

ADDENDUM D to the Chief Enterprise Architect Practitioner's Guide

Section 6: Building and Leading the Architecture Practice

Covers: Establishing the Architecture Capability • Capability Maturity Model in Depth
Building the Architecture Team • Hiring, Onboarding & Retention • Talent Development
Tooling Strategy • Practice Rituals • Culture & Change Leadership
Executive Sponsorship • Transformation Planning • Sustaining the Practice

Digital Enterprise Architecture Advisors LLC

Enterprise Architecture Leadership

Version: 1.0

Date: July 2026

Author: Christian Kobsa; Digital Enterprise Architecture Advisors LLC

Abstract

Addendum D expands Section 6 of the *Chief Enterprise Architect Practitioner's Guide* into a practical leadership manual for creating and sustaining an effective enterprise architecture practice. It details how CEAs establish an architecture capability, secure executive mandate, and navigate stakeholder dynamics; provides an in-depth maturity model with diagnostic indicators and transition strategies; and outlines the full talent lifecycle from assessment and hiring to development and retention. The addendum further covers tooling strategy, practice rituals, and long-term cultural leadership. Together, these sections equip CEAs to build credibility quickly, deliver visible value, and evolve the EA function into a strategic, predictive, and culturally embedded organizational capability.

Digital Enterprise Architecture Advisors LLC

Architecture • Strategy • Operating Models • Transformation © 2026 Digital Enterprise Architecture Advisors LLC. All rights reserved.

www.dea-advisors.com

Introduction to This Addendum

Section 6 of the CEA Practitioner's Guide introduced the principles of building and leading the architecture practice — from establishing architecture capability and assessing maturity, through building the team, selecting tools, and establishing practice rituals. This addendum expands every element of Section 6 into a practitioner's reference of sufficient depth to guide the CEA through the full lifecycle of practice establishment, transformation, and sustained leadership.

Building an architecture practice that genuinely influences organizational outcomes — rather than producing documents that nobody reads — is one of the hardest sustained leadership challenges in enterprise technology. It requires the CEA to operate simultaneously as a strategist, an organizational designer, a talent developer, a culture builder, a governance architect, and a credible technical authority. This addendum addresses each of these dimensions in detail.

The addendum is organized into eight sections that expand and deepen the topics introduced in Section 6:

- Section D.1 — Establishing the Architecture Capability: the first 90 days, stakeholder landscape, and mandate-building
- Section D.2 — The Architecture Capability Maturity Model in Depth: detailed characteristics, diagnostic tools, and transition strategies for each maturity level
- Section D.3 — Building the Architecture Team: the complete talent lifecycle from assessment through hiring, onboarding, development, and retention
- Section D.4 — Architect Hiring in Practice: interview design, assessment frameworks, sourcing strategies, and common hiring mistakes
- Section D.5 — Architect Talent Development: career frameworks, development programs, mentoring, and succession planning
- Section D.6 — Architecture Tools and Tooling Strategy in Depth: tool evaluation, implementation, governance, and the total cost of tooling
- Section D.7 — Architecture Practice Rituals in Depth: detailed operating guides for each ritual with facilitation guidance and quality standards
- Section D.8 — Building and Sustaining Architecture Culture: the long-term leadership work that makes the architecture practice durable

Relationship to Other Addenda

This addendum focuses on the people, culture, and practice leadership dimensions of the CEA role. Addendum A covers the TOGAF ADM phases. Addendum B covers deliverable content. Addendum C covers the EA Operating Model structure. Together they form a complete operational reference for the CEA.

Section D.1

Establishing the Architecture Capability

What the CEA must accomplish in the first 90 days to build a foundation for lasting architecture impact

Establishing the architecture capability is not primarily a technical challenge — it is a leadership and organizational challenge. The CEA arrives into an organization with existing technology landscapes, existing IT governance structures, existing stakeholder expectations, and existing opinions about what enterprise architecture is and whether it adds value. The first 90 days determine whether the CEA builds the credibility and mandate needed to make a genuine difference, or whether the architecture function becomes another well-intentioned initiative that fades into irrelevance.

D.1.1 The First 90 Days: A Structured Approach

Days 1–30: Listen, Learn, and Map the Landscape

The first month is not the time to announce changes, publish architecture principles, or redesign the governance model. It is the time to listen — deeply and systematically — to understand the organization's current state, its stakeholder dynamics, and the unspoken expectations that will determine the CEA's effectiveness.

Activity	Purpose	Output
1:1 meetings with all C-suite peers (CIO, CTO, CDO, CISO, CFO, COO)	Understand their priorities, their pain points, their expectations of architecture, and their previous experiences of EA (positive and negative)	Stakeholder map with concerns, expectations, and potential resistance points
1:1 meetings with all existing architects and architecture leads	Understand the existing team's capabilities, frustrations, strengths, and aspirations; identify informal leaders and at-risk talent	Team assessment with skill inventory, engagement levels, and development needs
Portfolio and artifact review	Assess what architecture work has been done: what artifacts exist, what quality they are, whether they are being used in decisions	Architecture asset inventory with quality assessment
Governance audit	Review existing governance processes: does an ARB exist? How consistently is it applied?	Governance gap analysis with risk assessment

Activity	Purpose	Output
	What decisions bypass architecture review?	
Delivery team interviews (5–10 program leads and product managers)	Understand how architecture is perceived by the people who interact with it most — is it seen as an enabler or an obstacle?	Delivery team perception report with themes and specific pain points
Business leader conversations (3–5 senior business stakeholders)	Understand the business strategy, the technology pain points visible to business leaders, and the business outcomes they expect technology to enable	Business stakeholder needs assessment with priority capability gaps
Financial landscape review (with CFO or finance business partner)	Understand the technology investment budget, how it is allocated, the financial governance process, and what the EA function is expected to deliver financially	Financial baseline: technology spend profile, cost of technical debt, rationalization opportunity estimate

Days 31–60: Synthesize, Prioritize, and Build Relationships

The second month is about synthesizing the intelligence gathered in month one into a clear picture of the opportunity and beginning to build the relationships that will determine the CEA's organizational effectiveness.

- Produce a written assessment of the architecture capability's current state — strengths, gaps, risks, and opportunities. Share it with the CIO/CTO to test alignment before taking it wider.
- Identify the three to five highest-value, most achievable quick wins that can be delivered within the first six months — specific problems the EA function can solve visibly and credibly.
- Begin deepening key relationships — particularly with the business unit leaders and program executives whose support will be essential for the architecture practice to have genuine influence.
- Assess the existing team more deeply — identify who is capable and engaged, who needs development, and who is unlikely to be effective in the architecture function regardless of investment.
- Develop the initial architecture mandate — a one-page statement of the EA function's purpose, priorities, and success criteria for the first year, agreed with the CIO/CTO.

- Identify the executive sponsor — the C-suite member who will actively champion the architecture function, provide air cover in governance disputes, and champion architecture investment in the budget process.

Days 61–90: Act, Communicate, and Establish Rhythm

The third month is about taking the first visible actions — establishing the governance foundation, communicating the direction, and beginning to deliver on the quick wins identified in month two.

