



Organizational Effectiveness and Computer-Based Collaboration

Case Studies

Eric Wilson
President, BRANE space LLC
www.branespace.com



Case Studies

- ⊗ A mid-sized BioPharma
- ⊗ A small Biotech

Summary

- ⊗ Improved collaboration using computer-mediated technology improves organizational effectiveness
- ⊗ Fuzzy measurements
- ⊗ Human, cultural, and process issues strongly influence the outcome
- ⊗ IT is both an enabler and a stumbling block

The technology

- ⊗ A web-based, structured “collaborative space”, supporting collaboration, communication, and coordination in context for teams engaged in complex projects/processes
- ⊗ Why is this technology a good platform for BioPharma?
 - ⊗ Needs improved R&D productivity
 - ⊗ Cross functional teams
 - ⊗ Inter-enterprise collaboration
 - ⊗ Geographical dispersion
 - ⊗ Broad range of (corporate) culture backgrounds

Case study 1: A mid-sized BioPharma

- Background
 - Privately held family-owned business
 - Worldwide operations
 - New management, new products, new ambitions
 - Pre IPO
- Business uses of collaborative technology
 - Drug development process management
 - Business development deal management
 - Supply chain redesign projects
 - Research collaborations
 - Process redesign projects
 - others

Results

- ⊗ Substantial growth in number of users and project spaces over time, however,
- ⊗ “Mixed” results – some good, some bad
- ⊗ No enterprise-wide change management program integrating new management principles and technology
- ⊗ Seen as an “IT matter”, not an integral part of the company’s competitive strategy

One failure to learn from

- ⊗ Effective collaboration *not* achieved
 - ⊗ Very complex project – collecting and standardizing data from many sources for an NDA
 - ⊗ Multiple geographies, internal organizations
 - ⊗ Outside service providers
 - ⊗ Little agreement on process persisting over time
 - ⊗ Strong turf politics
 - ⊗ Fear of transparency, accountability, flattening hierarchy
 - ⊗ Unclear leadership
 - ⊗ Little organizational, behavioral, process support during introduction, none after
 - ⊗ After one year, used principally as a common repository for documents

Case Study 2: A small Biotech

- ⊗ Background
 - ⊗ Publicly traded
 - ⊗ Localized operations
 - ⊗ Growth from one drug development program to Five
 - ⊗ Many new hires
- ⊗ Business uses of collaborative technology
 - ⊗ Drug development process management
 - ⊗ Other areas starting to adopt it

Results

- ⊗ Improved teamwork, coordination, accountability achieved through improved collaboration under strong leadership
- ⊗ Process redesigned during introduction to first development program, then embedded in the technology and extended to other programs (by mandate!)

One success to learn from

- ⊗ This was a “good one”
 - ⊗ Compelling need to standardize the process
 - ⊗ Ratio of new hires drove need to establish a “shared context” – the standard process
 - ⊗ Leadership constantly fostered collaboration in connection with accountability
 - ⊗ The technology was but one of a number of supports for collaboration
 - ⊗ Leadership took responsibility to introduce and support a new way of working supported by technology
 - ⊗ An integral element of the company’s competitive strategy, constantly communicated.

Lessons learned - technology

- ⊗ Amplifies “good” and “bad”
- ⊗ Neutral element, doesn't care
- ⊗ Can be a distraction from the real issues (Eastern flight 401)
- ⊗ Can be an excuse (too busy chopping down the tree to sharpen the saw)
- ⊗ Leadership - needs to be adopted (Tina Turner provides guidance here)
- ⊗ But one element for improved collaboration
- ⊗ Lack of interoperability is a major hindrance

Lessons learned – Human/Cultural

- ✦ Corporate culture is determinant
- ✦ A strong majority needs to understand and adopt a collaborative approach
- ✦ Effective leadership is paramount
- ✦ Identification of “collaboration land-mines” and their de-fusing takes courage
- ✦ Process clarity significantly impacts collaboration

Conclusion

- Collaboration as a tool for driving organizational effectiveness depends upon:
 - Leadership
 - Nurturing
 - Clarity
 - Commitment
 - Coaching
- On-going consulting – whether provided internally or externally, is a major determinant