This case study paper documents the approach undertaken by the Co-operative Financial Services (CFS) to develop an ‘ITIL Process Assessment Framework’ (IPAF) that provides a simple, low cost and modular methodology in the delivery of ITIL process assessments.
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1. Executive Summary

The ability to perform ITIL process assessments and use these to establish the baseline measurements and benchmark(s) for future comparison are key tenets of the Continual Service Improvement (CSI) model.

In the marketplace, there are many service management consultancy groups that provide ITIL process assessment services and offerings. Many companies perceive these to be their only viable option. Typically, this belief is based upon a view that they do not have the internal skills, expertise or tools to execute an assessment for an exercise that is considered overly complex and resource intensive.

The need to develop an in-house competency is becoming more important for organisations truly committed to CSI. ITIL process assessments should be performed and repeated on a periodic basis and therefore in today’s economic climate a more cost effective and flexible alternative is required from that available in the external marketplace.

This case study paper documents the approach undertaken by the Co-operative Financial Services (CFS) to develop an ‘ITIL Process Assessment Framework’ (IPAF) that provides a simple, low cost and modular methodology that delivers comparable results to that provided by external consultancy groups.

The methodology employed exploits your in-house ITIL skills\(^1\) and utilises existing available industry best practice publications, tools and reference material and adds additional value by providing a balanced and holistic view of the organisations ITIL process maturity by focusing on 4 key dimensions:-

- The Process Management perspective
- The Process Maturity perspective
- The Customer perspective
- The ITIL perspective

The IPAF methodology has been used extensively to assess the process maturity of the ITIL process environments across the CFS and Britannia organisations\(^2\).

This case study therefore benefits from the learning gained and provides you with a comprehensive guide including tangible ‘start-up’ support on how to successfully establish the IPAF methodology to deliver a successful in-house led ITIL process assessment exercise.

The benefits of the IPAF approach have been endorsed by the CFS and Britannia process owner community who validated that the core design principles of ‘simple, low cost and modular’ combine to provide a comparable output to that provided by consultancy groups.

The wider CFS organisational benefits gained by using the IPAF approach include:

- Improved staff satisfaction as the organisation is seen to trust and exploit the skills, knowledge and expertise of its people.
- Greater acceptance of findings and recommendations as these are based on a thorough understanding of the internal infrastructure and process environment.
- Greater cross team co-operation in improving the overall ITSM capability.
- Increased ITIL knowledge and understanding for those who have participated.

\(^1\) It is recommended that the personnel who lead an IPAF assessment are qualified to the Management Level (V2 Red Badge) or Expert level (V3).

\(^2\) CFS and the Britannia Building Society merged in August 2009 to create the UK’s 1st ‘super mutual’ financial services business.

67% rated the IPAF reports as comparable with 33% rating these as more valuable when compared with a previous externally led assessment report.
2. The Continual Service Improvement Perspective

Continual Service Improvement (CSI) embraces every aspect of the ITIL service lifecycle and can be applied to provide a sustained improvement in IT performance.

The most important aspect of understanding how to improve is by knowing what to measure and understanding how those measures can be assessed, analysed and used as a basis for delivering improvements. The ability to measure improvements and provide a ‘before and after’ comparison is essential in being able to demonstrate the benefits of CSI and the value delivered.

ITIL process assessments are the mechanism used to create these measures for your ITIL process environment. These then help identify the desired CSI improvement activities that can improve process maturity and the organisations overall IT service management capability.

- Assessments are the formal mechanisms for comparing the organisations current ITIL process environment against established industry performance standards and criteria for the purpose of identifying shortcomings, differences and gaps.

- Comparing the current ITIL process model against external industry references creates the benchmark against which the organisation can compare its existing maturity with industry norms. This provides guidance and direction in ensuring resultant CSI activities reference and leverage acknowledged industry best practice.

- The measures and results from a well structured ITIL process assessment create the baselines and benchmarks against which the progress of CSI activities instigated as a result of the assessment can then be demonstrated.

The Continual Service Improvement Model

![Diagram](image)

How the outputs from an ITIL Process Assessment Framework (IPAF) align with the CSI Model

- Assessments are an effective method of answering the question ‘Where are we now?’

- Establishing a benchmark to compare against industry norms identifies the shortcomings, differences and gaps within the existing ITIL process environment and defines the target for ‘Where do we want to be?’

- The findings and recommendations from an assessment formulate the process improvement plans to determine ‘How do we get there?’

- The original outputs from the assessment created the baseline measures and benchmarks against which a repeat assessment can demonstrate improvement and answer the question ‘Did we get there’?

Figure 2.1: Continual Service Improvement Model

---

3 Continual Service Improvement Model: Section 2.4 – ITIL V3 Core publication Continual Service Improvement. (ISBN 978 011331049 4)
3. Creating an ITIL Process Assessment Framework

The ITIL Process Assessment Framework (IPAF) was developed to enable us to adopt a modular approach in performing ITIL process assessments. This provided flexibility in the scheduling and execution of the required activities.

![ITIL Process Assessment Framework Diagram]

*Figure 3.1: ITIL Process Assessment Framework*

The use of this framework ensured a balanced and holistic view of our ITIL process environment and provided the recipients of the assessment outputs with a range of CSI opportunities to further improve their processes. The IPAF achieves this by ensuring the assessment considers each ITIL process from 4 differing perspectives:

- **The Process Management perspective**
  This assessment indicates the level to which Process Management has been formally established for each ITIL process.

- **The Process Maturity perspective**
  This assessment uses Self Assessment techniques. This provides a useful indication from the view of the IT practitioners on how well the process has been deployed and executed.

- **The Customer perspective**
  This assessment is based upon direct customer feedback on how well the ITIL process is focused on meeting customer needs.

- **The ITIL perspective**
  This assessment compares the current in-house ITIL implementation against the OGC ITIL guidance publications. This highlights the key differences between the in-house process and ITIL best practice covering areas such as execution, terminology, organisational construct, measurement and reporting.

The outputs from these 4 areas of assessment are then represented within a structured one page summary *Current State Assessment* report for each individual process within the scope of the ITIL process assessment activity.
4 The ITIL Process Assessment Framework – Modular Structure

4.1 Process Management

Process Management is a key discipline for any organisation committed to Continual Service Improvement (CSI). Process Management helps define, visualise, measure, control, report and improve processes so that they are efficient, effective and consistent.

The roles (Process Owner and Process Manager) define the accountabilities and responsibilities for performing the planning and control activities for each process.

The IPAF assessment helps to determine the level to which Process Management has been formally established for each ITIL process. Compliance against defined assessment criteria for each Process Management category determines the ‘R, A, G’ status that is reported⁴.

![Process Management Assessment](image)

*Figure 4.1: Sample Process Management Assessment as represented within the Current State Assessment for a selected ITIL process.*

4.2 Process Maturity

Process Maturity is an indication of how well the process has been developed, deployed and is capable of continuous improvement. Assessing the maturity of the ITIL process provides the Process Owner with an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of their process and importantly where CSI focus should be applied to further mature the process.

The IPAF assessment makes use of available public domain ITIL Self Assessment techniques to provide an approach that can easily be adopted by all organisations.

The benefits of ITIL Self Assessment are that they provide a baseline against which future improvements can be assessed and measured. The Self Assessments are easy to schedule and can be repeated as and when required.

⁴ The criteria used for this aspect of the assessment is available within Section 9
4.2.1 Process Maturity Self Assessment Techniques

There are two recommended Self Assessment techniques that can be used to provide your initial process maturity baseline results and create your initial internal benchmark against which repeat assessments can subsequently be compared. These are:

4.2.1.1 The ITSMF Self Assessment Tool

This was developed by the ITSMF\(^5\) with the endorsement of the Office of Government Commerce (OGC).

The tool supports individual process assessments of all ten processes within the Service Delivery and Service Support ITIL publications and additionally includes an assessment for the Service Desk function.

The Self Assessment is based upon a structured questionnaire specific to each process with each question requiring a simple YES/NO response with each question weighted based on its significance. A process management framework is used to provide the nine headings against which the questions are aligned and subsequently the results reported.

The ITSMF tool provides a flexible approach in the scheduling of your Self Assessments. The tool is easy to use and is built around Microsoft Excel and therefore can be completed online allowing results to be easily shared.

On completion of the survey the responses are immediately provided in numeric table and graphical form and provide a comparison of the completed scores vs. the ‘good practice’ target set for each element of the process management framework.