- Publish the initial Architecture Principles — even a draft set of 8–10 principles, workshopped with key stakeholders, begins to establish the governance foundation and signals that the EA function is operational
- Convene the first Architecture Review Board — even informally, this signals that architecture governance has begun and creates an expectation that significant technology decisions will be reviewed
- Launch the Architecture Community of Practice — a first all-hands architecture community meeting establishes the community and signals the CEA's intention to lead through culture as well as governance
- Communicate the EA direction — a clear, written communication to all architects, technology leads, and relevant business stakeholders explaining the EA function's purpose, priorities, and operating model
- Deliver at least one visible quick win — solve a real problem that a business or delivery stakeholder cares about, and make the win visible

☑ The 90-Day Listening Imperative

The single most common mistake made by incoming CEAs is acting too quickly. CEAs who arrive with a pre-formed architecture strategy — developed before they understand the organization — consistently fail to achieve the organizational support needed to execute it. The organization must see that the CEA understands its specific context before it will follow architectural direction. Spending the first 30 days almost entirely in listening mode feels uncomfortable but creates the foundation for everything that follows.

D.1.2 Securing the Executive Mandate

The architecture function has no intrinsic authority — it derives its authority from the organizational mandate granted to it by executive leadership. Without a clear, explicit, and actively maintained executive mandate, the CEA's governance mechanisms are advisory at best and ignored at worst. Securing and sustaining the executive mandate is a continuous leadership responsibility, not a one-time event.

Elements of a Strong Executive Mandate

Mandate Element	Description	How the CEA Secures It
Decision Authority	Explicit statement of which technology decisions require architecture review and approval before proceeding, and what happens when a project bypasses the process	Negotiate with the CIO/CTO; document in a formal EA governance policy; present to the technology leadership committee for ratification
Resource Commitment	Budget for the EA team, EA tooling, training, and the Community of Practice; commitment to fund domain architect roles in business units	Build a compelling business case using the financial baseline from day 1–30; tie investment to specific business outcomes; present to CFO and CIO jointly
Executive Sponsorship	A named C-suite sponsor who actively champions architecture governance, participates in the ARB, and resolves escalations in the CEA's favor	Identify the most naturally aligned C-suite executive (often the CIO or COO); make the sponsorship role specific and time-bounded; maintain the relationship actively
Organizational Positioning	Clear statement of where the EA function sits in the organizational hierarchy, what authority it has over domain architects, and how it relates to delivery governance	Negotiate reporting line with CIO/CEO; formalize domain architect professional reporting; document in EA operating model policy
Performance Contract	Agreed metrics and targets that the EA function will be held to — the basis on which the CEA's contribution will be assessed	Co-design with CIO/CTO; ensure metrics are achievable in year one while stretching in years two and three; include business value metrics not just process metrics

D.1.3 Stakeholder Landscape Management

The CEA operates in a complex stakeholder environment. Some stakeholders will be naturally supportive; others will be resistant. Understanding and actively managing this landscape is a continuous leadership responsibility.

Stakeholder Type	Typical Stance	Underlying Concern	CEA Engagement Strategy
CIO (direct sponsor)	Supportive — EA is their governance instrument	Wants EA to reduce IT risk and improve delivery quality without adding bureaucratic overhead	Co-design governance to balance rigor and speed; keep CIO informed of governance disputes before they escalate; make the CIO look good in board reporting
CTO (peer)	Variable — may see EA as constraining technology innovation	Wants freedom to adopt emerging technologies; may have had negative experiences with overly rigid EA governance	Involve CTO in Technology Radar design; make EA the enabler of responsible innovation rather than the blocker of it; give CTO a visible role in the architecture community
Business Unit Leaders	Initially skeptical — may have experienced EA as a slow gate	Want technology delivered faster, not slower; want technology to solve their business problems	Show early business value; use business capability language; make architecture reviews fast and helpful; celebrate business outcomes not architecture compliance
CFO	Neutral to supportive — values cost discipline	Wants to understand technology spending; concerned about uncontrolled technology cost growth	Lead with application rationalization business cases; provide a clear TCO view of the application portfolio; quantify the cost of architectural debt
Program / Delivery Leads	Often resistant — see EA as a bottleneck	Under pressure to deliver; experience architecture reviews as delays; may have had waivers denied without adequate explanation	Design governance for speed; train architects to be helpful rather than obstructive; measure time-to-decision and publish it; celebrate compliant delivery teams
Engineering Community	Mixed — technically oriented engineers often value	Want clear technical standards that help them make good	Engage through the CoP and working groups; involve senior engineers in Technology Radar design; make ADRs accessible and useful to engineers

Stakeholder Type	Typical Stance	Underlying Concern	CEA Engagement Strategy
	architecture; others see it as overhead	decisions without bureaucracy	
Audit / Risk / Compliance	Supportive — architecture governance supports their objectives	Want evidence that technology decisions are controlled and risks are managed	Align EA governance with audit requirements; provide compliance-ready reporting; position EA as a risk management function

Section D.2

Architecture Capability Maturity Model in Depth

Detailed diagnostic guidance for assessing current maturity and planning the transition to the next level

The Architecture Capability Maturity Model provides the CEA with a structured framework for assessing where the EA practice currently stands and planning credible progression toward greater impact. The five-level model introduced in Section 6.2 of the main guide is expanded here with detailed diagnostic indicators, transition strategies, and the specific leadership actions the CEA must take at each level.

D.2.1 Maturity Level 1 — Initial

Diagnostic Indicators

An organization is at Maturity Level 1 when most of the following are true:

- Architecture decisions are made by individual engineers, project managers, or delivery leads without a formal architecture review process
- No Architecture Principles document exists, or one exists but is unknown to most technologists
- Technology standards are informal, inconsistent, or absent — different projects use different technologies without governance
- There is no formal Application Portfolio — nobody can accurately state how many applications the organization runs or what they cost
- The term 'enterprise architect' may exist as a job title but describes someone who does solution design rather than enterprise-level architecture
- Architecture artifacts, where they exist, are produced for specific projects and not maintained or reused
- Executive stakeholders do not distinguish between enterprise architecture and IT project management

Primary CEA Risks at Level 1

- Technology fragmentation accelerating — each project team independently selects technology, producing an increasingly costly and unmanageable landscape
- Technical debt compounding — tactical decisions made without architectural oversight accumulate into systemic structural problems

- Regulatory exposure — architecture decisions with compliance implications (data sovereignty, security, audit) are being made without appropriate expertise
- M&A integration risks — if the organization is acquiring other companies, lack of architecture governance makes integration expensive and slow

Transition Strategy: Level 1 to Level 2

The primary objective at Level 1 is to establish the governance foundation — the minimum architecture infrastructure needed to stop the fragmentation from getting worse while building toward genuine impact.

Priority Action	Rationale	Timeline
Establish the CEA role with a clear mandate	Without an explicit mandate, architecture authority is advisory and easily ignored	Days 1–30: secure mandate before taking any governance action
Hire or identify a Deputy EA and one domain lead	The CEA cannot build alone; minimum viable team is CEA plus two senior architects	Days 30–90: identify from existing team or recruit externally
Develop and ratify Architecture Principles (10–12 principles)	Principles are the lowest-cost governance instrument with the highest organizational signal value	Days 60–90: co-develop with key stakeholders
Establish the Architecture Review Board	Even an informal ARB establishes the expectation that significant decisions will be reviewed	Month 3: first meeting; refine process over months 4–6
Conduct Application Portfolio discovery	Without knowing what applications exist, no portfolio management or rationalization is possible	Months 2–4: discovery; months 4–6: initial TIME classification
Launch the Architecture Community of Practice	The CoP builds relationships and shared vocabulary before formal governance creates friction	Month 3: first meeting; monthly thereafter
Deliver one visible quick win	Credibility at Level 1 comes from solving a real problem, not from publishing documents	Months 1–3: identify and deliver a specific, visible business or technology problem solution

