Niovandys

New Jersey, USA · United Kingdom

Case Study

Scenario

A mature and growing company in need of an improved operational capability.

The Review Phase

The general methodology:

1. A fast, but thorough, analysis of the Operations Capability.
2. Define improvement initiatives - and categorize into critical, important and nice to have.
3. Build the 30-60-90 day plan.

Analysis:

First of all the approach was agreed with C-Level leaders. Initial tasks included sitting down with key personnel - either individually or in small groups - to gather ideas and understand pain points. In addition all operational metrics were analyzed and all operational reports reviewed.

Improvement Initiatives:

Based on the analysis, key initiatives were defined and categorized into critical, important and nice to have. The critical initiatives included change management, automation, alerting, ticket administration, reporting, escalation and handover.

30-60-90 day plan:

The initiatives were then built into a 30-60-90 day plan for C-Level review.

Report:

The penultimate step of the review stage was to bring together all the data and findings, together with the plan, into a report for C-Level review.

Decision:

The report, including the plan, was then discussed at length with key decision makers up to the Chief Operating Officer.

One element within the report discussed the operational group structure - it was agreed with the COO that a new group structure should be introduced in order to facilitate a higher performing operational capability. In essence the new group structure involved bringing all technical teams and team managers into one group under one operational and technical leader.

The plan, with minor revisions was also accepted by the key decision makers and an implementation timescale agreed.

The Transformation Phase

Execute the plan:

1. The plan was overseen by the Operations and Technology Manager.
2. The initiatives forming the plan were delivered by the Operations and Technology Group.

Example deliverables:

Restructure:

The restructure of the operational group discussed above was implemented and certainly helped to achieve the better metrics that are noted below. In addition, the changes resulted in a streamlined management structure, reducing the management overhead within the group and also resulted in a one stop shop for all operational and technical matters which facilitated better communications, accountability and relationship management within the wider company.

Automation:

A key part of the transformation was to implement automation. For example, infrastructure monitoring alerts resulted in the automatic creation of an incident at the appropriate severity for action by the Service Desk or assignment to an infrastructure engineer. So no manual effort required from observing a monitoring alert to generating an incident within the service management tool. And for certain types of alert a script could be implemented to resolve the issue.

Handover:

A completely new handover process was introduced - from project team to operational group. Certainly this new process resulted in additional overhead, however, given the history of issues

seen in previous go-live phases it was absolutely seen as a necessary development. It should be noted that the first go-live managed under the new process resulted in a go-live with zero issues.

Service Management Improvements - Ticket Metrics:

It is of course always necessary to measure... to proved, or otherwise, the success of the improvements made. Some key service management / ticket administration metrics include:

Aged incidents: Improved by a factor of 12

Open incidents: Improved by a factor of 2

Incidents created: Improved by a factor of 18

Reporting:

Weekly reporting was introduced, in essence a new management information system, to provide visibility into the operations capability. Metrics covered included Incident, Problem, Change, Requests, Event Management, Project Status as well as an Executive Summary.