4.2.1.2 The Service Management Process Maturity Framework

An approach to assess process maturity is now documented within the ITIL V3 publications\(^6\).

The Service Management Process Maturity Framework uses an approach that has been widely used in the IT industry for many years based upon Software Engineering Institutes Capability Maturity Model Integration (SEI CMMI) and has been developed to bring a common, best practice approach to the review and assessment of Service Management process maturity.

The framework recognises that process maturity is heavily dependant on the maturity and capability of the overall IT organisation. This is reflected in the framework by ensuring that assessments consider the following five areas:

- Vision and steering
- Process
- People
- Technology
- Culture

The results from the assessment are aligned to one of the five maturity levels defined within the framework beginning with Level 1 which is described as ‘ad-hoc’ or potentially ‘chaotic’ through to Level 5 which is described as ‘institutionalised’ and its objectives and goals fully aligned with the strategic business and IT goals.

\(^5\) The OGC approved ITIL Self Assessment tool can be obtained from the ITSMF website (www.itsmf.co.uk/BestPractice/SelfAssessment.aspx) and is also provided in Section 9

4.3 ITSMF Self Assessment Tool

The ITSMF Self Assessment tool uses a process management framework consisting of nine process elements against which the questions and subsequent reporting are aligned. The description of these process elements is as follows:

- **Prerequisites**: - Ascertains whether the minimal levels of pre-requisite items are available to support the process activities

- **Management Intent**: - Establishes whether there are organisational policy statements, business objectives (or similar evidence of intent) providing both purpose and guidance to develop the process.

- **Process Capability**: - Examines the activities being performed to support the process.

- **Internal Integration**: - Seeks to ascertain whether the activities are integrated sufficiently in order to fulfil the process intent.

- **Products**: - Examines the process outputs to ascertain if all expected process outputs are being produced.

- **Quality Control**: - Is concerned with the review and verification of the process output to ensure that it is in keeping with the quality intent.

- **Management Information**: - Is concerned with the governance of the process and ensuring that there is adequate and timely information produced from the process in order to support management decision making.

- **External Integration**: - Examines whether all the external interfaces and relationships between the discrete process and other processes have been established within the organisation.

- **Customer Interface**: - Is primarily concerned with the ongoing external review and validation of the process to ensure that it remains optimised towards meeting the needs of the customer.

The results from the completed Self Assessment are available in graphical form and provide a numerical value for each element of the process management framework. Additionally, these scores are compared against the ‘target’ scores set which represent ‘good practice’. (See Figure 4.2)
4.3.1 Guidance on scheduling the Self Assessment using the ITSMF tool

There are two scheduling options that can be considered when planning for the Self Assessment exercises. These are as follows:-

- **Consensus Group**

This is based on a facilitated workshop approach where a selected group of process practitioners for the given process work through each section of the process management framework and debate each question and the response. The aim is to gain a consensus view on the response provided for each question.

**Pro’s**
- Time efficient in providing a single time boxed event to deliver the Self Assessment results
- Encourages debate and challenge to ensure the most appropriate responses are provided
- Anecdotal comments and observations can be captured to provide context and understanding on how the results have been derived.

**Con’s**
- Attendance levels can be impacted by operational events which may dilute the value of the session and the results obtained if key personnel fail to attend.
- Where consensus is achieved as a compromise, i.e. there is a minority in disagreement, results may not be truly balanced and have been swayed by those with the loudest voice.
- Generates additional time demands on key personnel who are required to contribute to multiple processes Self Assessment workshops, creating the danger of ‘workshop fatigue’ and risk of non-attendance.

- **Distributed**

This approach is to identify the individuals who are to participate in the process assessment and send them their individual copy of the Self Assessment questionnaire that you want them to complete. A deadline is set for the completion and return of the completed questionnaire.

With this approach it will be necessary to create a spreadsheet to record all individual responses and their scores. When all surveys have been returned and results recorded, these are then calculated to provide the average scores for each element of the self assessment process model.

To provide your final self assessment score for the given process, the easiest approach is to simply resubmit the average scores obtained into an unused copy of the self assessment questionnaire. Alternatively you can create your own graphs based on the results compared with the ITSMF/OGC targets for the given process.

**Pro’s**
- Provides the process practitioners with flexibility in completing the Self Assessment at a time convenient to them within their current workload.
- Completion rates by key personnel will be higher as there is no dependency on set times for workshop participation and the risk of non attendance due to operational events.
- Responses are more balanced and considered. Process practitioners are not influenced by the ‘group debate’ and have an opportunity to reflect and review their scores before they are returned for processing.
Con’s

- The likelihood that you will need to ‘chase’ individuals to complete the questionnaires where your deadline has passed and there are a number of ‘nil returns’.
- Practitioner questions and/or areas of clarification cannot easily be obtained.
- The Self Assessment co-ordinator receives numerous individually completed assessments. An additional spreadsheet is required to aggregate all the returned results to provide the final scores and graphical result.
- The timeframe to deliver the Self Assessment results for each process is longer compared to the scheduled single workshop approach

**Hints and Tips**

(1) One area of caution is that the process practitioners view the results as a reflection on their team or departments capabilities. So sections of the questionnaire that most closely relate to their team or department have an (unrealistic) positive bias.

- The ‘Consensus Group’ approach is an approach that can help mitigate this risk.

(2) A ‘Self Assessment’ is exactly that and results will naturally reflect ‘what you know’. So if the prevailing views are that we are ‘good’ or that we are ‘poor’, then results typically will reflect this. From experience junior staff are more likely to score positively compared with more experienced IT practitioners.

- To offset this and provide balance, the approach should be to schedule assessments with a mix of experienced individuals from different areas blending input from core process practitioners with colleagues from areas that interact or execute activities within the process.

- Consider involving Service Managers in all Self Assessments. As a group they intuitively know ‘what works well and what doesn’t’ particularly from the perspective of the customer.

(3) Each completed process assessment should be reviewed by the Process Owner to understand what drives the results for each section within the assessment.

(4) The ITSMF tool does not currently support the new ITIL processes introduced in ITIL V3. However, given that the ITIL V3 process model is built around the Service Delivery and Service Support ITIL processes defined in V2, the ITSMF tool can provide value and co-exist in the V2 and V3 process environments.
4.4 The Service Management Process Maturity Framework

This process maturity framework defines five levels of maturity (based on the Software Engineering Institutes Capability Maturity Model Integration (SEI CMMI)).

The major characteristics of each level are as follows:-

- **Initial (Level 1)**: The process has been recognised but there is little or no process management activity and it is allocated no importance, resources or focus within the organisation. This level can also be described as ‘ad hoc’ or occasionally even ‘chaotic’

- **Repeatable (Level 2)**: The process has been recognised and is allocated little importance, resource or focus within the operation. Generally activities related to the process are uncoordinated, irregular, without direction and are directed towards process effectiveness.

- **Defined (Level 3)**: The process has been recognised and is documented but there is no formal agreement, acceptance or recognition of its role within the IT Operation as a whole. However, the process has a process owner, formal objectives and targets with allocated resources, and is focused on the efficiency as well as the effectiveness of the process. Reports and results are stored for future reference.

- **Managed (Level 4)**: The process has now been fully recognised and accepted throughout. IT is service focused and has objectives and goals. The process is fully defined, managed and has become proactive with documented, established interfaces and dependencies with other IT processes.

- **Optimised (Level 5)**: The process has now been fully recognised and has strategic objectives and goals aligned with overall strategic business and IT goals. These have now become ‘institutionalised’ as part of everyday activity for everyone involved with the process. A self contained continual process of improvement is established as part of the process, which is now developing a pre-emptive capability.
4.4.1 Guidance on scheduling the Self Assessment using the Service Management process maturity framework

The Service Management process maturity framework enables each ITIL process to be compared against the criteria established for each level within the model. The result of this comparison is to assign a process maturity level for each process reviewed.

The assessment of the current process ‘as is’ vs. the criteria defined for each maturity level can be delivered in a number of ways based on organisational preference as follows:-

- Consensus Group

This is based on a workshop approach where a selected group of Senior IT personnel, typically Process Owners and Process Managers, review appropriate supporting process documentation as the basis for determining the how well the ‘as is’ process compares to the defined criteria for each process maturity level. An agreement is made on the level of process maturity to be assigned.

This has similar Pro’s and Con’s to that described for the Consensus Group approach in section 4.3.1.

