Section 05

Model for 5, 10, 20, 50 and 100 organisations

Bottom-up shared-services economic model: 5, 10, 20, 50 and 100 organisations

Using the country benchmarks already established, this is the next-stage model for Australia, United States, United Kingdom, India, Brazil and South Africa across the seven priority functions: IT support; cybersecurity; CRM/data infrastructure; finance administration; HR administration; reporting; and software procurement.

The market-price inputs are evidence-based; the shared-service workload assumptions are explicit modelling assumptions so they can later be tested and replaced without rebuilding the model.

1. Standard organisation used for comparison

To make the six countries comparable, one small patient organisation was modelled with:

- 5 active system users
- 3 paid employees
- substantial volunteer involvement, but volunteer hours are not yet monetised in this stage
- CRM software assumed available at no/very low nonprofit licence cost where eligible
- 40 hours initial CRM implementation, amortised over three years
- 48 hours/year of independent CRM administration
- 120 hours/year of reporting/admin work
- 12 hours/year spent on software selection/procurement.

This is deliberately closer to a small organisation than a micro volunteer-only organisation. A separate micro-organisational scenario should ultimately be added because its main benefit will probably be capability uplift rather than cash savings.

2. Independent-provision benchmark

The model first estimates what equivalent capability would cost if each organisation acquired the seven functions independently.

The IT assumptions are consistent with current market evidence. Australian managed IT is currently reported at about A$80–200 per user/month, with security-inclusive packages often around A$140–180; another Australian provider places comprehensive MSP pricing around A$149–349 per user/month. UK managed IT commonly ranges from £30–150 per user/month, with £50–85 around the mid-market range. South African standard managed services are reported at approximately R600–1,000/user/month, while Indian pricing examples range from ₹699 for basic MSP support to ₹1,499/user/month for a fuller service. Brazilian

managed IT is reported at around R$100–200/user/month for managed service. Finance benchmarks are also reasonably observable: Indian end-to-end small-business accounting commonly falls around ₹3,500–8,000/month, while Brazilian traditional accounting is reported at approximately R$800–1,600/month.

Using the central benchmark assumptions developed in the previous stage produces the following annual equivalent-capability cost per organisation**:**

Country	Annual independent cost
Australia	**A$50,227**
United States	**US$37,364**
United Kingdom	**£22,453**
India	**₹697,000**
Brazil	**R$64,833**
South Africa	**R281,867**

These should not be interpreted as estimates of what small patient organisations currently spend. Many organisations probably spend substantially less because they do not currently purchase equivalent IT, cyber, CRM, HR or reporting capability. They are the economic counterfactual: What would equivalent independent capability cost? That distinction remains central to the model.

3. Bottom-up shared-service architecture

Rather than simply assuming "shared services save 30%", each shared function is costed from an operational workload.

For the first-pass model uses the following central assumptions.

Function	Shared model assumption
IT	Common platform/monitoring equal to 20% of independent IT benchmark + 0.5 technical support hour/user/month + 40 technical governance hours annually shared across cohort
Cybersecurity	Shared security tooling/service equal to 50% of independent standalone benchmark + 30 specialist hours annually shared across cohort
CRM/data	8 hours annual organisation-specific administration + 60 CRM/data administration hours shared across cohort

Function	Shared model assumption
Finance	4 processing/bookkeeping hours per organisation/month + 40 annual finance oversight hours shared across cohort
HR	0.5 administrative hour/employee/month + 20 HR oversight hours annually shared across cohort
Reporting	Residual organisation-specific reporting reduced from 120 to 50 hours/year + 60 common reporting/data hours across cohort
Software procurement	2 organisation-specific hours/year + 20 common procurement/rationalisation hours across cohort

These assumptions are intentionally not aggressive automation assumptions. For example, organisations still retain 50 hours of reporting activity rather than assuming reporting becomes automatic. They also make no assumed software volume discount. That is conservative because nonprofit programmes may already provide more favourable prices than volume purchasing.

4. Australia

Independent equivalent capability is approximately A$50,227 per organisation/year under the standard archetype.