D.2.2 Maturity Level 2 — Developing

Diagnostic Indicators

- A central EA team exists and is operational — ARB meets regularly, Architecture Principles are published
- Basic standards exist for major technology domains (cloud, integration, security) but coverage is incomplete and inconsistency remains
- The Architecture Repository exists but is sparsely populated — data quality is inconsistent and it is not yet trusted as an authoritative source
- Some projects receive architecture review; others bypass the process without consequence
- The architecture function is known to exist but its value is not yet clearly demonstrated to executive stakeholders
- Domain architecture coverage is absent or very limited — most architecture work happens in the central team
- The CoP has launched but attendance is variable and content quality is inconsistent

Transition Strategy: Level 2 to Level 3

Priority Action	Rationale	Timeline
Deploy domain architects for top 3–4 priority domains	Without domain architects, central team is spread too thin and domain-specific guidance is absent	Months 6–18: hire or develop domain architects for Customer, Finance, Supply Chain, and Technology domains as a minimum
Build the Business Capability Model	The BCM provides the stable business-language foundation for all portfolio and investment decisions	Months 4–8: facilitate BCM workshops with business leaders; publish and communicate
Complete Application Portfolio assessment and TIME classification	Full portfolio visibility enables rationalization business cases and investment prioritization	Months 6–12: complete discovery and assessment; present rationalization opportunities to CFO
Publish the Technology Radar	Formalizes technology standards and creates a visible, accessible governance reference for delivery teams	Months 6–9: develop with domain leads and senior engineers; publish bi-annually

Priority Action	Rationale	Timeline
Strengthen ARB compliance tracking	Without compliance tracking, bypass is invisible and governance is ineffective	Months 3–6: establish project portfolio scan to identify ARB-eligible projects; track compliance rate
Improve Architecture Repository data quality	An inaccurate repository is worse than no repository — it creates false confidence	Ongoing: assign data owners; establish update cadence requirements; quarterly quality audit
Develop and publish EA metrics dashboard	Quantifying EA performance makes its value visible and supports investment case for growth	Months 9–12: establish baseline metrics; publish quarterly EA metrics report to CIO/CTO

D.2.3 Maturity Level 3 — Defined

Diagnostic Indicators

- Formal EA Operating Model is documented, understood, and operating consistently
- Comprehensive standards are defined across all major domains and consistently applied through the ARB
- Architecture Repository is well-populated, trusted as a source of truth, and actively consulted in portfolio and investment decisions
- Domain architects are in place for all major business domains and geographies
- The CoP is active and valued — attendance is strong and practitioners are generating content as well as consuming it
- ARB compliance rate is above 75% and compliance tracking is systematic
- The first application rationalization wave has been completed with measurable cost savings

Transition Strategy: Level 3 to Level 4

Priority Action	Rationale	Timeline
Establish EA as a strategic business partner in investment planning	Level 4 is defined by EA influencing decisions, not just governing them. This requires CEA presence in strategy and investment forums.	Ongoing: secure CEA seat at investment committee; present architecture implications of all major investment decisions

Priority Action	Rationale	Timeline
Quantify and communicate architecture value in business terms	Executive confidence in EA requires evidence of financial value, not just governance compliance	Months 12–24: develop EA value framework; track and report cost savings, risk reduction, and time-to-market improvements
Launch predictive architecture scanning	Level 4 practices anticipate technology shifts rather than merely responding to them	Month 18+: establish technology horizon scanning process; publish emerging technology assessments to leadership
Develop architect career framework and talent pipeline	Sustaining a Level 4 practice requires continuously developing architecture talent from within	Months 12–18: publish architect career framework; establish mentoring program; identify succession candidates for key roles
Extend governance to cover cloud FinOps and architecture debt	At Level 3, governance focuses on new decisions. Level 4 extends governance to managing the existing landscape's debt and cost.	Months 12–24: establish architecture debt register; integrate FinOps reporting into EA metrics; develop debt remediation roadmap

D.2.4 Maturity Levels 4 and 5 — Managed and Optimizing

Level 4 — Managed: Diagnostic Indicators

- Architecture metrics are tracked, reported regularly, and actively used by executives to make decisions about technology investment
- The Business Capability Model is the primary lens through which technology investment decisions are made — investment committee discussions reference capability heat maps
- The CEA is a recognized participant in C-suite strategy discussions — not just technology governance
- Application portfolio rationalization has delivered quantified, reported financial savings
- Architecture compliance rate is consistently above 85%; waiver volume is stable or declining
- The architecture community is self-sustaining — working groups operate without CEA instigation; practitioners proactively share architecture decisions

Level 5 — Optimizing: Diagnostic Indicators

- The EA function continuously improves its own processes based on metrics, feedback, and systematic review
- Architecture is embedded in organizational culture — technology decisions at all levels reflect architectural thinking without requiring formal governance intervention
- The CEA is recognized externally as well as internally — speaking at industry events, participating in standards bodies, contributing to the broader EA community
- The organization's architecture is genuinely predictive — the EA function identifies technology shifts before they create problems and prepares the organization proactively
- Architecture value is quantified at board level — technology investment ROI is measured partly in terms of architectural outcomes

The Level 5 Illusion

Many organizations claim to be at Maturity Level 4 or 5 based on the existence of governance processes and repository populations. True Level 4 is evidenced by demonstrable business outcomes — specific financial decisions that were changed because of architecture input, measurable cost reductions from portfolio rationalization, quantified time-to-market improvements from platform standardization. If you cannot point to specific business decisions that architecture changed, you are not at Level 4 regardless of how comprehensive your governance processes are.

Section D.3

Building the Architecture Team

The complete talent lifecycle: assessment, planning, hiring, onboarding, and developing the architecture function's people

The architecture practice is ultimately a people practice. Every governance framework, every repository, every community of practice is only as effective as the architects who operate it. The CEA must invest as much attention in talent as in process — and must resist the temptation to compensate for talent gaps with process complexity.

D.3.1 Comprehensive Team Assessment

Before making any hiring decisions, the CEA must conduct a thorough, honest assessment of the existing team. The assessment has five dimensions:

Assessment Dimension	Assessment Approach	Output
Technical Architecture Skills	Review of architecture artifacts produced by each individual; assessment of breadth across TOGAF domains; peer assessment of technical credibility	Skill matrix mapping each architect against the five architecture domains (business, data, application, technology, security) on a 1–5 scale
Business Acumen	Structured interviews probing understanding of business models, competitive dynamics, and how technology creates business value; assessment by business stakeholders	Rating of each architect's ability to engage business stakeholders as a credible peer (High / Medium / Low)
Communication and Influence	Review of architecture documents produced for executive audiences; observation of stakeholder meetings; 360 feedback from business and delivery stakeholders	Communication effectiveness rating with specific development areas identified
Engagement and Motivation	1:1 conversations exploring career aspirations, frustrations, and motivations; engagement survey; assessment of recent work quality and consistency	Retention risk assessment (High / Medium / Low) with specific retention strategies for high-value individuals

Assessment Dimension	Assessment Approach	Output
Cultural Alignment	Assessment of each architect's orientation toward the EA practice the CEA is building — collaborative vs. siloed, business-focused vs. technology-focused, governance-enabling vs. governance-resistant	Cultural fit assessment with development implications

D.3.2 Team Planning: From Assessment to Design

Based on the team assessment, the CEA produces an Architecture Team Plan covering a 12–24 month horizon. The plan addresses four questions:

1. Who do we retain and develop? — the architects who have the capability and motivation to grow into the roles the EA practice needs
2. Who do we develop into different roles? — architects with good foundations but currently in roles that do not maximize their contribution
3. Who do we manage out? — architects who cannot or will not develop the skills the EA practice requires, particularly the communication and business acumen dimensions that pure technical architects often lack
4. Who do we hire? — the capability gaps that cannot be closed by developing existing talent within the required timeframe

The team plan includes:

- A target team structure with roles, reporting lines, and domain coverage
- A role-by-role assessment of current vs. required capability
- A hiring plan with prioritized roles, timelines, and budget implications
- A development plan for retained architects with specific capability goals and investment requirements
- A retention plan for high-value architects at risk of leaving

The Honest Assessment Requirement

The team assessment is only valuable if it is honest. CEAs who inherit teams often feel pressure to be generous in their assessment — to avoid the difficult conversations that honest assessment requires and to avoid the perception of being unfair to the existing team. An assessment that inflates capability ratings produces a team plan that does not address real

gaps, leading to an EA practice that underperforms relative to its mandate. The CEA must be kind in their communication but clear-eyed in their assessment.