- Independent assessment

This follows the same principles of the above but the process maturity level assigned for the process is provided by an independent reviewer. A suggestion would be for Process Owners to perform this assessment for processes not under their remit. A degree of challenge via an appropriate Management forum or committee may be healthy to ensure there has been consistency in approach across the process owner community before the maturity level is ratified.

Considerations when using the Service Management process management framework

Pro’s
- Has less reliance on the input of a reasonably sized sample group of process practitioners to complete the ‘Self Assessment’
- The results can be considered more objective as they can be linked directly with the defined criteria for the process maturity level assigned.
- The results consider a broader Leadership and Management perspective of the process environment (Vision & Steering, Process, People, Technology and Culture) compared to the more practitioner focused tool based assessments.

Con’s
- Because of the broader Leadership and Management perspective the assessment may miss the input and opinions of the practitioner community. There is the potential for a mismatch between the Leadership and Management view and that of the ‘IT coalface’
- The outputs from the process maturity assessment will only provide high level pointers for areas of CSI to further improve the process.
- Movement across the model requires ‘step change’ improvement. Incremental improvements delivered may not be recognised in repeat assessments and may demotivate the process community.
**Hints and Tips**

(1) To help support the assignment of a process maturity level (using the Service Management process management framework) it is recommended that this aspect of the ITIL Process Assessment Framework is performed after completion of the other IPAF activities:

- Process Management
- Customer
- ITIL ‘Gap Analysis’

The outputs from the above will help better inform the comparative view of the process ‘As is’ with the defined process maturity level criteria and will maximise the value of the complete ITIL Process Assessment Framework by avoiding rework and/or duplication of effort.

(2) The Service Management process maturity framework is not version dependent so can be used as an alternative to the ITSMF Self Assessment tool.

---

**4.5 Customer**

ITIL strongly emphasises the importance of each process being optimised towards meeting the needs of the customer.

ITIL considers the following as key aspects of what customers want and expect⁷:

- Specification
- Conformance to specification
- Consistency
- Value for Money
- Communications

The IPAF assessment seeks direct customer input to help understand the effectiveness of each ITIL Process in delivering against the above and provides a useful insight into where future process improvements should be focused and prioritised.

The outcomes from this customer engagement also provide a good balance to the results from other aspects of the assessment, e.g. the ‘customer’ element of the ITSMF Self Assessment is based on the IT organisations view of how well ITIL processes meet customer needs.

Other results from the assessment, whether good, bad or indifferent should ultimately be viewed in the context of the prevailing customer perception.

■ Approach – Interview or Survey?

It is recommended that a ‘best of both’ approach is used to gain this vital perspective of ITIL process maturity. A selected number of customers should be interviewed individually using a structured approach to discuss aspects of each ITIL process in terms of how it interacts and supports the day-to-day business process. The structure of the questioning should aim to bring out the ‘key aspects’ listed above.

A key deliverable from the interview should be a set of scores determined by the customer based upon their view of each ITIL process that they have been asked to review in the interview.

---

⁷ “What Customers Want” is in section 3.4.5 (Getting Started chapter) of the ITIL V2 Service Support/Service Delivery publications. (ISBN 0 11 330015 8 / ISBN 0 11 330017 4)
**Hints and Tips**

(1) To simplify the scheduling of sessions with the business and avoid creating additional meetings, use the next appropriate monthly service review meeting and extend the agenda to include the completion of this survey.

(2) The interview approach will result in many anecdotal comments and observations which, where repeated by multiple customers indicates potential process shortfalls. These comments should be captured and formally recorded and handed to the appropriate process owners as an output.

(3) Consider the most appropriate customer groups for each process. Typically business customers will relate to the Service Desk function and ITIL processes such as Incident, Problem, Change and Service Level Management. Consider the internal IT departments and teams as a customer group. They will relate more closely with Availability, Capacity, Configuration, IT Service Continuity (ITSC) and Release.

**Scoring Mechanism**

A simple scoring mechanism has been devised to allow ‘customer perception’ to be represented as a score within the IPAF as follows:-

- For each customer interview, devise the level to which you wish to assign scoring of each ITIL process (See Figure 4.5)

- Each customer interviewed is requested to provide for each process discussed a ‘score’. This is based upon 1 – 5. (With 1 being Poor through to 5 being Excellent) for the level of the process you wish to score.

- On completion of the business customer interview schedule, produce an overall customer perception rating. The overall rating score is simply an average of all the scores provided.

**Process Level**

Each ITIL process should be represented within the IPAF report with a customer perception score.

This can be illustrated in the following ways:-

- A score is provided at the ITIL process level, e.g. Incident Management.

- Where the customers will recognise a differential, then bring this out by looking to provide scores for each aspect of the process, e.g. the customer recognises and differentiates Standard Incident Management from Major Incident Management.

- Where you want to get specific insights to key elements of each ITIL process, then provide scores against each of the key elements discussed with the customers e.g. For Incident Management score against Incident classification, Incident handling, Incident escalation, Incident communications.

![Figure 4.4: Simple Scoring Model for determining the Customer Perception score](image)

![Figure 4.5: Illustrative options on reporting the customer perception of the Incident Management process](image)
4.6 ITIL (Gap Analysis)

This assessment provides a ‘Gap Analysis’ by comparing the current in-house ITIL implementation against that documented in the OGC ITIL guidance publications and other best practice references you wish to include. This provides a useful indication of where gaps in process capability exist and highlights where there are opportunities to adopt best practice where this is considered beneficial.

- Gap analysis

This comparison of the ITIL implementation should cover aspects such as the following:-

- Process definitions
- Process policies, objectives, critical success factors
- Process roles and other organisational considerations
- Process interfaces (Inputs and Outputs)
- Process terminology
- Process measurement
- Process KPI targets
- Process reporting

- Approach

To support the ‘gap analysis’ it will be necessary to document in advance a ‘checklist ‘ against which the comparison can be performed.

The checklist will consist of a list of statements against which you will subsequently ‘test’ your in-house process(s) against.

The result of each ‘test’ will indicate if there is a positive match between the in-house process with established ITIL best practice, i.e. Where the ‘test’ is not successful, then this identifies an aspect of the process that can be improved by adopting best practice.

These statements are derived from your review of the established best practice publications where you identify the key features and requirements of the process.

This is an important investment as these checklists will be used in repeat ITIL process assessments. Over time the number of mismatches should reduce as CSI activities by the Process Owner community are implemented.

Structure your checklist so that any observations or deviations noted during the gap analysis can be recorded to help with subsequent reporting within the Gap Analysis section of the Current State Assessment.

Hints and Tips

When reviewing the in-house process documentation, record all findings and observations on your checklists electronically. This provides the audit trail but also allows the results to be shared and more importantly reviewed by the relevant process areas. Seek agreement to the findings and observations or respond to any challenges raised before completing the ‘ITIL Gap Analysis’ section of the Current State Assessment (CSA) report.
In compiling your checklists you may wish to reference additional best practice publications to further enhance the value from the gap analysis exercise. Some examples of additional references are as follows:

- COBIT and the mapping of its control objectives against ITIL. This helps establish the level of process controls that have been established.

- ISO/IEC 20000 assessment checklists are used as a pre-cursor to an audit for organisations aiming to achieve this standard. These checklists can be obtained and used to help formulate your Gap Analysis checklists.

- FSA – Business Continuity Management Practice Guide. This provides useful guidance on observed best practice for BCM and ITSC in the Financial Services Sector.

- Publication ‘Metrics for IT Service Management’. This provides the measures and targets that you would expect to be established for each ITIL process. This is particularly useful in allowing you to compare internal process KPI targets with external ‘best practice’.

- ITSMF Self Assessment questionnaire. Review the questions within the Self Assessment questionnaires and include key questions in your checklist.

The following are recommended sources of internal documentation that should be used as input to the review:

- Structure charts
- Process documentation & work procedures
- Reports produced as an output(s) from the process, e.g. Major Problem Report
- Process KPI’s and Measures

Example Statements for your ‘Checklist’

To provide a better understanding of how to populate your ‘checklists’, here are some example statements for a selection of the ITIL processes. These provide an indication of the range of statements that you can build to support your ITIL ‘Gap Analysis’:

**Service Desk (SD)**

- *The SD is the single point of contact for all business colleagues and 3rd party support organisations with regard to day-to-day contact regarding IT service.*

- *The SD has a marketing plan to raise the profile of the Desk and to better understand the user experience of their customers.*

- *The SD owns the incident control process and monitors progress on all incidents.*
Request Fulfilment

- Where the Service Desk is the central point for the processing of service requests, these are recorded and managed as a separate record type, i.e. not recorded as an incident record.