Participating organisations	Shared cost per organisation	Saving per organisation	Efficiency gain
5	A$28,280	A$21,947	**43.7%**
10	A$24,615	A$25,612	**51.0%**
20	A$22,783	A$27,444	**54.6%**
50	A$21,683	A$28,544	**56.8%**
100	A$21,317	A$28,910	**57.6%**

The most important result is not the 100-organisation figure. Most of the scale benefit is already captured by around 10–20 organisations**.**

At ten organisations:

- equivalent independent annual capability = approximately A$502,267
- modelled shared provision = approximately A$246,150
- economic resource difference = approximately A$256,117/year**.**

This is sufficiently large to justify testing the assumptions more rigorously.

5. United States

Independent equivalent capability is approximately US$37,364 per organisation/year**.**

Participating organisations	Shared cost per organisation	Saving per organisation	Efficiency gain
5	US$21,360	US$16,004	**42.8%**
10	US$18,570	US$18,794	**50.3%**
20	US$17,175	US$20,189	**54.0%**
50	US$16,338	US$21,026	**56.3%**
100	US$16,059	US$21,305	**57.0%**

US market evidence supports the high underlying independent-service cost. Current IT-support salary evidence places US IT-support specialists at roughly US$64,000/year on average, illustrating why specialist infrastructure is difficult for a very small organisation to internalise economically. HR-support specialist salaries are also around US$70,000 annually. At ten organisations, the model generates approximately: US$373,640 independent-equivalent cost versus US$185,700 shared cost**,** a modelled resource difference of US$187,940/year**.**

6. United Kingdom

Independent equivalent capability is approximately £22,453 per organisation/year**.**

Participating organisations	Shared cost per organisation	Saving per organisation	Efficiency gain
5	£13,010	£9,443	**42.1%**
10	£11,220	£11,233	**50.0%**
20	£10,325	£12,128	**54.0%**
50	£9,788	£12,665	**56.4%**
100	£9,609	£12,844	**57.2%**

These figures are consistent with a market in which even relatively routine professional capability has significant fixed cost. UK government career data place a bookkeeper at approximately £24,000 to £35,000/year, for example.

At ten organisations: £224,533 independent-equivalent capability versus approximately £112,200 shared provision**,** or roughly £112,333 annual economic resource difference**.**

7. India

Modelling for India behaves differently in terms of lower savings benefit. Independent equivalent capability is approximately ₹697,000 per organisation/year**.**

Participating organisations	Shared cost per organisation	Saving per organisation	Efficiency gain
5	₹435,900	₹261,100	**37.5%**
10	₹386,400	₹310,600	**44.6%**
20	₹361,650	₹335,350	**48.1%**
50	₹346,800	₹350,200	**50.2%**
100	₹341,850	₹355,150	**51.0%**

The lower savings percentage is partly driven by the model's cybersecurity floor cost. Indian managed IT can be relatively inexpensive, published plans begin around ₹699/user/month, but meaningful security, MDR and compliance-ready capability comes at a much higher minimum service level.

That creates an important result: The Indian case for sharing is not simply cheaper labour costs. It is spreading specialist fixed capability across organisations.

The finance comparator is comparatively low: routine CA-led accounting can be around ₹3,500–8,000/month. Consequently, the strongest value proposition in India is likely to come from cybersecurity, CRM/data, reporting and specialist infrastructure**,** rather than outsourcing already-low-cost bookkeeping.

At ten organisations: ₹6.97 million independent-equivalent capability versus ₹3.864 million shared provision**,** a modelled difference of approximately ₹3.106 million/year**.**

8. Brazil

Independent equivalent capability is approximately R$64,833 per organisation/year**.**

Participating organisations	Shared cost per organisation	Saving per organisation	Efficiency gain
5	R$34,650	R$30,183	**46.6%**
10	R$30,000	R$34,833	**53.7%**
20	R$27,675	R$37,158	**57.3%**
50	R$26,280	R$38,553	**59.5%**
100	R$25,815	R$39,018	**60.2%**

Brazil produces the highest modelled percentage saving, but it should also be treated with the lowest confidence of the six models. This is because transparent Brazilian price evidence for CRM administration, nonprofit reporting and outsourced HR is considerably weaker than for IT and accounting. Current Brazilian IT evidence supports managed support around R$100–200/user/month. Accounting prices are also observable, with traditional services around R$800–1,600/month versus very low-cost online products beginning around R$189/month. The model deliberately uses a higher accounting comparator rather than the R$189 product because a patient organisation's financial/governance requirements are unlikely to resemble a simple solo commercial entity.

