent management and information technology consultancies.

Foreword

Predictions about the future are often as unreliable as they are alluring – as the collective failure of forecasters to foresee the financial disaster which engulfed the global economy in 2008 testified all too clearly. Indeed, there's even a case to be made for saying that the more alluring the predictions, the more unreliable they're likely to be. But although uncertainty must necessarily lie at the heart of all predictions to some extent, that makes them no less important.

The irony, of course, is that predictions are most valuable at times of the greatest uncertainty; at times, in other words, when they're especially hard to make. And that's one of the greatest challenges facing the leaders of consulting firms today. The accepted wisdom holds that the consulting industry stands at an inflection point – brought about in part by the recent economic crisis but also by changing demand from clients – and that the future will be very different from the present. But how?

This report's attempt to answer that question fires the opening salvo in what will doubtless be a protracted exchange of opinions. Needless to say, it doesn't claim to hold all the answers. What it does is provide food for thought, based on research with consulting firms and their clients, about the attributes towards which consulting firms need to start moving today, if they're to be ready to meet the needs of their clients tomorrow.

At Kimble that evolution is one that we're delighted to support. Our Professional Services Automation solution for consulting firms is, at its heart, a mechanism for making the business of running a professional services firm less complex and more efficient. It provides, in one product, a range of solutions that have previously only been available by running a number of disparate, and often ill-suited, systems alongside each other. Using Kimble our customers are growing faster than their competitors and achieving tangible bottom line improvements too. The course of evolution for consulting firms may be uncertain, but it's our passionately-held belief that operational efficiency and the ability to put the right information in the hands of the people who need it, when they need it, are capabilities which will power the most successful firms. That's a prediction which is both alluring and reliable.

I hope you enjoy the report.

Mark Robinson

Chief Marketing Officer, Kimble Applications

For more information visit our website at www.kimbleapps.com or email mark.robinson@kimbleapps.com


Kimble
The No.1 Solution for Professional Services

Introduction

Our research into the consulting market over the last five years or so has unearthed many diverse trends, but unifying all those trends is one overriding theme: change. As client demand shifts, the very foundations on which the market is built begin to shift with it. That gives rise to questions about what consulting is, but it also brings into sharp focus the question of what a consulting firm needs to be. For instance, in a global market, can a consulting firm still afford to be structured around countries or even regions? And with technology advancing at the rate it is, and clients looking for expertise wherever it exists in the world, do consultants really need to be on site most of the time now?

Unsurprisingly, perhaps even inevitably, the answers to these sorts of questions start to challenge the way consulting firms do business and even call into question the idea of the firm itself. How consulting firms choose to respond depends, to a very large extent, on a number of factors, including their size, their culture, the sectors they serve and the extent to which they've already changed. For some the transition from past to future form has already begun; others were deliberately, and more recently, conceived in a response to the opportunities and challenges of the future. But there are those for whom the transition has not yet started in any meaningful way and will need to do so soon.

Let's not over-state this: though much will change, some things will remain constant. Reports of this type are notable for their tendency to overstate the case for change, or the urgency with which it is required, and it would be remiss of us in our introduction not to admit that a large part of the conversations we had with consulting leaders in the course of researching this could be summed up as concluding that "the more things change, the more they stay the same." No matter – our aim here is to focus on what will change, why and how. Because one thing is for certain: though it may not change either entirely or immediately, the consulting firm of the future will be different from the consulting firm of today.

Methodology

We used two main sources of data in this report:

Client data

Our client data is taken from research (in the form of surveys and in-depth interviews) conducted with about 800 senior end users of consulting from a variety of business functions in a wide range of sectors and geographical locations.

Consulting firm data

Our consulting firm data is based on in-depth interviews with leaders in five carefully selected consulting firms. A brief introduction to each of our interviewees is included at the end of this report.

