

Value Leakage Calculator Guide

Reading and presenting your IT and ServiceNow Value Scorecard · ValueNow · October 2026 edition

Your scorecard follows the ValueNow value chain: **Findings** → **Technical debt** → **Value leakage** → **KPI** → **Realized value**. Every number comes from your answers plus a few planning assumptions you can change. The examples below use the sample company **Sample Co.** (the same numbers as “See it with sample numbers”).



How and why to use this report

Less effort, more value. Your IT and ServiceNow investment loses value every day: tickets bounce between groups, licenses sit unused, changes fail and need rework. Those losses rarely show up as a dollar figure leadership can act on, and building a value case the usual way means days of pulling reports, interviewing teams and assembling spreadsheets and slides. This report starts from numbers your team can look up in ServiceNow and turns them into estimated annual value leakage, quick wins and KPIs to track. The scorecard, executive deck and executive report are ready made: review and modify them rather than build them. Spend less time building the case and more time recovering the value.

Why it helps. Most ServiceNow problems are described in technical terms (customizations, reassignments, CMDB gaps) that leaders can't weigh against other priorities. This report translates them into the language decisions are made in: what each problem costs a year, what to fix first, how long it takes to see results, and how you will prove the improvement. Because every number shows its calculation and assumptions, people can check it instead of debating it.

EXAMPLE: THE ONE-LINE MESSAGE THIS REPORT GIVES YOU

"An estimated **\$1.4M** a year is leaking from our ServiceNow investment; about **\$1.2M** of it is recoverable with quick wins we can start in the next 60 days."

Who to share it with, and why each audience needs something different:

● Peers: platform team, process owners, service desk leads

Goal: agree the facts before anyone else sees them. **Show:** the “Where value is leaking” table and the planning assumptions (the value chain slides in the deck, and the planning assumptions on the results page). **Ask them:** are the numbers right, who owns each finding, and which quick wins can start this month? **Why first:** findings your colleagues have checked and own are far harder for anyone to dismiss later, and the people who do the work feel part of the fix rather than blamed for the problem.

- **Your manager**

Goal: get support and priority. **Show:** the value health score, the quick wins and the KPIs (the value health, quick wins and KPI slides in the deck). **Ask for:** agreement on the first 30–60-day actions, the time or people needed, and a monthly KPI check-in. **Why:** a manager can say yes to a short, owned, measurable plan with visible early returns much more easily than to a list of problems.

- **Executives and sponsors (CIO, CFO, business leaders)**

Goal: a decision. **Show:** the headline and the size of the leakage first (the headline and 'where value is leaking' slides in the deck), then the plan (the quick wins slide). Keep it to three points: what it costs today, what can be recovered quickly, and what you need from them. **Ask for:** one clear decision: approve the quick-win plan, fund the larger fixes, or sponsor a full maturity assessment to confirm the numbers. **Why:** executives compare options in dollars and risk. A forecast with its assumptions in plain view earns more trust than a confident number nobody can check.

Suggested steps:

- 1 Check your answers and adjust the planning assumptions so the numbers reflect your organization.
- 2 Walk peers through the findings table; correct anything they can prove and name an owner for each item.
- 3 Brief your manager on the quick wins and the KPIs you will report monthly.
- 4 Present the executive deck: headline first, three points, one decision requested.
- 5 Re-run the value case each month or quarter and compare KPIs with today's baseline, so the next conversation is about realized value, not forecasts.

Present the numbers as estimates ("forecast, not invoice") and point to the calculation behind each one. That honesty is what makes the case credible.

Workstreams

A value case assesses the workstreams you pick in step 1: IT Service Management (ITSM), Change Management, Knowledge Management, CMDB and Discovery, IT Operations Management (ITOM), IT Asset Management (hardware and software), HR Service Delivery, Customer Service Management, Strategic Portfolio Management, Security Operations, Integrated Risk Management (IRM / GRC), Custom apps (App Engine). Each workstream adds a short set of questions, its own findings and its own score. A Single case covers one workstream; each 30-, 60- or 90-day plan covers up to three, shared by all of its value cases. Workstreams are fixed once a report has been downloaded, so start another value case to assess different ones.

