

Why SAP SuccessFactors Transformations Fail to Deliver Business Outcomes — and How to Fix It

A Practitioner's Perspective on Cloud HR Modernisation in Regulated Enterprises

Giovanni Leonardi

December 2025



Why SAP SuccessFactors Transformations Fail to Deliver Business Outcomes — and How to Fix It

*Transformation · No. 431
December 2025*

1. The Problem Nobody Wants to Name

Large-scale SAP SuccessFactors transformations are routinely commissioned with ambitious business cases—cost reduction, workforce agility, global standardisation, and compliance modernisation. Yet, despite rigorous planning and technical execution, the promised business outcomes frequently fail to materialise. The pattern is consistent: projects deliver a new cloud platform on time and within budget, only for adoption to stall, data integrity to degrade, and operational benefits to evaporate within 12–18 months of go-live. The root cause is not technical deficiency, but a fundamental misalignment between delivery methodology and business reality. Organisations treat SAP SuccessFactors as an IT project, not a business transformation. The result is a system that functions, but does not perform.

This problem persists because it is systemic, not situational. Across regulated enterprises—particularly in financial services, energy, and public sector environments—transformation programmes are structured around technical milestones: design, build, test, deploy. Business outcomes are assumed to follow. They rarely do. The disconnect is not a failure of intent, but of integration: HR, Payroll, IT, and Finance operate in silos, each with distinct success criteria. Without a unified governance framework that ties technical delivery to measurable business impact, SAP SuccessFactors becomes a platform in search of a purpose.

2. Why It Happens — Three Structural Reasons

2.11. Governance is Built for Delivery, Not Outcomes

Most SAP SuccessFactors programmes adopt SAP Activate or hybrid delivery methodologies, which provide robust stage-gate controls for technical execution. However, these frameworks are designed to manage scope, budget, and timeline—not business value. Governance forums, such as steering committees, focus on milestone completion and risk mitigation, with little visibility into adoption metrics, data quality, or operational efficiency post-go-live. The result is a governance model that ensures the system is delivered, but not that it is used effectively. In complex, multi-stakeholder environments—particularly those involving third-party vendors and system integrators—this misalignment is compounded. Suppliers are incentivised to meet contractual milestones, not to drive business outcomes. Without outcome-based KPIs embedded into governance from the outset, the transformation becomes a delivery

exercise, not a business enabler.

2.2 2. Data Migration is Treated as a Technical Task, Not a Business Risk

Data migration is the single greatest predictor of transformation success—and the most frequently underestimated risk. In legacy-to-cloud migrations, data integrity is not a technical challenge; it is a business continuity risk. Payroll errors, compliance breaches, and reporting failures can have material consequences in regulated sectors. Yet, data migration is often delegated to technical teams with limited input from HR, Payroll, or Finance stakeholders. The result is a migration that meets technical validation criteria but fails to support operational reality. For example, a global financial services firm may migrate employee records successfully, only to discover post-go-live that payroll calculations are misaligned with local tax regulations. The issue is not the data—it is the absence of business ownership over data quality. Without end-to-end accountability that spans technical migration and operational validation, data becomes a silent failure point.

2.3 3. Change Management is an Afterthought, Not a Delivery Lever

Change management is frequently positioned as a parallel workstream, rather than a core delivery discipline. Workshops, communications, and training are scheduled in the final phases of the programme, long after design decisions have been locked. This approach assumes that user adoption can be bolted on at the end. It cannot. In complex, multi-market transformations, change resistance is not a behavioural issue—it is a structural one. Users resist not because they are unwilling, but because the system does not align with their operational reality. For instance, a global enterprise may standardise HR processes across 30 markets, only to discover that local compliance requirements render the new system unusable in key regions. The solution is not more training, but earlier and deeper stakeholder engagement. Change management must be embedded into delivery from the design phase, with business stakeholders co-owning process design, data validation, and adoption metrics. Without this, SAP SuccessFactors becomes a system that is technically sound, but operationally irrelevant.

3. What Good Looks Like — The Three-Level Fix

3.1 1. Governance: From Delivery to Outcomes

The first step in fixing SAP SuccessFactors transformations is to reorient governance around business outcomes, not technical milestones. This requires a shift from stage-gate controls to outcome-based governance. Steering committees must track not only budget and timeline, but also adoption rates, data accuracy, and operational efficiency. For example, a global energy firm may set a governance KPI that 90% of HR transactions must be completed within the new system within six months of go-live. This metric is not a technical measure—it is a business outcome. To achieve this, governance must be integrated across HR, Payroll, IT, and Finance, with a single executive owner accountable for end-to-end success. Suppliers must be incentivised not only to deliver the system, but to drive adoption. This can be achieved through outcome-based contracts that tie final payments to business KPIs, such as user engagement or data quality.

3.2 2. Data: From Migration to Assurance

Data migration must be treated as a business risk, not a technical task. This requires a shift from technical validation to business assurance. Data migration teams must include HR, Payroll, and Finance stakeholders, with joint accountability for data integrity. For example, a financial services firm may establish a data governance forum that includes representatives from HR, Payroll, and Compliance, with a mandate to validate data not only against technical criteria, but also against operational and regulatory requirements. This forum must have veto power over go-live decisions, ensuring that data quality is not sacrificed for timeline. Additionally, data migration must be tested not only in isolation, but also in the context of end-to-end business processes. For instance, a payroll run must be executed in the new system prior to go-live, with results validated against legacy outputs. Without this level of rigour, data migration becomes a technical exercise, not a business enabler.

3.3 3. People: From Change Management to Change Ownership

Change management must be embedded into delivery from the outset, with business stakeholders co-owning adoption. This requires a shift from parallel workstreams to integrated delivery. For example, a global enterprise may establish a change leadership forum that includes HR, Payroll, and IT leaders, with a mandate to co-design processes, validate data, and drive adoption. This forum must be empowered to challenge design decisions that do not align with operational reality. Additionally, change management must be data-driven, with adoption metrics embedded into governance. For instance, a firm may track the percentage of HR transactions completed in the new system, with a target of 80% adoption within three months of go-live. Without this level of integration, change management becomes a communications exercise, not a delivery lever.

4. The Sector-Specific Complication

In regulated sectors—particularly financial services and public sector environments—SAP SuccessFactors transformations are further complicated by compliance and audit requirements. Governance frameworks must not only drive business outcomes, but also demonstrate regulatory compliance. For example, a bank may be required to maintain audit trails for all HR transactions, with strict controls over data access and modification. This adds a layer of complexity to data migration and system integration, as compliance requirements must be embedded into technical design. Additionally, regulated firms must demonstrate that the new system does not introduce operational risk. This requires rigorous testing not only of system functionality, but also of compliance controls. For instance, a firm may be required to execute a full payroll run in the new system, with results validated against legacy outputs and audited by internal compliance teams. Without this level of rigour, SAP SuccessFactors transformations risk delivering a system that is technically sound, but operationally non-compliant.

5. Conclusion

SAP SuccessFactors transformations fail to deliver business outcomes not because of technical deficiency, but because of structural misalignment. Governance is built for delivery, not outcomes. Data migration is treated as a technical task, not a business risk. Change management is an afterthought, not a delivery lever. The solution is not more methodology, but more integration. Governance must be reoriented around business outcomes. Data migration must be treated as a business risk. Change management must be embedded into delivery from the outset. Only then will SAP SuccessFactors transformations deliver not just a new system, but a new way of working. The question is not whether organisations can afford to fix this problem—it is whether they can afford not to.