The defining characteristics of the consulting firm of the future

Industry | not geography

Client view

"I've been in consulting since 1987" says Bill Cook at Capgemini Consulting, "and I've lived with every single organisational structure you can come up with." Cook's experience is, no doubt, familiar to anyone who has worked for a big organisation, and it's for that reason that positioning the idea of a perfect structure is a useless exercise. These things change. But while there are subtle differences in the way firms organise themselves today, there appears to be a broad consensus about the direction of travel: "We've already moved to regions and will now see them share more decisions with industry and service line. This should be easy for us because we are already one single firm in which partners own an interest," says Per Jacobsson at BearingPoint.

The reality is that geographical delineations within a firm are increasingly ill-suited to serving the demands of clients. That's partly because clients themselves are becoming more international – and fail to see why their cross-border projects should need to be served by disparate teams within the same consulting firm – and because they want to be served by a consulting team that is local, specialised in their industry or function (or both), and part of a wider, international network within the same firm. For many it has simply become too hard to find the skills they need within big firms, even though they know those skills probably exist somewhere.

But while the future is one in which consulting firms will undoubtedly be organised around industries, the reality is that geographical distinctions persist and may always do so. "How much of my business is really global?" asks Bill Cook. "Not much." So, rather than abandoning geography in favour of industry, this is more likely to be about hard and virtual organisational structures being switched. "There are big cultural differences from one country to the next," says Cook. "Clients still want some local culture and flavour but they expect knowledge about what's happening anywhere in the world. They want the guy in Chicago to know as much as the guy in Paris."

Beyond the idea that geographical structures are simply ill-suited to clients' needs (and their own structures), are a couple of important drivers:

Specialism

No longer convinced that there's a one-size-fits-all consulting solution that's right for them, what clients really want is specialism. According to Duncan Hare at XMCS, "They often have ex-consultants in senior management roles and they are more confident in negotiating with consultancies. They generally have a better idea of what they are looking for and of the issues to avoid in procuring consultancy services and they drive harder for the right price. In particular, clients increasingly understand that they should be going to the external market only for best of breed expertise which they don't have in house and that they shouldn't pay for anything else." "Clients want you to understand their business straight away," says Per Jacobsson. "It's vital that you're organised in a way that increases your capability to do so."

In fact, clients are quite comfortable with the idea that big firms lacking specialism (rather than simply hiding it away in poorly-optimised structures) should use external specialists to bolster their capabilities on a project. In our client survey, two-thirds of respondents agreed with the statement "Consulting firms should be willing to use external specialists (niche firms, contractors, academics etc)", and nearly one in five (19%) strongly agreed. So the firm of the future will be one that not only formalises specialism within its own structure, but has a network of external partnerships to call on where necessary.

Big firms are all pretty much the same – when they've got more than 5,000 people it becomes hard for us to find the people we need, so we end up working with multiple firms.

IT director, manufacturing sector

We believe in being an industry- and domain-centric organisation. In fact we go further and break down our structure to mirror the components of the value chain in our industries. Those areas are supported by people in service areas to some extent but our industry focus is the way it's always been and always will be.

Mohamed Mansour, Baringa Partners

Standardisation of prices

Spoken about less by firms – whose major interest is in moving towards pricing based on outputs rather than inputs – the standardisation of prices across geographies is nevertheless something that clients often speak about, and an inevitable consequence of a move towards industry-based structures. The reality is that as long as salaries and other costs vary from one country to the next, standardised pricing is going to be a difficult thing to achieve. But it's equally hard to see how clients would accept anything else when they're buying international teams of consultants to work on cross-border projects. The firm of the future will probably have to figure this out, at least to some degree, and some already have. "We standardise pricing across countries," says Dena McCallum at Eden McCallum.

