

# ITIL Process and Impact Analysis at Rabobank ICT

Tom Thaler, Sönke Knoch, Nico Krivograd, Peter Fettke, Peter Loos

Institute for Information Systems (IW<sub>i</sub>)  
{tom.thaler, nico.krivograd, peter.fettke, peter.loos}@iwi.dfki.de  
Research Department Intelligent User Interfaces (IUI)  
soenke.knoch@dfki.de

at the German Research Center for Artificial Intelligence (DFKI) and Saarland University

**Abstract.** The given BPI Challenge 2014 provides an ITSM case study at Rabobank based on ITIL with the demand on fact-based insights into the impact of changes to the workload at the Service Desk and/or IT Operations. The report at hand checks the conformance of the conducted ITSM processes at Rabobank Group ICT to the ITIL standard. Moreover, ITIL conforming reports considering Incident Management and Change Management are provided and an approach for the identification of CIs, wherefore change activities are most promising in terms of reducing the workload at Service Desk and IT Operations is developed. As a result, some concrete recommendations for the Rabobank Group ICT are derived.

**Keywords:** Business Process Intelligence, Business Intelligence, Process Mining, Data Warehousing, ITIL, BPM

## 1 Introduction


The given BPI challenge is about a use case at Rabobank Group ICT, the ICT part of the Rabobank. Similar to other ICT companies, Rabobank Group ICT has to implement an increasing number of software releases, while the time to market is decreasing. Thus, ITIL processes were implemented, wherein the change process is used for implementing so called planned changes.<sup>1</sup> The challenge is to develop method, techniques or prediction models reducing the workload at Service Desk and IT Operations. At the same time, the challenge description does not answer the question, whether the aspects of Rabobank overall or solely aspects of Rabobank Group ICT is of main interest. The relationship between the corresponding concepts is visualized in Figure 1.

Since we need to focus on a particular field, in this report the results from an analysis of ITIL-processes implemented by Rabobank Group ICT are presented. Methods of process mining [1] were applied and a set of tools used to understand the process in a bottom up manner. Log files generated by HP Service Manager 9 which is the software used in this process form the basis of this analysis. The main focus in this report is the conformance of the process discovered from the log compared to a

---

<sup>1</sup> BPI Challenge 2014: <http://www.win.tue.nl/bpi/2014/challenge>

reference process from literature. ITIL process metrics are used to provide an overview of most important facts and numbers. The development of the process over time is analyzed and gives insight on tendencies derived from the implemented business process. Finally, an approach is developed, which allows the identification of Configuration Items which are promising in term of their impact to Service Desk and IT Operations.



**Figure 1: Relationship between BPM and ITSM lifecycle at Rabobank**

Section 2 starts with a description about the process context and the main objectives for process analysis. Section 3 and 4 provide information about the approach applied to prepare and analyze the data. In Section 4 applied tools and techniques are described. Section 5 depicts the match between the ITIL reference process and the process at hand, split into incident (5.1) and Change Management (5.2). In Section 6 the results from data and process analysis are presented for Incident Management (6.1) and Change Management (6.2), respectively. In Subsection 6.3 a comprehensive analysis over all provided logs is presented. Section 7 underlines central findings and gives recommendations about what could be done to improve the process and future process analysis. Finally, in Section 8 the conclusion summarizes the results presented in this report.

## 2 Context Description and Objectives

The case study covers two parts of an IT Service Management (ITSM) at Rabobank Group ICT. These parts are Incident Management and Change Management from the ITIL framework, whereby the Rabobank is primarily interested in fact-based insights into the impact of changes to the workload at the Service Desk and/or IT Operations. The relevant processes (Interaction Management, Incident Management and Change Management) at Rabobank are summarized as follows:

**Table 1: Delivered database tables**

interaction	incident	incident activity	change
CI Name (aff)	CI Name (aff)	Incident ID	CI Name (aff)
CI Type (aff)	CI Type (aff)	DateStamp	CI Type (aff)
CI Subtype (aff)	CI Subtype (aff)	IncidentActivity Number	CI Subtype (aff)
Service Comp (aff)	Service Comp (aff)	IncidentActivity Type	Service Comp (aff)
Interaction ID	Incident ID	Interaction ID	Change ID
Status	Status	Assignment Group	Change Type
Impact	Impact	KM number	Risk Assessment
Urgency	Urgency		Emergency Change
Priority	Priority		CAB-approval needed
Category	Category		Planned Start
KM number	KM number		Planned End
Open Time	Open Time		Scheduled Downtime Start
Close Time	Reopen Time		Scheduled Downtime End
Closure Code	Resolved Time		Actual Start
First Call Resolution	Close Time		Actual End
Handle Time	Handle Time		Requested End
Related Incident	Closure Code		Change record Open Time
	Alert Status		Change record Close Time
	#Reassignments		Originated from
	#Related Interactions		#Related Interactions
	Related Interactions		#Related Incidents
	#Related Incidents		
	#Related Changes		
	Related Changes		
	CI Name (CBy)		
	CI Type (CBy)		
	CI Subtype (CBy)		
	Service Comp (CBy)		

**Interaction Management.** In order to manage calls or mails from customers (Rabobank colleagues) at the Service Desk concerning disruptions of ICT services, a Service Desk Agent (SDA) logs calls/mails in an Interaction record and relates them to an Affected Configuration Item (CI). The SDA can either resolve the issue for the customer directly (First Call Resolution) or create an incident record to assign the issue to an Assignment Group with more technical knowledge to resolve the service disruption. If similar calls/mails are received by the Service Desk, a SDA can decide to relate multiple Interaction records to one Incident record. Further logging of Activities to resolve the service disruption will be done in the Incident record.

**Incident Management.** Based on an estimated Impact and Urgency, graded by the SDA, an Incident record is prioritized and gets a deadline to resolve the service disruption. A Team Leader within the Assignment Group assigns the records to an Operator. The Operator resolves the issue for the customer, or reassigns the record to a colleague if other or more knowledge is needed. After solving the issue for the customer, the Operator relates the Incident record to the Configuration Item that caused the service disruption (CausedBy CI). After closing the Incident record, the customer receives an email to inform him that the issue is resolved.

**Change Management.** If particular service disruptions reoccur more often than usual, a problem investigation is started, conducting an analysis leading to an improvement plan to prevent the service disruption from happening again. The improvement plan leads to a Request for Change (RfC) on the CausedBy CI. All CIs are related to a Service Component, Risk Impact Analysis is done by an Implementation Manager assigned to changes related to the specific Service Component.