At ten organisations: R$648,333 equivalent independent cost versus R$300,000 shared provision, a difference of approximately R$348,333/year.

For this purpose, that number is considered as provisional until Brazil-specific HR, CRM and NFP accounting costs can be strengthened.

9. South Africa

Independent equivalent capability is approximately R281,867 per organisation/year**.**

Participating organisations	Shared cost per organisation	Saving per organisation	Efficiency gain
5	R162,000	R119,867	**42.5%**
10	R142,500	R139,367	**49.4%**
20	R132,750	R149,117	**52.9%**

Participating organisations	Shared cost per organisation	Saving per organisation	Efficiency gain
50	R126,900	R154,967	**55.0%**
100	R124,950	R156,917	**55.7%**

The South African market provides a relatively useful reality check. Current managed IT pricing is approximately:

- R400–600/user/month basic;
- R600–1,000 standard;
- R1,000–1,500+ premium.

The standard tier explicitly adds backup, EDR, security management and reporting. That confirms the importance of avoiding double counting IT and cybersecurity.

At ten organisations: R2.819 million independent-equivalent capability versus approximately R1.425 million shared provision**,** a modelled resource difference of roughly R1.394 million/year**.**

10. Cross-country scale effect

The overall pattern is consistent.

Country	5 orgs	10 orgs	20 orgs	50 orgs	100 orgs
Australia	43.7%	51.0%	54.6%	56.8%	57.6%
United States	42.8%	50.3%	54.0%	56.3%	57.0%
United Kingdom	42.1%	50.0%	54.0%	56.4%	57.2%
India	37.5%	44.6%	48.1%	50.2%	51.0%
Brazil*	46.6%	53.7%	57.3%	59.5%	60.2%
South Africa	42.5%	49.4%	52.9%	55.0%	55.7%

*Lower-confidence local inputs.

There are two important conclusions. First, the strongest marginal scale gain occurs early with the difference between 5 and 10 organisations being substantial. The difference between 50 and 100 is quite small. Economically, that suggests the model does not require hundreds of organisations before it becomes useful**.** A national hub of approximately 10–20 participating organisations may already capture much of the achievable fixed-cost efficiency.

Second, there is a natural ceiling. The model does not imply that costs approach zero as participation grows.

Variable costs remain:

- tickets still have to be handled;
- transactions processed;
- employees administered;
- organisation-specific reports completed;
- datasets maintained.

That is why the scale curves flatten around the 50–60% range rather than continuing indefinitely.

11. Function-specific break-even points

The model also allows calculation of the approximate cohort size at which the shared service becomes cheaper than the independent equivalent.

Function	AU	US	UK	India	Brazil	South Africa
IT	~5	~3	~7	No cash break-even*	No cash break-even*	~4
Cybersecurity	~4	~4	~5	~1	~4	~4
CRM/data	~2	~2	~2	~2	~2	~2
Finance	~3	~1	~2	~1	~1	~6
HR	~1	~1	~1	~1	~1	~1
Reporting	~1	~1	~1	~1	~1	~1
Software procurement admin	~2	~2	~2	~2	~2	~2

*Under the current technical-hours assumption, a locally contracted shared IT service in India and Brazil does not become cheaper than the relatively low independent IT benchmark merely through scale. This does not mean shared IT has no value; it means its case is primarily capability, integration and service-quality uplift unless the operating architecture is redesigned.This is one of the more useful outputs of the exercise because it prevents us from claiming that every shared function saves money in every country**.**

12. IT should be treated differently by country

The model indicates three different IT cases. Australia, US, UK and South Africa where shared IT has a credible direct economic case. India and Brazil where the local IT market is sufficiently inexpensive that a labour-intensive shared technical service may not outperform the market on cash cost.