Assets | not skills

In truth, this is not something clients talk about much outside of some specific areas (IT and HR being the most common) but for consulting firms, especially those troubled by squeezed margins, a move towards asset-based consulting can look extremely attractive. In other words, it's a solution to a supply-side problem. Per Jacobsson gives one example of how his firm is approaching this: "We've created something called a 'cloud navigator', which is a product designed to help people make sense of the cloud." It's exactly the sort of thing you can expect consulting firms to be doing more of in future, and for very good reasons:

- It gives a firm a consistent, replicable product
- It helps to create repeat business, moving the much-feared "cliff" backwards. Think here about Hay Group's job evaluation surveys and data, which effectively lock customers (albeit very willingly) into continuing to use the firm.
- It makes firms less dependent on the thing that troubles them most: talent
- It means firms can move faster. "Guys can really learn an application in months and be more important to client quicker," says Per Jacobsson.
- It counters the threat to margins caused by price pressure from clients and the growing cost of talent.
- It creates an environment more conducive to pricing based on outputs (rather than inputs)

Consulting firms charge ridiculous fees, and if things go wrong they say it's because you didn't implement well enough. They take no responsibility and manage to avoid virtually all liability. In the future they're going to need to be much more responsible and accountable because their life is too easy now. At the moment if something doesn't work they just walk out, walk in the next door, and sell the same crap again.

Strategy director,
manufacturing sector

This is never going to be about consulting firms moving wholesale over to an asset-based model (consulting will always be about people to some degree) but the firm of the future will almost certainly combine people and assets as part of its offering. The challenge, though, may be about persuading clients, who may take some convincing that assets are the solution they need when the problem was never theirs in the first place.

Outputs | not inputs

Client view

Strip away the hostility that you often get from clients in conversations about prices, and you find two sides that are not quite as irreconcilably opposed as you might imagine: both sides tend to end up agreeing that outputs are what matter most.

There are, of course, differences in motivation: clients want consulting firms to be held accountable for what they do in order to mitigate the effects of failed projects. Consulting firms want to talk about outputs because they're a very effective way to move conversation away from price and towards value. If the client can be made to see the value they add, consultants reason, then they might stop putting as much pressure on price.

These things may, ultimately, prove to be cyclical (not least because measuring value is such a notoriously difficult thing to do) but for now the weight of opinion on both sides points to a future in which firms are communicating with their clients in the language of outputs rather than inputs. “We believe in our value proposition,” says Mohamed Mansour. “Our commercial model corresponds to that.”

But this isn’t easy. “In a perfect world I would price by value to the client,” say Bill Cook. “But because the basic building blocks of our business are people – and they have a cost – it’s very hard to do that. You have to price by head.”

Nevertheless, in some sectors – most notably the public sector – the overwhelming message from clients is that this is what the future of consulting depends on. Most (though by no means all) clients are no longer prepared to bear the level of risk in a consulting project that they’ve had to bear up to now.

Assets have a role to play here: as long as consulting is about people it will always be hard not to price based on input. But assets are inherently more aligned around results and will help to shift the prevailing mindset of consulting firms away from inputs and towards solutions.

Diamonds | and pyramids

The client view



Big firms should be willing to offer consultant-only time without partner support.

If there is one quite literal way in which the shape of consulting is changing then this is probably it. Having clung for many years to a pyramid model in which consulting teams are made up of a very small number of very senior people (managing the relationship with the client and overseeing – notionally or otherwise – projects) and a much larger number of junior staff doing the doing, the pressure is finally starting to tell.

In part that’s because clients have simply got wise to the model – they know that the bottom is where all the margin is, and negotiate pretty hard on rates as a result – but it’s also because they tend to see the pyramid as a series of layers, and fail to understand why they can’t pick off one layer at a time. “The pyramid is being challenged,” says Per Jacobsson. “It’s gradually changing as clients expect more senior people. It becomes harder to convince clients of the value of young staff these days.”

What it’s turning into often feels like the subject of pre-school television: triangles (thinner ones than pyramids), mushrooms, diamonds and even coffins (though that one might be skipped by TV editors) are mentioned as possible replacements. Some firms are already there: “We have a diamond shape,” says Mohamed Mansour. “We’ve always had it. We tend to focus around the middle where you get people with 7-10 years’ experience.”

But reports of the death of the pyramid may have been exaggerated. Many clients, and particularly those commissioning very large projects, accept that the old model still has value. “They buy the pyramid when their budgets are big and they just can’t do things themselves,” continues Mansour. “That sort of work is still there for big firms.”