D.3.3 Workforce Planning for Architecture Teams

Architecture workforce planning in a large multinational must account for several dimensions beyond simple headcount:

Planning Dimension	Considerations
Domain Coverage	Which business domains and technology platforms have architecture coverage? Which are uncovered? What is the risk exposure from each coverage gap?
Geographic Coverage	Which geographies have local architecture presence? Which are served remotely? What regulatory or operational factors require local presence?
Seniority Balance	What mix of seniority levels is needed? Too many senior architects creates a high-cost team with limited bandwidth for delivery engagement; too many junior architects creates execution risk on complex programs.
Specialization vs. Generalism	What balance of deep specialists (Security Architecture, Data Architecture, Cloud Architecture) and broad enterprise generalists is needed for the practice to function?
Permanent vs. Contract	Which roles are core to the EA practice and should be permanent? Which represent cyclical demand (major transformation programs) and are better served by flexible resourcing?
Internal Development vs. External Hiring	For each capability gap, what is the realistic timeframe for internal development vs. the cost and availability of external hiring? In tight talent markets, internal development of adjacent talent is often more practical than external hiring.

Section D.4

Architect Hiring in Practice

Interview design, assessment frameworks, sourcing strategies, and how to avoid the most common hiring mistakes

D.4.1 Sourcing Architecture Talent

Architecture talent is scarce in most markets. The CEA must invest in a multi-channel sourcing strategy rather than relying on reactive recruitment:

Sourcing Channel	Strengths	Limitations	CEA Actions to Activate
Internal development	Deep organizational knowledge; no onboarding cost; cultural fit proven; strong retention	Slower to develop; requires significant investment; may lack external perspective	Establish architect career pathway; identify high-potential engineers for development; create apprentice architect program
Professional networks	Pre-assessed capability through reputation; faster trust-building; often passive candidates unavailable on job boards	Requires CEA to invest in their own network; limited geographic reach	CEA actively participates in TOGAF community, EA conferences, and industry forums; builds personal reputation as an architecture leader
Architecture communities (IASA, Open Group)	Access to certified practitioners; quality signal from certification; community reputation provides reference	Community is small; competition for the same candidates is high	Participate in IASA and Open Group events; sponsor community activities; build employer brand within architecture community
Specialist recruiters	Access to passive candidates; market intelligence on compensation; speed	High cost (15–25% of first year salary); quality varies; candidates often mis-assessed technically	Brief recruiters thoroughly on the specific skills and cultural requirements; require technical pre-screening before CV presentation; provide feedback on every submission
Universities and graduate programs	Fresh thinking; lower cost; can be developed into the	Requires significant development investment; 2–3	Partner with universities teaching enterprise architecture; create

Sourcing Channel	Strengths	Limitations	CEA Actions to Activate
	CEA's desired architecture culture from the start	year runway before productive	graduate architect program with structured development path
Consulting firms (alumni)	Former consultants have broad exposure, structured thinking, and strong communication skills	Often lack operational architecture depth; may be expensive; may not sustain engagement in internal roles	Target post-consulting transition candidates who have moved into delivery or operational roles and want to apply their skills internally

D.4.2 Interview and Assessment Design

Architecture assessment is one of the hardest hiring challenges in technology. Unlike software engineering roles, where coding tests provide objective evidence of capability, architecture requires judgment, communication, systems thinking, and business acumen that cannot be assessed through traditional technical interviews. The CEA must design a multi-stage assessment process that tests the full architect profile.

Assessment Stage	Format	What It Assesses	Quality Standard
CV and portfolio review	Structured CV assessment against role profile; review of any architecture artifacts the candidate has produced	Evidence of relevant experience; quality of written communication; scope and scale of previous architecture work	Reject candidates whose CVs contain no evidence of business stakeholder engagement, regardless of technical credentials
Architecture case study (written)	A business scenario relevant to the organization's context; candidate produces a 2–4 page architecture	Structured thinking; ability to frame a technical problem in business terms; knowledge of relevant architecture patterns; written communication quality	A good response identifies the business problem before designing the technical solution; proposes alternatives and explains the trade-offs; is readable by a non-technical senior stakeholder

Assessment Stage	Format	What It Assesses	Quality Standard
	response within 48–72 hours		
Technical deep-dive interview (90 minutes)	Panel of 2 architects; structured questions on architecture domains relevant to the role; scenario-based questions on architectural decision-making; review and discussion of the written case study	Technical architecture depth; architectural judgment under pressure; ability to defend decisions; knowledge of TOGAF, ArchiMate, and relevant frameworks	Interviewers complete a structured scorecard against defined criteria immediately after the interview; no post-hoc consensus without scorecard evidence
Stakeholder engagement simulation (60 minutes)	Role-play exercise: candidate must explain an architectural decision or concern to a 'business stakeholder' played by a senior business leader or CEA	Communication clarity without jargon; empathy for business concerns; ability to listen and adapt; influencing without authority	This is often the most revealing assessment stage — technically excellent candidates who cannot communicate in business language will fail in enterprise architecture roles
Leadership and culture interview (60 minutes)	CEO or senior business leader interview; focus on career motivations, leadership philosophy, organizational navigation experience, and cultural fit	Leadership potential; organizational intelligence; alignment with the EA practice culture the CEA is building	Ask for specific examples, not hypothetical answers; probe for evidence of organizational courage — architects who have stood by an unpopular architectural position under pressure

D.4.3 Common Hiring Mistakes and How to Avoid Them

Mistake	Why It Happens	Consequence	Prevention
Hiring technical experts who cannot communicate	Technical skills are easily assessed; communication and business acumen are harder to test; technical depth impresses in interviews	Architects who produce technically excellent work that nobody reads or acts on; governance that engineers comply with technically but do not believe in	Make the stakeholder engagement simulation a mandatory, non-negotiable stage; require a written communication sample that is assessed by a non-architect
Hiring for domain knowledge over architecture capability	Domain expertise is easy to verify; architecture capability requires more sophisticated assessment; organizations under pressure want someone who already knows the domain	A domain expert who cannot architect — knows what exists but cannot design what should exist; cannot see across domain boundaries	Separate domain knowledge (teachable) from architecture capability (the hiring bar); hire for architecture capability and develop domain knowledge
Over-weighting TOGAF certification	Certification is easy to verify and provides a false sense of objective quality assurance	Certified architects who can recite the ADM but cannot apply it in complex organizational contexts; undervaluing experienced practitioners who have not pursued certification	Use certification as a hygiene factor (required for senior roles) not a differentiator; weight practical architecture experience and demonstrated judgment far more heavily
Neglecting cultural assessment	Culture is difficult to assess systematically; hiring managers focus on capability; urgency to fill roles reduces thoroughness	Architects who have the skills but do not fit the collaborative, business-focused culture the CEA is building — often very effective individually but damaging to team dynamics	Include cultural interview as a distinct stage; involve existing high-performing team members in the final stage; define cultural expectations explicitly in the job description
Not involving business	Architecture leaders are assessed by IT	Senior architects hired for their technical	Include at least one senior business stakeholder in

Mistake	Why It Happens	Consequence	Prevention
stakeholders in senior architecture hiring	leaders; business stakeholders are not seen as qualified to assess technical roles	credentials who fail to build business credibility — the stakeholder who will determine their effectiveness was not part of the decision	the final assessment stage for all Lead Architect and above roles

Section D.5

Architect Talent Development

Career frameworks, development programmes, mentoring, and succession planning for the architecture community

Developing architecture talent is one of the CEA's most important and most neglected responsibilities. Most organizations invest heavily in technology training but invest very little in developing the specific skills that make architects effective: systems thinking, business acumen, stakeholder communication, and organizational navigation. The CEA must build a deliberate, structured development program that develops these capabilities alongside technical depth.