- Users are provided with self service ‘menu’ type selection options so that they can select and input details of service requests from a pre-defined list's.

- When a service request has been fulfilled it is referred back to the Service Desk for closure. The closure process should ensure the user is satisfied with the outcome.

Event Management

- All key configuration items are actively monitored to determine their status and availability. All exceptions generate an alert.

- Events are categorised to denote their significance. Event categories are Informational, Warning or Exception.

- An incident record is automatically opened immediately an exception is detected.

Incident Management

- Incident Classification is supported by a priority coding systems to assign Incident Priority based on an assessment of Urgency and Impact.

- A Major Incident Handling procedure is documented.

- The Target value for the Percentage of incidents resolved within target time by priority’ is set at 95%.  

Problem Management

- Problem Classification is supported by a priority coding systems to assign each problem a priority based on an assessment of Urgency and Impact.

- Major Problem Reviews are undertaken and documented upon the resolution of every major problem.

- Staff are trained in the use of methods and techniques that help with problem investigation and diagnosis, i.e. Kepner-Tregoe, Brainstorming, ISHIKAWA diagrams, Pareto Analysis.

Change Management

- Every Request For Change (RFC) is allocated a priority that is based on the impact of the Problem and the urgency of the remedy.

- Each RFC is categorised using ITIL prescribed change categories (Major, Significant, and Minor).

- There is a documented policy that defines how the delegation of change authorisation in ‘out of hours’ emergency situations is performed with the criteria and supporting procedures required to mobilise an emergency CAB (CAB/EC)

---

8 This statement was obtained from the publication ‘Metrics for IT Service Management’ ISBN 978 90 77212 69 1 to provide guidance on target setting for this incident management metric.
Release Management

- There is a documented Release Management policy to state the numbering, frequency and scope of which aspects of the IT infrastructure will be controlled by definable releases.
- Releases are categorised in line with ITIL guidance as major releases, minor Releases and emergency releases.
- A responsibility matrix (or similar) is defined to denote the release responsibilities of all teams and roles that execute within the Release Management process.

Configuration Management

- There are documented policies that define the objectives, scope, principles and Critical Success Factors for Configuration Management.
- The roles and responsibilities for the Configuration Manager, Asset Manager Configuration Analyst and Configuration Administrator are documented and assigned.
- Configuration verification and audit is periodically performed to verify the physical existence of CI's with the information recorded in the CMDB.

Service Level Management

- Service Level Agreements (SLA) have been negotiated and agreed with all business areas for the IT services provided.
- Service review meetings are scheduled on a monthly basis with representatives of each business area to review service achievement and discuss key issues.
- SLA documents are reviewed at least annually with representatives from each business area to ensure the services covered and targets are still relevant.

Availability Management

- The cost of an outage (financial) is known for each critical service to help understand business impact and help prioritise service improvements.
- ITIL methods and approaches to help determine and drive availability improvements are documented and embedded, i.e. The Expanded Incident Lifecycle, Service Failure Analysis (SFA), Component Failure Impact analysis (CFIA), Technical Observation posts (TOP).
- There is a test schedule for the regular planned invocation of resilience and fail over components to provide assurance on their readiness to 'work in anger' when required.

Capacity Management

- A Capacity Plan is produced and updated on a periodic basis (at least every 6 months)
- The capacity management process has the key capacity sub processes defined and executed (Resource Capacity Management, Business Capacity Management, Service capacity Management).
- End-to-End response times are measured and included in SLA reporting
IT Service Continuity

- *Proactive Risk Analysis and Management exercises are performed for critical End-End services and key components. These are performed at least annually or after a change in normal operations*.

- *All IT services are aligned to an ITSCM recovery option (do nothing, gradual, intermediate, fast, hot standby).*

- *An overview of the organisations approach to Business Continuity Management and the IT Service Continuity strategy is included in the staff induction process.*

IT Financial Management

- *Budgets are monitored and there are regular reports produced to compare expenditure against the budget.*

- *Invoices are produced for the customer groups which are simple, accurate and issued on time.*

- *The customer groups are periodically surveyed to ensure the activities performed by financial management adequately support their business needs.*

---

9 This statement was obtained from the FSA Business Continuity Management Practice Guide to provide additional guidance on the frequency of proactive risk management and analysis exercises (www.fsa.gov.uk/pubs/other/bcm_guide.pdf)
4.7 Current State Assessment (CSA)

This is the main output document bringing together all the results from each element of the ITIL Process Assessment Framework. A Current State Assessment (CSA) document is produced for each individual process. The report is produced on a single page and provides a powerful visual view of the results for each process.

**Process Management Assessment**
This assessment indicates the level to which Process Management has been formally established for each ITIL process. Compliance against defined assessment criteria for each Process Management category determines the ‘R, A, G’ status.

**Customer Perspective**
This assessment is based upon direct customer feedback on how well the ITIL process is focused on meeting customer needs. This is an interview based approach with selected business representatives. Each process is scored using a 1 (poor) thru 5 (Excellent) rating. Whilst subjective, it provides an important customer perspective of ITIL process maturity.

**Process Maturity – Self Assessment**
This assessment uses either the ITSMF V2 ITIL Self Assessment results (as shown) or the results from the ITIL V3 Self Assessment using the ITIL Process Management Framework (PMF). This section provides a useful indication of where gaps in process capability exist and an overall view of ITIL conformance.

**ITIL Key Differences**
This assessment compares the current in-house ITIL implementation against the OGC ITIL guidance publications. This highlights significant areas of difference with ITIL covering areas of execution, terminology, organisational construct, measurement and reporting.

**Figure 4.6:- Current State Assessment report format**

**Figure: 4.7:- Illustrative Current State Assessment report for Incident Management**
5 Baselines and Internal Benchmarking

The ITIL Process Assessment Framework (IPAF) has been developed to provide the mechanisms for comparing the organisation's current ITIL process environment against established industry performance standards and criteria for the purposes of identifying shortcomings, differences and gaps.

The IPAF will establish the baseline measurements and benchmarks which will help you identify improvement opportunities and help verify the progress of resultant CSI initiatives.

- Baselines

The results obtained from applying the ITIL Process Assessment Framework (IPAF) are documented in the Current State Assessment and provide the initial baseline measurements that establish the starting points or markers for later comparison.

- Internal Benchmarking

An internal benchmark is where an organisation sets its baseline measure(s) at a specific point in time and then assesses how they are performing over time by comparing results against the baselines originally set. By repeating ITIL process assessments on a periodic basis this allows you to compare progress made against the baseline measures initially obtained for each individual ITIL process.

5.1 Creating the baselines and Internal Benchmarking

The Current State Assessment (CSA) is the primary output from the ITIL Process Assessment Framework (IPAF).

The CSA provides the initial baseline measures against which future benchmarking can be performed and reported.

5.1.1 Process Management

The result from this assessment indicates the level to which Process Management has been formally established for each ITIL process. Compliance against defined assessment criteria for each Process Management category determines a ‘R, A, G’ status.

Process Management improvements can be evidenced by comparing the results from repeat ITIL Process Assessments. Improvement will be denoted by a positive status change in the ‘R, A, G’ status reported against each category.

- Sample Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Management</th>
<th>Assessment 1</th>
<th>Assessment 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process Owner assigned</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Management fully established</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Process Documented</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-End Process Documented</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Measured</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Optimised</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.1: Illustrative example of reporting the comparative Change Management Process Management status
5.1.2 Process Maturity

The results from this assessment are based on the outputs from the Self Assessment exercises performed. These provide a useful indication of the strengths and weaknesses of each ITIL process from the ITIL practitioner’s perspective.

Process Maturity improvements can be evidenced by comparing the results from repeat ITIL Process Assessments.

Improvements will be denoted by a positive increase in the Self Assessment ITIL Maturity scores (ITSMF Self Assessment tool) or by a positive change in the Process Maturity Level assigned (Service Management Process Maturity Framework).

- ITSMF Self Assessment tool – Sample Reporting

The Self Assessment is structured against 9 process management elements and results from the Self Assessments are mapped against these in both graphical and numeric formats.