In order to allow the community develop corresponding predictive and analysis models, the Rabobank provides extracts of four database tables (interaction, incident, incident activity, change) related to these processes. The field definitions are outlined in the following Table 1.

**Table 2: Description of selected fields**

CI Name (aff)	Configuration Item (CI) where a disruption of an ICT Service is noticed, this is what we call the "Affected CI". A Service Desk Agent always uses questions in a Knowledge Document (identified by a KM number) to find the correct CI in the Configuration Item Database (CMDB).
CI Type (aff)	Every CI in the CMDB is related to an Entity Type.
CI Subtype (aff)	Every CI in the CMDB is related to a Subtype, which is related to a CI Type.
Service Comp (aff)	Every CI in the CMDB is related to 1 Service Component, in order to identify which Product Manager is responsible for the CI. A Service Component is equal to a product in the Bill of Material and is part of one or more Services.
Category	In order to select and compare similar Interactions in the Service Management tool, all records are categorized. The categorization is derived from the Knowledge Document.
KM number	A Knowledge Document contains default attribute values for the Interaction record and a set of questions for a Service Desk Agent to derive which Configuration Item is disrupted and to determine Impact and Urgency for the customer.
Change Type	In order to select and compare similar Changes in the Service Management tool, all records are categorized by Change Type.
Risk Assessment	Impact of Change: Major Business Change, Business Change or Minor Change.


Based on the given data and process descriptions, participants are asked to identify impact pattern describing or predicting the impact of changes on the workload of the Service Desk and the IT Operations. Especially the identification of opportunities decreasing these workloads seems to be very relevant in that context. Against that background, the report at hand aims at treating the following business questions/objectives:

- Do the implemented ITSM processes at Rabobank follow the ITIL standard? What are conforming parts and where are differences?
- Reporting the current state of the IT Service Management (Incident Management and Change Management) at Rabobank.
- Developing an approach allowing the identification of most promising changes in terms of reducing the workloads of the Service Desk and IT Operations. This makes it possible to derive the parameters which are necessary for the development of a prediction model.

### 3 Data Preparation

Since the available data were provided as CSV files, an ETL process (extract, transform, load) was conducted in order to harmonize the data and write them into a database. Indeed, the extraction is already finished (relevant data are available), but there are some inconsistencies, although the data come from the same information system. For example, there are four different notations of timestamps, which need to be harmonized in order to allow an analysis. Furthermore, there are different spellings of particular attribute values (e.g. Software vs. software vs. SOFTWARE as closure codes in the interaction table).

These data transformation and harmonization steps, as well as a transportation of the resulting data to a PostgreSQL<sup>2</sup> database, is modeled and conducted using Jasper ETL<sup>3</sup>.



**Figure 2: Composition of used data, tools and methods/techniques**

<sup>2</sup> PostgreSQL: <http://www.postgresql.org/>

<sup>3</sup> Jaspersoft ETL: <http://community.jaspersoft.com/project/jaspersoft-etl>

## 4 Relevant Methods, Techniques and Tools

Since all data are now available in a database, it is possible to analyze them using BI / data warehousing methods and techniques. Thus, first of all, some analytical views similar to the concept of data cubes were created, which enables the slicing and dicing of the data considering particular aspects in detail. With this in mind, furthermore, some additional information is derived from the delivered data, as e.g. time attributes (year, quarter, month, week, etc. as well as durations), boolean values (e.g. is change in requested time, is change in planned time, etc.) as well as particular aggregations (e.g. aggregation of change types). In a nutshell, both the data are enriched and preprocessed for an efficient analysis.

In order to also enable the application of process mining techniques, the resulting data are linked at some points (e.g. interactions leading to incidents leading to changes), converted to process mining conforming log files (containing a case ID, an activity, a timestamp and an originator) and exported as CSV files (process logs). These process logs were also clustered by different aspects and characteristics (e.g. only interactions with first call resolution or only incidents without interactions etc.). Thus, an adequate data material for a detailed analysis of different process variants was created with the help of a database management system. Against the background that CSV files are not supported by all intended tools (only by fluxicon Disco<sup>4</sup>), they are additionally converted to the MXML format using the ProM Import Framework<sup>5</sup>.

With the help of ProM<sup>6</sup>, different process mining approaches, especially the Heuristics Miner [2] and the Fuzzy Miner [3], are applied to the generated log files, the resulting models are converted to EPCs (Event-Driven Process Chain) and exported as EPML<sup>7</sup>. This format is supported by the RefMod-Miner<sup>8</sup> and allows us, together with the log files, to analyze different further aspects like the correlation between different events, which are not visible in the mined process models.

Further analysis of the data and their visualization are conducted with the help of Microsoft Excel, the PostgreSQL database management system itself and the corresponding graphical user interface pgAdmin<sup>9</sup>. The range of the applied methods, techniques and tools is visualized in Figure 2.

## 5 ITIL Process Conformance

The given case study in general and the provided data material in particular cover two processes of the framework, (1) Incident Management and (2) Change Management. In order to gain a better understanding of what we are working on, a matching of the

---

<sup>4</sup> Fluxicon Disco: <http://fluxicon.com/disco/>

<sup>5</sup> ProM Import Framework 7.0: <http://www.promtools.org/promimport/>

<sup>6</sup> ProM 5.2: <http://www.promtools.org/prom5/>

<sup>7</sup> EPML: <http://www.mendling.com/EPML/>

<sup>8</sup> RefMod-Miner: <http://refmod-miner.dfki.de/>

<sup>9</sup> pgAdmin: <http://www.pgadmin.org/>

case study (especially the given data material) to the ITIL framework was performed. The established ITIL within the Rabobank may be much more extensive, however, the given data material only allows a limited view on the processes with a focus on the challenge questions. The basic processes are modeled by Software AG (with ARIS) and base on the original ITIL literature [4-8], whereby the matched parts are shaded in grey.

## 5.1 Incident Management


In the terminology of ITIL an incident is defined as “An unplanned interruption to an IT service or reduction in the quality of an IT service. Failure of a configuration item that has not yet impacted service is also an incident [...]. Incident Management is the process for dealing with all incidents; this can include failures, questions or queries reported by the users [...], by technical staff, or automatically detected and reported by event monitoring tools.” [4] In the context at hand, the customer reports the incident via calling a Service Desk where it is then treated by a service employee. The incident is categorized (here: complaint, regular incident, problem, change request, information request, service request), it is checked for corresponding incidents and prioritized (here: from 1 - critical to 5 – planning, plus a determination of urgency and impact on an analogue scale). As the database does not contain any special indicator or field characterizing a major incident, we define an incident as major if its attributes urgency and impact and priority are lower than or equal to 2 (0.8%).