D.5.1 The Architect Development Curriculum

An effective architect development curriculum addresses four capability clusters that the architecture role requires:

Capability Cluster	Development Approaches	Investment Level
Architecture Craft	TOGAF certification (Foundation and Practitioner); ArchiMate modeling training; architecture pattern libraries and case studies; structured architecture review shadowing program; formal mentoring by a senior architect	High — this is the core professional qualification investment
Business Acumen	Business strategy and operating model courses (e.g., Harvard Business School Online, INSEAD); business unit rotation (3–6 months embedded in a business domain); facilitation of business capability workshops; business case development training	Medium-High — often underfunded but critical for senior architect effectiveness
Communication and Influence	Executive communication training (written and verbal); presentation skills coaching; facilitation skills development; negotiation and influence training; regular presentation opportunities in the CoP and to senior stakeholders	Medium — often neglected; most impactful for career progression of technically strong architects who plateau at senior architect

Capability Cluster	Development Approaches	Investment Level
Domain Expertise	Domain-specific technology certifications (AWS, Azure, Salesforce, SAP); industry domain training (finance, healthcare, manufacturing as relevant); vendor solution architect programs; secondments to domain teams	Medium — varies by domain lead role requirements; solution architects prioritize depth in project-relevant technologies

D.5.2 Structured Development Programs

Graduate Architect Program

A two-year structured program for high-potential graduates or junior technologists developing into architecture roles:

Year	Focus	Activities	Outcome
Year 1	Architecture Foundations	TOGAF Foundation certification; rotation through two domain architecture teams (3 months each); architecture artifact production under supervision; monthly mentoring with a senior architect; CoP active participation	TOGAF certified; exposure to business and technology architecture domains; first independent architecture deliverable produced
Year 2	Applied Architecture	TOGAF Practitioner certification; lead architect for one small project under supervision; domain working group participation; stakeholder engagement development program; presentation at CoP showcase	TOGAF Practitioner certified; first independent SAD produced; recognized as a contributing member of the architecture community

Senior Architect Leadership Program

A 12–18 month program for Senior Architects (L3) preparing for domain lead or principal architect roles:

- Executive mentoring — paired with a C-suite executive (not the CIO/CTO) for quarterly conversations about business strategy and technology leadership

- Strategic project sponsorship — acts as the architecture sponsor for one strategic program, engaging with program board and executive sponsor
- External engagement — presents at one industry conference or publishes one external article on an architecture topic
- Team leadership experience — leads a CoP working group, demonstrating the ability to develop standards collaboratively across a diverse group
- Business case ownership — independently develops and presents one portfolio rationalization business case to the investment committee
- 360-degree assessment — formal assessment from peers, business stakeholders, delivery teams, and direct reports with structured development feedback

D.5.3 Mentoring and Coaching Architecture

Mentoring is one of the highest-return development investments the CEA can make. The most effective architecture learning happens in the context of real work — not in classrooms. A structured mentoring program pairs developing architects with experienced ones in a relationship focused on architectural judgment, organizational navigation, and career development.

Mentoring Tier	Pairing	Cadence	Focus
CEA to Principal / Domain Leads	CEA personally mentors all L4 architects and domain leads	Monthly 1:1, 60 minutes	Strategic thinking, executive stakeholder management, building architectural authority, career planning at senior level
Domain Leads to Senior Architects	Each domain lead mentors 1–2 Senior Architects (L3)	Bi-weekly 1:1, 45 minutes	Domain architecture depth, cross-domain awareness, stakeholder credibility, leadership skills development
Senior Architects to Mid-Level Architects	Senior Architects mentor developing architects (L2)	Monthly 1:1, 45 minutes	Architecture craft, first stakeholder engagements, producing quality deliverables, navigating governance processes
Community Peer Mentoring	Peer pairs within the CoP	Monthly, informal	Shared learning, emotional support, professional identity development

D.5.4 Succession Planning for the Architecture Function

The CEA must maintain a succession plan for all critical architecture roles — not just the CEA role itself. Architecture knowledge is highly concentrated; the departure of a domain lead or the CEA without a successor in place can set the architecture practice back by years.

- Identify the critical roles — the roles whose unexpected vacancy would most damage the architecture practice's effectiveness
- For each critical role, identify a primary successor (ready in 0–12 months) and a development successor (ready in 12–24 months)
- Design the development plan for each successor explicitly — what experiences, training, and exposure do they need?
- Test successors in stretch assignments before succession is required — not by appointment but by experience
- Review the succession plan annually and update it as team composition and individual development progress

Section D.6

Architecture Tools and Tooling Strategy in Depth

Tool evaluation methodology, implementation planning, governance, and the true total cost of EA tooling

Architecture tooling decisions have significant long-term consequences — an EA repository tool implemented without adequate planning becomes a data management burden that consumes architecture team capacity without delivering corresponding value. The CEA must approach tooling with the same rigor applied to any major technology investment.

D.6.1 Tool Evaluation Framework

Before selecting any EA tool, the CEA should apply a structured evaluation framework that assesses the tool against the organization's specific requirements — not against vendor marketing claims or analyst quadrant positions.

Evaluation Dimension	Assessment Criteria	Weight
Functional Fit	Does the tool support the specific architecture practice activities the organization needs? Repository, portfolio management, modeling, governance workflow, reporting — assess each against requirements.	High
Adoption Likelihood	How easy is the tool to use for the architects who will populate it? Complex tools with high data entry burden will not be adopted regardless of their functional richness. Pilot with real users before selection.	Critical — this is the most commonly underweighted factor
Integration Capability	Does the tool integrate with the organization's existing systems? CMDB, ITSM (ServiceNow), project management (Jira), financial systems, cloud platforms. Integration reduces manual data entry and improves data quality.	High
Vendor Viability	Is the vendor financially stable? Do they have a credible development roadmap? How large is their customer base in the organization's industry? What is the risk of acquisition or product discontinuation?	Medium
Total Cost of Ownership	What is the full cost over 3–5 years? License costs are often only 30–40% of TCO — implementation, training, data migration, ongoing support, and administration add significantly.	High

Evaluation Dimension	Assessment Criteria	Weight
Data Model Flexibility	Can the tool's metamodel be configured to reflect the organization's specific architecture vocabulary and relationships? Rigid tools force organizations to adapt their architecture practice to the tool rather than the reverse.	Medium-High
Reporting and Visualization	Does the tool produce the reports and dashboards that executive stakeholders will consume? A repository that cannot produce a one-page portfolio heat map for the CFO is not serving its communication function.	High
Security and Compliance	Does the tool meet the organization's data security requirements? Where is data hosted? Does it support SSO, role-based access control, and audit logging?	High for regulated industries

