



*The Imperative for Modernization*

# Addressing Technical Debt

*and*

Driving Innovation  
in Financial Services

 Delta Data

[WWW.DELTADATA.COM](http://WWW.DELTADATA.COM)

## THE FINANCIAL SERVICES INDUSTRY IS AT A CROSSROADS.

*While technological innovation presents unprecedented opportunities for growth and efficiency, many firms are burdened by substantial technical debt—a legacy of outdated systems, inefficient processes, and poorly designed code.*

Addressing this debt is not merely an IT issue but a strategic imperative for survival and competitiveness. There is a multifaceted nature of technical debt with significant costs and various strategies for effective modernization. Tackling this problem relies on an examination of technological advancements, changing management best practices, and the crucial role of organizational culture in driving successful transformation.

### THE CHALLENGE

## Navigating the Legacy Landscape

The financial services sector is undergoing rapid and profound transformation, driven by evolving client expectations, industry competition, increasingly stringent regulatory requirements, and the emergence of disruptive technologies like artificial intelligence (AI) and blockchain. However, the industry's legacy infrastructure, built over decades, presents a formidable challenge.

Accumulated technical debt—the implied cost of rework caused by choosing an easy (often quick and dirty) solution now instead of using a better approach that would take longer—hinders innovation, likely lacks scalability, increases operational costs, and exposes firms to significant risks.



# Deconstructing Technical Debt: A Multi-Dimensional Analysis

Technical debt is not a monolithic entity. It's a complex web of interconnected issues, spanning various aspects of an organization's technological infrastructure and operational processes:

**FUNCTIONAL DEBT** refers to the shortfall in functionality, features, and capabilities needed to meet evolving market demands and client expectations. A lack of features essential for competitive advantage falls under this category. This is often exacerbated by a lack of agility in adapting to new market trends or establishing oneself as an industry disruptor.

**CODE DEBT** encompasses poorly written, undocumented, or difficult-to-maintain code. Legacy languages (e.g., COBOL), undocumented dependencies, and a lack of consistent coding standards (e.g. hard coding versus creating business rule engines for more flexibility and scale) significantly contribute to this type of debt. The result is increased development time, higher costs, and a greater risk of errors and system failures.

**KNOWLEDGE DEBT** is a reliance or overdependence on a few people with critical knowledge or legacy coding skillsets, creating bottlenecks and increased risk where a lack of knowledge or skillset is spread across the organization increases the likelihood of introducing new technological debt to uninformed decisions.

**ARCHITECTURAL DEBT** stems from inefficient system architecture that hinders scalability, flexibility, and integration with new technologies. Monolithic architectures, tightly coupled systems, and a lack of modularity create significant obstacles to modernization efforts.

**DATA DEBT** involves inconsistent, inaccurate, or incomplete data that hinders decision-making, regulatory reporting, and client service. Disparate data sources, lack of data governance, and poor data quality are primary contributors. This can result in significant reputational damage.

**PROCESS DEBT** refers to outdated or inefficient business processes reliant on manual intervention significantly increase operational costs and slow down transactions. Redundant steps, lack of automation, and inadequate workflow optimization contribute to this type of debt.

**SECURITY DEBT** arises from outdated security practices and vulnerabilities within legacy systems, increasing exposure to cyber threats and data breaches. This can lead to significant financial losses and reputational damage.

## DEPLOYMENT DEBT

For some firms with monolithic mainframe systems, having segregated Dev, QA, and UAT environments is either very challenging, expensive, or non-existent. This can be a huge pain point that requires a lot of shared environment coordination across all domains which are still on the mainframe.

- **Manual Deployment Processes:** Relying on human intervention for steps that could be automated increases the likelihood of errors and inconsistencies.
- **Lack of Deployment Automation:** Absence of robust Continuous Integration/Continuous Deployment (CI/CD) pipelines.
- **Environment Drift:** Discrepancies between development, staging, and production environments due to improper environment configurations.

# The Exorbitant Cost of Inaction: Quantifying the Impact

Ignoring technical debt is a costly gamble. The consequences can be far-reaching and significantly impact a firm's profitability, stability, and competitive position:

### *Escalating Operational Costs*

Maintaining outdated systems requires substantial ongoing investment, diverting resources from innovation and strategic initiatives.

### *Reduced Agility and Responsiveness*


Technical debt hinders the ability to adapt quickly to market changes, and resources consumed by maintaining legacy systems are diverted from developing new technologies and innovative solution, hindering a firm's competitive edge.

### *Heightened Regulatory Risk*

Outdated systems often struggle to meet the ever-evolving regulatory requirements, leading to increased compliance costs and potential penalties.

### *Reputational Damage and Loss of Trust*

Legacy systems often lack modern security features, exposing the firm to cyberattacks and data breaches, with potentially devastating consequences. These system failures arising from technical debt can severely damage a firm's reputation and erode clients' trust.



<sup>1</sup>According to a June 2022 McKinsey survey of CIOs, 30% believed that nearly

20%

of their technical budget seemingly dedicated to new products is diverted to resolving issues related to tech debt.

They also estimate that tech debt amounts to

20 to 40%

of the value of their entire technology estate (before depreciation).

