



	Level 1 (Passive)	Level 2 (Reactive)	Level 3 (Proactive)	Level 4 (Dynamic)
--	------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------

Governance	No engagement from Senior Management	Sporadic engagement from Senior Management	Structured Engagement from Senior Management	Strategic/Proactive engagement sought by Senior Management
Scope	No defined scope for the SAM programme	Only certain vendors covered by SAM Programme	Coverage of SAM Programme exceeds 80% of IT estate	Coverage of SAM Programme achieves 100% of IT estate
Data	Data Sources are ill-defined and captured hap-hazardly	Data Sources are known and captured methodically	Data sources are integrated with the SAM Tool	Data sources have QA metrics placed against them for performance monitoring
Systems	Spreadsheets underpin SAM activity	A centralised repository for SAM exists	Inventory capture matches the agreed scope	QA metrics are in place to measure system performance
Policies & Procedures	No policies and procedures exist	Procedures are followed, but not documented	Procedures are documented and followed	Policies and procedures are documented, followed and QA checked for performance assessment



	Level 1 (Passive)	Level 2 (Reactive)	Level 3 (Proactive)	Level 4 (Dynamic)
--	------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------

Implementation	The SAM Programme is in resource deficit (Either People, Systems or Processes)	Systems require manual transmission of data in pursuit of an ELP	All departments are bought in to providing the necessary data for SAM	Technology, People and Data are in harmony to produce near-automated ELPs
Control	No QA checks are in place to assess performance of any SAM components	Some QA checks are in place to assess performance of SAM components	All relevant components of the SAM Programme have QA assessments made against them	QA assessments are used to drive the SAM Maturity level higher
Reporting	No means of systematic reporting is in place	Reporting only covers some software vendors	Reporting covers all software vendors	Reporting is dynamic, efficient and integrated with Service Management & other IT Disciplines
Processes (operational)	No operational SAM processes exist	Inventory Capture and Entitlement Capture Processes are in place	Request, Procurement and Deployment Processes are in sync and respect SAM	ELP generation is systematic and repeatable in nature
Processes (Best Practice)	ELPs drive IT change	SAM Processes have been linked to IT & Business Requirements	Use cases have been developed to reinforce the links between processes	Fiscal KPIs are in place against major SAM processes

For a comprehensive/full process maturity assessment, please reach out to: roy.canavan@samcharter.com