ADDENDUM C to the Chief Enterprise Architect Practitioner's Guide

The EA Operating Model: Organizing for Scale (*Expanding Section 4 of the CEA Practitioner's Guide)*

Covers: EA Operating Model Design • Organization Models • All Architect Roles in Detail ARB Design & Governance • Community of Practice • EA Metrics & Value Demonstration Team Building • Tooling Strategy • Practice Rituals • Maturity Roadmap

Digital Enterprise Architecture Advisors LLC

Enterprise Architecture Leadership

Version: 1.0
Date: July 2026
Author: Christian Kobsa; Digital Enterprise Architecture Advisors LLC

Abstract

This addendum provides a comprehensive practitioner's reference for building and operating an Enterprise Architecture function at the scale required by a large multinational organization. It expands Section 4 of the CHIEF ENTERPRISE ARCHITECT PRACTITIONER'S GUIDE — the EA Operating Model — into ten detailed sections covering every component the Chief Enterprise Architect (CEA) must design, build, and sustain: organization design, detailed role profiles for every architect type, Architecture Review Board (ARB) design and governance, the Architecture Community of Practice, EA metrics and value demonstration, team building, tooling strategy, practice rituals, and the EA maturity roadmap.

Where the main Guide introduces the operating model conceptually, this addendum supplies the structural detail: three organization design models — centralized, federated, and hub-and-spoke — with guidance on when each applies; complete role profiles and competency requirements for the CEA, deputy, domain architecture leads, and solution architects; tiered ARB structures and operating procedures for multinational governance; a Community of Practice program design for scaling architecture culture beyond the central team; a full EA metrics framework spanning portfolio health, compliance, and business value; and a year-by-year maturity progression roadmap.

Addendum C addresses how the EA practice is organized and operated. It complements Addendum A, which addresses what the CEA does within each TOGAF Architecture Development Method phase, and Addendum B, which details the content of each architecture deliverable. Together, the three addenda form a complete operational reference for the CEA role, translating the strategic guidance of the main Guide into day-to-day operating practice.

Table of Contents

Introduction to This Addendum

Section 4 of the CEA Practitioner's Guide introduced the EA Operating Model — the organizational framework that allows a Chief Enterprise Architect to lead architecture at enterprise scale without personally producing every artifact. This addendum expands every element of that section into a detailed practitioner's reference.

Building and operating an EA function in a large multinational is one of the most organizationally complex leadership challenges in enterprise technology. The CEA must simultaneously design an organization, develop a team, establish governance, build a culture, and demonstrate value — all while producing strategic architecture outputs and navigating the political landscape of a complex institution. This addendum provides the detailed guidance needed to do each of those things well.

The addendum is structured to mirror and expand Section 4 of the main guide:

- Section C.1 — EA Operating Model Design: the six components of the operating model in depth
- Section C.2 — Organization Design Models: detailed design guidance for centralized, federated, and hub-and-spoke models
- Section C.3 — Roles in Depth: detailed role profiles for every architect type in the EA organization
- Section C.4 — Architecture Review Board: complete ARB design, operating procedures, and governance mechanics
- Section C.5 — Architecture Community of Practice: building, running, and sustaining the architecture community
- Section C.6 — EA Metrics and Value Demonstration: a comprehensive measurement framework for the EA function
- Section C.7 — Building the Architecture Team: hiring, assessing, developing, and retaining architects
- Section C.8 — EA Tooling Strategy: selecting and governing the tools that support the architecture practice
- Section C.9 — EA Practice Rituals: the operating cadence that keeps the practice coherent and productive
- Section C.10 — EA Maturity Roadmap: how to build the practice from initial capability to optimizing maturity

Relationship to Other Addenda

This addendum covers how the EA practice is organized and operated. Addendum A covers what the CEA does in each TOGAF ADM phase. Addendum B covers the detailed content of each

architecture deliverable. Together, the three addenda form a complete operational reference for the CEA role.

Section C.1

EA Operating Model Design

The six components that define how architecture work is organized, executed, and governed at enterprise scale

The EA Operating Model is the design of the architecture function itself — the answer to the question: 'How do we do architecture at the scale this organization requires?' It is the CEA's first and most consequential design problem. A well-designed operating model makes the EA practice scalable, sustainable, and credible. A poorly designed one creates bottlenecks, inconsistency, and organizational friction that undermines the value of even the best architecture work.

The operating model has six interdependent components. Weakness in any one of them propagates into the others — a weak governance mechanism undermines the value of a strong architecture repository; an underdeveloped community of practice limits the reach of even the best central EA team.

C.1.1 Organization Design

Organization design defines how architects are structured — who reports to whom, what authority each level has, and how the architecture function relates to the broader IT and business organization. This is covered in depth in Section C.2.

C.1.2 Roles and Responsibilities

The roles and responsibilities component defines what each type of architect does, at what level of the organization, with what scope of authority, and accountable for what outcomes. Without clear role definition, architects default to doing what they are most comfortable with — which may not be what the organization most needs. Role clarity is also essential for recruitment, performance management, and career development.

Role definition must address four dimensions for each architect type:

Dimension	Questions to Answer
Scope	What domains, geographies, or projects does this role cover? What is explicitly out of scope?
Authority	What can this role decide independently? What requires escalation? What can this role block?
Accountability	What outcomes is this role personally responsible for? What metrics reflect their performance?

Dimension	Questions to Answer
Interfaces	Who does this role collaborate with? Who does it report to? Who reports to it? How does it interface with delivery teams, business stakeholders, and other architects?

C.1.3 Governance Mechanisms

Governance mechanisms are the processes through which architecture authority is exercised — the means by which the CEA ensures that architectural standards are applied consistently across the enterprise. Governance is covered in depth in Section C.4 (ARB) and is also touched on throughout the deliverables discussion in Addendum B.

The key principle of effective architecture governance is proportionality: governance effort should be proportional to the architectural risk and strategic significance of the decision being governed. Applying the same governance process to a choice between two open-source logging libraries and a choice of enterprise cloud platform is a misallocation of governance capacity that breeds resentment and bypass behavior.

Decision Risk Level	Examples	Governance Approach	Review Authority
Critical	Enterprise cloud platform, ERP replacement, enterprise integration pattern	Full ARB review; CEA sign-off; Architecture Contract; quarterly compliance review	CEA + Enterprise ARB
High	Domain platform selection, major application replacement, cross-domain integration design	Domain ARB review; domain architect sign-off; Architecture Contract; compliance review at key milestones	Domain Architecture Lead + Domain ARB
Medium	Solution architecture decisions within approved patterns, technology selections from Adopt ring	Solution architect self-assessment against standards; domain architect spot-check	Solution Architect + domain architect review
Low	Implementation details within approved designs, framework and library choices within approved technology	Engineering team decision; solution architect awareness; no formal review required	Engineering Lead

C.1.4 Architecture Repository

The Architecture Repository is the knowledge management system of the EA practice — the place where all architecture artifacts, decisions, standards, and assessments are stored, maintained, and made accessible. A well-governed repository transforms the EA practice from a team that produces documents into an organization that manages an enterprise asset.

The Architecture Repository serves five distinct functions:

- Reference — provides the authoritative source of enterprise architecture standards, principles, and approved patterns that architects and delivery teams can consult
- Record — maintains the history of architecture decisions, compliance assessments, and waiver approvals that constitutes the institutional memory of the practice
- Analysis — enables portfolio analysis, gap analysis, and impact analysis by maintaining the relationships between architecture artifacts (applications to capabilities, capabilities to systems, systems to infrastructure)
- Governance — provides the evidence base for ARB decisions, compliance assessments, and waiver reviews
- Communication — makes the architecture visible to stakeholders through dashboards, views, and reports generated from the repository data

Repository governance requirements that the CEA must establish:

- Metamodel definition — the schema of the repository: what entity types exist, what attributes each has, and what relationships can be defined between entities
- Ownership model — every artifact in the repository has a named owner responsible for its accuracy and currency
- Update cadence — mandatory update triggers (when a project completes, when a standard changes, when a waiver is granted) and periodic review schedules
- Access control — who can read, create, update, and delete each artifact type
- Quality standards — what constitutes a complete and accurate artifact; how quality is assessed and reported

C.1.5 Community of Practice

The Community of Practice (CoP) is the mechanism through which the CEA scales architecture culture and capability beyond the boundaries of the central EA team. It transforms architecture from a function performed by a small team into a discipline practiced across the organization. The CoP is covered in depth in Section C.5.

C.1.6 Performance Management

Performance management defines how the EA function measures its own effectiveness and demonstrates value to executive stakeholders. It is both an internal management tool and an external communication instrument. EA metrics are covered in depth in Section C.6.

The performance management component of the operating model must address:

- What the EA function is trying to achieve — the mission and strategic objectives of the EA practice
- How achievement will be measured — the metrics framework (portfolio health, compliance, business value)
- How performance will be reported — the cadence, format, and audience for EA performance reporting
- How the CEA's own performance is evaluated — the objectives and measures by which the CEA is held accountable by the CIO, CTO, or CEO

Section C.2

Organization Design Models

Designing the right architecture organization structure for the context, culture, and scale of the enterprise

The choice of organization design model is one of the most consequential structural decisions the CEA makes. It determines how architecture authority flows through the organization, how consistently standards are applied, how responsive the EA function is to business needs, and how scalable the practice is as the organization grows and changes.

No single model is universally correct. The right model depends on the organization's culture (centralized vs. decentralized decision-making), the maturity of the EA practice, the degree of business unit autonomy, the geographic spread, and the CEA's political mandate. Most large multinationals evolve through models as the EA practice matures.

C.2.1 The Centralized Model

Structure

In the centralized model, all architects — including domain architects and solution architects — report directly to the CEA or to a direct report of the CEA. The EA function is a single organizational unit with unified command.

Detailed Characteristics

Characteristic	Description
Reporting Lines	All architects report to the CEA (or via intermediate management layers within the EA function). No dotted-line or matrix relationships to business units.
Authority Model	The CEA has full authority over all architectural decisions. Business units request architecture services from the EA function rather than owning architecture capability themselves.
Standards Enforcement	Maximum consistency — all architects apply the same standards because they are all governed by the same leadership. Deviations are visible and managed centrally.
Business Alignment	Risk of disconnection — central architects may not develop deep enough understanding of specific business domain needs. Business units may perceive the EA function as 'IT's architecture' rather than a business partner.

Characteristic	Description
Scalability	Limited — the CEA and central team become a bottleneck as the organization grows. Review queues lengthen; architects are spread too thin across too many domains.
Speed	Slower — all architecture work flows through a single organizational unit. Cannot easily parallelize across multiple domains or programs.

When to Use It

- Early-stage EA practices where establishing consistent standards is the overriding priority
- Organizations recovering from significant technical debt caused by inconsistent architecture decisions
- Highly regulated industries where architecture consistency is a compliance requirement
- Smaller organizations (under 5,000 employees) where the total architect population is small enough to manage centrally
- Post-merger integration phases where the acquiring organization is imposing architectural standards on acquired entities

> ⚠ **Centralization Trap**
> Organizations that maintain a centralized model beyond the early maturity phase frequently experience a paradox: the EA function becomes simultaneously the most powerful and the most resented team in IT. Its authority over architecture decisions creates dependency; its inability to keep pace with demand creates bottlenecks; and its disconnection from business unit realities erodes its credibility. The CEA must recognize when the centralized model has outgrown its context and begin the transition to federation.

C.2.2 The Federated Model

Structure

In the federated model, architects are embedded in business units, technology domains, or delivery programs, reporting to business unit CIOs, product leaders, or engineering managers. The central EA function — typically just the CEA and a small team of 2–4 senior architects — provides standards, governance frameworks, and strategic direction but has no direct authority over the embedded architects.

Detailed Characteristics

Characteristic	Description
Reporting Lines	Domain and solution architects report to business unit or product leadership. The CEA has a governance relationship (standards authority) but not a line management relationship.
Authority Model	The CEA's authority is indirect — exercised through the standards, principles, and governance processes that embedded architects are required to follow. This authority is only as strong as the organizational mandate behind it.
Standards Enforcement	High risk of standards drift — embedded architects face constant pressure from their direct line management to prioritize delivery speed over architectural standards. Without strong governance mechanisms and cultural commitment, federation produces fragmentation.
Business Alignment	Maximum alignment — embedded architects develop deep domain expertise and genuine business relationships. Architecture is perceived as part of the business, not imposed by IT.
Scalability	Highly scalable — new domains or geographies add their own architect without adding to the central team's load.
Speed	Faster local delivery — domain architects make decisions within their domain without central bottlenecks.

Making Federation Work: CEA's Essential Governance Levers

Federation without governance is chaos. The CEA must put in place robust governance mechanisms that maintain architectural coherence despite the absence of direct organizational authority:

- Mandatory ARB participation — embedded architects must participate in the enterprise ARB and domain ARBs; their decisions are subject to architecture review
- Standards as conditions of employment — architecture standards are written into role descriptions and performance objectives for all architects, regardless of their reporting line
- Architecture Contract at program initiation — every significant program is issued an Architecture Contract by the CEA's team before build begins, regardless of which architect is assigned
- Strong CoP — the Architecture Community of Practice provides the social and professional glue that keeps federated architects aligned to enterprise standards
- Repository participation — all federated architects are required to register their domain artifacts in the enterprise Architecture Repository

- Dotted-line professional authority — while federated architects report operationally to business units, the CEA has formal professional authority over their architecture practice, including input into their performance review

C.2.3 The Hub-and-Spoke Model (Recommended for Large Multinationals)

Structure

The hub-and-spoke model is a hybrid that combines the consistency benefits of centralization with the scalability and business alignment benefits of federation. A small, senior central EA team (the hub) owns enterprise architecture strategy, standards, and governance. A network of domain and regional architects (the spokes) applies enterprise standards within their domains, with varying degrees of reporting relationship to the central team.

Hub Design: The Central EA Team

The hub is deliberately small — typically 6 to 15 people in a large multinational. Its members are senior, strategic, and cross-domain. The hub does not try to do all architecture work; it creates the conditions for architecture work to be done well across the enterprise.

Hub Function	Activities	Output
Strategy and Vision	Develop and maintain the Architecture Vision; engage C-suite; translate business strategy into architectural direction	Architecture Vision, Architecture Principles, EA Strategy
Standards and Governance	Develop and maintain architecture standards; chair the enterprise ARB; manage the waiver process; track compliance across the portfolio	Standards Register, Technology Radar, ARB decisions, Compliance reports
Repository and Tooling	Own and govern the Architecture Repository; manage EA tooling; maintain the enterprise architecture metamodel	Architecture Repository, EA tooling platform, metamodel
Community and Capability	Run the Architecture CoP; develop the architecture talent pipeline; establish the architect career framework	CoP program, career framework, capability assessments
Portfolio and Roadmap	Maintain the enterprise Application Portfolio; develop and update the	Architecture Roadmap, Application Portfolio, investment cases

Hub Function	Activities	Output
	Architecture Roadmap; support investment planning	
Transformation Support	Provide architecture oversight to major transformation programs; resolve cross-domain architecture conflicts	Architecture Contracts, cross-domain decisions, program governance

Spoke Design: Domain Architecture Network

The spokes are domain architects embedded in or aligned to specific business domains, technology platforms, or geographies. Their reporting line varies by organization — some report to the central EA team (stronger governance), some report to business unit leadership (stronger business alignment), and some have a formal dual reporting arrangement.

Spoke Type	Scope	Reporting Options	Key Tension
Business Domain Architect	A specific business domain: Finance, HR, Supply Chain, Customer, etc.	Business unit CIO (primary) + CEA (dotted-line professional authority)	Business unit delivery pressure vs. enterprise architecture standards
Regional Architect	A geographic region: EMEA, APAC, Americas, or a specific country cluster	Regional CIO or IT Director (primary) + CEA (dotted-line)	Local regulatory and operational requirements vs. enterprise standardization
Platform Architect	A specific enterprise platform: SAP, Salesforce, Azure, AWS, Microsoft 365	Platform owner or CTO office (primary) + CEA (dotted-line)	Platform vendor roadmap vs. enterprise integration architecture
Solution Architect	A specific program, project, or product team	Program Manager or Product Owner (primary) + Domain Architect (professional)	Delivery timeline pressure vs. architecture compliance

Governing the Hub-and-Spoke Model

The hub-and-spoke model requires deliberate governance investment to prevent it from drifting into an ungoverned federation. The CEA must establish and maintain:

- A clear RACI for architecture decisions — which decisions the hub makes, which the spokes make, and which require both

- Regular spoke engagement — at minimum monthly 1:1s between the CEA or deputy and each domain architecture lead
- Cross-spoke coordination — regular forums where domain architects share decisions and identify cross-domain conflicts before they become expensive problems
- Consistent performance standards — architecture quality expectations are the same for hub and spoke architects; the CEA has input into the performance review of all spoke architects even where they do not report directly

☑ The Dual Reporting Arrangement

The most effective governance arrangement for domain architects in a hub-and-spoke model is formal dual reporting: operational reporting to the business unit (day-to-day work, business context, local budget) and professional reporting to the CEA (architecture standards, quality, career development). This arrangement gives domain architects clear accountability to both business and architecture and gives the CEA formal authority without full organizational control. It requires investment in relationship management but produces the best outcomes in practice.

Section C.3

Architect Roles in Depth

Detailed role profiles, competency requirements, and career pathways for every architect type in the EA organization

Clear role definition is the foundation of an effective architecture practice. Architects who do not know what they are responsible for default to what they enjoy or what they were previously rewarded for — which may not align with what the organization needs. The CEA must invest in developing and communicating role definitions that are specific enough to guide behavior, stable enough to provide a foundation for career development, and flexible enough to accommodate the reality that architecture roles evolve as the practice matures.

C.3.1 Chief Enterprise Architect — Detailed Role Profile

Mission

To build and lead an architecture capability that ensures the organization's technology landscape evolves in a coherent, cost-effective, and business-aligned direction — enabling strategic objectives, managing technology risk, and creating durable competitive advantage through architecture.

