MAXIMO KPI GUIDE SERIES

PM/PdM Compliance Self-Assessment

Six questions to find out whether your PM compliance number reflects work that actually happened.

Jason Brock
Principal Maximo Functional SME | 36x IBM Certified
linkedin.com/in/brockjason

Free download. Share freely. No email required.

What Is PM/PdM Compliance?

PM/PdM Compliance measures how much of your scheduled preventive and predictive maintenance gets done on time. It is one of the most reported metrics in maintenance, and one of the least trustworthy, because most organizations measure whether a work order was closed, not whether the work was done. Those are not the same thing.

It is also not the same as two metrics people confuse it with. It is not PM Yield, which asks whether the PM actually found or prevented anything. And it is not Schedule Compliance, which covers all scheduled work, not just preventive and predictive. PM/PdM Compliance answers a narrower question: of the PMs that came due, how many were finished on time, and can you prove the work behind that number happened? Most maintenance teams cannot answer the second half of that question without auditing their data, and most have never audited it.

THE FORMULA

PM/PdM Compliance % = PMs Completed On Time / PMs Due x 100

EXAMPLE

PMs Due (period): 240
PMs Completed On Time: 192
PM/PdM Compliance %: 80%

PM/PdM Compliance is not PM/PdM Yield. Compliance asks whether the work got done on time. Yield asks whether the work was worth doing.

PMs Due is every preventive or predictive work order generated for the measurement period, not just active PM records. PMs Completed On Time is the count finished inside your compliance window. In Maximo, the data comes from the work orders your PMs generate: WORKORDER records linked to a PM by PMNUM, comparing the Target Finish (TARGCOMPDATE) to the Actual Finish (ACTFINISH), with status confirming completion. One caution: a PM that should have come due but never generated, because the generation job failed or the PM was inactivated, is work that was due and never showed up to be counted, an invisible gap your compliance number will never reveal. You can calculate compliance by work order count or by labor hours. Count tells you how many jobs slipped. Hours tells you how much planned work slipped. Both are useful, but pick one and stay with it.

DEFINITION NOTE

On time is not a fixed thing, and that is the root of most compliance confusion. It can mean completed on or before the target finish date, completed within a tolerance window (often plus or minus 10 percent of the PM interval), completed within the same calendar month, or completed within the fiscal period. The same raw data produces very different numbers depending on which one you use. The questions below help you see whether your reported number reflects real, verified, on-time work, or whether it is reporting closure against a generous window.

What Good Looks Like

Expressed as on-time compliance, most mature programs land like this. These are working references, not research claims, and your number depends on your industry, your regulatory environment, and the window you chose.

MATURITY	TYPICAL ON-TIME COMPLIANCE
Reactive / firefighting	Under 60%
Developing	60% to 80%
Proactive	80% to 90%
World-class	90% and up (95% and up in regulated sectors)

But the level is only half the story. A reported 92 percent built on auto-completed, zero-labor closures is worse than a reported 78 percent you can stand behind. This assessment is about that second part: whether the number is real.

The Assessment

Each question targets a specific reason a PM compliance number is unreliable or a program is quietly failing. If you answer yes, the paragraph below it explains what that usually means and what to look at first.

QUESTION 1

Is your compliance window undocumented, or does “on time” mean different things to different people?

This is the foundational problem. If you cannot point to a written definition of what counts as on time, then your compliance number is whatever the last person to build the report decided it was. One supervisor counts a PM done within the calendar month as compliant. Another counts only completion by the target date. A third quietly extended the window last quarter to make the number look better. None of them are lying, but none of their numbers can be compared, and none can be trended. Before you trust or defend a compliance figure, you need one documented window that everyone reports against. Until then, the number is an opinion.

QUESTION 2

Do PMs ever complete automatically without anyone recording that the work was done?

Auto-completion is the most common way a compliance number gets inflated. Some organizations configure PM work orders to close automatically, or train crews to mass-close generated PMs at the end of the period to keep the dashboard green. The result is a work order in completed status with a clean on-time date and no evidence that anyone touched the equipment. In Maximo, these show up as completed PM-generated work orders with no field updates, no failure reporting, and no labor. If your PMs can reach a completed status without a person confirming the work, your compliance number is measuring closure, not maintenance. This is the single biggest gap between reported and real compliance.

QUESTION 3

Are completed PMs showing zero labor hours?

A PM that took real work but recorded no labor is a red flag. Maybe the crew did the work and never reported time, in which case you have a labor reporting problem that hides cost and effort. Or the work was never done and the order was closed anyway, in which case your compliance number is fiction. Either way, a completed PM with zero

Actual Labor Hours (ACTLABHRS on the work order, or no rows in LABTRANS) is a record you cannot trust. On a healthy program, near-zero PMs close with zero labor. If a meaningful share of your completed PMs have no hours, that share is the part of your compliance number that is not real.

Labor is one evidence signal, not the only one. For route-based PMs, inspection PMs, and task-heavy job plans, also check whether the required tasks, readings, and checklist results were actually recorded. A completed parent work order with empty task evidence is the same hollow completion in a different form.

QUESTION 4

Do PMs get deferred or rescheduled repeatedly without being counted as missed?