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/mckinsey-digital/our-insights/demystifying-digital-dark-matter-a-new-standard-to-tame-technical-debt>



## STRATEGIC MODERNIZATION

# A Phased Approach Fueled by Technology Partnerships

Addressing technical debt requires a well-defined, phased modernization strategy. This is not a one-time project but a continuous process of improvement and adaptation. Central to this process is the strategic selection of technologies and partners that can propel financial institutions into the future. A phased approach, with a focus on technology includes:

### *Vendor Selection*

This is a *critical* component of modernization. A rigorous process for selecting third-party vendors is essential. Evaluate factors such as:

**SYSTEM MATURITY** Ensure the solution is proven and reliable.

**INDUSTRY EXPERTISE** Prioritize vendors with deep experience in the financial services sector with established relationships and influence within the industry.

**INTEGRATION CAPABILITIES** Verify that the vendor's solution can easily integrate with your existing systems, accelerating time to market through a streamlined onboarding process.

**SCALABILITY** Confirm that the system can handle your current and future needs.

**SUPPORT SERVICES** Secure a partner that will provide ongoing support and guidance.

### *Assessment and Prioritization*

A comprehensive audit of existing systems is imperative in identifying areas with the most significant technical debt. This helps prioritize areas that pose the greatest risk or offer the highest return on investment (ROI). This assessment informs the subsequent technology selection, ensuring that solutions are targeted to specific needs and weaknesses.

### *Technology Selection: Choosing the Right Partners for the Future*

Careful evaluation of various modernization technologies is crucial. This isn't just about adopting new tools but about finding the right technology partners with the capability to remove legacy hard code from processes and build business rule engines.

Considerations for choosing the right partners include...

**CLOUD ADOPTION (IAAS, PAAS, SAAS)** Moving to the cloud offers scalability, flexibility, and reduced infrastructure management overhead. Selecting the right cloud provider is key, considering factors like security, compliance, and integration capabilities.

**MICROSERVICES ARCHITECTURE** Shifting from monolithic to microservices allows for more agile development, easier maintenance, and the ability to deploy independent services. This requires a partner experienced in designing and implementing microservices.

**API-LED INTEGRATION** APIs act as connectors, enabling different systems to communicate seamlessly. Choosing partners experienced in building and managing robust APIs is crucial for integrating new and legacy systems.

**STRATEGIC IMPLEMENTATION OF AI AND MACHINE LEARNING** Harnessing AI and ML can automate tasks, enhance decision-making, and personalize client experiences. Partnering with specialized AI vendors can accelerate development and provide access to cutting-edge technologies.

**PHASED IMPLEMENTATION** A gradual, iterative approach minimizes disruption and allows for continuous monitoring and adaptation. This involves clearly defined milestones and regular progress reviews. The technology selection should enable this iterative approach.

**CHANGE MANAGEMENT** Implementing effective change management strategies is vital to minimize resistance to change, ensure smooth transitions, and secure employee buy-in throughout the modernization process. Choosing technologies that are user-friendly and support training initiatives is key.

**TALENT ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT** Addressing the skills gap by recruiting and training employees with expertise in modern technologies. Technology partners can play a crucial role in providing training and upskilling resources.

**CONTINUOUS MONITORING AND IMPROVEMENT** Establishing robust monitoring mechanisms to track progress, identify areas for improvement, and ensure the ongoing success of modernization efforts. Choosing solutions that have built in monitoring and analysis tools is also critical.

*The selection of technology and strategic technology partners is not just a component of modernization, it is the driving force.*

Choosing the right partners ensures that solutions are not only technically sound but also fit for the financial services industry, providing the expertise needed for a successful and sustainable future.

# Navigating the Buy vs. Build Decision

Financial institutions facing substantial technical debt often grapple with the "buy versus build" dilemma. While building custom solutions might seem appealing for unique requirements, in most cases, purchasing off-the-shelf products and partnering with specialized vendors offers a more strategic and efficient path to modernization. Here's why buying often emerges as the superior choice for tackling technical debt:

## ✓ **REDUCED TIME TO MARKET**

Developing custom solutions from scratch is a time-consuming endeavor, often taking months or even years. In contrast, purchasing readily available solutions allows for a much faster implementation. This accelerated timeline means quicker realization of benefits and a reduced period of exposure to the risks associated with outdated systems.

## ✓ **LOWER UPFRONT COSTS**

The initial investment for custom development is significantly higher than the cost of purchasing a pre-built solution. Custom development includes expenses such as development teams, infrastructure, and ongoing maintenance. Off-the-shelf products, while entailing subscription or licensing costs, are generally far less expensive upfront and offer predictable pricing.

## ✓ **MINIMIZED RISK OF FAILURE**

Building custom solutions comes with inherent risks, including development delays, budget overruns, and the potential for failure due to unforeseen technical issues or a lack of internal expertise. Off-the-shelf solutions have already undergone extensive testing and refinement by the vendor, minimizing the risk of errors and ensuring a more reliable outcome.