So the future isn’t about a choice between pyramids or diamonds so much as it’s about the flexibility to offer clients both. Nevertheless, pyramids are what the industry is used to: what consulting firms of the future will have to do is learn how to be something else.

I’d like to think we’re moving more and more towards pricing based on values.

Per Jacobsson, BearingPoint

I’ve always thought that paying £5,000 for a partner to sign off on something was obscene.

IT director, manufacturing sector

Consultants are only able to deliver a fair price if they apply the pyramid.

Finance director, manufacturing sector

We want more flexibility than the consulting pyramid so we tend to look more to the boutique firms now.

Sales director, manufacturing sector

Work-life | not work-work

The client view

I always depend on my relationship with the consultants I bring in; the 'firm' never does anything.

IT director, manufacturing sector

We don't really need consultants to be on site – what is important to us is that we have regular meetings to check on progress and that we're able to discuss things with them. It's really important for us to claim ownership of their work and to be sure they understand exactly what we expect from them. There's never any need for them to integrate with our teams.

Strategy director, manufacturing sector

We'll never go back to how things were in the days when I first started, when every third night was an all-nighter.

Bill Cook, Capgemini

Speak to consulting firms and it becomes apparent that there are two irreconcilable issues at play when it comes to their staff. The first is that consultants of the future (and already some of those of the present) expect to have a different type of consulting job from those of the past. "For me, the greatest thing that will change is about individuals," says Mohamed Mansour. "People's expectations about how they're treated by their employers have changed a lot. You used to go into consulting to do the hard days, the flights and the long hours. You used to go into it knowing you'd learn from being beaten down by it. I grew up in a Gordon Gekko era when the mentality was all about working hard and being rewarded for it, but the generation that's coming in now are driven by different things. They want to know how they can impact society for the better and how they can really change something for their client. You can't expect to take on a 23 year old and drive them into the ground or call them up in the middle of the night any more. That requires radical change – in fact that will be the greatest change in consulting."

The momentum behind providing a better work-life balance for consultants may have been held in check to some extent by the recent economic difficulties. "Over the last couple of years the attitude towards work-life balance has changed," says Bill Cook. "But if you're one of 1400 applicants for 12 positions and you're one of those 12, you work a bit." But all the evidence points to the idea that this is a blip in the trend and that the consulting firm of the future will find a way to accommodate people who are looking for something different from their work.

The trouble, of course, is how that works alongside the second issue: which is the idea that clients – who will almost certainly be experiencing the changing demands of staff themselves – still have an old-fashioned view of consultants. "It's a little bit incongruent now," says Mohamed Mansour. "We believe in identifying and implementing innovative ways to balance the needs of our clients, with the needs of our employees – something we feel we've been very mindful of and successful with at Baringa." The prevailing school of thought amongst consultants holds that although much about consulting has changed, what clients still want is for consultants to turn up on site and put in the hard graft. "Clients still think that if they're paying for ten people then they ought to see ten people in their office most of the time," says Bill Cook. "As a consultant you still spend most of your time on the client's site. You can't really get a feel for the client if you don't."

It would be tempting to conclude that the tension between what staff and clients want represents a battle between an irresistible force and an immovable object – and that the winner simply can't be called. But that would be to ignore two important factors:

The first is that there's a notable difference between what consultants say about what clients want, and what clients themselves say. Or, to put it another way, that the view that consultants need to slog it out on site for hour after hour might not be as much a reflection of what clients want, as it is a reflection of what consultants still think of themselves.

The second is that the irresistible force (the changing demands of staff) will win. Because it must. Consulting is just a choice, and it's not even the first choice for many graduates any more. And if consulting firms can't find a way to make themselves attractive to the best talent in the world then, sooner or later, their role will become greatly diminished if it doesn't cease to exist completely. Added to which, technology continues to make more flexible working an attractive possibility, if not yet a mainstream reality, in the consulting industry.