D.6.2 Tool Implementation Planning

Tool selection is the beginning of the investment, not the end. Successful EA tool implementation requires a structured program that is often as complex as implementing any other enterprise software:

Implementation Phase	Activities	Duration	Success Criteria
Discovery and Design	Define the metamodel (entity types, attributes, relationships); map to existing architecture vocabulary; design the data governance model (owners, update cadence, quality standards); design the access control model; define the reporting requirements	4–8 weeks	Approved metamodel design; data governance policy drafted; reporting requirements documented
Configuration and Setup	Configure the tool to the approved metamodel; set up access control groups; configure integrations with CMDB, ITSM, and other systems; build initial report templates and dashboards	4–8 weeks	Tool configured and accessible; integrations tested; core report templates available
Initial Data Population	Import existing architecture data (application portfolio, infrastructure inventory, capability maps if available);	6–12 weeks	Core data imported and validated; data quality baseline established; at

Implementa tion Phase	Activities	Duration	Success Criteria
	data cleansing and normalization; validation against source systems		least 70% of known applications registered
Pilot and Iteration	Pilot with a small group of 5–10 architects; gather feedback on usability, missing features, and data quality; iterate on configuration and process based on feedback	4–6 weeks	Pilot group Net Promoter Score above zero; critical usability issues resolved; data quality improving
Rollout and Adoption	Phased rollout to full architecture community; training program for all users; adoption tracking; regular support sessions; recognition for high- quality contributions to the repository	8–12 weeks	80%+ of architects with active accounts; monthly active user rate above 60%; data quality score above 70%
Sustaining and Improving	Quarterly data quality audits; regular training for new joiners; annual metamodel review; continuous improvement based on usage analytics and user feedback	Ongoing	Data quality score maintained above 80%; monthly active user rate above 70%; repository cited in investment committee discussions

D.6.3 The True Total Cost of EA Tooling

EA tool investment is consistently underestimated because only license costs are budgeted. The CEA must ensure that the full Total Cost of Ownership is included in the business case:

Cost Category	Typical Proportion of 3-Year TCO	Cost Drivers
Software Licenses	25–40%	User-based or data-volume-based pricing; enterprise tier features; support and maintenance contracts
Implementation	20–30%	Configuration effort (internal architect time or system integrator fees); data migration; integration development
Training	5–10%	Initial training for all users; ongoing training for new joiners; advanced training for administrators and power users
Administration and Support	15–20%	Ongoing tool administration (metamodel maintenance, user management, integration)

Cost Category	Typical Proportion of 3-Year TCO	Cost Drivers
		monitoring); vendor support costs; internal helpdesk time
Data Quality Management	10–15%	Regular data audits; data cleansing; owner engagement to maintain currency; automated quality monitoring
Lost Productivity	5–10%	Time architects spend on data entry that could be spent on architecture work; this is the hidden cost that is rarely quantified but is often the most significant

Tool Adoption is the ROI Driver

A £200,000 EA repository tool with 90% adoption and high-quality data delivers more value than a £500,000 tool with 30% adoption and poor data quality. The CEA must invest in adoption — training, user experience optimization, data entry minimization through integration, and community recognition for quality contributions — at least as heavily as in the tool itself. Budget for adoption investment explicitly; it is not optional.

Section D.7

Architecture Practice Rituals in Depth

Detailed operating guides for each practice ritual — facilitation, preparation, quality standards, and failure modes

Practice rituals are the heartbeat of the architecture function. Executed well, they create the rhythm, relationships, and shared knowledge that make the practice greater than the sum of its parts. Executed poorly, they consume time without creating value and breed cynicism about the architecture function. The CEA must invest in making each ritual excellent — not just present.

D.7.1 Architecture Review Board — Operating Excellence

Pre-Meeting Preparation (CEA and EA Practice Manager)

- Agenda published at least 3 business days before the meeting — includes submission summaries, pre-reading links, and decision questions for each agenda item
- Domain architect preliminary assessments circulated 2 business days before — ARB members arrive with a view, not a blank slate
- Submitters confirmed and briefed on what to prepare — a 10-minute presentation maximum; decision question clear; alternatives documented
- Any potential conflicts of interest identified and managed — ARB members with a material interest in a decision should declare it and may need to recuse

Meeting Facilitation (CEA)

- Start each item by stating the decision required — not the background — this keeps the meeting focused on decisions rather than discussions
- Time-box each item explicitly: 10 minutes for presentation, 15 minutes for questions, 5 minutes for deliberation and decision — 30 minutes maximum per item for standard reviews
- Separate information-sharing from decision-making — some agenda items may be updates that require no decision; these should be labeled as such and kept to 5 minutes
- Make the decision in the room — deferring decisions to email or the next meeting is a failure mode that creates uncertainty and delays delivery

- Capture the decision rationale, not just the outcome — 'Approved because it is consistent with the cloud-first principle and the integration pattern aligns to the enterprise API standard' is more valuable than 'Approved'

Post-Meeting Actions (EA Practice Manager)

- Decision register updated within 24 hours of the meeting — the record is permanent and searchable
- Decision communication published to the architecture community within 48 hours — transparency builds trust
- Action items assigned and tracked — no ARB item closes until all action items are resolved
- Submitters notified of the outcome within 24 hours with the written decision rationale

ARB Failure Modes and Remedies

Failure Mode	Symptoms	Remedy
Discussion without decision	Items are discussed at length but decisions are deferred; the same items appear on multiple consecutive agendas	CEA must state the decision required at the start of every item and call a decision at the end of the allotted time, even if the decision is 'we need more information — specifically X'
Rubber-stamping	Every submission is approved; compliance assessments are not read carefully; members do not challenge submissions	CEA introduces structured devil's advocate role; invites domain architects to actively identify risks in submissions; tracks the rate of unconditional approvals and investigates spikes
Bottleneck	Submission queue grows; time-to-decision exceeds 15 business days; submitters bypass the process to avoid delay	Review the ARB decision threshold — is too much going to the ARB? Delegate more to domain ARBs; introduce a fast-track process for lower-risk submissions
Attendance erosion	Key members send delegates or do not attend; quorum is regularly at risk; decisions are made without the right expertise in the room	CEA has direct conversations with non-attending members about the importance of their participation; adjusts meeting time if scheduling is the issue; considers whether membership needs to change
Governance bypass	Projects proceed without ARB review; bypass is only discovered at post-implementation audit	CEA introduces a project portfolio scan — review all active projects monthly to identify any that should have had ARB review; make

Failure Mode	Symptoms	Remedy
		bypass a governance incident with consequences

D.7.2 EA Leadership Team Meeting — Operating Excellence

Purpose and Non-Negotiables

The weekly EA Leadership Team meeting is the operational heart of the central EA function. Its purpose is cross-team coordination, issue resolution, and strategic alignment — not status reporting. If the meeting is primarily used for status updates, it should be replaced with a written status report and the saved time used for more valuable activity.