The numeric values reported in the Self Assessment results can be used to provide the initial baseline scores at a high and detailed level for each process and subsequent results from repeat assessments can then be used to denote progress in improving process maturity.

Detailed ITIL Process Maturity Reporting

The example below shows how the detailed results from the ITSMF Self Assessment tool can be used to demonstrate areas of improvement for each ITIL process. In this example we use the results for the SLM process based on the results from two assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Element</th>
<th>OGC Target</th>
<th>Assessment 1</th>
<th>Assessment 2</th>
<th>Increase (Points)</th>
<th>Increase (%)</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Requisites</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Intent</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Capability</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Integration</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Information</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Integration</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Interface</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.2: Table illustrating ITIL Self Assessment tool scores for the Service Level Management process.
Creating an ITIL Maturity Score (%) for each ITIL process

The results from the ITSMF Self Assessment can also be used to create a high level ‘Maturity’ score for each ITIL process.

This approach allows you to report the relative Maturity of all processes within the complete ITIL process environment to provide a holistic view of ITIL process maturity. Additionally, the scores can be used to report improvements in process maturity at the individual ITIL process level.

The following steps outline how to create your Maturity scores.

- Using the results from the previous table you will need to total up the points achieved from the Self Assessment(s).
- These are contained in the columns headed ‘Assessment 1’ and ‘Assessment 2’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Element</th>
<th>OGC Target</th>
<th>Assessment 1</th>
<th>Assessment 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Requisites</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Intent</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Capability</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Integration</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Information</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Integration</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Interface</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>407</strong></td>
<td><strong>695</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Each element within the Self Assessment has a maximum points score of 100 therefore the maximum number of points that can be scored = 900 (100 per element x 9 elements)
- To create an overall Maturity score calculate your assessment scores as a percentage of the total points available (900).
- Using the above table, Assessment 1 = 45% Maturity and Assessment 2 = 77% Maturity.

The following illustrative graphs show how these Maturity scores derived from the Self Assessment results can be reported.
The following tables are examples of how the results from this process maturity framework can be reported.

Figure 5.5: Table based on Service Management PMF illustrating process maturity improvement for the Problem Management process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Desk</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Fulfilment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Configuration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.6: Illustration of table based approach to report current ITIL process maturity based on the Service Management Process Maturity Framework.
5.1.3 Customer perspective

This assessment is based upon direct customer feedback on how well the ITIL process is focused on meeting customer needs.

Each process is scored by the customer groups using a 1 (poor) through 5 (Excellent) rating. This is reported in the CSA as an average score per process.

Improvements recognised by the Customer can be evidenced by comparing the results from repeat ITIL Process Assessments. Improvements will be denoted by a positive increase in the Customer perception scores.

Hints and Tips

(1) The use of customer based input to ‘score’ how well the ITIL process(s) meet customer needs will inevitably be influenced by recent events. A ‘bad experience’ prior to the survey may result in a negative score compared with the previous assessment rating.

(2) Take the view that this is an opportunity to identify further improvements. Process capabilities during prolonged periods of stability do not stress the process and its execution. During a period of instability, any shortfalls recognised by the customer help in the longer term to identify the process improvements that ultimately make a tangible and recognised difference to the customer.

(3) If these scores are reported in the organisations management reporting it is important this context of the Customer perspective of the ITIL Process Assessment Framework is understood by Senior Management.

(4) The results from the ITSMF Self Assessment for the ‘Customer’ element are a source for additional comparison. Process improvements aimed at customer outcomes should see improvements in both IPAF customer based measures. Where these appear out of balance this may indicate a differing perception on the value provided from recent improvements.

Sample Reporting

The table below provides the status for each process within the ITIL process environment. The ‘R, A, G’ status is determined from the average scores achieved using the above scoring model. Optionally the actual scores can be denoted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Assessment 1</th>
<th>Assessment 2</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Desk</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Fulfilment</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident</td>
<td></td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Configuration</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSC</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLM</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.7: Illustrative customer rating trend for the complete ITIL process model.
In the previous section when describing the Customer section of the ITIL Process Assessment Framework and how the results would be obtained, an option outlined was to seek customer scores for different elements of an ITIL process.

The example below illustrates how this would be reported to denote improvements to individual elements of the Incident Management process.

5.1.4 The ITIL perspective

This assessment compares the current in-house ITIL implementation against the OGC ITIL guidance publications. This highlights aspects of the process that are not aligned with ITIL best practice guidance. Alignment to ITIL best practice can be evidenced by simply providing a total number of key differences identified.

The key differences identified in comparison with ITIL best practice guidance is based upon the number of ‘tests’ failed during the in-house process review using the predefined ‘checklists’.

Closer alignment to ITIL can be evidenced by comparing the number of key differences reported from repeat ITIL Process Assessments.

Improvements will be denoted by a positive decrease in the number of key differences identified.

- Sample Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCIDENT MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>Assessment 1</th>
<th>Assessment 2</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incident Classification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Communications</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Resolution</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Closure</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.8:– Illustrative customer perception scores as a trend for the key elements of the Incident Management process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITIL Key Differences</th>
<th>Q3 2009</th>
<th>Q2 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Desk</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Fulfilment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Configuration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.9:– Illustrative ITIL key difference scores as a trend for the ITIL process environment.
6 Planning Considerations

6.1 High Level Aims and Objectives

A well planned and structured ITIL process assessment exercise should have the following clearly defined aims, objectives and scope:

■ Aims

ITIL process assessments provide the basis for determining areas for further CSI related process improvement with the aims of:

- Delivering business value (recognised by the business) through the implementation of process and capability improvements.
- Enhancing the overall IT Service Management capability of the IT service provider.
- Increasing the levels of integration across the complete ITIL process model.
- Establishing the baseline measures and benchmarks against which future improvements can be demonstrated.

■ Objectives

- To assess the level of effective process management performed against each selected ITIL process.
- To review the level of alignment with ITIL defined best practice for each selected ITIL process.
- To review current process measurements and associated targets for each selected ITIL process and identify gaps and differences in the metrics produced compared to ITIL defined best practice.
- To understand from the customer perspective how well each selected ITIL process meets the needs of the business.
- To perform a ‘Self Assessment’ for each selected ITIL process to create a baseline measure against which future process improvements can be measured.
- To document a one page assessment summary (Current State Assessment) report for each selected ITIL process.

■ Scope

The ITIL Process Assessment Framework (IPAF) documented within this case study can be applied to one or multiple processes.

The number of ITIL processes to be included in the ITIL process assessment exercise should be documented as the agreed scope.

The IPAF can be applied to ITIL V2 or ITIL V3 processes.

Hints & Tips

It is recommended that the initial assessment scope should be performed against all processes within the ITIL process model. This will provide a comprehensive benchmark and set of baseline measures for the complete ITIL process environment.

Resultant CSI activities are likely to progress at differing rates of pace based on the range, size and complexity of the process improvements identified. It is recommended that periodic process assessments are then performed at an appropriate time for each process.
6.2 Modular Approach

A benefit of using the ITIL Process Assessment Framework (IPAF) is the modular structure. From a planning perspective this provides an option to breakdown the overall ITIL process assessment exercise into more manageable chunks by creating individual ‘module’ plans. This allows you to consider for each module the most effective way of scheduling and coordinating the required activities.

This approach from experience is recommended where the scope of the ITIL process assessment exercise covers multiple ITIL processes.

6.3 Outline Planning Approach

The model below illustrates an outline planning approach to your ITIL process assessment exercise. As mentioned above, if the exercise is looking to perform assessments for multiple processes or the full ITIL process environment this can be applied to each module within the ITIL Process Assessment Framework.

6.4 Key Roles

A key benefit of the ITIL Process Assessment Framework (IPAF) is to exploit the modular approach to make the most effective use of available resources and allow multiple ‘assessment’ activities to run in parallel.

This helps to spread the workload across a wider number of resources to limit the time demand for those ‘doing the day job’ and to reduce the overall elapse time to complete the ITIL process assessment exercise. The IPAF removes the need for the creation of a dedicated team to perform the ITIL process assessment exercise.10

---

10 Each organisation can of course consider an approach that best works for them. The IPAF is supportive of any organisational approach.
- **Lead Assessor**

  This role is responsible for the overall planning and co-ordination of the ITIL process assessment exercise and the delivery of the final management reports.

  It is recommended that the Lead Assessor role has the practical experience and good understanding of the ITIL process model. Typically this level of ITIL knowledge would be demonstrated by personnel who have attained the Management Level qualifications (V2) or ITIL Expert Level (V3).

