## **MRO and Stores Self-Assessment**

No.	Assessment Question	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
1	Our storeroom inventory accurately reflects real-time stock levels.	1	2	3	4	5
2	Each spare part in our inventory is correctly labeled and easily identifiable.	1	2	3	4	5
3	We have a comprehensive and up-to-date Bill of Materials (BOM) for all critical equipment.	1	2	3	4	5
4	Our CMMS effectively tracks spare parts usage and history.	1	2	3	4	5
5	We regularly assess and categorize spare parts based on their criticality to operations.	1	2	3	4	5
6	Our inventory levels are optimized to balance availability with carrying costs.	1	2	3	4	5
7	We have a process to identify and phase out obsolete or rarely used parts.	1	2	3	4	5
8	Lead times for procuring critical spares are well-understood and factored into inventory decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
9	Our MRO procurement process is standardized and consistently followed.	1	2	3	4	5
10	We have strong relationships with reliable suppliers who meet our quality and delivery expectations.	1	2	3	4	5
11	We leverage data analytics to inform purchasing decisions and negotiate better terms.	1	2	3	4	5
12	Our procurement team collaborates effectively with maintenance and operations departments.	1	2	3	4	5
13	The storeroom layout is organized to facilitate quick and easy access to parts.	1	2	3	4	5
14	We utilize technology (e.g., barcoding, RFID) to manage inventory movements.	1	2	3	4	5
15	Storeroom staff are trained in best practices for inventory management.	1	2	3	4	5
16	We conduct regular audits to ensure inventory accuracy and compliance.	1	2	3	4	5
17	Our MRO data (e.g., part numbers, descriptions) is standardized and free from duplicates.	1	2	3	4	5
18	We have metrics in place to monitor MRO performance and identify improvement areas.	1	2	3	4	5
19	Lessons learned from past MRO challenges are documented and used to refine processes.	1	2	3	4	5
20	We actively seek feedback from stakeholders to enhance our MRO strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
	Score	:				

## Scoring Guide:

**80–100:** Excellent – Your MRO processes are well-optimized.

**60–79:** Good – Some areas may benefit from targeted improvements.

**40–59:** Fair – Consider a comprehensive review to identify inefficiencies.

Below 40: Poor – Immediate attention is needed to address critical gaps.



Total Score:

