

Anne Schaefer

**Nonparametric frontier-based
analysis of efficiency and its drivers
in business processes**

*Comparison of methods with empirical application
to an OTC derivatives post-trade clearing process
of a major German bank*

Verlag Dr. Kovač

**Hamburg
2016**

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Danksagung | VII |
| List of Figures | XVI |
| List of Tables | XX |
| List of Abbreviations | XXV |
| List of Symbols | XXIX |
| 1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Aim of this dissertation | 2 |
| 1.2 Specification of the contribution of this dissertation | 3 |
| 1.2.1 Perspective I: Focus on a relevant efficiency type and a relevant banking efficiency modelling type | 4 |
| 1.2.2 Perspective II: The business process as relevant level for measurement | 6 |
| 1.2.3 Perspective III: Nonparametric frontier-based efficiency analysis as relevant method to be used on process level | 9 |
| 1.2.4 Perspective IV: Securities clearing and settlement processes as rel- evant dimension for efficiency measurement in banking | 11 |
| 1.3 Structure of this dissertation | 12 |
| 2 Related literature, problem definition, and research questions | 15 |
| 2.1 Origins of disaggregated performance measurement | 15 |
| 2.2 Business process management | 17 |
| 2.2.1 Origins and definitions of BPM | 18 |
| 2.2.2 Performance measurement in BPM | 19 |
| 2.2.2.1 Performance measures of business processes | 23 |
| 2.2.2.2 Specifics of process measurement | 26 |
| 2.2.2.2.1 Process types | 27 |
| 2.2.2.2.2 Infrastructure for measurement | 28 |
| 2.2.2.2.3 Linkage to business level information | 30 |
| 2.2.3 Applications of frontier-based efficiency measurement on process level | 30 |