EXAMPLE: WORKSTREAMS IN THE SAMPLE CASE

- IT Service Management (ITSM): 4 findings, \$676,800 a year
- Knowledge Management: 3 findings, \$351,000 a year
- IT Asset Management (hardware and software): 3 findings, \$216,000 a year

Key terms: technical debt and value leakage

• Technical debt

The ongoing cost, complexity, risk or constraint created by earlier design, maintenance, process or governance decisions. It includes the everyday working practices that keep that burden in place. A **finding** is what you can see today; technical debt is **why** it keeps happening.

EXAMPLE: TECHNICAL DEBT

Findings: Heavy customization (about 1,800 records), and upgrades are falling behind. Why upgrades are two or more releases behind: "Custom scripts in Incident and HR break on each upgrade, and regression testing is manual, so upgrades keep getting postponed."

Technical debt: Custom code duplicates or blocks out-of-box features and must be retested every upgrade. Every upgrade, that custom work has to be checked and fixed again, so the cost repeats year after year.

• Value leakage

The money lost each year because of that technical debt: staff hours spent on avoidable work, licenses paid for but not used, rework after failed changes. It is an **estimate built from your own numbers**, and the calculation is always shown so you can check it. If there isn't enough evidence to put a fair dollar figure on an impact (for example, the cost of user downtime), it stays "nonfinancial" rather than being guessed. Value leakage is a forecast, not an invoice.

EXAMPLE: VALUE LEAKAGE

Customization drag on upgrades: $1,800 \text{ records} \times 1.5 \text{ hrs/yr} \times \$65/\text{hr} = \text{\$175,500 a year}$.

Licenses paid for but not used: $135 \text{ unused} \times \$1,200 \text{ per license per year} = \text{\$162,000 a year}$.

EXAMPLE: ONE FINDING THROUGH THE WHOLE VALUE CHAIN

Findings: 135 of 600 fulfiller licenses (22.5%) show no use in 90 days.

Technical debt: License entitlements are not tied to roles or reviewed against actual use.

Value leakage: \$162,000 a year ($135 \text{ unused} \times \$1,200 \text{ per license per year}$)

KPI: License utilization, from 77.5% today to 90% or higher

Realized value: Licenses re-harvested or removed at the next true-up, verified against the contract.

1. Value health score (0–100) and rating

The average of the area scores below, rounded: platform health, one area for each workstream you chose, license value, and governance. An area you didn't answer is left out of the average rather than counted as zero.

Rating: 75–100 = **Strong**, 50–74 = **Developing**, below 50 = **At risk**.

EXAMPLE: VALUE HEALTH SCORE

$(30 + 51 + 45 + 32 + 55 + 25) \div 6 = 40 \rightarrow$ **At risk**

2. Estimated annual value leakage

The yearly cost of the problems we can put a dollar figure on, added together. “Determined” findings have enough of your numbers to estimate; findings with value leakage “not yet determined” are real issues that need a measurement first (for example, the cost of user downtime). They are never guessed.

EXAMPLE: ESTIMATED ANNUAL VALUE LEAKAGE

- Tickets bounce between groups: **\$514,800**
- Low self-service resolution: **\$351,000**
- Software paid for but not used: **\$216,000**
- Customization drag on upgrades: **\$175,500**
- Licenses paid for but not used: **\$162,000**

Total = **\$1,419,300** (shown as \$1.4M) · 5 determined · 10 not yet determined

3. Recoverable value in 60 days

The part of the leakage tied to **quick wins**: findings rated Low or Medium effort that can start within 30 or 60 days. It shows how much value is within reach without a major program.