  Each organisation will determine from where this role should be assigned, for example:

  - IT Manager
  - Continual Service Improvement Manager
  - IT Quality Manager / IT Audit Manager
  - An independent Process Owner, i.e. who has no process(s) within scope of the assessment.
  - ITIL experienced Project Manager

  The skills and experience of individuals from the above provide a good match for those required to plan, schedule and co-ordinate the process assessment exercise and have the authority and experience to challenge where necessary.

- **Supportive roles**

  The model below denotes how key roles across the IT organisation can support and share the workload associated with an ITIL process assessment exercise. Again this emphasises how by using the IPAF approach you can limit the time demand on busy individuals and reduce the overall elapse time by scheduling parallel activities across the IPAF framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITIL Process:</th>
<th>Process Goal:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process Management Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Options and roles to perform these assessments include:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lead Assessor performs an independent review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lead Process Owner performs an independent review of all processes (not under their control.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Process Owners are assigned a process each (not under their control) to review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Process Managers are assigned a process each (not under their control) to review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Process Maturity – “Self Assessment”** | Options and roles to perform these assessments include:- |
| Electronic Self Assessment Tool | - Lead Assessor co-ordinates the completion of electronic Self Assessments by the appropriate Process and IT practitioners (Distributed approach). |
| | - Each Process Owner co-ordinates the completion of electronic Self Assessments for their process by the appropriate Process and IT practitioners. (Distributed approach). |
| | - Lead Assessor and/or Process Owners schedule and facilitate the completion of a self Assessment as a group session (Consensus approach). |
| Process Maturity Framework (PMF) | - Lead Assessor and/or Process Owners perform an independent review of all processes (not under their control). (Independent Assessment approach) |
| | - Process Owners are assigned a process each (not under their control) to review. |
| | - Process Managers are assigned a process each (not under their control) to review. |

| **Customer Perspective** | Options and roles to perform these assessments include:- |
| | - Provide Service Managers with structured questionnaire and scoring mechanism and engage Customer representatives as part of existing service review schedule. |
| | - Lead Assessor schedules and performs Customer interviews. |

| **ITIL Gap Analysis** | Options and roles to perform these assessments include:- |
| | - Lead Assessor and/or Process Owners compile checklists in advance. (Process Owners should not create ‘Checklists’ for their processes to ensure impartiality). |
| | - Lead Assessor performs Gap Analysis using predefined ‘Checklists’. |
| | - Lead Process Owner performs an independent review of all processes (not under their control) to review. |
| | - Process Owners are assigned a process each (not under their control) to review. |

*Figure 6.2: Illustrative use of CSA template to denote options and roles that can be used to support your ITIL process assessment*
6.5 Planning Activities

The following provide some high level guidelines on the planning activities required to deliver a successful ITIL process assessment.

6.5.1 Planning and Preparation

- Confirm Sponsorship for the ITIL process assessment exercise.
- Agree the scope of ITIL processes to be included in the assessment.
- Identify the key stakeholders, practitioners and customer representatives.
- Document, agree and circulate to all stakeholders a ‘Terms of Reference’.
- Determine the approach you wish to adopt for the Process Management module.
- Determine the approach you wish to adopt for the Process Maturity module.
- Determine the approach you wish to adopt for the Customer modules.
- Determine the approach you wish to adopt for the ITIL (Gap analysis) module.
- Create a schedule for the required kick off session, 1:1 meetings and workshops.
- Document and agree the ‘R, A, G’ criteria to be used to assess Process Management.
- Create the structured interview/questionnaires per process for the Customer meetings
- Create the individual ITIL process ‘checklists’ for the ITIL gap analysis.
- Create the ‘Current State Assessment’ (CSA) template
- Prepare the Self Assessment guides and results spreadsheets.

6.5.2 Data Gathering

- Obtain all required best practice publications to support the overall process assessment.
- Identify the location and access to all internal process documentation sources to support the overall process assessment.
- Obtain a copy of locally and centrally produced Process MI, scorecards etc.
- Obtain copies of sample Service Level Agreement documents
- Obtain current service attainment reporting.
- Obtain copies of IT structure charts
- Optionally, consider gaining access to Job Descriptions to validate that appropriate roles and responsibilities are defined for key roles.

6.5.3 Assessment

- Perform assessment of Process Management capability per process using the predefined criteria and assign the appropriate ‘R, A, G’ status.
- Conduct interviews with Customer representatives and ensure anecdotal comments are recorded and process ratings provided as deliverables from the meetings.
- Perform ITIL Self Assessments using either the ITSMF Self Assessment tool or Service Management process management framework and record all responses.
- Compare current in-house ITIL processes with the predefined ITIL best practice ‘checklists’. Denote all observations where there is a key difference.
- Review all current ITIL process measures and targets and compare with ITIL best practice.
6.5.4 Analysis

- Review anecdotal comments from customer interviews. Identify and highlight any common themes. Summarise all comments per process and share with appropriate Process Owners.
- Review process ratings provided by customer representatives. If there are significant variations across the customer groups consider if these have been influenced (+/-) by recent events. (you may need to context and balance if later questioned by your stakeholders in the management reporting).
- Record all individually completed ITSMF Self Assessment results per process to create an aggregate score using the Self Assessment provided framework and reporting structure. Share these in advance with the Process Owner community.
- If using the Service Management process maturity framework then review the Self Assessment results and record results.
- Review all observed ITIL key differences from the ITIL gap analysis and convert into a list of non alignment statements. Validate these with the appropriate Process Owners.
- Review all observed differences in ITIL process measures and targets and add to the list of non alignment statements. Validate these with the appropriate Process Owners.

6.5.5 Create Baselines (Inaugural results)

- Capture results from the inaugural ITIL process assessment exercise to provide the basis for future comparison on improvements made.
- Section 5 provides comprehensive guidance on how to determine the most appropriate baseline measures and suggested methods of reporting.

6.5.6 Internal Benchmarking (Subsequent results)

- To be able to demonstrate and evidence the results from CSI activities instigated as a result of your ITIL process assessments you will need to compare results obtained from subsequent process assessment exercises with the initial baseline measures that were created from the inaugural exercise.
- Section 5 provides comprehensive guidance on how to develop the measures and reporting of your internal benchmarking of the ITIL process environment.

6.5.7 Current State Assessment

- The CSA provides the Process Owner and key stakeholders with a structured one page summary.
- Take the results from the Process Management assessment and complete the section within the CSA template and repeat for each process.
- Take the rating from the structured interviews with Customer representatives and complete the section within the CSA template and repeat for each process.
- Take the aggregate results from the ITIL Self Assessments and complete the section within the CSA template and repeat for each process.
- Insert the ITIL non alignment statements derived from the gap analysis exercise within the CSA template and repeat for each process.
- See Figure 4.6 for the structure and composition of the CSA.
6.5.8 Management Reporting

Consider the reporting requirements from the perspective of the Sponsor and the key stakeholders.

- The sponsor is interested in the overall maturity of the ITIL process environment and the strategic issues highlighted.
- The IT directorate are more interested in gaining a holistic view of the maturity of the ITIL process environment.
- Process Owners are interested in the detail documented in the CSA relevant to their process.

To avoid creating multiple reports, the following report structure is suggested to meet the different requirements of your key stakeholders:

- Participation and references
- Introduction and background
- The ITIL Process Assessment Methodology (based upon the IPAF)
- Management Summary (based on the common themes and observations across all the individual process assessments)
  - Process Management
  - Process Maturity (based on Self Assessment results)
  - Customer Perspective
  - Significant key differences with ITIL best practice guidance
- Current State Assessments
  - One page CSA per process
- Strategic Opportunities
  - Consider using this report to convey the strategic issues and opportunities that require organisational commitment and funding to deliver, i.e. things which are outside the influence of the individual Process Owners.
- Appendices
  - The criteria used to assign ‘R, A, G’ status for the Process Management assessment within the CSA.
  - The scoring model to explain how the customer rating scores determine the ‘R, A, G’ status reported in the CSA.
6.6 Planning Estimates

The following estimations are provided as a guideline to assist with planning an ITIL process assessment using the IPAF approach.

- **Start-up activities**

  Before you can commence your ITIL process assessment exercise there will be a need to create the supporting templates and checklists.