In addition to the ITIL standard, the Rabobank distinguishes between interactions and incidents, whereby interactions can be interpreted as a preliminary state of an incident or also as an incident with special characteristics. If a request can be resolved directly by the Service Desk (with or without first call resolution), it is not necessary to record an incident, in all other cases, it is. Thus, the interaction constitutes the first point of contact in ITIL terminology. When an incident is recorded, it is then assigned to an operator, who either resolves it or reassigns it via different service levels, in case deeper knowledge is needed. If necessary, a change request (Change Management) is created. Furthermore, a solution or a workaround (<0.1%) for the incident is provided, afterwards the incident is closed. Otherwise, the incident stays open and a problem (Problem Management) is created. Thus, the given processes for Interaction Management and Incident Management are matched to the ITIL Incident Management Process in Figure 3 (detailed analysis in Section 6.1).

## 5.2 Change Management

In the terminology of ITIL, “Changes arise for a variety of reasons:

- Proactively, e.g. seeking business benefits such as reducing costs or improving services or increasing the ease and effectiveness of support.
- Reactively as a means of resolving errors and adapting to changing circumstances.” [ITIL Service Transition, pp. 42]





The changes considered in the case study seem to come only from a reactively perspective since the ‘originated\_from’ field in the change table only contains “Incident” (7,192 cases), “Interaction” (2 cases) and “Problem” (10,810 cases). After the request for change (RfC) is accepted, it is prioritized in terms of deciding whether the change is an emergency change (about 0.3%) or not. ITIL defined emergency changes as reserved “changes intended to repair an error in an IT service that is negatively impacting the business to a high degree” ([6], pp. 60). The risk for the change is assessed subsequently, thus, the change is assigned to one of the following categories: Minor Change (94%), Business Change (5.7%) and Major Change (0.4%). The ITIL standard furthermore describes a standard change as “a change to a service or infrastructure for which the approach is pre-authorized by Change Management that has an accepted and established procedure to provide a specific change requirement” ([6], pp. 48). It seems, that no of the named change types can be mapped to the standard change, as all of the type contain cases, in which a CAB approval is necessary (see Table 3, shaded in grey). However, having a look on the column named ‘change type aggregated’ (we aggregated the entries to the basic types: Change Component, Master Change, Master Change Roadmap, Release Change, Standard Activity and Standard Change), one can easily see that only Release Change falls into the ITIL definition of a standard change. Thus, not only the risk assessment but also the change type must be taken into account according to the context, which outlines an adaption to the ITIL standard.

**Table 3: Risk assessment to CAB approval needed**

risk assessment	change type aggregated	Need CAB appr.	#cases	ratio
Minor Change	Change Component	No	15	0.08%
Business Change	Master Change	No	1	0.01%
Minor Change	Master Change	No	35	0.19%
Minor Change	Master Change Roadmap	No	2	0.01%
Business Change	Release Change	No	40	0.22%
Major Business Change	Release Change	No	2	0.01%
Minor Change	Release Change	No	1,063	5.9%
Business Change	Standard Activity	No	11	0.06%
Major Business Change	Standard Activity	No	1	0.01%
Minor Change	Standard Activity	No	6,504	36.13%
Business Change	Standard Change	No	748	4.16%
Major Business Change	Standard Change	No	21	0.12%
Minor Change	Standard Change	No	9,185	51.02%
Business Change	Release Change	Yes	211	1.17%
Major Business Change	Release Change	Yes	25	0.14%
Minor Change	Release Change	Yes	138	0.77%




Figure 4: ITIL Change Management Process matched to the given case study.

The evaluation fragments of the ITIL process cannot be matched to the given case study, however, the changes are generally planned, scheduled and processed in conformance to the ITIL standard, although it is not possible to identify a review and documentation of them in the database tables. The matched fragments of ITIL Change Management process are visualized in Figure 4 (detailed analysis in Section 6.2).

## 6 Data and Process Analytics

### 6.1 ITIL Incident Management Report

In this section we use the ITIL Incident Metrics ([4], pp. 54) and analyze the tables for further interesting information.

In this case, we have a special issue. The Rabobank differentiates the ITIL-Incidents between interactions and incidents. Interactions are events which could be dissolved in a first call. Interactions that cannot be solved immediately will be escalated to the next support level. Then, in the next support level, they are called Incidents. In the following, we use the ITIL definition of incidents and we do not differentiate between interactions and incidents.

The following Table 4 presents the considered ITIL Incident Metrics and gives an overview on the actual state. Details to these metrics and values are presented in the subsequent explanatory notes.

**Table 4: ITIL Incident Management Metrics**

ITIL Metric	Value
01   <b>Total number of incidents</b>	<b>150,720</b>
02   Breakdown of <b>incidents at each stage</b>	Solved on first contact: <b>93,996 (≈ 62.36%)</b> Further support levels involved: <b>42,881 (≈ 28.45%)</b> Not initiated by Service Desk: <b>3,716 (≈ 2.47%)</b>
03   Size of current incident <b>backlog</b>	<b>15</b>
04   Number and percentage of <b>major incidents</b>	<b>1,207 (≈ 0.8 %)</b>
05   Mean <b>elapsed time</b> to archive incident resolution of circumvention, broke down by impact code	<i>see explanatory notes</i>
06   Number of <b>incidents reopened</b> and as a percentage of the total	<b>2,428 (≈ 0.52 %)</b>
07   Number and percentage of <b>incidents incorrectly assigned</b>	<b>51,961 (≈ 11.13 %)</b>
08   Percentage of incidents <b>closed by the Service Desk</b> without reference to other levels of support (often referred to as “first point of contact”)	<b>93,996 (≈ 62.36 %)</b>
09   Number and percentage of <b>incidents resolved remotely, without the need for a visit</b>	<b>3,546 (≈ 83.01 %)</b>
10   Breakdown of <b>incidents by time of day</b> , to help pinpoint peaks and ensure matching of resources	<i>see explanatory notes</i>

## Explanatory notes

### 1. Total number of incidents

The total number of incidents is 150,720. The result was determined by means of an outer join on Interactions and Incidents.

### 2. Breakdown of incidents at each stage

The 150,720 incidents were broken down to their status as shown in Table 5.

**Table 5: Breakdown of incidents at each stage**

Status	Description	#Incidents
Closed	Interactions solved on the first contact	93,996
	Interactions leading to incident	42,881
	Incidents without interactions	3,716
	Interactions which are closed but no incidents exist	101,12
Open	Interactions with status "Open - Linked"	6
	Interactions with status "Closed" but the incidents status are "Work in progress"	9

### 3. Size of current incident backlog

Another interesting point is the number of incident backlogs. The incident backlog contains incidents, which are still opened. Corresponding to Table 5, the backlog has a size of 15.