EXAMPLE: RECOVERABLE VALUE IN 60 DAYS

Tickets bounce between groups \$514,800 + Software paid for but not used \$216,000 + Licenses paid for but not used \$162,000 + Low self-service resolution \$351,000 = **\$1,243,800** (shown as \$1.2M)

4. Scores by area

Each bar is 0–100: green is 75 or more, light green 50–74, orange below 50. Each area is the average of its parts:

● Platform health

Customization: light 100, moderate 60, heavy 25, unknown 40. Upgrades: latest release 100, one behind 75, two or more behind 35.

EXAMPLE: PLATFORM HEALTH

- Customization level: **25**
- Upgrade currency: **35**

Average = **30**

● One area per workstream

Each workstream you chose gets its own score from its answers. Shares are scored against a planning target (on target or better = 100), and Yes / Partly / No answers score 100 / 50 / 0. Each part is kept between 0 and 100; unanswered parts are skipped. How each workstream is scored:

- **ITSM:** Average of reassignment ($100 - 3 \times (\text{rate} - 5)$), resolution time ($\text{target} \div \text{actual} \times 100$) and fulfillment ($100 - 12 \times (\text{days} - 2)$).
- **Change:** Average of change success rate ($((\text{success \%} - 80) \times 5)$, so 100% scores 100 and 80% or less scores 0), standard changes vs the 40% target, and emergency changes ($100 - 5 \times (\text{emergency \%} - 10)$).
- **CMDB & Discovery:** Average of Discovery coverage vs the 80% target, CMDB health vs the 85% target, share of configuration items updated in 90 days, and data ownership (Yes 100, Partly 50, No 0).
- **Knowledge:** Average of self-service vs the 40% target, knowledge attach vs the 30% target, share of articles reviewed in 12 months, and ownership (Yes 100, Partly 50, No 0).
- **ITOM:** Alerts closed automatically vs the 60% target.
- **ITAM:** Average of software utilization ($((100 - \text{unused \%}) - 50) \times 2$) and automatic reclamation (Yes 100, Partly 50, No 0).
- **HR Service Delivery:** Average of HR self-service vs the 50% target and automated lifecycle events (Yes 100, Partly 50, No 0).
- **CSM:** Average of customer self-service vs the 40% target and first-contact resolution vs the 70% target.
- **SPM:** Average of on-time, on-budget delivery vs the 80% target and benefits tracking (Yes 100, Partly 50, No 0).
- **Security Operations:** Average of remediation time vs your SLA ($\text{SLA} \div \text{actual} \times 100$) and automatic assignment vs the 80% target.
- **IRM / GRC:** Automated control testing vs the 30% target.
- **App Engine:** Average of custom apps in active use and duplication (none 100, some 60, yes 25, unknown 40).

EXAMPLE: ITSM

- Reassignment: **49**
- Resolution time vs target: **53**
- Request fulfillment time: **52**

Average = **51**

EXAMPLE: KNOWLEDGE

- Self-service vs target: **30**
- Knowledge attach vs target: **47**
- Articles reviewed in 12 months: **54**
- Knowledge ownership: **50**

Average = **45**

EXAMPLE: ITAM

- Software utilization: **64**
- Automatic reclamation: **0**

Average = **32**

• License value

For each license type you entered: (licenses used ÷ licenses paid for) as a percentage, then (utilization – 50) × 2. 100% use scores 100; 50% or less scores 0. The area is the average across license types.

EXAMPLE: LICENSE VALUE

ITSM: $465 \div 600 = 77.5\% \rightarrow (77.5 - 50) \times 2 = \mathbf{55}$

• Governance & measurement

Your four governance answers: Yes 100, Partly 50, No 0.

EXAMPLE: GOVERNANCE & MEASUREMENT

- Platform owner and governance: **50**
- Trusted CMDB: **0**
- Monthly KPI baseline: **50**
- Realized-value tracking: **0**

Average = **25**

5. Action plan and quick wins

Every finding is placed in a 30-, 60- or 90-day window. **Quick wins** are the actions in the first 30 and 60 days; the 90-day items are **larger fixes**. Each line shows the effort, the yearly value where it can be determined, and what happens first. The scorecard, the deck and the report list the same actions.