For these countries, Amplify Impact modelling should potentially procure an existing local MSP rather than create its own shared IT helpdesk.

The shared layer would then provide:

- architecture;
- common specifications;
- cybersecurity standards;
- procurement;
- integration;
- CRM/data architecture;
- vendor management.

That is a significant design improvement arising directly from the model.

13. Which functions appear most economically compelling?

Based on both the benchmark evidence and model behaviour, these have been ranked as follows:

Priority	Function	Why
1	CRM/data infrastructure	Very high duplication and specialist capability; strong early scale economies
2	Reporting/data reuse	Large administrative-time component and highly reusable infrastructure

Priority	Function	Why
3	Finance administration	Predictable workload and strong standardisation
4	HR administration	Low relational requirement for basic administration; strong fixed-cost efficiency
5	Cybersecurity	Strong capability uplift and pooling of specialist fixed costs
6	Software procurement	Easy to share, but direct savings may be modest where nonprofit discounts already exist
7	IT support	Strong in higher-cost countries; less compelling as an internally delivered shared service where local MSP markets are inexpensive

This differs slightly from the original assumption that IT would necessarily be one of the largest sources of savings.

The evidence suggests CRM, reporting and common administrative infrastructure may actually be more central to the model**.**

14. A critical interpretation of the 40–60% efficiency figures

The current model is deliberately an equivalent-capability comparison. It assumes that an organisation independently acquiring professional capability would incur approximately the market benchmark.

But a volunteer-led patient group might currently do this instead:

- IT: volunteer fixes problems;
- cyber: basic antivirus only;
- CRM: spreadsheets;
- finance: volunteer treasurer;
- HR: CEO;
- reporting: unpaid CEO time.

Its actual cash spend may therefore be only A$5,000 or A$10,000. Offering it A$20,000 of shared infrastructure clearly does not "save cash". Instead it may provide A$40,000-equivalent organisational capability for A$20,000**.** That is a capability efficiency, not a budget saving.

The economic model must therefore present two comparisons:

Model A — equivalent capability

Independent market capability versus shared capability (This is what is calculated in this document)

Model B — current-state budget impact

Actual existing expenditure versus shared-service contribution.

That requires only a small amount of organisational validation.

This distinction will make the economic argument much harder to challenge.

15. Implications for a government-funded model

The results also suggest a potentially much stronger advocacy proposition than simply asking patient organisations to purchase shared services themselves. If government or philanthropy funded the fixed infrastructure, patient organisations would need to finance only the organisation-variable cost.

At 10–20 organisations, the remaining variable component is already the dominant cost.

Public investment could therefore fund:

- initial CRM/data platform;
- cyber architecture;
- national compliance infrastructure;
- integrations;
- common reporting tools;
- implementation;
- initial process redesign.

Patient organisations would then pay only an affordable variable operating contribution, or nothing, depending on the policy model. This is economically rational because a single infrastructure investment prevents multiple small organisations from repeatedly solving the same fixed problem**.**

17. Overall conclusion

The bottom-up model supports the economic plausibility of shared infrastructure. Under transparent central assumptions, equivalent-capability efficiencies emerge even with relatively small cohorts. For a standard five-user organisation, the modelled reduction in the economic cost of equivalent capability is approximately:

- 38–47% at five organisations,
- 45–54% at ten organisations,
- 48–57% at twenty organisations, and
- roughly 50–60% once the system reaches mature scale.

The more robust result is the shape of the curve**:** most of the economies of scale emerge relatively early, around 10–20 participating organisations. The modelling also identifies important country-specific variation. It suggests that shared IT should not automatically be internally delivered everywhere; India and Brazil may be better served through coordinated procurement of inexpensive local MSP services. CRM/data, reporting, finance administration and common administrative infrastructure produce more consistently attractive economics across the six countries.