### 4. Number and percentage of major incidents

A major incident is defined for us by a value less than or equal to 2 at each of the fields "Impact", "Urgency", and "Priority" (IUP). The scale of fields ranges from 1 - very high to 5 - very low. We noticed a type conflict in the analysis. The interaction with the "Interaction ID" = SD0117519 and the incident with the "Incident ID" = IM0038625 have by the field "Urgency" the value "5 -Very Low". In contrast, all other records have only numeric values.

A total of 1,207 ( $\approx 0.8\%$ ) incidents are major incidents, whereby 1,203 (99.67%) of them have an IUP code of (2,2,2) and 4 (0.33%) have an UIP code of (1,1,1).

### 5. Mean elapsed time to archive incident resolution of circumvention, broke down by impact code

Here, we could not determine a link between the IUP code and the rate of dissolution. Incidents with a higher IUP code do not have a better average solution time as incidents with a lower IUP code.

6. *Number of incidents reopened and as a percentage of the total*

A total of 2,428 ( $\approx 0.52\%$ ) incidents must be reopened (see Table 6). Especially already completed incidents to applications often need to be reopened. 2,428 of 32,900 application incidents must be reopened, which corresponds to a rate of 7.80%. This indicates that the service team has made mistakes or that the incidents remained unsolved.

**Table 6: Number of Reopen Activity / CI Type**

CI Type	#reopen activities	Fraction of all reopen activities
Application	1,858	76.52%
Subapplication	367	15.12%
Computer	118	4.86%
Database	30	1.24%
Software	12	0.49%
Hardware	10	0.41%
Storage	9	0.37%
no type	8	0.33%
Office electronics	7	0.29%
Display device	4	0.16%
Network components	4	0.16%
Application component	1	0.04%

7. *Number and percentage of incidents incorrectly assigned*

In 51,961 ( $\approx 11.13\%$ ) cases, the incidents were incorrectly assigned and therefore had to be reassigned (see Table 7). Most commonly, such faulty assignments occur in applications (40,405). This is an indicator for the Service Desk making an incorrect assignment at each tenth incident.

**Table 7: Reassignments depending on CI Types**

CI Type	#Reassignments	Fraction of all reassignments
Application	40,405	77.76%
Subapplication	5,926	11.41%
Computer	4,200	8.08%
Hardware	353	0.68%
Software	253	0.49%
Display device	225	0.43%
Storage	217	0.42%
Database	163	0.31%
no type	88	0.17%
Network components	65	0.13%
Office electronics	48	0.09%
Application component	11	0.02%
Phone	4	0.01%

8. *Percentage of incidents closed by the Service Desk without reference to other levels of support (often referred to as “first point of contact”)*

In total, there are 93,996 ( $\approx 62.36\%$ ) interactions without an incident and a successful first call resolution (see Table 8). The most frequently occurring incidents belong to the category of "incident". They have an average handle time of 7 minutes. The second most frequent category is "request for information" with an average handle time of 7 minutes.

**Table 8: Number of Interactions without an Incident**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Number of Incident</b>	<b>Average handle time</b>
incident	73,828	7 m
request for information	20,124	7 m
service request	22	10 m
complaint	17	5 m
problem	5	8 m
average handle time		<b>7.12 m</b>

9. *Number and percentage of incidents resolved remotely, without the need for a visit*

Since no incident activity type "customer visit" exists in the data, we have defined a visit to the customer as follows. When an external vendor was involved and we contacted the customer, this was considered a visit.

In 4,272 ( $\approx 2.83\%$ ) cases an external vendor was involved in the resolution of the incident. In 726 ( $\approx 16.99\%$ ) of these cases, a visit to the customer was necessary. This means that 3,546 ( $\approx 83.01\%$ ) incidents were resolved remotely, without the need for a customer visit.

10. *Breakdown of incidents by time of day, to help pinpoint peaks and ensure matching of resources*

In Figure 5 you can clearly see that most incidents occur in the morning. At midday we have a decrease of incidents. This is most likely the case because the employees then take their lunch break, and therefore not report any incidents. In the afternoon the number of incidents rises again. These incidents occurring in the morning can often be dissolved in a first contact.

**Additional Facts**

In addition to the ITIL Incident Management Metrics, we also investigated some further interesting facts and key figures on the incidents. First of all, there are 289 service components (products) which were supported in terms of concrete cases. Depending on the characteristics of the Incidents, we investigated the corresponding time consumption as follows.




Figure 5: Number of Incidents per Time of Day

Table 9: Time consumption depending on process characteristics

Characteristics	handle time		
	average	min	max
Solved by Service Desk	00:07:12	00:00:00	06:15:30
Recorded but not solved by Service Desk	0.96 days	0 days	181.46 days
No Service Desk involvement	18:51:44	00:04:38	19,61 days
Open-close time of all incidents recorded by Service Desk	1.98 days	0 days	889 days

Furthermore, we analyzed the waiting time (open-close time - handle time; without the exceptions and shortened to whole days):

- Exceptions: In 15 cases, the handle time is greater than the open-close time
- Average wait time: 3.78 days
- Min wait time: 0
- Max wait time: 477

We also identified the Top 3 service components and Top 3 CI Types in context of Incident Management:

Table 10: Top 3 service components and CI types (Incident Management)

	Object	#Incidents (Ratio)
Top 3 Service Components	WBS000073	33,528 (22.25%)
	WBS000128	14,130 (9.36%)
	WBS000092	7,219 (4.79%)
Top 3 CI Types	Application	99,483 (66.01%)
	Subapplication	20,745 (13.76%)
	Storage	11,829 (7.85%)

## 6.2 ITIL Change Management Report

Analogue the Incident Management, we instantiated an ITIL Change Management Report based on the ITIL standard [4]. Since the given information on changes are rare, 15 metrics were selected, which were possible to calculate and to derive statements for.