Agenda Section	Duration	Content Standard
Hot Issues (standing first item)	10 minutes	Any issues requiring immediate cross-team attention or CEA decision; identified by team members before the meeting via a shared hot issues log
Stakeholder Intelligence	10 minutes	What are team members hearing from stakeholders? Any emerging concerns, political developments, or opportunities the team should be aware of?
Cross-Domain Coordination	15 minutes	Architecture decisions made this week that have cross-domain implications; conflicts identified between domain architecture directions; shared concerns about in-flight projects
Upcoming Commitments	10 minutes	Key ARB submissions, domain reviews, stakeholder meetings, and delivery deadlines in the next two weeks; resource conflicts or support needs
CEA Communication	5 minutes	Strategic context from the CEA: what is happening at executive level that the team should know; priorities for the coming week

D.7.3 Architecture Community of Practice — Operating Excellence

Monthly All-Community Meeting Structure

Section	Duration	Content Standard	Facilitation Notes
Opening and News (CEA)	5 minutes	Key architecture decisions taken since last meeting; significant standards updates; important ARB	CEA opens personally — community expects to hear

Section	Duration	Content Standard	Facilitation Notes
		outcomes; upcoming community events	from the practice leader, not a deputy, at the opening
Featured Decision or Standard	15 minutes	A significant architecture decision or new standard presented by the architect who made it; includes context, alternatives considered, and key takeaways for the community	Rotate presenters across the community; avoid central EA team monopolizing this slot; coach presenters to focus on the decision rationale, not the technical details
Community Contribution	15 minutes	A working group update, a lesson learned from a project, a pattern the community has found valuable, or a technology assessment; presented by a community member	This slot signals that the CoP is a community, not a broadcast channel. Guard it carefully — cancel if a good community contribution is not available rather than filling it with central EA team content
External Perspective	10 minutes	A brief on an industry development, technology trend, or research finding relevant to the community's work; can be a CEA share or an invited guest	Keep it brief and relevant; connect it explicitly to the organization's architectural context
Open Forum and Q&A	10 minutes	Open questions to the CEA and domain leads; community members can raise architecture questions, governance clarifications, or technology queries	CEA must model openness to challenge; questions should be answered honestly including 'I don't know — let me find out and post the answer to the community'
Upcoming Events and Close	5 minutes	Next ARB, domain reviews, CoP events, external conferences; any actions from today's meeting	End on time — community members who have back-to-back meetings will not attend if the CoP routinely overruns

D.7.4 Architecture Roadmap Review — Operating Excellence

The quarterly Architecture Roadmap Review is the CEA's primary mechanism for maintaining alignment between the architecture direction and the organization's evolving business priorities and delivery portfolio. It is a working session, not a presentation — the outcome is a mutually agreed set of adjustments to the roadmap, not applause for the CEA's slides.

-
- Pre-work: Domain leads prepare a one-page domain update for each of their roadmap streams — progress since last review, issues, dependencies, and proposed changes — circulated at least 3 days before the meeting
 - Opening: CEA provides a 10-minute business context update — what has changed in business strategy, market conditions, or regulatory environment since the last review that may require roadmap adjustment
 - Domain updates: each domain lead presents their domain update in 5 minutes; the group identifies cross-domain conflicts and dependencies in real time
 - Decision agenda: proposed roadmap changes (sequencing adjustments, new work packages, scope changes) are reviewed and decided
 - Portfolio alignment: the updated roadmap is cross-referenced against the delivery portfolio — are the resources available to execute what the roadmap requires?
 - Actions and communication: agreed changes are captured; the updated roadmap is published within 5 business days; program and portfolio management are briefed on significant changes

Section D.8

Building and Sustaining Architecture Culture

The long-term leadership work that makes the architecture practice durable, influential, and self-renewing

Architecture governance without architecture culture is brittle. A practice that relies entirely on formal governance mechanisms — ARBs, Architecture Contracts, compliance assessments — is one leadership change, one budget cut, or one hostile CIO away from collapse. A practice that has built genuine architecture culture — where good architectural thinking is part of how the organization thinks about technology — is durable across leadership changes, budget cycles, and organizational restructurings.

Building architecture culture is the CEA's longest horizon responsibility. It takes years and requires sustained, deliberate investment in the attitudes, values, and shared vocabulary that make architecture a genuine organizational discipline rather than a compliance function.

D.8.1 What Architecture Culture Looks Like

An organization with a mature architecture culture exhibits the following observable behaviors:

Behavior	Observable Evidence	Culture Signal
Architects engage business stakeholders proactively	Business leaders initiate conversations with architects; architects are invited to strategic planning sessions by business leaders, not just IT	Architecture is seen as a business function, not an IT function
Delivery teams engage architecture early	Projects include architects in project initiation, not just at governance gates; engineers ask architecture questions before making significant technical decisions	Architecture is seen as a useful resource, not a gate
Technical decisions reference architecture standards	Engineers in code reviews reference the Technology Radar; project teams ask whether their approach is consistent with enterprise patterns before asking for a waiver	Architecture standards are internalized, not just complied with

Behavior	Observable Evidence	Culture Signal
Architecture decisions are discussed openly	The CoP discussion forum has active threads; architects challenge each other's decisions constructively in community forums	Architecture is a professional discipline with genuine peer accountability
Bad architecture is surfaced early	Engineers and delivery leads raise architectural concerns before they become expensive problems; they trust the architecture function to respond constructively	Psychological safety in the architecture community is high
Business leaders use architecture language	Business case documents reference business capabilities; investment committee discussions reference the Architecture Roadmap; executive presentations include architectural context	Architecture thinking has penetrated business decision-making

D.8.2 Culture Building Levers

Recognition and Celebration

Culture is shaped by what gets celebrated. The CEA must invest in recognizing and celebrating good architecture work — not just governance compliance, but genuine architectural excellence, business value creation, and community contribution.

- Architecture Excellence Awards — annual recognition at the Architecture Summit for outstanding architecture work across categories: Best Solution Architecture, Best Domain Architecture, Best Community Contribution, Most Impactful ADR
- CEA Recognition Letters — personal notes from the CEA to architects who have done excellent work; shared (with permission) in the community newsletter
- CoP Showcase — regular forum where project teams present architecture they are proud of; creates positive peer recognition and surfaces reusable patterns
- Executive Communication — when architecture-driven decisions deliver business value, the CEA ensures that the architects involved are mentioned by name in executive communications

Storytelling as a Culture Tool

Architecture culture is built through stories — specific narratives about times when good architecture made a real difference, and times when poor architecture created expensive problems. The CEA must be a deliberate storyteller:

- The architecture success story — 'The API gateway we standardized on last year enabled us to launch the new mobile app in three months instead of twelve. Here is how that happened and who made the architecture decisions that enabled it.'
- The architecture debt story — 'The reason the customer portal migration is taking 18 months and costing £4M more than planned is that five years ago a project chose a non-standard integration approach without going through architecture review. Here is what it has cost us and what we are doing to prevent it happening again.'
- The architecture foresight story — 'Two years ago our Technology Radar moved a particular vendor to Hold status. Three months ago that vendor was acquired and their product was discontinued. Because we had already moved our critical workloads off their platform, we had no emergency migration to execute.'

Architecture as a Career Destination

Architecture culture is sustained when the best people in the organization want to be architects. The CEA must make the architecture career compelling:

- Visible impact — architects must be able to see that their work changes real decisions; if architecture is perceived as producing documents that nobody acts on, talented people will not choose it as a career
- Intellectual challenge — the architecture community must be a place where hard problems are explored seriously; if standards discussions are superficial and governance decisions are formulaic, curious people will not find it engaging
- Career progression — the architect career framework must be credible; architects must be able to see a path from their current role to the most senior architecture positions in the organization
- External reputation — the organization's architecture community must be connected to the external world — conferences, publications, industry bodies; architects who feel part of a global discipline have stronger professional identity and are more likely to stay

D.8.3 Change Leadership for the EA Practice Transformation

Building or transforming an architecture practice is a change management challenge as much as a technical or organizational design challenge. The CEA must approach it with the same discipline applied to any major organizational transformation.