| | | |
|---------|--|-----|
| 2.2.4 | Lack of research and positioning of the dissertation | 34 |
| 2.3 | Productivity of services | 39 |
| 2.3.1 | Approaches for measuring productivity of services | 40 |
| 2.3.2 | Services characteristics and the services delivery process | 41 |
| 2.3.3 | Types and classification of service processes | 43 |
| 2.3.4 | Applications of frontier analysis to services | 45 |
| 2.3.5 | Lack of research and positioning of the dissertation | 46 |
| 2.3.5.1 | Definition of services process | 47 |
| 2.3.5.2 | Framework for measuring services productivity | 48 |
| 2.4 | Securities clearing and settlement | 52 |
| 2.4.1 | Basic functions of the post-trade services industry | 53 |
| 2.4.2 | Participants in the post-trade services market | 55 |
| 2.4.3 | Risks associated with securities clearing & settlement | 56 |
| 2.4.4 | Scale economies, scope economies, efficiency and competition in securities clearing & settlement | 60 |
| 2.4.5 | Harmonization of the pan-European C&S landscape | 65 |
| 2.4.6 | Structure of securities clearing & settlement in Germany | 66 |
| 2.4.7 | Generic process of securities clearing & settlement | 68 |
| 2.4.8 | Lack of research and positioning of the dissertation | 69 |
| 2.5 | Clarification of research gap | 70 |
| 2.6 | Research questions and research design | 73 |
| 2.7 | Research process | 76 |
| 2.8 | Description of case study | 78 |
| 2.8.1 | Background information | 78 |
| 2.8.2 | Description of OTC derivatives clearing and settlement process and positioning of the sample process | 79 |
| 2.8.3 | Process characteristics and service classification of sample process | 82 |
| 2.8.4 | Appropriateness of the case study for the dissertation | 84 |
| 2.8.5 | Derivation of process description by process mining | 86 |
| 2.8.5.1 | Data | 87 |
| 2.8.5.2 | Description of the process mining technique | 89 |
| 2.8.5.3 | Results of process mining and process description | 91 |
| 2.8.6 | Description of case study data | 97 |
| 2.8.6.1 | Level of analysis | 97 |
| 2.8.6.2 | Process variants | 98 |
| 2.8.6.3 | Data and data cleansing | 99 |
| 2.8.6.4 | Descriptive statistics | 102 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 3 | Methodological basis of frontier-based efficiency analysis and their implications for measuring business process efficiency | 107 |
| 3.1 | Defining efficiency | 107 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|------------|
| 3.2 | Estimating efficiency with frontier analysis | 112 |
| 3.2.1 | Basic methodology of nonparametric efficiency estimation | 113 |
| 3.2.1.1 | Nonparametric efficiency analysis with distance function approach | 114 |
| 3.2.1.2 | Input set requirements for nonparametric efficiency analysis | 115 |
| 3.2.1.3 | Additional requirements and conceptual considerations for applying nonparametric efficiency analysis | 119 |
| 3.2.2 | Basic methodology of parametric frontier-based efficiency estimation | 121 |
| 3.3 | Application to the case study | 126 |
| 3.3.1 | Frontier-based efficiency analysis on process level following Burger (2009) | 126 |
| 3.3.2 | Input-output-model | 127 |
| 3.3.3 | Problems with applying SFA in the context of business process efficiency analysis | 128 |
| 3.3.4 | Fulfillment of input set requirements in the case study | 130 |
| 3.4 | Requirements for applying nonparametric efficiency measurement on process level | 132 |
| 4 | Comparison of frontier-based nonparametric methods to measure business process efficiency | 135 |
| 4.1 | Most popular nonparametric efficiency measurement methods | 135 |
| 4.1.1 | Data envelopment analysis | 135 |
| 4.1.1.1 | The basic model | 138 |
| 4.1.1.2 | The role of the virtual multipliers (weights) in DEA | 143 |
| 4.1.1.3 | The role of specific values of input and output variables in DEA | 145 |
| 4.1.1.4 | Zeros in inputs and/or outputs | 145 |
| 4.1.1.5 | Normalized models | 147 |
| 4.1.1.6 | Congestion and undesired outputs | 147 |
| 4.1.1.7 | Measure-specific DEA-models | 148 |
| 4.1.2 | Slack-based models | 149 |
| 4.1.2.1 | Basic slack-based models | 149 |
| 4.1.2.2 | Super-efficiency slack-based model | 153 |
| 4.1.3 | Free disposable hull | 154 |
| 4.1.4 | Bootstrapped nonparametric efficiency estimators | 156 |