Core Accountabilities

Accountability	Description	Key Outputs
Architecture Vision & Strategy	Personally owns the articulation of the enterprise architecture direction. Engages C-suite to ensure the architecture vision is grounded in business strategy and has executive commitment.	Architecture Vision Document; annual Architecture Strategy briefing to board/executive committee
Architecture Governance Authority	Final decision authority for architecture standards, principles, and significant deviations. Chairs or sponsors the Enterprise ARB.	Architecture Principles; ARB governance framework; waiver decisions on critical deviations
EA Practice Leadership	Designs, builds, and leads the EA operating model. Accountable for the quality, credibility, and impact of the entire architecture function.	EA Operating Model; EA team performance; architecture practice maturity progression

Accountability	Description	Key Outputs
Executive Stakeholder Management	Manages the architecture function's relationships with the CEO, CFO, CIO, CTO, CDO, CISO, and COO. Ensures architecture is represented in executive decision-making forums.	Regular briefings to C-suite; representation on technology leadership committee; board-level technology risk reporting
Architecture Roadmap and Investment Alignment	Personally owns the enterprise Architecture Roadmap and its alignment to the organization's capital planning and portfolio management processes.	Enterprise Architecture Roadmap; annual technology investment recommendation to CFO/CIO
Enterprise Transformation Leadership	Provides architecture leadership for major transformation programs. Ensures that transformation programs do not create new technical debt.	Architecture Contracts for major programs; transformation program governance participation
Architecture Talent Pipeline	Accountable for the development of architecture capability across the enterprise. Sets the architect career framework, sponsors talent development programs, and builds the architecture community.	Architect career framework; CoP program; mentoring of senior architects

Competency Profile

Competency Domain	Required Level	Key Indicators
Business Strategy	Expert	Can read financial statements, articulate competitive dynamics, and translate business model changes into architectural implications without guidance
Enterprise Architecture	Expert	Comprehensive command of TOGAF ADM, ArchiMate, and complementary frameworks; can architect solutions across all four domains
Technology Landscape	Advanced	Broad, current awareness of the technology landscape across cloud, data, application, and security domains; deep expertise in at least one
Executive Communication	Expert	Can present complex architecture trade-offs to a board-level audience in business language; written communication at C-suite standard

Competency Domain	Required Level	Key Indicators
Organizational Leadership	Expert	Track record of building and leading high-performing teams; ability to influence without direct authority across a matrix organization
Stakeholder Management	Expert	Can manage complex stakeholder landscapes including resistant business leaders, competing technology executives, and board-level scrutiny
Commercial Acumen	Advanced	Understands technology investment economics; can construct and defend business cases; understands contract structures and vendor relationships

C.3.2 Deputy / Lead Enterprise Architect — Detailed Role Profile

Mission

To manage the day-to-day operations of the EA function, coordinate cross-domain architecture activity, facilitate the governance process, and deputize for the CEA in all technical and operational matters.

Core Accountabilities

- Day-to-day EA operations management — ensures the EA practice runs smoothly: ARB meetings are scheduled and productive, architecture reviews happen on time, the repository is maintained, and the CoP program is delivered
- Cross-domain architecture coordination — identifies and resolves conflicts between domain architecture decisions before they escalate to the CEA or ARB
- Architecture Roadmap maintenance — maintains the enterprise Architecture Roadmap between major refresh cycles, incorporating delivery updates and business changes
- ARB facilitation — prepares ARB agendas, facilitates ARB sessions, documents ARB decisions, and tracks action items to closure
- Stakeholder support — manages relationships with program delivery leads and business unit architects on behalf of the EA function
- CEA deputization — represents the CEA in governance forums, delivery engagements, and stakeholder meetings when the CEA is unavailable

Competency Profile

Competency	Required Level
Enterprise Architecture (TOGAF)	Expert — TOGAF Practitioner certified; deep ADM knowledge; can lead any phase independently
Cross-Domain Architecture	Advanced — credible across business, data, application, and technology domains; recognized by domain leads as a peer
Governance and Process Design	Advanced — can design effective governance processes; experienced running ARBs; strong facilitation skills
Communication	Advanced — strong written and verbal communication; comfortable presenting to senior IT and business stakeholders
Leadership	Developing — experience leading small teams or working groups; coaching and mentoring capability

C.3.3 Domain Architecture Leads — Detailed Role Profiles

The domain architecture leads are the CEA's functional peers within the central EA team. Each owns a specific architecture domain and is the recognized authority on that domain across the enterprise. The following profiles cover the five most common domain lead roles.

Business Architecture Lead

Attribute	Detail
Mission	To develop and maintain the enterprise Business Architecture — the capability model, operating model, and value stream designs that translate business strategy into architectural foundations.
Core Accountabilities	Own and maintain the enterprise Business Capability Model; lead Phase B engagements in the ADM; facilitate business architecture workshops with senior business stakeholders; develop and maintain the enterprise operating model design; support business cases for architecture-driven investment
Key Deliverables	Business Capability Model; Value Stream Catalog; Target Operating Model; Business Architecture Baseline and Target documents; Business Architecture Gap Analysis
Critical Competencies	Deep business analysis and business process design skills; strong facilitation and workshop design capability; ability to engage senior business leaders as a credible peer; understanding of business model design and operating model frameworks (e.g., CANVAS, McKinsey 7S)
TOGAF Alignment	Primary lead for Phase B (Business Architecture); contributes to Phase A (Architecture Vision) and Phase E (Opportunities and Solutions)

Data and Analytics Architecture Lead

Attribute	Detail
Mission	To define and govern the enterprise data architecture — the data platform strategy, master data management approach, data governance framework, and analytics architecture that makes the organization's data an exploitable strategic asset.
Core Accountabilities	Own enterprise data architecture strategy; lead the data sub-phase of Phase C; define master data management standards; govern data platform decisions; ensure data architecture compliance with GDPR, CCPA, and other data regulations; partner with the CDO on data governance
Key Deliverables	Enterprise Data Architecture; Master Data Management Framework; Data Governance Standards; Data Platform Architecture; Data Security and Privacy Architecture; Domain Data Models (quality assurance)
Critical Competencies	Deep data architecture expertise (data warehouse, data lake, data mesh, streaming, MDM); strong data governance knowledge; understanding of data privacy regulations; familiarity with cloud data platforms (Snowflake, Databricks, BigQuery, Azure Synapse); analytical mindset
TOGAF Alignment	Primary lead for the Data sub-phase of Phase C; contributes to Phase D (data platform infrastructure) and Phase B (data entities in capabilities)

Application Architecture Lead

Attribute	Detail
Mission	To manage the enterprise application portfolio as a strategic asset — governing application investment decisions, defining integration architecture standards, and driving systematic rationalization of the application landscape.
Core Accountabilities	Own and maintain the enterprise Application Portfolio; lead the application sub-phase of Phase C; define and govern enterprise integration architecture standards and API governance; lead application rationalization analysis and business case development; review and approve solution architecture patterns; govern the enterprise integration platform
Key Deliverables	Enterprise Application Portfolio; Application Rationalization Plan; Enterprise Integration Architecture; API Governance Framework; Application Architecture Standards; Solution Architecture review decisions

Attribute	Detail
Critical Competencies	Broad application architecture expertise across ERP, CRM, custom development, and SaaS; deep integration architecture expertise (API, event-driven, microservices); strong commercial awareness (vendor evaluation, contract implications); experience with application portfolio management tools (LeanIX, Alfabet)
TOGAF Alignment	Primary lead for the Application sub-phase of Phase C; contributes to Phase E (solution identification) and Phase G (solution architecture reviews)

Infrastructure and Cloud Architecture Lead

Attribute	Detail
Mission	To define and govern the enterprise cloud and infrastructure strategy — the platform standards, cloud operating model, and technology architecture that provide the reliable, scalable, and cost-effective foundation for all enterprise applications and data.
Core Accountabilities	Own enterprise cloud strategy and cloud operating model; lead Phase D engagements; develop and maintain the enterprise Technology Radar; govern technology standards across all infrastructure domains; define and govern FinOps standards; lead strategic vendor relationships for infrastructure and cloud platforms; ensure infrastructure architecture supports enterprise security, resilience, and compliance requirements
Key Deliverables	Cloud Strategy; Cloud Operating Model and Landing Zone Design; Technology Radar; Enterprise Technology Standards Register; Infrastructure Architecture Baseline and Target; FinOps Governance Framework; Platform Architecture Standards
Critical Competencies	Deep expertise in at least one major cloud platform (AWS, Azure, GCP); broad awareness of cloud-native patterns (containers, serverless, managed services); infrastructure-as-code and DevOps practices; FinOps and cloud cost management; network architecture; security architecture fundamentals
TOGAF Alignment	Primary lead for Phase D (Technology Architecture); contributes to Phase E (technology solutions) and Phase G (technology compliance reviews)

Security Architecture Lead

Attribute	Detail
Mission	To ensure that security is a first-class architectural concern across the enterprise — defining the security architecture standards, patterns, and

Attribute	Detail
	governance mechanisms that protect the organization's assets, data, and operations while enabling business agility.
Core Accountabilities	Define enterprise security architecture strategy aligned to SABSA or equivalent framework; develop and maintain enterprise security architecture standards; conduct security architecture reviews for major programs; own the enterprise identity and access management architecture; govern data security and privacy architecture; represent security architecture in the ARB; partner with the CISO on security strategy and risk management
Key Deliverables	Enterprise Security Architecture; IAM Architecture; Data Security and Privacy Architecture; Security Architecture Standards; Security architecture review outputs; Zero-Trust Network Architecture
Critical Competencies	SABSA or CISSP certification preferred; deep IAM expertise; cloud security architecture; application security (OWASP); data privacy regulation knowledge (GDPR, CCPA); threat modeling capability; security operations architecture
TOGAF Alignment	Contributes security architecture views to all ADM phases; particularly critical in Phase C (data security), Phase D (security infrastructure), and Phase G (security compliance reviews)

C.3.4 EA Practice Manager — Detailed Role Profile

Mission

To operate the machinery of the EA practice — managing the governance processes, repository, tooling, metrics, and administrative infrastructure that allow the architecture team to function effectively and demonstrate value.