## ✓ **FOCUS ON CORE COMPETENCIES**

By choosing to buy, financial institutions can free up their internal resources to concentrate on core product differentiations and strategic initiatives, rather than getting bogged down in complex software development. This allows them to better leverage their in-house talents in areas where they provide the most value.

## ✓ **FASTER INNOVATION**

By selecting a technology partner, financial institutions can begin using cutting edge technology faster than building it. These vendors have teams working on cutting edge technology and therefore will allow you to be innovative faster.

## ✓ **ACCESS TO INDUSTRY EXPERTISE & BEST PRACTICES**

Reputable vendors specializing in the financial services sector bring a wealth of industry knowledge and best practices to the table, including deep connections and relationships (e.g. sitting on DTCC committees, being able to pull in asset managers and distributors to create win-win solutions). Their solutions are designed to address the specific challenges faced by financial institutions, incorporating regulatory compliance, security protocols, and industry standards. In-house development teams may lack this specialized expertise, leading to suboptimal solutions.

## ✓ SCALABILITY AND FLEXIBILITY

Modern off-the-shelf solutions are typically designed for scalability and flexibility, allowing them to adapt to changing business needs and growth. In contrast, custom solutions may be difficult and costly to scale as requirements evolve.

## ✓ ONGOING SUPPORT & MAINTENANCE

When buying a solution, you benefit from the vendor's ongoing support and maintenance services, including bug fixes, security updates, and new feature enhancements. This reduces the burden on your internal IT staff and ensures the long-term reliability and security of the system.

# The Risk for Young Firms

Young firms often fall into the tech debt trap by prioritizing speed over quality, and/or by not realizing the importance of building a robust and scalable architecture from the beginning. When starting out they may take short-cuts with technology to get to market fast, but as the business grows they often must take significant time and resources to address their tech debt.

This can include...

### INEXPERIENCED TEAMS

Often, young firms lack experienced tech leadership and architects who understand the importance of making good technology decisions, early.

### LACK OF PROCESS

Without established processes and coding standards, the technical debt can build-up quickly.

### PRESSURE TO DELIVER

The need to meet investor expectations can lead to shortcuts and choices that build tech debt.

### BUDGET CONSTRAINTS

Early-stage companies may try to cut costs by opting for quick, cheap, or open-source technology solutions that result in technical debt.

### CHASING PRODUCT FEATURES

Young firms focus on building features without thinking about scalability or long-term maintainability, leading to debt.

*Buying solutions with established vendors helps mitigate these risks, providing a faster, more reliable, and scalable path to growth for these young companies.*



# Considerations When Choosing to Buy

*While buying is often the preferred path, careful consideration is still necessary:*

## **TOTAL COST OF OWNERSHIP (TCO)**

Conduct a comprehensive comparison of long-term costs, including subscription fees, support services, and integration efforts.

## **VENDOR SELECTION**

Choose a vendor with a proven track record, deep industry experience, strong integration capabilities, and a long term vision.

## **INTEGRATION COMPLEXITY**

Assess the complexity of integrating the purchased solution with existing infrastructure. Vendors should offer robust support for integration.

## **CUSTOMIZATION NEEDS**

If unique requirements necessitate customizations, ensure that the chosen solution is flexible and adaptable.

*For most financial institutions struggling with technical debt, buying is the more practical and efficient choice.*

It offers faster implementation, reduced risk, lower costs, access to industry expertise, and the ability to focus on core competencies.

By carefully selecting the right vendor, financial institutions can leverage the power of purchased solutions to accelerate their modernization efforts and move towards a more competitive and sustainable future.

# Cultivating a Culture of Continuous Modernization: Beyond Technology

Successful modernization isn't merely about technology; it requires a fundamental shift in organizational culture:

## *Leadership Commitment*

Executive sponsorship is vital to secure resources, drive accountability, and ensure alignment across the organization.

## *Empowered Teams*

Fostering a culture of collaboration, innovation, and continuous improvement empowers teams to take ownership of the modernization process.

## *Management Strategy Changes*

Implementing robust change management strategies to effectively navigate the transition minimizes resistance and maximizes employee buy-in.

## *Knowledge Transfer and Upskilling*

Investing in training and development programs equips employees with the skills needed to support and maintain modern systems.

## Future-Proofing: *A Strategic Imperative for Long-Term Success*

Addressing technical debt is not optional; it's a strategic imperative for financial institutions seeking long-term sustainability and competitiveness.

By adopting a well-defined, phased modernization approach, and by fostering a culture of continuous improvement, financial services firms can mitigate risks, enhance efficiency, and future-proof themselves to capitalize on the immense opportunities presented by technological innovation. The journey toward modernization is ongoing, requiring consistent investment, adaptation, and a commitment to a future-proof infrastructure, which is staked on having the right technological partners.

Ultimately, the question for a firm is where they want to allocate their dollars and resources – is it around in-house processes, or is it a realization that they are a financial services company focused providing superior products and services to clients and not a software development firm?

*Contact Delta Data about how to employ a better approach to technical debt through innovation, decreased operational costs, and less exposure to significant risks.*



[www.deltadata.com](http://www.deltadata.com)



[sales@deltadata.com](mailto:sales@deltadata.com)