| 4.2 | Application to the case study | 159 |
| 4.2.1 | Motivation of choice of methods | 160 |
| 4.2.2 | Results of efficiency analysis with SBM- and SSBM-model | 161 |
| 4.2.2.1 | Results for process variant A | 162 |
| 4.2.2.1.1 | Descriptive statistics of SBM- and SSBM-model | 162 |
| 4.2.2.1.2 | The efficient set | 164 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----|
| 4.2.2.1.3 | Interpretation of reference clusters | 166 |
| 4.2.2.1.4 | Endogenous input inefficiency (EII) | 171 |
| 4.2.2.1.5 | Projected input reduction | 173 |
| 4.2.2.1.6 | Mean weights of input variables | 173 |
| 4.2.2.1.7 | Results of super-efficiency SBM-model | 174 |
| 4.2.2.2 | Results for process variant B | 175 |
| 4.2.2.2.1 | Descriptive statistics | 175 |
| 4.2.2.2.2 | The efficient set | 176 |
| 4.2.2.2.3 | Interpretation of reference clusters | 178 |
| 4.2.2.2.4 | Endogenous input inefficiency (EII) | 183 |
| 4.2.2.2.5 | Projected input reduction | 184 |
| 4.2.2.2.6 | Mean weights of input variables | 184 |
| 4.2.2.2.7 | Results for super-efficiency SBM-model | 185 |
| 4.2.3 | Results of efficiency analysis with CCR | 185 |
| 4.2.3.1 | Descriptive statistics for both process variants | 185 |
| 4.2.3.2 | Results for process variant A | 189 |
| 4.2.3.2.1 | The efficient set | 189 |
| 4.2.3.2.2 | Projected input reduction and mean weights of the input variables | 190 |
| 4.2.3.3 | Results for process variant B | 190 |
| 4.2.3.3.1 | The efficient set | 191 |
| 4.2.3.3.2 | Projected input reduction and mean input weights | 191 |
| 4.2.4 | Results of efficiency analysis with FDH | 191 |
| 4.2.5 | Results of efficiency analysis with m -out-of- n bootstrap | 198 |
| 4.2.6 | Robustness tests | 202 |
| 4.2.6.1 | Sensitivity of results towards changes in input variables . . | 202 |
| 4.2.6.2 | Sensitivity of results towards outliers | 204 |
| 4.2.6.2.1 | Conceptual consequences of outlier removal for the case study | 205 |
| 4.2.6.2.2 | Elimination of DMUs with extreme input variables | 205 |
| 4.2.6.2.3 | Identification of outliers using SSBM-model . . . | 207 |
| 4.2.6.2.4 | Detecting outlier following the methodology of Simar (2003) | 207 |
| 4.2.6.3 | Frontier stability tests | 208 |
| 4.2.6.3.1 | Deletion of input variables and impact on efficient set | 209 |
| 4.2.6.3.2 | Spearman rank correlations after elimination of input variables | 209 |
| 4.2.6.3.3 | Deletion of most efficient DMUs and its impacts . | 209 |
| 4.3 | Comparison and discussion | 211 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 4.3.1 | Methodologically-based comparison | 211 |
| 4.3.2 | Discussion and overall comparison of case study results | 217 |
| 4.3.2.1 | Discussion and comparison of SBM-results | 222 |
| 4.3.2.2 | Discussion and comparison of CCR-results | 224 |
| 4.3.2.3 | Discussion and comparison of FDH-results | 225 |
| 4.3.2.4 | Discussion and comparison of results of m -out-of- n bootstrap | 226 |
| 4.3.2.5 | Comparison between process variants | 227 |
| 4.3.2.6 | Comparison of results to previous relevant case studies | 227 |
| 4.3.3 | Guidelines and pitfalls for applying nonparametric efficiency analysis on business process level | 228 |
| 5 | Comparison of methods in combination with nonparametric frontier-based efficiency analysis for identification of efficiency drivers in business processes | 237 |
| 5.1 | Terminologies | 237 |
| 5.2 | Most popular methods applied in combination with nonparametric efficiency analysis to assess the impact of explanatory variables on efficiency | 240 |
| 5.2.1 | Benchmarking efficient DMUs | 240 |
| 5.2.2 | Comparison of efficiency between groups | 240 |
| 5.2.3 | One-stage approaches: Inclusion of explanatory variables in efficiency estimation | 242 |
| 5.2.3.1 | One-stage approaches with hierarchical order (CAT-model) | 242 |
| 5.2.3.2 | One-stage approaches without hierarchical order (SYS-model) | 244 |
| 5.2.4 | Combination with data mining | 245 |
| 5.2.5 | Two-stage approaches: Assessing the impact of explanatory variables with regression analysis | 247 |
| 5.2.5.1 | Problems with consistency of the <i>nonparametric efficiency estimator</i> and regression estimators | 248 |
| 5.2.5.2 | Problem of serial correlation | 250 |