Core Accountabilities

- ARB process management — schedules ARBs, manages submission processes, tracks action items, maintains the decision register, and reports ARB outcomes
- Architecture Repository governance — owns the repository platform, enforces the metamodel, manages access, monitors data quality, and produces repository reports
- EA tooling management — manages the EA tool stack, coordinates vendor relationships, onboards new tools, and trains users
- EA metrics and reporting — owns the metrics framework, produces regular EA performance reports, and manages the EA value dashboard

- CoP program management — manages the CoP calendar, coordinates working groups, maintains the CoP platform, and tracks community engagement
- EA communications — manages internal EA communications: newsletters, announcements, the EA portal, and stakeholder briefing preparation
- Budget management — manages the EA team's operating budget, tracks expenditure, and supports the CEA in investment planning

> **The EA Practice Manager Is Not a Junior Role**
>
> The EA Practice Manager is sometimes mistakenly staffed as an administrative coordinator. In a mature EA practice, this role requires a combination of project management expertise, technology platform knowledge, data analysis skills, and strong organizational awareness. The right person is someone who could have been a senior solution architect but has chosen to focus on practice excellence rather than technical depth. Understaffing this role creates a practice that is technically excellent but organizationally chaotic.

C.3.5 Domain Architects — Detailed Profiles by Type

Business Domain Architect

Business Domain Architects are the primary architecture interface between the central EA function and specific business domains. They combine architecture skills with genuine business domain expertise — not a generalist architect who happens to cover the Finance domain, but an architect who understands the Finance function deeply enough to design architecture that solves real Finance business problems.

Attribute	Detail
Scope	A specific business domain: Finance, HR, Supply Chain, Customer, Product, Legal/Compliance, or similar
Key Activities	Develop and maintain domain capability maps; manage the domain application landscape; develop domain architecture roadmap; conduct or support solution architecture reviews for domain projects; represent domain requirements in enterprise ARB; enforce enterprise standards within the domain
Key Deliverables	Domain Capability Map; Domain Application Landscape; Domain Data Model; Domain Integration Architecture; Domain Roadmap; Architecture compliance assessments for domain projects
Essential Competency	Must have genuine domain expertise — ideally 3+ years working in or closely with the business domain — in addition to architecture skills. An HR architect who has never worked with HR processes, HR data, or HR systems will not be credible to HR business stakeholders.

Attribute	Detail
Success Metrics	Domain application portfolio health (TIME classification progress); domain architecture compliance rate; stakeholder satisfaction in the business domain; domain roadmap delivery progress

Regional Architect

Regional Architects serve as the architecture interface for specific geographic regions, ensuring that the enterprise architecture is adapted appropriately to local regulatory, operational, and cultural requirements without sacrificing global consistency.

Attribute	Detail
Scope	A geographic region (EMEA, APAC, Americas) or a specific country cluster with distinct regulatory or operational requirements
Key Activities	Identify and document regional regulatory and operational requirements with architecture implications; develop Regional Architecture Variations with formal justification; review enterprise standards for regional applicability; represent regional requirements in enterprise governance forums; manage relationships with regional IT leadership
Key Deliverables	Regional Architecture Variation documents; Regional compliance assessments; Regional input to the enterprise roadmap; Regional architecture landscape documentation
Essential Competency	Deep knowledge of the regulatory landscape in the relevant region; awareness of data sovereignty, privacy, financial services, and sector-specific regulations; strong cross-cultural communication skills; ability to navigate both local and central organizational politics
Success Metrics	Number of regional regulatory risks identified and addressed architecturally before they become compliance incidents; regional variation documentation completeness; regional architecture compliance rate

Solution Architect

Solution Architects are the architecture function's primary interface with project delivery. They operate at the program or project level, translating enterprise and domain architecture standards into concrete solution designs that engineering teams can build from.

Attribute	Detail
Scope	A specific program, project, or product team. May be assigned to one large program or cover multiple smaller projects.

Attribute	Detail
Key Activities	Develop Solution Architecture Documents (SADs); produce Architecture Decision Records for project-level decisions; complete Architecture Compliance Assessments against the Architecture Contract; facilitate HLD development with engineering leads; identify and escalate deviations from enterprise standards; represent architecture in project governance forums
Key Deliverables	Solution Architecture Document; Architecture Decision Records (solution level); Architecture Compliance Assessment; High-Level Design (led or co-authored); Non-Functional Requirements Specification; Integration Design Documents
Essential Competency	Strong technical depth in the technology stack relevant to the project; good communication skills to engage both business stakeholders and engineering teams; understanding of delivery methodology (Agile, SAFe, waterfall); ability to make and document pragmatic architectural decisions under time and cost pressure
Success Metrics	Architecture compliance rate for assigned projects; delivery of SAD and compliance assessment before build gate; post-deployment architectural defect rate; stakeholder satisfaction from delivery teams and domain architects

Section C.4

Architecture Review Board (ARB)

Designing, operating, and continuously improving the primary architecture governance forum

The Architecture Review Board is the institutional expression of architecture authority in the organization. It is the forum where significant architectural decisions are made with appropriate rigor, visibility, and cross-functional input. A well-designed ARB is the difference between architecture governance that shapes organizational behavior and architecture governance that is bypassed, ignored, or resented.

C.4.1 ARB Design Principles

Before designing the ARB, the CEA must commit to a set of design principles that will guide every structural and procedural decision:

Principle	Design Implication
Decisions, not discussions	The ARB exists to make decisions, not to hold architecture discussions. Every ARB agenda item should have a clear decision required and a decision owner. Discussion without decision is a waste of senior people's time.
Proportionate governance	The ARB should only review decisions that warrant ARB-level governance. Low-risk decisions reviewed by the ARB waste capacity; high-risk decisions not reviewed by the ARB create unmanaged risk. The decision authority matrix must be explicit.
Speed matters	Every day an architectural decision is pending in an ARB queue has a cost. The CEA must design the ARB process to minimize queue time without sacrificing decision quality. A target of 5 business days from submission to decision is achievable for standard reviews.
Transparency builds trust	ARB decisions must be published and accessible to the entire architecture community. Closed-door governance that nobody understands creates suspicion. Published decisions educate the community and reduce the volume of repeat questions.
Business voices are essential	Architecture decisions have business consequences. An ARB composed entirely of architects makes decisions from a technology perspective; business stakeholders on the ARB ensure that business impact is part of every significant decision.
Measure and improve	The ARB should track its own performance: time to decision, decision reversal rate, waiver volume and trends, and post-implementation

Principle	Design Implication
	quality of ARB-approved architectures. A governance forum that does not measure its effectiveness will not improve.

C.4.2 Tiered ARB Structure for Large Multinationals

A single ARB cannot effectively govern the full range of architectural decisions in a large multinational — from enterprise cloud platform strategy to the technology choice for a single application component. A tiered structure delegates governance to the appropriate level while maintaining escalation paths for decisions that exceed a tier's scope or risk threshold.