What's more, the fact that clients are facing the same problem carries a lot of weight here. Not only will they understand the predicament of consulting firms, but as Generation Y moves upward through the ranks, they'll be managed by people who wouldn't have it (and might not even know it) any other way.

The role of technology

If consulting firms are, indeed, going to be compelled to find ways to accommodate staff who demand a better work-life balance then it seems safe to assume that technology will have a role to play. After all, if technology has allowed clients' own staff to work remotely and flexibly then there's no reason why it shouldn't be able to do the same for their consultants.

And yet talking to consultants you sense that, so far, the impact of technology in this respect has been minimal. Video-conferencing – the most obvious facilitator of communication between clients and consultants in different locations – may have increased the possibilities for internal communication (between consultants) and even between consulting firms and potential recruits, as Liann Eden at Eden McCallum explains: "The calibre of video-conferencing means that we can do a lot of first screening remotely." But where consultants' interaction with clients is concerned, it has done little to alter things yet. "We might get an expert from the US to join a workshop for an hour by video conference," Eden goes on to say, "but you get so much more productivity when people are in a room together than you do when they're apart."

Perhaps the lack of progress here is partly caused by consulting firms allowing the agenda to be dictated to them by their clients. For Bill Cook, much can be achieved by taking an active, rather than a passive approach to the issue: "If you turn up at your client's office and say 'I'm going to give you 20 iPads, all set up with the apps you need to communicate with us and monitor our progress', then clients just aren't going to need to see you on site as much and you won't end up involved in massive workshops in which nothing gets done because you keep breaking for coffee." Nor should we discount the role of technology itself. As new and improving technologies continue to erode the distinction between face-to-face and remote communication and collaboration, it becomes increasingly easy to see how they could come to play a more central role in the interface between consultant and client. Indeed, there are those of a technical disposition who would argue that we've already reached that point.

At any rate, this is an approach that is almost certainly more suited to certain types of project than others. It's going to work a lot better on a technology implementation project, for example, than it is in a corporate strategy project. But the consulting firm of the future will need to understand where there are opportunities to use technology to allow staff to work remotely, and show the client how the level of service they get is going to be improved by doing so.

Flexible | not fixed

The client view



Using an agency to provide short-term resources (body shopping) and consulting are very different models. We would expect one firm to do both.

Of all the characteristics of the firm of the future discussed in this report, flexibility is arguably the most significant because it challenges the very foundations on which many firms are built. The fact is that clients are tired of having a consulting firm's view of consulting imposed on them: "Telling us we'll pay 100k-per-week for a team structure we have no say in might work in a seller's market" a strategy director told us, "but it doesn't work now."

Consulting firms have to be very flexible – they need to be able to provide body-shopping through to a classic team structure. That's what we want and, in a buyer's market, we expect to get it.

Strategy director, financial services sector

We used firms with an independent professional model and they can really flex it up. It's a really interesting model – really disruptive.

Procurement director, manufacturing sector

What they want, instead, is to be able to use consulting firms on their terms – to pick the bits they want and leave the bits they don't. But while that might not sound like an especially revolutionary concept (put another way it's simply giving customers what they want), the flexibility it imposes on the structure of a consulting firm almost certainly is. And it's where associate networks, like Eden McCallum spring from. "It was entirely driven by clients," says Liann Eden. "They wanted high-calibre people but in bite-sized chunks and the only way to give them that was to have a different model."

The benefits of using associates are certainly something that is being recognised by consulting firms of all sizes and descriptions, particularly at time when market volatility makes forward planning so difficult: "We've used associates, but it's something we need to do more of in future," says Bill Cook. "At the moment if it was more than 5 or 6% of our business then I'd be surprised, but we need to do it more because we need more flexible access to specialist skills. From a business perspective it's about staffing up to troughs rather than peaks."

But the implications of moving to an associate model, and the way you deal with those implications, are less well understood. "It's a lot harder than most people think," says Dena McCallum. "At one level the barriers to entry are not very high. But to build a sustainable business takes a lot more effort." "We've put a huge amount of effort into making the model work," agrees Liann Eden. "You have to work out how to manage everything from relationships to delivery, and we know how to do that now – that's our IP. When we recruit new people they often say that it takes them 18 months to truly understand what we're doing. There are so many nuances."