| 5.2.5.3 | Problems with adequacy of the DGP defined for nonparametric efficiency estimation | 252 |
| 5.2.5.4 | Problems with <i>correlation between independent variables and input variables</i> | 254 |
| 5.3 | Application to the case study | 254 |
| 5.3.1 | Data | 255 |
| 5.3.2 | Explanatory variables | 257 |
| 5.3.3 | Results of <i>benchmarking the efficient DMUs</i> | 278 |
| 5.3.3.1 | Results for process variant A | 278 |
| 5.3.3.2 | Results for process variant B | 281 |
| 5.3.4 | Results of comparison of efficiency between groups | 281 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----|
| 5.3.4.1 | Results for process variant A | 284 |
| 5.3.4.2 | Results for process variant B | 288 |
| 5.3.5 | Results of one-stage approaches | 291 |
| 5.3.5.1 | Results for process variant A | 293 |
| 5.3.5.2 | Results for process variant B | 299 |
| 5.3.6 | Results of combination with cluster analysis | 304 |
| 5.3.6.1 | Results for process variant A | 307 |
| 5.3.6.1.1 | Cluster characterization | 309 |
| 5.3.6.1.2 | Assessment of influence of exogenous variables | 313 |
| 5.3.6.2 | Results for process variant B | 324 |
| 5.3.6.2.1 | Cluster characterization | 328 |
| 5.3.6.2.2 | Assessment of influences of exogenous variables | 329 |
| 5.3.7 | Results of two-stage approaches | 337 |
| 5.3.7.1 | Inclusion of input variables as independent variables | 338 |
| 5.3.7.2 | Inclusion of interaction terms with input variables | 340 |
| 5.3.7.3 | Treatment of outliers | 341 |
| 5.3.7.4 | Results for process variant A | 342 |
| 5.3.7.4.1 | Results for A-models | 342 |
| 5.3.7.4.2 | Results for B-models | 353 |
| 5.3.7.4.3 | Results for C-models | 362 |
| 5.3.7.5 | Results for process variant B | 368 |
| 5.3.7.5.1 | Results for A-models | 368 |
| 5.3.7.5.2 | Results for B-models | 376 |
| 5.3.7.5.3 | Results for C-models | 384 |
| 5.4 | Comparison and discussion | 392 |
| 5.4.1 | Methodologically-based comparison | 392 |
| 5.4.1.1 | Benchmarking the efficient process instances | 396 |
| 5.4.1.2 | Comparison between groups | 397 |
| 5.4.1.3 | One-stage approaches | 398 |
| 5.4.1.4 | Cluster analysis | 400 |
| 5.4.1.5 | Two-stage approaches | 401 |
| 5.4.2 | Case-study-based comparison | 404 |
| 5.4.2.1 | Amount of documents | 404 |
| 5.4.2.2 | Cancel | 419 |
| 5.4.2.3 | Fail | 419 |
| 5.4.2.4 | Risk | 421 |
| 5.4.2.5 | Escalation | 422 |
| 5.4.2.6 | Carrier | 423 |
| 5.4.2.7 | Central settlement | 425 |
| 5.4.2.8 | Matching type | 425 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 5.4.2.9 | Matching date | 427 |
| 5.4.2.10 | Product type | 428 |
| 5.4.2.11 | Broker | 429 |
| 5.4.2.12 | Collateral | 430 |
| 5.4.2.13 | Deal type | 430 |
| 5.4.2.14 | Currency | 431 |
| 5.4.2.15 | Trader | 432 |
| 5.4.2.16 | Trade frequency | 433 |
| 5.4.2.17 | Counterparty location | 434 |
| 5.4.2.18 | Results of CCR- versus SBM-efficiency estimation | 435 |
| 5.4.3 | Guidelines and pitfalls for identifying inefficiency drivers in business processes in combination with nonparametric efficiency analysis | 436 |
| 6 | Conclusion | 441 |
| 6.1 | Summary of main results | 441 |
| 6.2 | Assessment of the research | 446 |
| 6.2.1 | Contribution to academic research | 446 |
| 6.2.2 | Contribution to business practice | 449 |
| 6.3 | Limitations | 450 |
| 6.4 | Avenues for future research | 451 |
| 7 | Appendix | 453 |
| 7.1 | Appendix A – Appendix for chapter 2 | 453 |
| 7.2 | Appendix B – Appendix for chapter 3 | 454 |
| 7.2.1 | Case study applied for SFA | 454 |
| 7.2.1.1 | Results SFA Pretest | 455 |
| 7.2.1.2 | Results SFA | 457 |
| 7.3 | Appendix C – Appendix for chapter 4 | 458 |
| 7.3.1 | Figures for BIAS-corrected efficiency scores determined by <i>m</i> -out-of- <i>n</i> bootstrap | 458 |
| 7.3.2 | Histograms of efficiency scores after removal of zeros | 463 |
| 7.3.3 | Box plots of input variables after outlier removal | 464 |
| 7.4 | Appendix D – Appendix for chapter 5 | 466 |
| 7.4.1 | Correlation matrices for explanatory variables | 466 |
| 7.4.2 | Robustness tests for reduced dataset for explanatory variables | 472 |
| 7.4.3 | Figures KW-tests for comparison of groups | 480 |
| 7.4.4 | Differences between CAT- and SYS-model | 490 |
| 7.4.5 | Figures KW-tests for cluster analysis | 493 |
| | References | 497 |