Tier	Name	Scope	Membership	Cadence	Chair
1	Enterprise ARB	Cross-cutting decisions affecting multiple domains; enterprise platform selections; changes to enterprise principles or standards; dispensations from enterprise standards	CEA, domain leads (5), senior business stakeholders (2), CIO/CTO representative	Bi-weekly; 90 minutes	CEA
2	Domain ARB	Domain-specific architectural decisions within enterprise standards; domain platform selections; domain integration designs; domain standard exceptions	Domain Architecture Lead, relevant business domain architect(s), application architect, solution architects active in domain, business domain representative	Monthly; 60 minutes	Domain Architecture Lead
3	Solution Review	Solution architecture decisions for specific projects; technology selections within Adopt ring; solution-level ADR review; compliance assessment sign-off	Solution Architect, Domain Architect, relevant engineering leads, product owner	As needed; 60–90 minutes per project	Domain Architect or Senior Solution Architect

C.4.3 ARB Membership and Roles

Role	Responsibilities	Selection Criteria
Chair (CEA)	Sets the governance tone; ensures decisions are made with appropriate rigor; has casting vote on contested decisions; signs off on all enterprise ARB decisions	Always the CEA for enterprise ARB; cannot be delegated except to Deputy EA
Domain Architecture Leads	Represent the architectural perspective of their domain; identify cross-domain impacts of proposed decisions; vote on decisions affecting their domain	All central EA domain leads are standing members of the enterprise ARB
Business Stakeholder Representatives	Represent the business impact of architecture decisions; ensure business value is considered in every significant decision; provide business context for proposed exceptions	Senior business leaders (Director level or above) with genuine accountability for technology investment; rotated annually to maintain broad engagement
CISO Representative	Ensures security implications of all architecture decisions are considered; has veto right on decisions with unacceptable security risk	CISO or delegated senior security architect; standing member
Secretary / Practice Manager	Prepares agendas; manages submissions; documents decisions; tracks action items; publishes ARB outputs	EA Practice Manager
Subject Matter Experts	Provide technical depth on specific agenda items; invited per item, not standing members	Domain architects, platform architects, external experts as needed per agenda

C.4.4 ARB Operating Procedures

Submission Process

1. Submitter completes the standard Architecture Review Request (ARR) template: solution description, business context, proposed architecture, alignment to enterprise standards, alternatives considered, risks identified, and compliance self-assessment
2. ARR submitted to EA Practice Manager at least 5 business days before the target ARB meeting

3. EA Practice Manager performs a completeness check; incomplete submissions are returned within 1 business day with a list of missing information
4. CEA or Deputy EA reviews complete submissions and assigns to the appropriate ARB tier based on scope and risk
5. Domain architect(s) conduct desk review and prepare a preliminary assessment before the ARB meeting
6. Submitter presents at the ARB meeting; ARB members question and deliberate; decision is made in the session where possible

Decision Outcomes and Documentation

Outcome	Meaning	CEA Action	Communication
Approved	Architecture is compliant with enterprise standards; may proceed	Sign off Architecture Contract; update Architecture Repository	Decision published to Architecture Repository and CoP
Approved with Conditions	Architecture may proceed subject to named conditions being satisfied before build or deployment	Issue Architecture Contract with explicit conditions; track compliance at review gates	Decision and conditions published; conditions tracked by domain architect
Deferred	Submission requires additional information or rework before a decision can be made	Return to submitter with specific list of requirements; reschedule for next ARB	Submitter notified; not published until re-submission
Rejected	Architecture does not meet enterprise standards and cannot proceed as proposed	Issue rejection with written rationale and guidance on alternative approaches	Rejection rationale published; submitter offered architecture advisory support
Waiver Granted	Architecture deviates from a standard; deviation is accepted with conditions (time-limited; remediation plan required)	Issue Waiver Certificate; update Waiver Register; schedule remediation review	Waiver published in Waiver Register with remediation timeline
Waiver Denied	Requested deviation from a standard is not accepted; architecture must be revised to comply	Issue denial with written rationale; offer architecture advisory support	Denial published; architecture team required to revise and resubmit

C.4.5 ARB Performance Management

The CEA must measure and continuously improve ARB performance. Key metrics:

Metric	Target	Measurement Approach
Time to Decision	95% of standard submissions decided within 10 business days of complete submission receipt	Tracked from submission receipt to decision date in ARR register
Decision Quality	Less than 5% of approved architectures require significant rework within 12 months of ARB approval	Tracked via post-implementation architecture review programme
Waiver Volume Trend	Waiver volume declining or stable year-on-year (rising waivers signal a standard that needs updating or a governance process that is too rigid)	Tracked from Waiver Register; reviewed quarterly by CEA
Bypass Rate	Less than 10% of projects that should have had ARB review were identified as having bypassed the process	Identified via Architecture Repository gap analysis; delivery portfolio audit
Stakeholder Satisfaction	Architecture review process rated 3.5 out of 5 or above by submitters and delivery leads	Quarterly survey of recent submitters and delivery programme leads

Section C.5

Architecture Community of Practice

Building the social and professional network that scales architecture culture across the enterprise

The Architecture Community of Practice (CoP) is the CEA's most powerful instrument for scaling architecture culture beyond the reach of the central EA team. While the ARB governs decisions and the Architecture Repository stores knowledge, the CoP builds the relationships, shared vocabulary, and professional identity that make architecture a discipline practiced across the organization rather than performed by a central team.

A thriving CoP multiplies the impact of the central EA team by creating hundreds of architecture-aware practitioners who apply sound architectural thinking in their daily work, escalate the right decisions to the right levels, and identify emerging architectural issues before they become expensive problems.

C.5.1 CoP Design Principles

- Voluntary participation — the CoP is not a governance body; membership is not mandatory. People join because they find it valuable, not because they are required to. Design the CoP to be genuinely useful to its members.
- Pull, not push — content and activities should be designed to draw people in by addressing problems they actually face, not to push standards and mandates at them. The ARB pushes; the CoP pulls.
- Practitioner-led — the most credible CoP content comes from practitioners sharing what they have learned on real projects. Central EA team content is valuable but should not dominate.
- Inclusive scope — the CoP should be open to architects at all levels, from junior solution architects to senior domain leads, and to non-architects who interact with architecture (technical leads, product owners, delivery managers).
- Measurable engagement — track attendance, content consumption, working group participation, and member-generated contributions. A CoP that is not growing in engagement is not fulfilling its purpose.

C.5.2 CoP Programme Design

Activity	Frequency	Format	Purpose	Owner
All-Community Meeting	Monthly	60-min hybrid session (video + in-person hub)	Share significant architecture decisions, new standards, technology radar updates, and lessons learned. Q&A with the CEA.	CEA + EA Practice Manager
Architecture Showcase	Quarterly	90-min session; 2–3 project teams present	Project teams present their architecture decisions, challenges, and outcomes for peer learning and review. Celebrates good architecture work.	EA Practice Manager + rotating project teams

Activity	Frequency	Format	Purpose	Owner
Working Group Sessions	Bi-weekly per group	60-min focused sessions per working group	Domain working groups develop specific standards, patterns, or guidance documents (API standards, cloud patterns, data governance, security).	Working group leads (rotating domain architects)
Architecture Clinic	Weekly (office hours)	30-min drop-in slots with a domain architect	Delivery teams and solution architects get informal architecture advice without going through formal ARB process. Reduces bypass behaviour.	Rotating domain architects
External Speaker Series	Quarterly	60-min webinar open to full community	Bring in industry practitioners, TOGAF experts, vendor architects, and Gartner/Forrester analysts to share external perspective.	CEA + EA Practice Manager
Architecture Book / Paper Club	Monthly	45-min discussion session	Community discusses a selected book, paper, or article. Builds shared intellectual foundation and keeps the community current.	Rotating community members
Annual Architecture Summit	Annual	1–2 day in-person event	Full architecture community gathering: strategic direction from CEA; deep-dive workshops; cross-team networking; awards and recognition.	CEA + EA Practice Manager

C.5.3 Working Group Design

Working groups are the engine rooms of the CoP — the mechanism through which the community actively develops architecture standards and guidance rather than just consuming them. Well-run working groups produce better standards than the central EA team can produce alone, because they incorporate the practical experience of architects working in the field.

Working Group	Charter	Typical Output
API and Integration Standards	Define and maintain the enterprise API design standards, integration pattern library, and API governance framework	API Design Guide; Integration Pattern Catalog; API Governance Policy
Cloud and Infrastructure Patterns	Develop cloud architecture patterns, landing zone standards, and FinOps guidance for the enterprise cloud operating model	Cloud Architecture Pattern Library; Landing Zone Standards; FinOps Playbook
Data Architecture and Governance	Develop data architecture patterns, canonical data model standards, and data governance guidance in partnership with the CDO function	Canonical Data Model Standards; Data Quality Framework; Data Governance Playbook

Working Group	Charter	Typical Output
Security Architecture Patterns	Develop security architecture patterns, threat model templates, and secure-by-design guidance in partnership with the CISO function	Security Architecture Pattern Library; Threat Model Template; Secure Design Checklist
Developer Experience and DevOps	Define standards for CI/CD, infrastructure as code, observability, and developer tooling that enable consistent, high-quality delivery	DevOps Standards; Observability Standards; Developer Platform Guidance
Architecture Tooling	Evaluate and recommend tools for the architecture community: modeling tools, ADR tools, documentation tools	Tool evaluations and recommendations; Tooling usage guidance

C.5.4 CoP Metrics

Metric	Target	Measurement Method
Active membership	Growing year-on-year; at least 60% of identified architects in the organization are active CoP members	CoP platform membership count; meeting attendance rate
Meeting attendance	Average attendance at monthly all-community meeting above 50% of membership	Attendance register; trend tracked quarterly
Working group participation	At least 3 active working groups with 5+ regular participants each	Working group attendance; output production rate
Content contributions	At least 20% of content at community meetings contributed by non-central-EA-team members	Content origin tracking in CoP programme
Architecture Clinic utilization	At least 5 sessions per week; 80% of attendees rating it as useful	Session booking rates; post-session survey
Net Promoter Score	CoP NPS above +30 (measured annually)	Annual community survey

Section C.6

EA Metrics and Value Demonstration

Measuring what matters and communicating EA value in language that executives act on

Demonstrating value is one of the CEA's most strategically important — and most frequently neglected — responsibilities. An EA practice that cannot articulate its value in business terms will eventually be reduced, restructured, or dissolved when the organization faces budget pressure. The CEA must invest in a metrics framework that makes the EA function's contribution visible, credible, and compelling.