Change Dimension	CEA Leadership Action
Creating urgency	Make the cost of the current state visible — the financial cost of technical debt, the delivery delays caused by architectural fragmentation, the regulatory risk from ungoverned data decisions. Without urgency, the status quo is comfortable enough.
Building the guiding coalition	Identify the 5–8 key stakeholders whose active support is essential for the architecture practice to succeed — the CIO, a respected business unit leader, a senior delivery executive, the CISO. Invest in their understanding and commitment before announcing changes.
Developing and communicating the vision	The Architecture Vision is not just a technical document — it is a change communication. It must answer 'why change?' as compellingly as 'what are we changing to?'
Enabling action by removing obstacles	The most common obstacle to architecture engagement is time — architects are pulled into delivery work rather than architecture work; delivery teams are too busy to participate in governance. The CEA must actively protect architecture time and simplify governance processes to reduce the burden of participation.
Generating short-term wins	Architecture practices that do not demonstrate value within 6 months of establishment are vulnerable. The CEA must identify and deliver quick wins — specific, visible, business-relevant outcomes — that prove the practice's value before the investment case is questioned.
Consolidating gains and producing more change	As early wins build credibility, use it to accelerate — expand domain architect coverage, strengthen governance, deepen the Community of Practice, and raise the ambition of the Architecture Vision.
Anchoring changes in culture	The final phase is making architecture the 'way we do things here' — embedding it in hiring criteria, performance management, project governance, and the organizational stories that define what the organization values. This takes years and is the CEA's longest horizon responsibility.

The CEA as Role Model

The most powerful culture-building tool available to the CEA is personal behavior. How the CEA conducts themselves in architecture discussions — whether they listen as well as direct, whether they acknowledge when they are wrong, whether they engage with business problems as well as technology problems, whether they treat governance as a service or a power — sets the tone for the entire architecture community. Architects learn what architecture is by watching the CEA practice it. The CEA who wants an architecture culture characterized by intellectual humility, business focus, and collaborative problem-solving must demonstrate those qualities personally and consistently.

Addendum D Summary: The CEA's Practice Leadership Checklist

The following checklist gives the CEA a structured self-assessment tool for evaluating the completeness and quality of the architecture practice leadership activities covered in this addendum.

Topic	Foundation Indicators	Developing Indicators	Mature Indicators
Capability Establishment	90-day listening plan executed; executive mandate documented; first ARB convened; Architecture Principles ratified	Quick wins delivered and communicated; stakeholder perception improving; team assessment complete; team plan in place	Architecture function recognized as a strategic asset; CEA participates in C-suite strategy discussions; architecture influence on investment decisions measurable
Maturity Assessment	Current maturity level honestly assessed with evidence; target maturity level and timeline defined	Maturity progression plan in place; transition actions tracked; maturity assessment refreshed annually	Maturity level externally benchmarked; evidence-based reporting to board on maturity progression; Level 4 achieved
Team Building	Team assessment complete; critical gaps identified; hiring plan funded and active	All critical roles filled; onboarding program operating; development plans for all architects	Succession plan in place for all critical roles; architect talent pipeline producing; retention rate above 85%
Hiring Practice	Job profiles published; multi-stage interview process defined; sourcing strategy active	Assessment consistency across hiring panels; candidate pipeline diverse; quality of hire tracked	Architecture hiring recognized as a competitive advantage; graduate program established; architecture employer brand strong
Talent Development	TOGAF certification funded for all senior architects; mentoring pairs established; CoP development content available	Graduate architect program running; senior architect leadership program in development; individual development plans for all architects	Internal promotion rate for architecture roles above 60%; external recognition of architecture talent (conferences, publications);

Topic	Foundation Indicators	Developing Indicators	Mature Indicators
			succession depth at all levels
Tooling	Core tooling selected and implemented; adoption above 60%; data quality baseline established	Integration with CMDB and ITSM operational; adoption above 75%; quarterly quality audits running	Adoption above 85%; repository cited in investment committee; tool value ROI measured and reported
Practice Rituals	ARB, EA team meeting, and CoP monthly meeting established and regular	All seven core rituals operating; facilitation quality consistently good; attendance targets met	Rituals self-sustaining; community-led content dominates CoP; ritual quality measured by participant feedback
Architecture Culture	CEA role-modelling the desired culture; recognition program established; architecture storytelling active	Architecture language visible in business discussions; CoP community-generated content increasing; architecture cited in performance reviews	Architecture embedded in hiring criteria and performance management; external reputation established; architecture a recognized career destination

References for This Addendum

- [1] The Open Group. TOGAF Standard, Version 9.2. The Open Group, 2018. opengroup.org/togaf — Primary reference for TOGAF Architecture Capability Framework, Preliminary Phase, and architecture governance.
- [2] The Open Group. TOGAF Series Guide: Architecture Capability Framework. The Open Group, 2020 — Detailed guidance on establishing and maturing the EA architecture capability, including the maturity model.
- [3] IASA Global. IT Architecture Competency Framework (ITACF). iasaglobal.org — The most comprehensive architect competency and career framework; primary reference for architect hiring, development, and career progression.
- [4] Gartner. EA Maturity Assessment. Gartner Research — Gartner's EA maturity model; available to Gartner subscribers. The five-level model referenced in Section 6.2 of the main guide and Section D.2 of this addendum.
- [5] Kotter, J.P. Leading Change. Harvard Business School Press, 1996 — The eight-step change model referenced in Section D.8.3; the most widely applied change management framework for organizational transformation.
- [6] Kotter, J.P. & Cohen, D.S. The Heart of Change. Harvard Business School Press, 2002 — Companion to Leading Change; focuses on the human and emotional dimensions of transformation that the CEA must navigate in building the architecture practice.
- [7] Hohpe, G. The Software Architect Elevator. O'Reilly, 2020 — Essential reading on how the CEA operates across organizational levels; directly relevant to Sections D.1 and D.8.
- [8] Schein, E.H. Organizational Culture and Leadership, 5th ed. Jossey-Bass, 2016 — The foundational academic reference for organizational culture change; relevant to Section D.8 on building architecture culture.
- [9] Wenger, E., McDermott, R. & Snyder, W.M. Cultivating Communities of Practice. Harvard Business School Press, 2002 — Primary reference for Community of Practice design and sustainability; relevant to Sections D.7.3 and D.8.
- [10] Smart, B. & Street, D. Topgrading: The Proven Hiring and Promoting Method That Turbocharges Company Performance. Portfolio, 2012 — Practical reference for the structured hiring methodology described in Section D.4.
- [11] Lencioni, P. The Ideal Team Player. Jossey-Bass, 2016 — Framework for assessing cultural fit in architect hiring; identifies humble, hungry, and smart as the three essential virtues of an effective team member.
- [12] Watkins, M. The First 90 Days: Proven Strategies for Getting Up to Speed Faster and Smarter. Harvard Business Review Press, 2013 — The primary reference for the 90-day onboarding approach described in Section D.1.1.
- [13] Forsgren, N., Humble, J. & Kim, G. Accelerate: The Science of Lean Software and DevOps. IT Revolution Press, 2018 — Primary reference for the delivery performance metrics used in EA value measurement and architect development curriculum.

[14] 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 underlying the EA mandate-building approach in Section D.1.2.

[15] Ashkenas, R. & Manville, B. Harvard Business Review Leader's Handbook. Harvard Business Review Press, 2018 — Practical leadership reference for the CEA; particularly relevant to stakeholder management (Section D.1.3) and culture building (Section D.8).

End of Addendum D — Building and Leading the Architecture Practice

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