

This is just a rough outline with some of the points to consider. Not all points are included. For exam purposes you would want to carefully develop your best thoughts in each section.

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Zumwald | |
| Issues | <p>Pricing dispute between managers</p> <p>Should Fettinger (managing director) intervene?</p> <p>Does the current MCS align the interests of the managers with the interests of the owners?</p> <p>Should the company revise their MCS?</p> |
| Background | <p>located in Germany; produces medical diagnostic imaging systems & equipment</p> <p>6 divisions; 3 involved in the dispute</p> <p>ISD - sells high-end units to external customers</p> <p>Heidelberg - sells monitors, controls, subsystems: 50% external - 50% internal; 70% capacity</p> <p>ECD - sells application-specific circuits; external & internal sales; profit centre; 90 % capacity</p> <p>Internal transfer price of cost + 20% designed to motivate ECD to internal transactions</p> <p>STRENGTHS: Solid reputation; stable company; good profits; \$3B in annual sales</p> <p>WEAKNESSES: Internal transfer prices may lead to suboptimization; internal quarrelling; loss of sales</p> <p>OPPORTUNITIES: New sales order</p> <p>THREATS: Global business slowdown; excess capacity available</p> <p>There may be others; these are just a sample</p> |
| KSF's | <p>Return on Invested Capital (ROIC)</p> <p>Meeting targeted budgets</p> <p>Sales growth (What is the relationship between quality and sales growth?)</p> <p>Quality; innovation</p> |
| Current MCS | <p>6 Divisions</p> <p>Highly decentralized; considerable autonomy IF PERFORMANCE IS ON TARGET</p> <p>Return on Invested Capital - and sales growth</p> <p>ECD = profit centre; Heidelberg & ISD = investment centres (ROIC)</p> <p>Transfer pricing rule: can source from external suppliers if it helps meet targets; freedom to choose</p> <p>ECD - Internal transfer price of cost + 20% designed to motivate ECD to internal transactions</p> <p>Bauer - says if he is forced to purchase internally it will jeopardize his ability to obtain serious quotes from external vendors; freedom to chose is imperative</p> |
| Current Conflict | <p>3 quotes received: Heidelberg - \$140,000; Bogardus - 120,500; Display Technologies - 100,500</p> <p>Display Technology is lowest; but is unproven in market. Quality is unknown - bidding low to try to capture market share</p> <p>May offer low price to get customer; then raise, as may not be able to maintain low price and acceptable quality. If others can't, how can they offer such a low price?</p> <p>Deal is less than 5% of revenue for each of the divisions</p> <p>Heidelberg had helped design X73; but had only been reimbursed for costs - no profit made</p> <p>took their time & resources, but left them at nil change</p> <p>If Heidelberg got order, would buy components from ECD.</p> <p>Each department wants to charge standard markup; but Heidelberg & ECD are not operating at capacity; could other departments lower their profit margins in order to "get the business" from ISD? Is a smaller margin better than NO margin when operati</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--------------------|-----------------|
| FINANCIAL ANALYSIS: | | | | |
| If full transfer prices were used: | ECD | Heidelberg | ISD | Zumwald |
| Revenue or Transfer Price | 21,600 | 140,000 | 340,000 | |
| Variable Costs | 9,000 | 28,400 21,600 | 72,000 26,300 | |
| Gross Margin (profit if fixed costs are ignored) | 12,600 | 90,000 | 140,000 101,700 | 204,300 |
| Fixed Costs | 9,000 | 55,000 | 117,700 | |
| Profit | 3,600 | 35,000 | (16,000) | 22,600 |
| If purchased from Display Technologies | ECD | Heidelberg | ISD | Zumwald |
| Revenue or Transfer Price | 0 | 0 | 340,000 | |
| Variable Costs | 0 | 0 0 | 72,000 26,300 | |
| Gross Margin (profit if fixed costs are ignored) | 0 | 0 | 100,500 141,200 | 141,200 |
| Fixed Costs | 9,000 | 55,000 | 117,700 | |
| | fixed costs that may not be eliminated | fixed costs that may not be eliminated | | |
| Profit | (9,000) | (55,000) | 23,500 | (40,500) |
| Profit variance | (12,600) | (90,000) | 39,500 | (63,100) |
| Is this variance material??? Could something be done to help equalize impact to each division? | | | | |
| Recommendations | | | | |
| Evaluate centralized vs. decentralized | | | | |
| Evaluate responsibility centres | | | | |
| Evaluate transfer pricing policy | | | | |
| What would you change, how would you change them, and why. What are the strengths of your changes, and might they cause? Will they solve the real problem? | | | | |
| Would you add any new components to the MCS that are not currently in use? | | | | |
| Should Fettinger intervene? If so, in what way? Is there an effective way for him to be involved? | | | | |
| Could insist on internal transfer | | | | |
| This deal is less than 5% of overall annual revenue | | | | |
| Could intervene by providing training and assistance in how to settle the dispute. | | | | |
| Could do some number crunching with the managers to ensure they understand the overall impact | | | | |
| Could restructure the departments in a different way to minimize suboptimization | | | | |
| May jeopardize manager's autonomy and ability to transact in good faith with external suppliers | | | | |
| If Fettinger intervenes in this small matter, what might he do in better ones; | | | | |
| may defeat the purpose of the control systems | | | | |
| These are just some rough points that could be used to present your position on how to solve the issues at Zumwald. | | | | |
| End with, fully developed recommendations that include the strengths and weaknesses of the current plan and recommendations. This is the place to really focus on applying all of the things you learned in this section of the course. | | | | |