The challenge is that architecture value is often indirect and long-term — the technical debt avoided by a standards decision made three years ago does not appear on any budget line; the revenue enabled by a platform investment whose architecture was shaped by the EA team is attributed to the business unit. The CEA must develop the ability to tell these stories, supported by data.

C.6.1 The EA Value Framework

EA value operates on three time horizons and two dimensions:

Time Horizon	Value Dimension	Examples	Measurement Approach
Immediate (0–6 months)	Cost avoidance	Prevented a duplicate application purchase; identified a vendor contract that could be consolidated	Cost of avoided purchase; consolidated contract saving
Immediate (0–6 months)	Risk reduction	Architecture review identified a security vulnerability before deployment; compliance risk identified and remediated	Estimated cost of incident avoided; regulatory fine avoided
Medium-term (6–24 months)	Delivery improvement	Standardized integration platform reduced integration development time by 40%; cloud migration enabled auto-scaling reducing infrastructure cost	Delivery velocity improvement; infrastructure cost reduction; time-to-market improvement
Medium-term (6–24 months)	Portfolio optimization	Application rationalization retired 45 applications saving £4.2M per year in support and licence costs	Annual TCO reduction from retired/consolidated applications
Long-term (2–5 years)	Revenue enablement	Enterprise API platform enabled 3 new digital product launches; cloud platform enabled international expansion in 60% of planned time	Revenue attributed to architecture-enabled capabilities
Long-term (2–5 years)	Strategic optionality	Modular architecture enables future capability additions without full system replacement; cloud-native deployment enables geographic expansion	Estimated cost and time savings vs. alternative architectural approaches

C.6.2 Portfolio Health Metrics

Metric	Definition	Target Direction	Reporting Frequency
Total Application Count	Total number of applications in the enterprise portfolio	Declining (rationalization progress)	Quarterly
Applications by TIME Category	Count of applications in each TIME category (Tolerate, Invest, Migrate, Eliminate)	Migrate + Eliminate count declining; Invest count stable or growing	Quarterly
Applications Past End-of-Support	Count and percentage of applications running on vendor end-of-life technology	Declining to zero	Monthly
Application Duplication Rate	Count of business capabilities served by 3 or more applications	Declining	Bi-annually
Portfolio TCO	Total annual cost of ownership of the enterprise application portfolio (licence + infrastructure + support + maintenance)	Declining in real terms	Annually
Rationalization Savings Realized	Cumulative annual savings from applications retired or consolidated in the current financial year	Growing	Quarterly
Strategic Platform Adoption Rate	Percentage of applicable workloads running on enterprise-standard (Adopt-ring) platforms	Growing toward 90%+	Quarterly
Technical Debt Index	Composite score measuring the estimated remediation cost of the portfolio's technical debt as a multiple of annual run cost	Declining	Annually

C.6.3 Architecture Compliance Metrics

Metric	Definition	Target	Reporting Frequency
ARB Coverage Rate	Percentage of projects above the ARB threshold that received an architecture review	Greater than 95%	Quarterly
Compliance Assessment Pass Rate	Percentage of projects achieving Compliant or Conditionally Compliant status at first formal review	Greater than 80%	Quarterly
Waiver Volume	Total number of architecture waivers granted in the period	Stable or declining; investigate spikes	Quarterly

Metric	Definition	Target	Reporting Frequency
Waiver Remediation Rate	Percentage of time-limited waivers remediated by their agreed remediation date	Greater than 85%	Quarterly
Repeat Waiver Rate	Percentage of waivers for the same standard granted more than once in 12 months (signals standard needs updating)	Less than 10%	Annually
Time to Architecture Decision	Average elapsed days from complete ARB submission to decision	Less than 10 business days	Monthly
Post-Deployment Architecture Defect Rate	Number of significant architectural issues identified post-deployment that should have been caught in architecture review	Less than 2 per quarter	Quarterly

C.6.4 Business Value Metrics

Metric	Definition	Measurement Challenge & Approach
Architecture-Enabled Revenue	Revenue from products or capabilities that required EA-governed architecture decisions to be viable	Attribution is challenging. Track via business cases approved through ARB that cited revenue potential; follow up 12–18 months post-launch to verify.
Time-to-Market Improvement	Reduction in time to deliver new capabilities attributable to architectural investments (platform standardization, reusable components, API catalogue)	Baseline pre-architecture programme delivery times for comparable capability types; measure post-programme delivery times for same types.
Infrastructure Cost Savings	Annual infrastructure cost reduction attributable to architecture-driven decisions (cloud migration, rightsizing, application rationalization)	Track via FinOps reporting for architecture-governed cloud workloads; compare to pre-migration costs with inflation adjustment.
Incident Reduction	Reduction in major incidents attributable to architecture improvements (resilience patterns, elimination of end-of-life technology, security architecture improvements)	Track major incident volume by root cause category; isolate incidents caused by architecture deficiencies; track trend against architecture investment timeline.
Compliance Penalty Avoidance	Regulatory fines or audit findings avoided due to architecture-driven compliance measures	Track regulatory audit findings pre and post architecture investment; obtain compliance team attestation for specific findings remediated by architecture decisions.

C.6.5 EA Value Reporting

Metrics are only valuable if they are communicated to the right audiences in the right format. The CEA must establish a regular reporting cadence:

Report	Audience	Content	Frequency
EA Executive Dashboard	CIO, CTO, CFO	One-page visual: portfolio health RAG status, compliance rate, top 3 value stories, key risks, roadmap progress	Monthly
EA Board Report	Board Technology Committee or Risk Committee	Narrative summary: architecture risk landscape, major decisions taken, strategic roadmap progress, investment outcomes	Quarterly
EA Programme Report	Programme / Portfolio Management Office	Compliance status by programme, ARB decision log, waiver register summary, upcoming architecture review schedule	Monthly
EA Community Newsletter	All architects and technology leads	New decisions, standards updates, CoP highlights, upcoming events, case studies	Monthly
EA Annual Value Report	All executive stakeholders	Full-year metrics performance, value delivered (cost savings, risk reduction, capability enablement), roadmap for next year	Annually

Section C.7

Building the Architecture Team

Hiring, assessing, developing, and retaining the architects who make the EA practice work

C.7.1 Assessing the Starting Position

Most CEAs inherit an existing architecture landscape rather than building from scratch. Before making any hiring or restructuring decisions, the CEA must conduct a thorough assessment of the existing architecture capability:

Assessment Area	Questions to Answer	Method
People	Who are the existing architects? What are their skills, experience levels, and domain coverage? Who has genuine architecture capability vs. who holds an architecture title without the skills?	1:1 conversations; skills assessment; portfolio review of work produced
Deliverables	What architecture artifacts exist? What quality are they? Are they current? Are they being used in decision-making?	Architecture Repository audit; stakeholder interviews about whether artifacts are consulted
Governance	What governance processes exist? How consistently are they applied? What decisions are being made without architecture review?	Review of any existing governance documentation; interview programme and project managers
Culture	How is the EA function perceived? Is it seen as a strategic partner or a bureaucratic gate? Do delivery teams engage willingly or reluctantly?	Stakeholder satisfaction survey; conversation with delivery leads and business unit leaders
Gaps	What domains, geographies, or capability areas have no architecture coverage? Where are the most significant capability gaps vs. requirements?	Map existing architect coverage against the domains, geographies, and capability areas the organization requires

C.7.2 Architect Hiring Framework

The T-Shape Model for Architects

The most effective architects in enterprise settings have T-shaped skills: deep expertise in at least one domain (the vertical bar of the T) combined with broad awareness across all architecture domains (the horizontal bar). Pure specialists struggle to see cross-domain implications; pure generalists lack the depth to make credible technical judgments.