But for bigger firms the challenge is about how to accommodate different models under one roof. Clients might want bite-sized chunks sometimes, but at other times they want either the whole meal (a classic pyramid team) or simply the raw ingredients with which to do things themselves (bodies). "There's absolutely more than one model," says Bill Cook. "We all like to think we don't shift bodies, but we do. Even the big strategy firms do it, though they wouldn't like to admit it."

And that's before you throw in models driven by technology. "We have a traditional consulting model," says Per Jacobsson, "but it sits alongside adaptive and innovative accelerators and software aimed at pervasive business challenges and this partially requires its own separate model."

So the consulting firm of the future will either be one that works out how to incorporate more than one model successfully, or learns how to work with entirely new models. Or both.

The end of the firm?



We're quite comfortable with virtual firms.

The client view

Of course what Eden McCallum's success challenges more than anything else is the notion of the firm itself. Central to what it offers clients is the idea that you can have the people you want without taking on the firm that ties them up and holds both them, and you, back. It sees the firm as a value-eroding concept that needs to get out of the way before the real work can begin.

If that sounds like a threat to big consulting firms then it almost certainly is. But it's not the only form in which threats to the traditional construct of the consulting firm are manifesting themselves. Another comes in the shape of talent marketplaces like eLance and oDesk – websites through which clients can access the skills they need in a way that's simple enough to remove the burden of contracting with hundreds of freelancers individually. These may not be offering an alternative to every part of the consulting value chain by any means, but they're something else that nibbles away at the notion of the management consulting firm, separating commodity from non-commodity and carrying with it the potential that what will be left will be greatly diminished.

That's an issue that causes concern for Duncan Hare. While others talk about tweaks to the model, of a re-alignment around outputs rather than inputs and of an industry in which new ways of working are accommodated, Hare's view is altogether more radical. For him, the truth is that, like it or not, economic forces are driving the commoditisation of management consultancy but there is a serious structural gap which means that both clients and consultants will suffer. As Hare explains, "to commoditise a service you need three things: the service needs to be codified; users have to understand where the service fits into their organisations so they can 'plug and play'; and there needs to be a market supplying it. The market is increasingly codifying what a given type of consultancy should do and there is certainly a supply market willing to meet the demand for commoditised consulting services. The missing piece is the second one – organisations must have a much better understanding of their own business operations and how to deliver change in order to make effective use of management consulting."

The solution, according to Hare, is something as simple as it is profound: organisations must have their own understanding of their 'business blueprint', their DNA. "Only if you know how the basic moving parts of your organisation fit together can you properly commission and manage external expertise to transform." Hare notes that, too often, organisations pay successive consultancies high fees to learn how their organisation works, simply to enable them to write high level reports or to influence a few decisions or to produce deliverables which don't become part of any blueprint, but, he says, "organisations are gradually waking up to the fact that, if they want to be agile, they need an in-house capability to manage their own 'blueprint'."

So how does Hare see this affecting the consulting firm of the future? He sees the 'business change' industry ultimately adopting a model closer to that of the construction industry, with organisations having a strong internal function which uses an understanding of the blueprint and roadmap, to more effectively bring in high-end best-of-breed consulting services to fill knowledge/skill gaps or commoditised services for non-core change activities (both procured with clearly defined scope).

Will it happen? At the moment there are too many unknowns to be able to answer that question, and it's certainly important to recognise that the views of both Eden McCallum and XMCS are informed by a vested interest, as are those (different views) of the likes of Capgemini Consulting.

Conclusion: Unravelling assumptions

It would take a brave person to suggest that there will be no consulting firms in future. The critical thing is that the end of the firm is a theoretical possibility (however unlikely) because the conditions already exist for that to happen. So what does that mean for consulting firms? We think it means that, as they try to re-imagine their future, consulting firms need to be prepared to pare back what they know to the point where the notion of the firm itself is called into question. Because it's in accepting the possibility of a future without a firm – in being prepared to challenge even that basic assumption – that the shape of the successful of the firm will almost certainly emerge.