Every program has PMs that slip. The problem is the ones that slip every single cycle and never show up as misses. A PM gets pushed, the next due date moves, and because it was rescheduled rather than missed, it never counts against compliance. These ghost PMs can run for years. The equipment they protect is effectively unmaintained, but the compliance report looks fine because the work was never officially due-and-missed, it was always due-later. In Maximo, you can start by reviewing PM records where the next due date (NEXTDATE) appears to advance without a matching completed work order, then compare that pattern against generated work orders that were canceled, rescheduled, or left incomplete. If serial deferral is invisible in your reporting, your real compliance is lower than your number says.

QUESTION 5

Is your PdM (condition-based) compliance lumped in with calendar PM compliance?

Predictive and condition-based tasks (vibration routes, thermography, oil sampling, ultrasonic surveys) behave differently from calendar PMs. They need specialized labor, specialized tools, and often an outside vendor, so they slip more often. When you report one combined number, the calendar PMs, which are easy to complete, carry the average and hide the PdM gap. A combined 90 percent can be 95 percent calendar PM and 70 percent PdM, and the 70 is where your reliability risk actually lives. If you are not reporting PdM compliance separately, you cannot see that gap, and you are almost certainly overstating how well your condition-based program is running.

QUESTION 6

Do you only track one plant-wide compliance number, with no breakdown by craft, site, or asset criticality?

A single aggregate number tells you whether to investigate, not where. A plant at 85 percent might be 98 percent on low-criticality assets and 60 percent on the critical ones, which is exactly backward from what you want. Or one craft, one site, or one shift might be dragging the whole number down. Without segmentation by work type, craft (LABTRANS.CRAFT), site (SITEID), and asset criticality (ASSET.PRIORITY or WOPRIORITY), you are managing a program you cannot actually see. If the only compliance number anyone can show you is the plant-wide one, you are flying blind on where the real failures are.

Reading Your Results

YES ANSWERS	LIKELY EXPOSURE	WHAT IT MEANS
0 to 1	Number is largely trustworthy	Validate it with a quick data audit and move on.
2 to 3	Number overstates real compliance	Common. A focused audit will show you the true figure.
4 to 5	Reported number is unreliable	Your dashboard is measuring closure, not work. Audit before you trend it.
6	Compliance reporting is broken	Rebuild the definition and the verification process before trusting any number.

These are directional estimates, not precise measurements. The only way to know your real compliance is to audit the work orders against your data. But if you answered yes to three or more questions, the number on your dashboard is almost certainly higher than the work that actually happened.

Do not discipline crews or change PM frequencies based on this assessment alone. Use it to decide what to audit first.

The Connection to Reactive Work

PM/PdM Compliance and Reactive Work Percentage move together when a program is real. The whole point of completing PMs on time is to prevent the failures that drive reactive work. So if your compliance is climbing and your reactive work is falling, the program is working. But if your compliance is high and your reactive work stays high, something is wrong: either the compliance number is hollow, with work being closed but not done, or the PMs are getting done but they are the wrong PMs, on the wrong assets, at the wrong frequency. A high compliance number on its own proves nothing. It only proves a healthy program when reactive work is falling alongside it. That is why the first thing to check when good compliance is not reducing breakdowns is whether the compliance number is real, which is exactly what this assessment is for.

Best Next Action

Pull every PM-generated work order from the last period (WORKORDER records with a PMNUM). Sort and check three things. First, compare Target Finish to Actual Finish against a single, hard window and recount compliance. Second, flag every completion with zero Actual Labor Hours, because those records need verification before you treat them as confirmed work. They may be unreported work, vendor work recorded elsewhere, or closures without confirmed execution. Third, spot-check the PMs that completed exactly on the due date and confirm the work happened. Also pull the canceled PM-generated work orders for the period and review them separately, because canceling work is a quiet way to keep it from going overdue. Then segment what is left by PM versus PdM, craft, site, and asset criticality. The gap between your reported number and what you find is your real starting point.

MAXIMO FIELDS TO PULL

Work Order, Description, PM (PMNUM), Asset (ASSETNUM), Target Finish (TARGCOMPDATE), Actual Finish (ACTFINISH), Status, Work Type (WORKTYPE), Actual Labor Hours (ACTLABHRS), Craft (LABTRANS.CRAFT), Site (SITEID), Asset Priority (ASSET.PRIORITY / WOPRIORITY).

Go Deeper: The PM/PdM Compliance Guide

This self-assessment tells you whether to trust your number. The full Maximo KPI Guide: PM/PdM Compliance covers the on-time definition choices and how to set a defensible compliance window, the KPI Manager SQL for compliance percentage and overdue counts, the segmentation methodology (PM versus PdM, by craft, site, and asset criticality), the drilldown from aggregate number to root cause, and the business case to justify a compliance program. Available on Amazon.com.

See also: PM/PdM Compliance Industry Benchmark (free download at brockindustries.io)

Quick Maximo questions are always free. Reach out on LinkedIn at linkedin.com/in/brockjason. I never charge for chatting.

Jason Brock | Principal Maximo Functional SME | Author, Work Execution Management in Maximo | 36x IBM Certified