

## The increasing relevance of centralization

The case for centralized Global Mobility models has never been more compelling. Survey data consistently reveals that organizations are grappling with unprecedented demands for agility, requiring mobility functions that can respond and execute with speed and precision. The convergence of macro-level disruptions and evolving internal expectations is fundamentally reshaping how effective mobility operations must be structured.

### The Pressure Points

At the macro level, rapid geopolitical shifts create volatility that demands immediate response capabilities. Trade tensions, regulatory divergence, and political instability require mobility functions to pivot quickly, sometimes relocating entire teams or reimagining deployment strategies with minimal notice. Compliance requirements grow more stringent and complex across jurisdictions, with tax authorities, immigration bodies, and labour regulators intensifying scrutiny of cross-border employment arrangements.

Simultaneously, technological advances continuously reshape skill demands, creating persistent talent gaps that mobility must help address by enabling access to expertise regardless of location. The integration of mobility strategy with broader talent acquisition and development initiatives has become essential, elevating the function from administrative support to



a strategic workforce planning partner.

Internally, stakeholder expectations have evolved dramatically. Business leaders expect enhanced flexibility in deployment models, which means the ability to move talent quickly without bureaucratic friction. Finance demands rigorous cost management and transparency. Legal and compliance functions require stronger governance frameworks and comprehensive oversight. Meanwhile, employees and their managers expect robust duty of care protocols that reflect the complexity of modern global work environments.

The scope itself is expanding in ways that challenge traditional operational models. Business travellers, once outside mobility's remit, increasingly require the same compliance oversight and duty of care as traditional assignees.

Remote employees working across borders create tax, immigration, and employment law complexities that fall naturally to mobility expertise. The recent pandemic elevated these realities while simultaneously demonstrating the crisis-critical nature of Global Mobility capabilities, likely cementing the function's future role in formal crisis management and business continuity planning.

### **The Centralization Imperative**

These converging pressures make centralized models virtually imperative. Organizations need a Centre of Expertise that consolidates specialized knowledge, maintains consistency in policy interpretation, ensures quality standards, and provides authoritative guidance across the enterprise. Centralization enables the development of deep technical capability, facilitates knowledge sharing, and creates economies of scale in vendor management and technology deployment.

However, centralization of expertise alone is insufficient. What distinguishes truly effective models is the coupling of centralized strategic oversight with strong operational execution capability on a global basis. The challenge many organizations face is that their employment structures remain fragmented even as they centralize their mobility expertise, creating a fundamental misalignment between strategic intent and operational reality.

### **The GEC Advantage**

This is precisely where Global Employment Companies demonstrate their strategic value. A GEC fundamentally aligns organizational structure with the centralization imperative. When mobile employees are employed through a single entity, the mobility function gains direct operational leverage that fragmented employment models cannot replicate.

Policy changes don't require negotiation across multiple country HR organizations. Instead, they flow through unified

## **The increasing relevance of centralization**

governance channels with clear accountability. Compliance monitoring becomes more systematic when employment relationships are consolidated rather than scattered across dozens of legal entities with varying practices and interpretations. Data consistency improves dramatically when employee information resides within a single system architecture rather than fragmented across multiple HRIS platforms.

For rapidly evolving challenges like remote work taxation or business traveller compliance, GECs enable faster response. The mobility team isn't coordinating with disparate stakeholders to implement new protocols; they're managing a cohesive employee population under their direct purview. When geopolitical events necessitate rapid workforce relocation or risk mitigation, decision-making authority is clear and execution pathways are direct, eliminating the coordination delays that can compromise both business continuity and employee safety.

The expansion of mobility's remit also aligns naturally with GEC structures. As business travellers and remote employees come under mobility oversight, employing these populations through a GEC creates the operational infrastructure to manage them effectively. Rather than influencing how other entities handle these workers, the mobility function has direct employment relationship control, ensuring consistent application of policies and protocols.

### **Strategic Alignment**

Ultimately, GECs don't merely support centralized mobility models: they operationalize them. They transform the Centre of Expertise concept from advisory to direct operational authority, creating the structural foundation that today's complex global landscape demands.

For organizations serious about mobility agility, governance, and effectiveness, GECs represent not just an option, but an increasingly logical architectural choice.