**Table 11: ITIL Change Management Metrics**

ITIL Metric		Value
01	Mean Time to Restore Service (MTRS)	Average delta downtimes scheduled: ≈21 hours conducted: ≈10 hours
02	Changes without reference to the CAB	98.04%
03	Outstanding changes and changes in progress	7.28%
04	Number and percentage of emergency changes	34 (0.19%)
05	Number of changes which met the customer's requirements, e.g., quality, cost, and time	Achieved requested end: 14,266 (85.45%)
06	Reduction in the backlog of change requests	yes
07	Reduction in the number and percentage of unplanned changes and emergency fixes	No significant reduction
08	Average time to implement	1 day 8 hours
09	Incidents attributable to changes	205 (1.14%)
10	Efficiency	16,688 (92.71%)
11	Reduction in time, effort, cost to make changes	Light reduction trend
12	Frequency of changes	18,000
13	Ratio of planned vs. unplanned changes	15 changes not planned
14	Ratio of accepted to rejected changes	92.73%
15	Time to execute a change	See Figure 10

### Explanatory notes

#### 1. Mean Time to Restore Service (MTRS)

According to ([4], pp. 45), the MTRS is the total downtime divided by the number of service breaks. In the data set, we define a downtime as the difference between actual start and end of an implementation when a scheduled downtime is set. This is the case for only 2.12% (382) of all changes. While for 36 changes actual start or end is not set (scheduled and not conducted), the remaining 346 changes were focused. For 55 changes the actual start is earlier than it was scheduled (in time), for 137 actual start equals the scheduled downtime (just in time) and for 154 it was later than it was scheduled (not in time). The average delta between scheduled downtime and actual start is 8 days and 5 hours. Comparing the average delta between start and end of scheduled downtimes (21 hours) to the average delta between the actual start and end (10 hours), it turns out that the actual downtime is on average 11 hours, shorter than it was scheduled.



## 2. Changes without reference to the CAB

([4], CAB-Agenda, pp. 59) claims to measure failed changes, unauthorized changes, backed-out changes, or changes without reference to the CAB sorted by Incident Management, Problem Management or Change Management. While information on the first three points is rare, it was focused on the last. 98.04% of all changes need no CAB-approval. Table 12 lists change numbers that need a CAB-approval by their origin. Note that the sum of all changes equals 18,004, as 4 changes are labeled as both, incident and problem.

**Table 12: Number of changes that need CAB-approval by origin**

Origin	CAB-approval	Share of Changes
Interaction	No	2 (0.01%)
	Yes	0 (0.00%)
Incident	No	7102 (39.45%)
	Yes	90 (0.50%)
Problem	No	10526 (58.47%)
	Yes	284 (0.58%)

## 3. Outstanding changes and changes in progress

To analyze the number of outstanding changes and changes in progress as suggested in ([4], CAB-Agenda, pp. 59), a glimpse on the data fields containing timestamps as provided in Table 13 is necessary. The table shows all change-related data fields containing time data and provides the earliest and latest time value respectively. It can be seen that every change has a record open and close event, indicated by the number of empty cells that is null. To identify outstanding changes, changes that were opened and closed although an implementation never started were considered. The number of such changes is 1,310 (7.28%). The timestamp in 2021 in the table seems to be an error, as no change implementation can be finished in the future. In total, four changes with an actual start after March 2014 exist.

**Table 13: Earliest and latest timestamp and number of empty cells**

Data field	Earliest	Latest	Null cells
Requested end	26.10.2012 11:00:00	20.02.2028 17:00:00	0
Change record open time	01.09.2011 09:13:00	31.03.2014 16:46:00	0
Change record close time	01.10.2013 06:47:00	31.03.2014 23:53:00	0
Planned start	01.06.2011 07:00:00	20.02.2021 12:30:00	0
Planned end	13.10.2011 10:00:00	20.02.2021 17:30:00	43
Actual start	16.10.2012 13:09:00	21.03.2021 00:00:00	3258
Actual end	26.10.2012 11:00:00	21.03.2021 00:01:00	3261
Scheduled downtime start	21.12.2012 14:29:00	21.03.2015 01:00:00	29520
Scheduled downtime end	23.06.2013 04:00:00	21.03.2015 01:00:00	29531

## 4. Number and percentage of emergency changes

The number and percentage of emergency changes is 34 (0.19%).

5. *Number of changes which met the customer's requirements*

To calculate the number of changes implemented to services which met the customer's agreed requirements, e.g. quality, cost, and time, it was focused on the time of change implementations that can be understood as a change's costs. 66% of all changes were started in time (started before planned to start), 22% were started just in time (exactly started when planned to start) and 12% were started later than they were planned to start. The difference between planned and actual start of changes that lies on average at 3 days and 19 hours indicates a potential for optimization. In an ideal world, changes should always start when they were planned to start.

Customer's agreed requirements are defined as changes where the requested end date was not reached. In total, 2,430 (14.55%) did not achieve the requested end. The mean deviation was 11 days and 13 hours. 747 (4.47%) changes ended exactly when requested to end and 13,519 (80.98%) changes ended earlier with a mean deviation of 9 days and 22 hours.


6. *Reduction in the backlog of change requests*

To check for a reduction in the backlog of change requests, changes with an earlier requested end compared to the actual end were analyzed. For a statement concerning the development over time, the data set was divided into two sets. We used the date '2013-12-31 23:59:59' and split the data in changes that occurred before and after that date. We divided according to the requested end and the actual end, respectively, with the results presented in Table 14. Divided by the requested end data field, a reduction of the average deviation between requested and actual end by about 50% could be observed. Divided by the actual end, no improvement in time could be observed. Thus, we had a view on changes with a start and end in the respective intervals indicated by actual end' in the table. A reduction of 1 day was determined.

**Table 14: Backlog development over time**

Criterion for division	Changes	Average deviation
Requested end < 2013-12-31 23:59:59	1429 (58.81%)	14 days 14:44:14
Requested end > 2013-12-31 23:59:59	1001 (41.19%)	6 days 28:20:27
Actual end < 2013-12-31 23:59:59	1359 (55.93%)	10 days 11:44:23
Actual end > 2013-12-31 23:59:59	1071 (44.07%)	12 days 21:37:10
Actual end' < 2013-12-31 23:59:59	1268 (64.27%)	9 days 12:14:59
Actual end' > 2013-12-31 23:59:59	708 (35.83%)	8 days 12:45:14

Figure 6 shows the deviation of changes between requested and actual end for the time interval between October 2013 and March 2014. Changes with a deviation greater 1 month were considered as outliers (151) and were filtered out. The data is arranged according to the actual end timestamp, but the diagram looks similar if arranged according requested end timestamp. Beside the gap around the turn of the year no trends are visible.




**Figure 6: Deviation between requested and actual end ordered by actual end.**

7. *Reduction in the number and percentage of unplanned changes and emergency fixes*

Similar to the approach above, we divided the data set into two halves for emergency changes. Between October and December 2013, 18 emergency changes occurred, while, between January and March 2014, 13 emergency changes occurred. To check for unplanned changes, changes where the planned start or (inclusive) the planned end is null were considered. Both between October and December 2013 and between January and March 2014, 15 of such changes occurred. Due to the low number of relevant changes in both cases, no significant reduction was detected.