The CEA should hire for T-shape and develop architects to extend both dimensions over time. The specific vertical depth required varies by role:

Role	Required Depth (Vertical)	Required Breadth (Horizontal)
Business Architecture Lead	Deep expertise in business analysis, operating model design, capability modeling	Awareness of application portfolio, data governance, and technology strategy
Data Architecture Lead	Deep expertise in data platform architecture, MDM, data governance, and data privacy	Awareness of application integration, cloud infrastructure, and business capability mapping
Application Architecture Lead	Deep expertise in application design patterns, integration architecture, and API design	Awareness of data architecture, infrastructure platforms, and business capability mapping
Infrastructure & Cloud Lead	Deep expertise in at least one cloud platform, networking, and infrastructure-as-code	Awareness of application deployment patterns, data platform requirements, and security architecture
Security Architecture Lead	Deep expertise in IAM, application security, and security architecture frameworks (SABSA, NIST)	Awareness of all architecture domains from a risk and control perspective
Domain Architect	Deep expertise in the specific business domain (Finance, HR, Supply Chain)	Awareness of enterprise standards across application, data, and technology domains
Solution Architect	Deep expertise in the specific technology stack of assigned projects	Awareness of enterprise patterns, integration standards, and non-functional requirements

Essential Hiring Criteria for All Architect Roles

- Communication skills — can explain complex architectural concepts to both technical and non-technical audiences; written communication is clear and structured
- Systems thinking — can see how components interact as a system; understands second-order effects of architectural decisions
- Business curiosity — genuinely interested in understanding the business problems technology must solve; not satisfied with technical solutions to technical problems
- Decision discipline — can make and commit to architectural decisions under uncertainty and time pressure; documents decisions with clear rationale
- Collaborative instinct — sees architecture as a co-design activity with delivery teams and business stakeholders, not a gate or a constraint
- Continuous learning orientation — the technology landscape changes rapidly; architects who stop learning become liabilities within 3–5 years

C.7.3 Architect Career Framework

The CEA must establish a clear career framework for architects that defines progression paths, capability expectations at each level, and the development investments needed to progress. Without a career framework, architecture talent is lost to management tracks or to organizations that offer clearer progression.

Level	Title	Primary Focus	Typical Experience	Progression Criteria
L1	Associate Architect	Learning architecture craft; supporting senior architects on deliverables; developing technical depth	0–3 years architecture experience; strong engineering background	Consistent delivery of architecture artifacts; TOGAF Foundation certification; positive peer feedback
L2	Architect	Independent delivery of solution architecture; active ARB participation; developing domain expertise	3–6 years; track record of delivered SADs; domain expertise developing	TOGAF Practitioner; independent SAD delivery; architecture compliance rate above 85%
L3	Senior Architect	Lead architect for complex programmes; domain architecture ownership; mentoring of junior architects	6–10 years; multiple major programme SADs; domain or platform expertise	Domain architecture ownership; working group leadership; measurable mentoring impact
L4	Principal / Lead Architect	Enterprise-wide architectural influence; domain lead responsibilities; C-suite engagement capability	10–15 years; enterprise-scale programme experience; recognized domain authority	Domain lead role performance; ARB regular contributor; CEA-endorsed progression
L5	Distinguished Architect / CEA	EA practice leadership; organizational architecture authority; executive stakeholder management	15+ years; multiple enterprise transformation programmes; recognized industry expertise	Board-level reporting track record; demonstrated business value creation; EA practice leadership

Section C.8

EA Tooling Strategy

Selecting, implementing, and governing the tools that support the architecture practice at enterprise scale

EA tooling is an enabler of the architecture practice, not the practice itself. The CEA must select tools that genuinely amplify the team's capability without creating tool-dependency that substitutes for architectural thinking. The primary risk in EA tooling is over-investment: buying expensive enterprise EA platforms and spending more energy on populating the tool than on doing architecture.

C.8.1 EA Tool Categories and Selection Guidance

Tool Category	Purpose	Leading Options	Selection Criteria
Enterprise Architecture Repository	Store, manage, and visualize the full architecture landscape: applications, capabilities, technology, relationships, decisions	LeanIX, Ardoq, Bizzdesign Horizzon, Alfabet (Software AG), Sparx Enterprise Architect	Ease of data entry (adoption depends on it); relationship modeling capability; reporting and dashboard quality; integration with CMDB and ITSM tools; pricing model (per-user vs. per-record)
Architecture Modeling	Create formal ArchiMate and UML models; produce diagrams for ADM phase deliverables and architecture views	Sparx Enterprise Architect (full), draw.io (lightweight), Archi (free ArchiMate tool), Bizzdesign Horizzon (integrated)	ArchiMate 3.x support; collaborative editing; export formats (SVG, PNG, HTML); cost vs. team size
Diagramming and Collaboration	Produce informal architecture diagrams, roadmap visuals, capability maps, and workshop artifacts	Miro (collaboration), Lucidchart (cloud diagrams), Microsoft Visio (Microsoft environments), draw.io (free)	Real-time collaboration; template library quality; integration with Microsoft 365 or Google Workspace; accessibility
ADR Management	Create, store, version, and cross-reference Architecture Decision Records	Confluence (Atlassian environments), GitHub/GitLab (engineering-led organizations), ADR-tools (CLI), Backstage (developer portals)	Integration with the development workflow; search and cross-referencing capability; version control; accessibility to non-engineers
Portfolio Management	Manage the application portfolio with TCO, lifecycle, and business value data	LeanIX (integrated EA+portfolio), Alfabet, Apptio (financial focus), ServiceNow SPM (ITSM integration)	Integration with financial systems; capability mapping support; lifecycle management; reporting quality
Governance Workflow	Manage ARB submissions, review workflows, decision	ServiceNow (enterprise ITSM environments), Jira (Atlassian environments), Microsoft Power	Workflow configurability; notification and escalation

Tool Category	Purpose	Leading Options	Selection Criteria
	tracking, and waiver management	Platform (Microsoft environments), custom SharePoint	capability; reporting and audit trail; integration with calendar systems

C.8.2 Tooling Implementation Principles

- Start simple, expand deliberately — begin with the minimum viable toolset (a repository and a diagramming tool); add tools only when a genuine pain point justifies the investment and adoption overhead
- Adoption is the success metric — an expensive tool with 20% adoption is worth less than a simple tool with 80% adoption. Design the tooling experience to minimize data entry burden and maximize value received.
- Integration reduces burden — tools that integrate with each other (EA repository with CMDB, ADR tool with code repositories, governance tool with project management) reduce double-entry and improve data accuracy
- Data quality governance — every tool requires a data quality governance process. Assign owners for each data domain in the tool; establish update cadence requirements; audit data quality quarterly
- Training and onboarding — budget for training the architecture community on every tool introduced; underfunded training is the most common reason for poor tool adoption

Section C.9

EA Practice Rituals

The operating cadence that keeps the architecture practice coherent, connected, and continuously improving

Practice rituals are the regular, repeating activities that give an organization's architecture function its operating rhythm. They create the predictability and consistency that allow the EA practice to function effectively even during periods of organizational change, strategic uncertainty, or team transition. The CEA must design, establish, and protect these rituals — cancelling them repeatedly under pressure signals that architecture is not a genuine priority.

C.9.1 The EA Operating Calendar

Ritual	Frequency	Duration	Participants	Purpose & Key Activities
CEA 1:1 with CIO/CTO	Bi-weekly	30 min	CEA + CIO/CTO	Maintain executive alignment; surface architecture issues requiring executive support; share upcoming governance decisions; receive strategic context for architecture planning
CEA Team Stand-Up	Weekly	30 min	Central EA team	Cross-team coordination; surface blockers; share stakeholder intelligence; brief on upcoming commitments
CEA 1:1 with Domain Leads	Weekly	30 min each	CEA + each domain lead	Domain status; emerging issues; stakeholder relationship management; coaching and development
Architecture Review Board	Bi-weekly	90 min	ARB members; submitters as needed	Review and decide on architectural submissions; manage the governance queue; review waiver requests
Cross-Domain Architecture Review	Monthly	90 min	All domain leads + CEA	Identify cross-domain architecture conflicts; share domain decisions with potential enterprise implications; coordinate on shared architecture themes
EA Practice Review	Monthly	60 min	Central EA team + EA Practice Manager	Review practice metrics (ARB queue, compliance rates, CoP engagement, repository health); identify process improvements; plan upcoming period
Architecture Community of Practice	Monthly	60 min	All architects + interested stakeholders	Share decisions, standards, lessons learned; working group updates; community contributions; CEA strategic update

Ritual	Frequency	Duration	Participants	Purpose & Key Activities
Domain Architecture Reviews	Monthly per domain	90 min	CEA + domain lead + domain business/IT stakeholders	Deep dive into specific domain architecture: portfolio health, roadmap progress, emerging issues, upcoming decisions
EA Metrics Review	Quarterly	60 min	CEA + CIO/CTO + EA leadership team	Review EA performance metrics; assess progress against EA strategy objectives; update executive stakeholders; identify adjustments needed
Architecture Roadmap Alignment	Quarterly	Half day	CEA + domain leads + programme/portfolio management	Align Architecture Roadmap with business priorities, programme portfolio, and budget cycle; update sequencing and dependencies; refresh investment estimates
Technology Radar Update	Bi-annually	1 day workshop	CEA + all domain leads + senior engineers	Review technology landscape changes; assess technologies for ring movement; publish updated radar; communicate changes to community
EA Annual Planning	Annually	2 days	CEA + domain leads + CIO/CTO	Set EA strategy objectives for the coming year; develop EA investment plan; refresh Architecture Vision if required; present to executive committee
Architecture Summit	Annually	1–2 days	Full architecture community	Strategic direction from CEA; deep-dive workshops; cross-team networking; recognition and awards; external speakers

Section C.10

EA Practice Maturity Roadmap

A structured progression from initial capability to an optimizing enterprise architecture practice

Building an EA practice from scratch — or transforming an immature one — is a multi-year endeavour. The CEA must set realistic expectations about how long it takes to build genuine organizational capability, resist pressure to demonstrate impact before the foundations are in place, and invest in the sequence that builds the most durable practice.