  Using the IPAF framework, the following estimation guidelines are based on experience:

  **Process Management**

  - Research Process Management best practice and develop the Process management structure and the supporting criteria against which your ‘R, A’ G’ status is determined.

  Approx 1 man day

  **Process maturity – Self Assessment**

  - (V2 tool) Create a spreadsheet per process to capture individual scores and create aggregate results matched against the OGC process scores. Use this spreadsheet to create your graphical results and an overall ITIL Maturity score (%).

  Approx 1.5 man days to cover creation of spreadsheet and then customisation for each ITIL process.

  - V3 (PMF) Research PMF framework and create results template.

  Approx 1 Man day

  **Customer Perspective**

  - Create structured interview approach for each process. Include the scoring mechanism and process level structure for reporting purposes.

  Approx 1.5 – 2 man days for the complete ITIL process environment

  **ITIL (Gap Analysis)**

  - Create ‘Checklist’ to include non alignment statements and metrics comparison.

  Approx 0.5 man days per process

**Hints & Tips**

This investment in time is to establish the basic templates and supporting documents to support ongoing process assessments.

To help reduce this effort a basic starter pack is provided in Section 9.

These provide the basic document set upon which you can customise and enhance as appropriate.
Process Assessment Exercise

The following are estimation guidelines for the execution aspects of the IPAF framework:-

**Process Management**

- Review process documentation and assess against the structure and assessment criteria you created to provide a series of ‘R, A, G’ status indicators.

  *Approx 0.25 man days per process*

**Process Maturity – Self Assessment**

- This will depend on the approach taken and the Self Assessment method employed.
- The distributed method will require results to be collated and your spreadsheets updated to produce your overall scores.

  *Approx 1 man day for the ITIL process model.*

- The consensus approach will require workshop sessions to be organised/facilitated.

  *Allocate 1 hr per process.*

**Customer Perspective**

- Conduct meeting with each customer representative to discuss their experiences of process interfaces, outputs and consequences and create process scores.
- A minimum of 4 separate Customer representatives is recommended for interview.

  *Approx 1 – 1.5 hrs per customer*

**ITIL (Gap Analysis)**

- Review in-house documentation and measures against your ITIL ‘Checklists’.
- Optionally consider observing activities/areas, e.g. attend a scheduled CAB.

  *Approx 0.5 - 1 man day per process.*

**Creating your Current State Assessment (CSA)**

- Ideally you should capture and finalise your results from the above activities to update on an ongoing basis the CSA for each process.

  *Approx 1 hr per CSA for quality control*

**Elapse Time**

- The number of processes within the scope of your ITIL process assessment and how you wish to discharge the activities across the IPAF framework will influence how long the process assessment exercise should take.

  From our experience, a rule of thumb would be:-

  *5 x processes = approx 4 weeks*
  *10 x processes = approx 6 weeks*

The above timelines builds in the need for flexibility in scheduling workshops, interviews and access to process owners to validate initial findings, quality checks. From experience this compares with timelines provided by external consultancy organisations.
7 Benefits of using the ITIL Process Assessment Framework (IPAF)

The IPAF provides a *simple, low cost and modular approach* in performing ITIL process assessments.

7.1 IPAF Design principles

The benefits of the IPAF approach based upon the above design principles are as follows:-

- **Simple**
  - The IPAF framework provides an easy to understand implementation approach to performing ITIL Process Assessments.
  - The IPAF utilises existing public domain reference materials and tools to support assessment activities and uses standard desktop office products for the creation and production of baseline and internal benchmarking measurement and reporting.
  - The Current State Assessment (CSA) provides the recipient Process Owner community with an easily understood but comprehensive assessment of each ITIL process 'on a single page'.

- **Low Cost**
  - The IPAF enables process assessments to be delivered in-house without the need for expensive consultants. The aim of the IPAF is to deliver a comparable standard of content and value when compared with the external market.
  - The IPAF approach leverages existing in-house (ITIL practitioner and project management) skills and expertise. No additional skills need to be developed or contracted in.
  - The IPAF framework can be used to perform ITIL process assessments against specific processes or the full ITIL process environment.
  - The investment in time and effort in establishing the IPAF is protected. The IPAF supports and encourages periodic assessments utilising previously delivered supporting materials and reporting frameworks.
  - The IPAF utilises existing public domain reference materials and tools. The only additional expense would be for any additional reference publications not currently available in-house.

- **Modular Approach**
  - The modular design provides flexibility in the scheduling, co-ordinating and execution of the required assessment activities.
  - The IPAF is not resource intensive. The modular approach has been designed so that the workload for assessment activities can be spread and shared across a number of roles within the IT service management function.
  - The IPAF modular approach to ITIL process assessments provides an holistic and balanced view of overall process maturity by gaining input from ITIL practitioners, Customers and the use of existing best practice as reference points.
• The CSA provides the stimulus for both tactical and strategic CSI initiatives. At the process level it can highlight quick win opportunities. The CSA’s when viewed in aggregate can highlight significant gaps in the organisation overall IT Service Management capability that require ‘step change’ improvements to be driven through.

7.2 Additional Benefits

Some additional benefits that can be gained from adopting the IPAF approach:-

• The IPAF approach encourages Process Owner and Process Manager participation across the wider ITIL process environment. ITIL knowledge and understanding within these key roles will increase.

• The IPAF approach encourages greater internal co-operation, participation and communication across the IT organisation. This increases the acceptance of findings and creates a more joined up and shared approach in taking forward resultant CSI activities.

• The IPAF approach is to leverage existing skills and importantly knowledge of the internal environment. This is an important advantage over the use of external consultants.

• Increased staff satisfaction as management are seen to trust and exploit the skills, knowledge and expertise of their people rather than bring in expensive consultants.

7.3 IPAF – Validation of Stakeholder Value

To validate that the benefits expected from the use of the IPAF approach are being realised, a post assessment survey should be issued to gain the views of the participating Process Owners (PO), Process Managers and IT directorate.

The aim of the survey should be to assess:-

• How well the IPAF approach made the best use of time for the participating PO’s
• The extent to which PO’s felt engaged in the IPAF based assessments
• The value to the PO’s in the final report to provide a balanced view of process maturity and the identification of future process improvements.
• Optionally, to provide a view on how comparable the internally led IPAF approach compares with any recent externally led process assessment exercises and reporting.

Following the completion of the ITIL process assessment exercises performed across the CFS and Britannia organisations (using the IPAF approach), the survey results obtained were as follows:-

Q: “How well did the planning and preparation for this assignment make best use of your time and that of your people who were required to provide input and critique?”

✓ 83% responded Good or Excellent. 17% responded as Satisfactory

Q: “To what extent do you feel you were sufficiently engaged to provide input and to review and critique the results for your process(s)?”

✓ 67% rated their engagement as Excellent with 25% rating this as Good.
Q: - “As a Process Owner how would you rate the value of the final report in providing you with a balanced view of process maturity and in the identification of process improvement opportunities?”

✓ **83% rated the value to them as Excellent or Good. 17% rated this as Satisfactory.**

A key aim of the IPAF approach was to provide a low cost, high value internally led approach to ITIL process assessments which would be comparable to externally provided process assessment services.

This aspect of the IPAF was tested within the survey by providing the participants with copies of previous externally led ITIL process assessment reports to compare alongside the outputs from the IPAF.

The results from the Process Owners surveyed are as follows:-

Q: - How would you compare the value to you of the IPAF assignment and reports compared with those provided in recent years by external consultancy groups?

✓ **67% validated that this key design principle had been met (Comparable deliverable) with 33% rating the IPAF deliverable as more valuable.**

- Anecdotal Comments

The following is a sample of the anecdotal comments received from the survey to further endorse the IPAF approach:-

- “I felt engaged throughout the process and was always given the opportunity to review and comment”
- “As Process Owner the report pretty much hit the spot”
- “I don’t believe there is any tangible benefit in engaging external consultancy when the expertise already exists in-house. Providing in-house is impartial (which it was) the results stand validation”
- “I thought the assessment used a number of different techniques to help assess process maturity, these results were then translated into a final report to give me a good balanced view”
- “Your availability in being able to share approach, provide us with updates and the quick timescales/turnaround from initial engagement to report generation was very impressive.”
- “”The assessment has helped me understand how important it is that I start to improve business awareness of the Major Incident and problem Management processes”
- “This was a good use of my time as it helped to focus the mind on the gaps that are taken for granted or had not been previously identified”
8 Lessons Learned

The following are the ‘Lessons Learned’ based on our experience of developing the IPAF framework and using it successfully to review the full ITIL process environments across the CFS and Britannia organisations.

8.1 Planning

- We encountered an interesting paradox. The time required completing a process assessment of a less mature or undefined process took much longer than that of a mature and well defined process. The learning here was:
  - The less mature/undefined processes typically have no clear ownership so therefore no single and informed point of contact to provide input to and review outputs from the process assessment.
  - Whilst the process may not ‘exist’, in reality a range of activities are likely to be performed across the IT teams which need to be identified and reviewed.
  - More people are needed to engage in supporting the process assessment.
  - A greater degree of exploratory work is required to prepare for the process assessment where formal process management disciplines have not been implemented.

An example of this was Capacity Management. This process was not defined and had no obvious functional owner, supporting documentation, measures etc. However, core activities related to Capacity Management were being performed across the disparate technology teams which needed to be assessed and included in the overall process assessment for Capacity Management.

8.2 Organisational Culture

- When performing any form of assessment or audit, typically there is a degree of nervousness within the IT community who are being assessed. To offset this and ensure we had the full support and co-operation of the process community we:
  - Actively included all the Process Owner and Manager community in the pre planning, engagement and output reviews.
  - We continually emphasised to Senior Management and the process community that the process assessments were not about identifying ‘who was good’ and ‘who was bad’ but about identifying where and how as an organisation we needed to improve the maturity of the full ITIL process environment.
  - Ensured that all outputs contained in the CSA were ‘fact based’. Nothing was documented that could be interpreted as a judgement, opinion or hard critique.
  - The criteria used for the ‘R, A, G’ assessments in the Process Management section of the IPAF and the ‘checklists’ used in assessing ITIL alignment are good examples of how to ensure results have a fact based reference point.

This aspect of how well the cultural aspects of the process assessment exercises were met is covered by the results of the post assessment surveys instigated with the Process Management community. (See section 7.3)
8.3 The Customer Perspective

Arguably the most important section of the ITIL Process Assessment Framework (IPAF) is the 'Customer Section'. During the process assessment exercises we continually developed the approach to ensure we maximised the value gained from the customer insight into our processes. Key learning points were:-

- Don’t assume the customer representatives are ITIL literate. In some of the early customer reviews there was clearly confusion and misunderstandings on the differences between Incident, Major Incident and Problem Management.

- We learned to structure the review sessions less on ITIL terminology and process to that more related to business understanding of what they should expect, the formal and informal interfaces and contact points used, communications and reporting.

- Whilst the key output from the customer sessions are to agree a rating for each process, the real value comes from the anecdotal comments relating to their experiences. These were captured, summarised and then given back to the process owners. Where there were ‘repeat’ experiences conveyed by different customer representatives these clearly highlighted a process improvement opportunity.

- When the customer provides a rating for the specific process, e.g. Incident Management = 3, we always followed this with ‘what would we need to do to score 4’. This provides a good insight to the improvements the customers would most instantly recognise. Again excellent feedback to the Process Owners.

8.4 The Process Maturity Perspective

The use of Self Assessment techniques can misrepresent the true state of the process(s) being assessed by the participating practitioners. Our learning in summary from this aspect of the IPAF implementation was:-

- We encountered some examples of where individuals or teams felt the results from the assessment would be a reflection on their team or departmental capabilities and as a consequence scored ‘generously’ in sections of the Self Assessment.

- Work with the Process Owner to take a view on whether any ‘dubious’ results should stand, be rejected and/or the Self Assessment rerun. In the above situations we reran the Self Assessment as a ‘Consensus Group’ to facilitate the journey through the questionnaire which produced a more balanced set of results.

- There may be a tendency to schedule Self Assessments from a functional perspective rather than an End-End perspective, e.g. The Problem Management team only complete the Self Assessments for ‘Problem Management’. We consciously ensured that we got participation in the Self Assessments from a range of roles that execute across the Process.

- We found that our Service Managers in particular were a good group to enlist across most Self Assessments given their organisational knowledge and outward customer perspective on process outcomes. Typically this group will intuitively know ‘What works well and what doesn’t’ from the ITIL process perspective.

We cover the area of ITIL Self Assessment in more detail within Section 4. and provide guidance to ensure a realistic set of results are produced.
The results from the ITSMF Self Assessment tool provide each Process Owner with results that they can individually review to help formulate an appropriate Process Improvement Plan. We found that it was also useful to take an aggregate view of the results to help identify a broader organisational perspective. Our learning from this approach was:

- All processes (even if not formally defined) typically scored high in the Prerequisites section of the Self Assessment.
- The Processes that had strong ownership (Service Desk, Incident, Problem, Change, and SLM) also scored high in the Management Intent section of the Self Assessment.
- Conversely, the Processes that had no obvious ownership (Availability, Capacity, ITSC, Configuration, Release) scored very low in this section of the Self Assessment.
- All processes scored low in the External Integration section of the Self Assessment, thus indicating the lack of a well established integrated toolset and developed process interfaces across the complete ITIL process environment.
- All processes scored low on the Customer Interface section of the Self Assessment, thus indicating that ITIL process development in the main was IT centric rather than being developed from the desired outcomes of the Customer.

This aggregate view of the ITIL Self Assessment results provided a powerful insight into how over time organisational focus and investment (or lack of) has resulted in an inconsistent ITIL process environment.

8.5 The ITIL Perspective

In compiling the ITIL ‘Checklists’ that are used to support the ITIL gap analysis we found the structure and content of the ITIL V3 publications an easier source of input compared to the ITIL V2 publications. The learning here was:

- We found it was easier to pick out the key tenets of each process to include as statements in the checklists using the V3 material.
- The V3 publications and process content have a consistent structure and format. This helped more easily identify the statements that related to organisational roles and structural considerations. By contrast, the V2 publications have a much looser structure and can be harder to follow by non practitioners.
- There were some initial ‘concerns’ on inter mixing V2 and V3 given the view that all processes within the organisations were based on V2. There are only minor differences between the V2 Service Delivery and Service Support processes and their equivalents documented in the V3 publications. We do not feel this is an issue.
- The use of V3 material better supports the desire to align more closely with ITIL ‘best practice’. We pushed this angle with Senior Management and the Process Owner community as a positive.
One of the objectives of the Process Assessment exercise was to review the current process measurements and associated targets and identify the gaps and differences in the metrics produced compared to ITIL best practice. We used the publication ‘Metrics for IT Service Management’ to support this aspect of the assessment exercise. This provided a comprehensive view of the range of ITIL measurements that should be implemented with recommended ‘industry’ targets. The learning we gained from using this publication was:

- The majority of the ITIL processes reviewed had significant gaps in the range of measures currently produced.
- That in some cases we identified that ‘we were measuring the right things but reporting them the wrong way’. This was particular evident in the Service Desk arena.
- Where we had targets set, in most cases these were below the recommended targets set. Our processes were therefore not being set stretch targets to drive process efficiency.
- Conversely we identified a key incident management target set at 99% compared to the recommended target of 95%. The initial view was this was ‘good’ as we were driving above ITIL recommended values. This was until we provided examples of the negative behaviours being displayed by teams attempting to achieve an unrealistic target and how this was impacting other aspects of Incident and Problem Management performance.
9 Starter Pack toolkit

To help with the initial planning and preparation of your ITIL process assessments, the following templates are provided. These can/should be customised to meet your particular organisational requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Material</th>
<th>Supporting Template</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process Management Assessment Criteria</td>
<td>Process Management - assessment criteria.xlsx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Perception scoring mechanism</td>
<td>Customer - scoring mechanism.ppt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSMF Self Assessment Questionnaires</td>
<td>Self Assessment (Service Delivery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSMF Self Assessment reporting spreadsheet</td>
<td>Self Assessment (Service Support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITIL Metrics Checker</td>
<td>ITIL Metrics Checker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ITIL Gap Analysis templates</td>
<td>ITIL Gap Analysis - Sample Checklists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current State Assessment (CSA) template</td>
<td>Current State Assessment template</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hints & Tips
It is recommended that the initial assessment scope should be performed against all processes within the ITIL process model. This will provide a comprehensive benchmark and set of baseline measures for the complete ITIL process environment. Resultant CSI activities are likely to progress at differing rates of pace based on the range, size and complexity of the process improvements identified. It is recommended that periodic process assessments are then performed at an appropriate time for each process.