8. *Average time to implement based on urgency/priority/change type*

Focusing on the duration of change implementations, 35.77% show a time difference of zero, thus, they are closed instantly. The remaining 64.23% of changes have a duration that ranges from a few hours up to two years. On Figure 7 it is visible that the majority of all changes takes between 0 and 2 minutes (13.30%; in all cases exactly 1 minute), between 10 and 20 minutes (9.52%) and between 1 and 2 hours (13.18%). Divided into rougher time intervals, about 43% of all changes have a duration of less than 1 hour, 38% between 1 and 24 hours, 13% between 24 hours and 1 week and the remaining 6% up to two years. Average implementation time of all changes is 1 day and 8 hours. Focusing on change started and ended between October 2013 and March 2014 the average is 19:52:54 and affects the majority of all changes (16215 / 90%).



**Figure 7: Number of changes per duration of actual implementation.**

Table 15 shows the average implementation times for five different categories. It is noticeable that master changes (0.21% of all changes) take significantly longer than other changes. Standard change types (56%) and release types (8%) take about one day longer than the average.

**Table 15: Average time of implementation per category**

Category	Average time	
Change type	Change Component	Values not set
	Standard Activity [x]	1 day 08:14:40
	Standard Change Type [x]	2 days 02:26:28
	Release Type [x]	2 days 12:05:43
	Master Change	7 months 14 days 09:30:00
CAB-approval needed	yes	09:41:27
	no	1 day 08:27:44
Emergency change	yes	07:41:43
	no	1 day 08:08:02
Risk assessment / impact of change	Major Business Change	01:24:38
	Business Change	15:32:05
	Minor Change	1 day 09:03:20
Originated from	Interaction	11:43:30
	Incident	21:47:16
	Problem	1 day 15:17:32
All changes	1 day 08:05:08	
Changes started / ended between Oct.'13 / Mar.'14	19:52:54	

9. *Incidents attributable to changes*


Respective data fields indicate 11 related interactions and 18,789 related incidents. Only 205 changes (1.14% of all changes) are marked as related in the Incident log.

10. *Efficiency: Ratio of changes implemented vs. Request for Change (RFC) received*

16,688 changes were implemented in the data set. This results in an efficiency of 92.71%.

11. *Percentage reduction in time, effort, cost to make changes and releases (e.g., by service, change type, asset type)*

To check for a reduction in time, again, the time interval between October 2013 and March 2014 was investigated. Therefore, time intervals equal to zero and greater one month were filtered out. Figure 8 shows a light trend of time reduction indicated by the red line.




**Figure 8: Implementation time between Oct. 2013 and Mar. 2014.**

12. *Frequency of changes*

The change log lists 18,000 changes, each identified by an ID. Changes are divided into 240 change types. Figure 9 presents a rough division of changes according to five different change types abstracted from the 240 concrete change types. It can be seen that the majority of changes are types as Release Type (8%), Standard Activity (37%) and Standard Change Type (56%). Parallel to the division into change types, changes are arranged according to their Impact of Change in the Risk Assessment column.

According to this categorization, a change is a Minor Change (94.11%), Business Change (5.62%) or Major Business Change (0.27%). Changes originate from an Interaction (0.02%), an Incident (39.94%) or a Problem (60.04%).



**Figure 9: Rough division of changes into types.**

#### 13. Ratio of planned vs. unplanned changes

Having a look on the delta between the time when a change implementation was planned to start and when it actually started, it turns out that 66% of all changes were started in time (started before planned to start), 22% were started just in time (exactly started when planned to start) and 12% were started later than they were planned to start. The mean delta between the planned and the actual start is about 3 days and 19 hours.

Focusing on the ratio of planned and unplanned changes, only 15 changes have no planned start and end. Only one of these 15 was actually implemented – caused by a hardware problem.


#### 14. Ratio of accepted to rejected change requests

1,309 (7.27%) changes have a record close time and no actual start and end, thus are rejected. For 63 changes the actual start lies behind the close time of the record. Finally, the ratio of accepted to rejected change requests is 92.73%.

#### 15. Time to execute a change (from initiation through each stage in the lifecycle of a change, ending in completion: by lifecycle, by service, by infrastructure problem)

Figure 10 shows the process steps a change goes through. The edges of the graph are labeled with the mean duration calculated by fluxicon Disco. Activities were set to 100% and path to 10%. It is noticeable that not every change runs through all of these

nine process steps. For example, for 97.87% of all changes no service downtime was scheduled. For 7.22% of all listed changes, the change implementation was never conducted (no actual start and end).



**Figure 10: Life cycle of changes annotated with absolute change frequency and mean duration inspired by fluxicon Disco.**

### Additional Facts

The change log contains 30,275 records that cover Configuration Items (CI) and changes. In this log, 10,293 different CI names are listed divided into 13 types and 74 subtypes. CIs are related to 286 service components. A product manager is responsible for respective service components.

**Delay to start.** We wanted to get a deeper understanding of the delay from the point when a record was opened until the point when the change implementation was

started. In the result, 1.43% are implemented instantly, 18.37% take up to one hour to be implemented, 25.85% up to 24 hours, 28.39% up to one week, 16.96% up to one month and 8.69% up to one year. There are also a few changes that take several years to start (0.29% between one and two years, 2 changes between two and three (0.01%), 1 change seven years (0.01%). The mean difference between both timestamps over all changes averages 12 days. Changes that are labeled as an emergency change average about 3 and a half days. When a CAB-approval is needed, the change needs on average 65 days to start. When a CAB-approval for an emergency change is needed, it takes only about 8 days.

**Deviation between requested and actual end.** To validate the planned values, the requested end was analyzed. Comparing it to the actual end of a change implementation results in the mean deviation of 9 days and 17 hours. When the change involves an emergency change the deviation is 1 day and 18 hours. When a CAB-approval is needed the mean deviation counts 18 days and 18 hours.

**Time a record remains open.** The mean time a change record remains open is about 18 days. Using the change categorization from above, the analysis of the data shows that Business Changes take longer (with an average duration of 42 days) than Minor Changes (with an average duration of 16 and a half days). As expected, a Major Business Change takes even longer with an average of about 85 days. Concerning the change's origin, Incidents result in change records that are open for about 21 days on average. Changes with an Incident as origin remain open for 13 and a half days. The two changes with an Interaction as origin remain open for 1 year 2 month 15 days and 10 days 20 hours respectively. According to the five change types depicted in Figure 9, Change Components take about 180 days and Master Changes almost 200 days on average. Release Types remain open for about 77 days, Standard Activities for 33 days and Standard Change Types for 56 days. Table 16 provides an overview on the discussed time intervals regarding the time, a change record remains open.