EXAMPLE: ACTION PLAN

1. **Tickets bounce between groups** · 30 days · Low effort · \$515K/yr
Find the categories with the most reassignments, fix their assignment rules and routing data, and review the top offenders every week.
2. **Software paid for but not used** · 30 days · Low effort · \$216K/yr
Turn on reclamation rules for the publishers with the most unused installs, and reuse reclaimed licenses before buying new ones.
3. **Licenses paid for but not used** · 30 days · Low effort · \$162K/yr
Run a usage report, remove licenses from users with no activity in 90 days, tie licenses to roles, and reduce the count at the next true-up.
4. **Agents don't reuse knowledge** · 30 days · Low effort
Require agents to search and attach knowledge on resolution for the top categories, and coach teams using a monthly attach-rate report.

6. Where value is leaking (the value chain table)

The six largest findings by value, one per row. Any others are in the executive deck.

- **Findings**

What your answers show is happening today.

- **Technical debt**

The underlying cause: design, process or governance decisions that keep the problem in place.

- **Value leakage / yr**

The yearly cost, with the calculation underneath in small print so you can check it. "Nonfinancial" means it is real but needs a measurement before its value leakage can be determined.

- **KPI (baseline → target)**

The measure to track. The baseline is your number today; the target is a starting point to agree with the owner.

- **Realized value**

How you will prove the improvement actually happened after the fix, not just forecast it.

EXAMPLE: THE TOP ROW

Tickets bounce between groups

Findings: 22% of incidents are reassigned more than once.

Technical debt: Assignment rules, categories, and CMDB support groups are out of date.

Value leakage: **\$514,800** = 15,840 reassigned/yr × 0.5 hrs × \$65/hr

KPI: Multi-reassignment rate, 22% → 10% or lower

Realized value: Fewer handoffs and faster resolution for the affected categories.

7. Planning assumptions

A few figures can't come from your answers, so we start with planning values. Open "Planning assumptions" below the scorecard to change them; the scorecard and deck update immediately.

Only the assumptions for the workstreams you chose are shown. The full list:

- Self-service planning target: **40 %**
- Max self-service shift modeled in year one: **10 pts**
- Extra effort per reassigned incident: **0.5 hrs**
- Rework effort per failed change: **12 hrs**
- Upkeep effort per customized record: **1.5 hrs/yr**
- Knowledge attach-rate target: **30 %**
- Most articles allowed past their 12-month review: **25 %**
- Target share of alerts closed automatically: **60 %**
- Manual triage time per alert not closed automatically: **5 min**
- Discovery coverage target: **80 %**
- Standard (pre-approved) change target: **40 %**
- Approval and CAB effort per normal change: **2 hrs**
- Most emergency changes expected: **10 %**
- CMDB health target: **85 %**
- Most configuration items allowed un-updated for 90 days: **10 %**
- Share of manual CMDB effort Discovery could replace: **50 %**
- Share of unused software spend realistically recoverable: **50 %**
- HR self-service planning target: **50 %**
- Customer self-service planning target: **40 %**
- First-contact resolution target: **70 %**
- On-time, on-budget project target: **80 %**
- Target share of vulnerabilities auto-assigned: **80 %**
- Manual effort to assign one vulnerable item: **10 min**
- Target share of control tests automated: **30 %**

Value leakage is a forecast, not an invoice. Use the scorecard to decide where to look first, then confirm the numbers with the KPIs.

© 2026 ValueNow, a Sage Choice, LLC company. Estimates are based on stated inputs and assumptions and are not a guarantee of results. ServiceNow is a trademark of ServiceNow, Inc. ValueNow and Sage Choice, LLC are independent and are not affiliated with, endorsed by, or sponsored by ServiceNow, Inc. or the PeopleCert group. ITIL® is a registered trademark of the PeopleCert group. All rights reserved. Other product names are the property of their respective owners.