C.10.1 Maturity Level Definitions

Level	Name	Characteristics	Typical Timeline to Achieve
1	Initial	Ad hoc architecture activity; no formal practice; architecture standards informal or absent; governance non-existent; architecture artifacts inconsistent in quality and coverage	Starting point — most organizations at Level 1 when EA practice is first established
2	Developing	Central EA team established; basic governance (ARB) in place but inconsistently applied; standards defined for major domains but coverage incomplete; Architecture Repository established but sparsely populated; CoP in early stages	12–18 months from Level 1 with adequate investment and CEA mandate
3	Defined	Formal EA operating model documented and operating; comprehensive standards defined and ARB consistently applied; Architecture Repository well-populated and actively used; CoP active with regular participation; domain architects in place for major domains	18–30 months from Level 2; requires sustained investment and organizational commitment
4	Managed	EA metrics tracked and reported regularly; architecture demonstrably influencing investment decisions; application portfolio managed as a strategic asset; CEA actively engaged in executive strategy forums; business capability mapping driving portfolio decisions	24–36 months from Level 3; requires CEA with strong business relationships and executive credibility
5	Optimizing	EA function continuously improving based on metrics and feedback; architecture practice deeply embedded in organizational culture; CEA recognized as a strategic business partner; predictive architecture planning (anticipating technology shifts before they create problems); architecture value quantified and reported to board	3–5 years from Level 4; few large organizations achieve and sustain this level

C.10.2 Maturity Progression Roadmap by Year

Year	Priority Investments	Key Milestones	CEA Focus
Year 1: Foundations	Hire central EA team core; establish ARB; develop Architecture Principles; build Architecture Repository; launch CoP; produce Architecture Vision	ARB operating; Principles ratified by C-suite; first Architecture Vision published; Architecture Repository live; CoP monthly meeting established	Establishing credibility; building executive relationships; designing the governance model; demonstrating early wins
Year 2: Coverage	Deploy domain architects for top 3–4 priority domains; build Business Capability Model; complete application portfolio assessment; publish Technology Radar; establish ARB compliance tracking	BCM published and endorsed; Application Portfolio fully assessed and TIME-classified; Technology Radar published; domain architecture coverage for priority domains; ARB metrics reporting live	Scaling architecture coverage; building business relationships; driving first rationalization decisions; CoP growth
Year 3: Impact	Drive portfolio rationalization (first wave); publish enterprise Architecture Roadmap; launch working groups; establish EA metrics reporting to executive committee; extend domain architect coverage	Architecture Roadmap approved and funded; first application retirements executed; EA value dashboard live; 5+ working groups active; ARB compliance rate above 80%	Demonstrating financial value; connecting architecture to investment decisions; building business case for sustained EA investment
Year 4: Optimization	Mature governance (tiered ARB fully operational); develop architect career framework; expand CoP working group output; establish predictive architecture scanning; launch architecture clinic	Tiered ARB operating effectively; architect career framework published; CoP NPS above +30; 90%+ of in-scope projects receiving architecture review	Embedding architecture culture; developing the next generation of architects; optimising governance for speed and value
Year 5+: Leadership	Establish architecture as a recognized organizational discipline; CEA recognized externally; architecture function contributing to industry standards and frameworks; EA practice serving as a model for peers	Architecture cited by board as a competitive advantage; CEA speaking externally; EA practice assessed at Maturity Level 4 or 5	Strategic leadership; organizational influence; industry engagement; next-generation architecture capability (AI, quantum, edge)

Sequencing Maturity Investment

The most common mistake in building an EA practice is trying to do everything simultaneously. The CEA who spends Year 1 building a comprehensive Architecture Repository, an elaborate ARB process, a full Community of Practice, and a detailed Architecture Roadmap will achieve none of them well. Sequence deliberately: establish governance first (it creates the mandate for everything else), build coverage next (domain architects extend reach), then drive impact (rationalization, roadmap, value demonstration). Culture builds continuously throughout.

Addendum C Summary: The CEA's Operating Model Checklist

The following checklist provides the CEA with a structured self-assessment tool for evaluating the completeness and maturity of each EA Operating Model component.

Component	Foundation (Year 1)	Developing (Year 2–3)	Mature (Year 4+)
Organization Design	Central EA team hired; model chosen (hub-and-spoke recommended); reporting lines agreed	Domain architects in place for top 4–6 domains; dual reporting arrangements formalized; role profiles published	Full domain and regional coverage; career framework operating; succession planning in place for key roles
Roles & Responsibilities	Central EA team role profiles defined; decision rights documented; RACI for key decisions published	Domain architect role profiles published; solution architect expectations defined; performance objectives set	Architect competency framework mature; 360 performance process in place; external benchmarking conducted
Governance Mechanisms	Enterprise ARB operating; Architecture Principles ratified; decision authority matrix defined	Tiered ARB structure operating; Architecture Contracts in use; compliance tracking live; waiver register active	Governance metrics reported to board; bypass rate below 5%; compliance rate above 90%; waiver remediation rate above 85%
Architecture Repository	Repository platform selected and configured; metamodel defined; core artifacts loading	Repository actively populated across all domains; integration with CMDB and ITSM; data quality governance in place	Repository is the authoritative source of truth for the technology landscape; real-time dashboards; self-service reporting
Community of Practice	Monthly all-community meeting established; CoP platform live; first working group launched	3+ active working groups producing standards; Architecture Clinic operating; Architecture Showcase quarterly	CoP NPS above +30; 60%+ membership rate; community-generated standards recognized across the enterprise
Performance Management	Basic ARB and portfolio metrics defined; quarterly reporting to CIO/CTO	Full metrics framework operating; EA value dashboard live; quarterly executive reporting	EA value quantified in business terms and reported to board; EA ROI calculated annually; external benchmarking

References for This Addendum

[1] The Open Group. TOGAF Standard, Version 9.2. The Open Group, 2018. opengroup.org/togaf — Primary reference for architecture governance, ARB design, Architecture Capability, and the EA Operating Model within the TOGAF framework.

[2] The Open Group. TOGAF Series Guide: Architecture Governance. The Open Group, 2019 — Detailed guidance on ARB design, governance levels, Architecture Contracts, and compliance assessment.

[3] IASA Global. IT Architecture Competency Framework (ITACF). iasaglobal.org — The most comprehensive architect competency framework available; primary reference for architect role profiles and career frameworks.

[4] Gartner. EA Maturity Assessment Framework. Gartner Research — The Gartner five-level EA maturity model referenced in Section C.10; available to Gartner subscribers.

[5] Wenger, E., McDermott, R. & Snyder, W.M. Cultivating Communities of Practice. Harvard Business School Press, 2002 — The foundational reference for Community of Practice design, facilitation, and sustainability.

[6] Ross, J.W., Weill, P. & Robertson, D.C. Enterprise Architecture as Strategy. Harvard Business School Press, 2006 — Essential reading on EA operating models and the relationship between EA maturity and business performance.

[7] Scaled Agile Inc. SAFe 6.0: System Architect Role. scaledagileframework.com — Primary reference for integrating the Solution Architect role with agile delivery teams and Architecture Runway design.

[8] Hohpe, G. The Software Architect Elevator. O'Reilly, 2020 — The most practical guide available for the CEA on how to operate across all levels of the organization, from engineering teams to board level.

[9] Henderson, J.C. & Venkatraman, N. Strategic Alignment: Leveraging Information Technology for Transforming Organizations. IBM Systems Journal, 1993 — The foundational academic reference for IT-business alignment, underpinning the EA Operating Model's business alignment imperative.

[10] Kotter, J.P. Leading Change. Harvard Business School Press, 1996 — Essential reading for CEAs building EA practices in resistant organizational cultures; the eight-step change model applies directly to EA practice establishment.

[11] Lencioni, P. The Five Dysfunctions of a Team. Jossey-Bass, 2002 — Relevant to CEAs building the central EA team and the architecture community; addresses trust, conflict, commitment, accountability, and results.

[12] Forsgren, N., Humble, J. & Kim, G. Accelerate: The Science of Lean Software and DevOps. IT Revolution Press, 2018 — Primary reference for DORA metrics used in EA maintainability NFR specification and EA value measurement.

[13] ThoughtWorks. Technology Radar. thoughtworks.com/radar — The model for the enterprise Technology Radar described in Section C.8 and Addendum B; published bi-annually.

[14] LeanIX. EA Management Suite. leanix.net — The primary commercial EA repository platform referenced in this addendum; documentation available at leanix.net/docs.

[15] Ardoq. Architecture Platform. ardoq.com — Alternative commercial EA repository platform with strong relationship modeling and impact analysis capability.

End of Addendum C — The EA Operating Model: Organizing for Scale

Append to: Chief Enterprise Architect Practitioner's Guide, Version 1.0 | Following Addendum B