**Table 16: Mean time a record remains open per category.**


Change Category	Mean Time Difference per Change	Share of Changes
Business Change	42 days 01:41:45	5.50%
Minor Change	16 days 11:59:20	94.25%
Major Business Change	85 days 07:41:37	0.25%
Interaction	226 days 11:10:00	0.01%
Incident	13 days 11:23:56	39.92%
Problem	21 days 02:31:21	60.07%
Emergency Change Y	15 days 14:51:34	0.19%
Emergency Change N	18 days 02:04:58	99.81%
CAB-approval needed Y	79 days 10:55:11	1.96%
CAB-approval needed N	16 days 20:27:04	98.04%
Master Change	198 days 20:41:08	0.21%
Change Component	179 days 15:16:40	0.08%
Release Type [x]	77 days 16:05:25	8.21%
Standard Activity [x]	33 days 02:24:46	36.20%
Standard Change Type [x]	56 days 08:50:15	55.30%



### 6.3 Crossover Analytics


We generally consider the time span between 2013-10-01 and 2014-03-31, since this is the relevant time span within the given data, wherein cases (interactions, incidents, changes) were closed.

First of all, we try to answer the question of whether there are particular Configuration Items (CIs) affecting the workload of the Service Desk and IT Operations significantly more than others. Since we identified the combination of CI name and the service component as a precise identifier of a CI, we analyzed the number of interactions to the different CIs (Figure 11).



**Figure 11: Number of interactions per CI**

Thereby we found out, that only 144 of the available 4,213 CIs cover 87.37% of all interactions. Moreover, only 21 of the CIs still cover 50.28% of all interactions and are responsible for 46.88% of the overall Service Desk workload (see Figure 12). Moreover, about 30% of the corresponding interactions lead to the creation of an incident (further service levels) and there are also 10 CIs whose interactions lead to an Incident in more than 40% of the cases (when the green line in the figure is over the dotted line). These 21 CIs are analyzed with a special consideration of their characteristics and impact to the IT Operations (see Table 17).



**Figure 12: Most important CIs at Service Desk**


**Table 17: Workload Characteristics of Most Important CIs at Service Desk**

ID	CI-Name	Service Component	CI-Type	CI-Subtype	#Interactions	Fraction of all Interactions	Leading to Incident	First Call Resolution	Fraction of Service Desk Workload
1	SAN000182	WBS000128	S	SAN	10668	7.26%	4.52%	95.02%	3.23%
2	WBA000133	WBS000073	A	WBA	6897	4.69%	24.87%	74.92%	5.41%
<b>3</b>	<b>SUB000456</b>	<b>WBS000073</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>WBA</b>	<b>6476</b>	<b>4.41%</b>	<b>52.63%</b>	<b>47.33%</b>	<b>3.94%</b>
4	DTA000057	WBS000094	A	DA	5708	3.88%	13.84%	86.05%	4.46%
5	DTA000616	WBS000089	A	DA	4173	2.84%	10.54%	89.17%	3.32%
6	SBA000439	WBS000219	A	SBA	3983	2.71%	14.06%	86.09%	3.46%
7	DTA000616	WBS000092	A	DA	3738	2.54%	16.1%	83.52%	3.05%
<b>8</b>	<b>SBA000462</b>	<b>WBS000073</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>SBA</b>	<b>3693</b>	<b>2.51%</b>	<b>53.86%</b>	<b>46.06%</b>	<b>2.64%</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>SBA000263</b>	<b>WBS000072</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>SBA</b>	<b>3309</b>	<b>2.25%</b>	<b>75.49%</b>	<b>24.51%</b>	<b>0.95%</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>SBA000607</b>	<b>WBS000263</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>SBA</b>	<b>2827</b>	<b>1.92%</b>	<b>67.46%</b>	<b>32.51%</b>	<b>1.55%</b>
11	SBA000729	WBS000101	A	SBA	2588	1.76%	4.1%	95.71%	1.54%
12	SBA000659	WBS000128	A	SBA	2531	1.72%	11.5%	88.46%	1.36%
<b>13</b>	<b>WBA000058</b>	<b>WBS000073</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>WBA</b>	<b>2515</b>	<b>1.71%</b>	<b>68.23%</b>	<b>31.77%</b>	<b>1.64%</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>SUB000113</b>	<b>WBS000095</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>SBA</b>	<b>2213</b>	<b>1.51%</b>	<b>53.55%</b>	<b>46.41%</b>	<b>1.62%</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>WBA000011</b>	<b>WBS000152</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>WBA</b>	<b>2112</b>	<b>1.44%</b>	<b>50.28%</b>	<b>49.57%</b>	<b>1.5%</b>
<b>16</b>	<b>WBA000144</b>	<b>WBS000318</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>WBA</b>	<b>2112</b>	<b>1.44%</b>	<b>46.78%</b>	<b>53.22%</b>	<b>1.46%</b>
17	APP000005	WBS000292	A	C	1954	1.33%	24.31%	75.33%	1.48%
<b>18</b>	<b>SUB000424</b>	<b>WBS000073</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>WBA</b>	<b>1936</b>	<b>1.32%</b>	<b>41.89%</b>	<b>58.01%</b>	<b>1.52%</b>
<b>19</b>	<b>SBA000017</b>	<b>WBS000099</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>SBA</b>	<b>1512</b>	<b>1.03%</b>	<b>47.09%</b>	<b>52.71%</b>	<b>0.76%</b>
20	MON00015	WBS000091	D	M	1478	1.01%	8.66%	91.27%	1.17%
21	SBA000659	WBS000255	A	SBA	1477	1.00%	7.92%	92.08%	0.81%

*Legend:* CI-Type: S = Storage; A = Application; SA = Subapplication, D = Displayservice, CI-Subtype: SAN = SAN; WBA = Web Based Application; DA = Desktop Application; SBA = Server Based Application; C = Citrix; M = Monitor

One can see that the bold written CIs in Table 17 lead to significantly more Incidents than the others. Against that background, we call CIs which are responsible for more than 1% of all Interactions and which lead to an Incident in more than 40% of all cases *Most Incident-Relevant Interaction CIs (MIRIC)*. The MIRICs are now deeper analyzed concerning their impact to the whole Incident Management (Service Desk and IT Operations) and their impact on the Change Management (see Figure 13).