An introduction to our interviewees

Baringa Partners

Mohamed Mansour, Managing Partner

Having joined Baringa Partners in its startup phase in 1999/2000, Mohamed initially worked as an energy consultant in North America, before moving to London in September 2000. He has worked across most of the energy value chain for nearly 18 years. Mohamed's European clients over the recent years include many of the industry's most prominent organisations, including EDF Energy, Centrica Energy, E.ON, British Energy, BP and others. As well as his client work, Mohamed has been responsible for establishing and executing Baringa Partners' business strategy in Europe, leading to its current position as one of the leading medium-sized consulting firms and a recognised Great Place to Work.

BearingPoint

Per Jacobsson, Chief Development Officer and member of BearingPoint Management Committee

Throughout his career at BearingPoint, Per has had the opportunity to work with some of the largest and most innovative companies in the Nordic countries and across Europe, helping them on their business transformation and change journeys. He has been the Engagement and Quality Partner on a large number of client engagements in a wide range of industry segments: Retail, Consumer Markets, Manufacturing, Telecom, Financial Services, Postal and Transportation and more.

Capgemini Consulting

Bill Cook, CEO, Capgemini Consulting UK

Bill Cook began in the UK Civil Service working as a Private Secretary to Ministers and Permanent Secretaries before leading a Cabinet Office efficiency team. He left the Civil Service in 1987 to join Ernst & Young. He was appointed a partner in 1994 and subsequently led the E&Y Public Sector practice. Following Capgemini's acquisition of E&Y's consulting business in 2000, Bill led Capgemini's Public Sector business until 2003 when he joined the Capgemini UK Executive as Director of Strategy. Following stints as Commercial, Finance and Sales Directors, Bill became Head of Capgemini's UK Technology Services in 2009. From 2011 to date Bill has been CEO of Capgemini Consulting UK.

Eden McCallum

Liann Eden, Founding Partner

Liann was raised in upstate New York, but most of her career has been in Europe. Before founding Eden McCallum in 2000 with Dena McCallum, she was a consultant in McKinsey's London office, worked for Unilever in European brand management and in business to business marketing for OSRAM, the Siemens lighting business, based in Munich. Liann holds an MBA from INSEAD and a BA from Smith College.

Dena McCallum, Founding Partner

Dena grew up in Toronto and settled in the UK when she transferred with McKinsey to London, working there and in Germany. After leaving McKinsey, where she co-led the global CRM practice, Dena joined Conde Nast International as Director of Strategy. Dena works closely with clients in the retail, financial services, media and business to business service sectors. She holds an MBA from INSEAD, an MPA from the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton and a BA from the University of Toronto.

XMCS

Duncan Hare

Duncan was PwC's Global Lead Practitioner for Programme and Portfolio Management and is an external Senior Executive and Advisor to the UK Cabinet Office on major programmes and commercial interventions. His work includes turning around some of the world's largest, most high profile programmes. He played a key role in rebuilding PwC's management consulting propositions and capability after the sale of PwC Consulting to IBM. Recognising a structural gap in the market, Duncan left PwC and joined forces with other ex-Big Four colleagues to create an alternative model to allow client organisations to access best-of-breed expertise.

© Source Information Services Ltd 2013

Source Information Services Ltd and its agents have used their best efforts in collecting the information published in this report. Source Information Services Ltd does not assume, and hereby disclaims any liability for any loss or damage caused by errors or omissions in this report, whether such errors or omissions result from negligence, accident or other causes.

Notice: This document is protected by copyright law. It is illegal to copy any of the contents of this document without permission.



288 Bishopsgate • London • EC2M 4QP
Tel: +44 (0)20 3178 6445

PO Box 340505 • Dubai • United Arab Emirates
Tel: +971 (0)52 989 5224

Email: info@sourceforconsulting.com

www.sourceforconsulting.com