**Analysis of Most Incident-Relevant Interaction CIs (MIRICs)**  
 (Interaction Ratio > 1% and Leading to Incident Ratio > 40%)



**Figure 13: Analysis of Most Incident-Relevant Interactions**

A first interesting result is that these 10 CIs are responsible for ~18% of the Service Desk workload and ~21% of the IT Operations workload. The MIRICs also cover 31.51% of all Incidents coming from Interactions. Thus, one should derive the conclusion that the MIRICs are of major importance to the Service Desk and IT Operations and have high potentials for a positive impact of changes. At the same time, one can see only little efforts in addressing the affected CIs of the MIRICs in Change Management. 4 of the 10 MIRICs do not have any changes during the whole observation period, 3 have less than 10 changes and the other 3 have 29, 35 and 52 changes respectively. Overall, these 133 changes cover only 0.44% of all changes, which seems to be a value too low with a consideration of the relevance for the Service Desk and IT Operations. To ensure the correctness of that result, we will carry out a deeper analysis of these cases over time. Intuitively, there is no trend observable concerning the occurrence of service cases at those CIs, wherefore no changes are available. Figure 14 visualized that for CI 16; CI03, CI18 and CI19 look quite similar. In contrast to the analysis above, we have taken here the case start point instead of the case end into consideration, which is necessary in terms of impact analysis.

The following two figures visualize the occurrences of cases over time related to the different other CIs, while the first figure shows one of the CIs with only changes in the observation period and the second figure shows one of those CIs which have more changes. The dotted lines represent the points of time, where a change was done.




Figure 14: MIRIC 16 case occurrences over time




Figure 15: MIRIC 13 change impacts (affected CI)





Figure 16: MIRIC 15 change impacts (affected CI)

The case occurrence behavior of all considered CIs have tail at the year switch in common, which is explicable by holiday time. Moreover, a trend, also at those CIs where changes were conducted, is not observable. Since there is no detailed information on what is done in particular changes, it is unclear whether that result is the cause of inadequate changes or whether the changes are not related to the occurred interactions and incidents. Since up to now, solely the affected CIs were taken into account, it now also checked, whether the affected CIs are generally equal to the CausedBy CIs at the corresponding Incidents (Figure 17).



**Figure 17: Affected CIs vs. CausedBy CIs at MIRICs**

As a result, in 90.75% of all MIRIC Incidents, the affected CI is equal to the CausedBy CI. Solely CI19 (CI-Name: SBA0000017, Service Component: WBS000099) is a statistical outlier. Thus, the analysis shows, that itit would be promising to invest more workload in changes concerning the MIRICs.

## 7 Central Findings and Recommendations

**MIRIC Identification Approach.** We developed an approach which allows the identification of CIs, wherefore the analysis of change possibilities is very promising. With the help of that approach, 10 MIRICs (*Most Important Incident-Related CIs*) were identified, which are responsible for about 18% of the overall Service Desk workload and for about 21% of the overall IT Operations workload. Against the background of more than 10,000 supported CIs overall, these CIs have a significant importance for the IT service management. It can also be observed that for 4 of these MIRICs no changes exist. Moreover, the changes conducted to the other 6 MIRICs do not have a relevant impact to the workload they cause.

Since we do not have detailed information on what exactly these CIs are, we strongly recommend analyzing them on a functional level. The provision of adequate changes seems very promising in terms of reducing the workload of the Service Desk and the IT Operations. A possible scenario may be password forgotten requests, which can be avoided by providing a web form automating the processing of these

requests. There are many similar scenarios, in which a simple workflow implementation is able to reduce the upcoming workload in an extensive manner.

**Change Analysis.** The Analysis on changes has shown that in many cases the actual implementation do not match the planned point in time and duration. Thus, we see an optimization potential in a better match of planned marks. One barrier that hinders the change to finish is a CAB approval. Having a look at the effect of change in CI types, it turned out that change seem to have a positive impact on the occurrence of incidents. For example, changes in the categories “application component”, “computer” and “application” led to a reduction in incidents. Here, further analysis could deliver promising results.

**Data quality improvement.** As described in section 3, it was necessary to harmonize some data as e.g. closure codes. Since software tools supporting the IT service management processes are typically able to report different metrics themselves, the mentioned different spellings may lead to errors in the reports. Against that background, it would be meaningful to improve the data quality in general by taking care of a consistent data basis.

## 8 Conclusion

The case study shows, that depending on the objectives, many software tools and techniques are necessary to enable a detailed analysis of data and processes. In fact, there are particular tools, e.g. SAP Business Objects, ARIS PPM, fluxicon Disco etc. which are excellent in analyzing either the data or the processes. However, an integrated solution, which would be necessary in contexts like that at hand, is missing.

Also the quality of data plays an important role at analyzing. To get a handle on that, one could provide support within the operational system to prevent a quality issues. Another way may be the use of data quality management software, which, indeed is connected with further costs, personal and time effort.

In a nutshell, despite all that, it is generally possible to analyze such data, without detailed knowledge on what e.g. the concrete CI covers or what the content of an Incident or a Change is. However, one should gain a feeling for the data in order to develop an intuition for relevant analysis aspects. The section *ITIL Process Conformance* and the two ITIL reports for Incident and Change Management within the report at hand allowed us to acquire such a feeling. Based on that, it is important to have an analysis focus, since there is a vast number of possibilities deriving interesting and business relevant information.

## References

1. van der Aalst, W., Process Mining: Discovery, Conformance and Enhancement of Business Processes 2011, Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer. XVI, 352.
2. Weijters, A., W.M.P. van der Aalst, and A. de Medeiros, Process mining with the Heuristics Miner algorithm. Tech. Rep., 2006. 166.
3. C.W., G., nther, and W.M.P. van der Aalst, Fuzzy mining: adaptive process simplification based on multi-perspective metrics, in Proceedings of the 5th international conference on Business process management 2007, Springer-Verlag: Brisbane, Australia. p. 328-343.
4. Office of Government Commerce, ITIL - Service Operation 2010, Norwich: TSO Information & Publishing Solutions.
5. Office of Government Commerce, ITIL - Service Design 2010, Norwich: TSO Information & Publishing Solutions.
6. Office of Government Commerce, ITIL - Service Transition 2010, Norwich: TSO Information & Publishing Solutions.
7. Office of Government Commerce, ITIL - Service Strategy 2010, Norwich: TSO Information & Publishing Solutions.
8. Office of Government Commerce, ITIL - Continual Service Improvement 2010, Norwich: TSO Information & Publishing Solutions.