AMBIT

EA Practice Starter Pack

v2.0

A complete methodology playbook for bootstrapping, establishing, and maturing an Enterprise Architecture practice in a medium-size enterprise.

Six Waves · Six Ambits · End-to-End

Based on AMBIT Framework v3.0 · Kotusev empirical EA research

What is new in v2.0

This version incorporates a detailed reading of the EA Practice on a Page diagram (Kotusev, v2.2). Seven structural improvements have been made: (1) the External Business Environment is formalised as the explicit trigger for Strategic Alignment; (2) the two named output flows from Strategic Planning are distinguished; (3) Planned vs. Urgent Business Needs are treated as separate initiative triggers; (4) Cancelled Projects are documented as a first-class process output; (5) the Updates and Learned Best Practices feedback loop from project delivery into Technology Alignment is formalised; (6) Technical Rationalisation Suggestions are introduced as an input to Initiative Alignment Initiation (not just Design); (7) Related Documents and Relevant Techniques are documented for each process. None of these additions are extrapolations — every one is directly visible in the source diagram.

— HOW TO USE THIS STARTER PACK

How to Use This Starter Pack

This Starter Pack is a practitioner's playbook. It does not repeat the AMBIT framework — it operationalises it. Every Wave is a self-contained unit of organisational work that, when complete, leaves a permanent, institutionalised capability behind. Waves are sequenced so that each builds on the one before.

The pack is designed for a medium-size enterprise with a two-tier architecture function (Enterprise Architects + Solution Architects) and two governance committees (Business Architecture Committee and IT Architecture Committee).

Read the whole document before starting. Then execute one Wave at a time. Do not begin a Wave until all Done-When criteria of the previous Wave are met.

Document Structure

Part I — Before You Start	Preconditions, the founding team, the problem-first mandate, and how to calibrate the starting Wave.
Part II — Six Waves	The step-by-step playbook. Each Wave targets one AMBIT Ambit and has: Situation, Objective, Preconditions, Steps, Artefacts, Governance, and Done-When criteria.
Part III — Sustaining Maturity	After all six Waves: how to measure health, run continuous improvement, and recognise a genuinely mature practice.
Appendix A — Artefact Templates	Minimal viable template outlines for each of the six AMBIT artefact types.
Appendix B — Wave Planner	A one-page planning grid for Wave scoping and scheduling.
Appendix C — Glossary	Key AMBIT terms used throughout this playbook.
Appendix D — Process Reference	NEW IN v2.0: The three EA processes with their input triggers, output flows, Related Documents, and Relevant Techniques as shown in the EA Practice on a Page diagram.

MECE Design Principle

The six Waves are Mutually Exclusive and Collectively Exhaustive. No single AMBIT element appears in more than one Wave. Together the six Waves establish every element of a full AMBIT practice: three processes, governance structures, artefact types, meeting patterns, conceptual models, and maturity management.

PART I Before You Start

— BEFORE YOU START

Before You Start

No Wave will succeed without the foundational conditions described in this Part. These are not procedural steps — they are preconditions for the entire enterprise. Skipping them produces the most common failure mode: an EA practice that exists on paper but has no mandate, no trust, and no organisational traction.

I.1 The Four Preconditions

Precondition 1 — Executive Mandate

A senior executive — the CIO, a Chief Digital Officer, or the CEO — must explicitly commission the EA practice and be willing to require others to engage with it. Without this mandate, governance committees cannot be formed, architects cannot be appointed, and business stakeholders cannot be required to participate.

The mandate must be communicated in writing, must name a responsible EA Leader, and must commit the organisation to allocating the first cohort of architect roles.

Precondition 2 — An Identified Burning Problem

The EA practice must be started in response to a specific, senior-executive-acknowledged business problem related to IT. The problem determines which Wave to start from.

IT initiatives deliver late, over-budget, or with poor business value	Start from Wave 1 (Initiative Alignment first). This is the most common starting point.
IT landscape too complex, costly, or fragile; legacy out of control	Start from Wave 1 but accelerate to Wave 2 (Technology Alignment) within 6 months.
IT investments not aligned to business strategy	Start from Wave 1 and plan Wave 5 early, which introduces Strategic Alignment capability.
Multiple problems simultaneously	Start from Wave 1 regardless. All three processes converge there. Address acutest pain first.

Precondition 3 — An Experienced EA Leader

An experienced architect — someone who has personally operated in an EA practice, not merely studied one — must be appointed as EA Leader. They must have the executive mandate to act, the time to lead, and the credibility to engage business leaders. Do not outsource this role to a consultancy.

Precondition 4 — A Minimal Architecture Team

At minimum: one EA Leader (serving as senior Enterprise Architect), one or two additional Enterprise Architects, and two to four Solution Architects embedded in the project portfolio.

I.2 The Founding Team and Roles

EA Leader	Commissions and owns the AMBIT practice. Chairs the IT Architecture Committee. Primary relationship holder with the CIO and business executives. Accountable for all Wave outcomes.
Enterprise Architect(s)	Drive Strategic Alignment and Technology Alignment processes. Own organisation-wide artefacts (Factors, Visions, Standards, Landscapes). Participate in the Business Architecture Committee.

Solution Architect(s)	Drive Initiative Alignment on individual projects. Own initiative-level artefacts (Outlines, Designs). Participate in the IT Architecture Committee.
CIO (Sponsor)	Holds the executive mandate. Chairs or co-chairs the Business Architecture Committee. Commits budget and political capital to the practice.
Business Arch. Sponsor	A senior business executive who participates in Strategic Alignment discussions. Not an architect — a willing business partner who opens doors to other senior business leaders.

I.3 The AMBIT Practice on One Page

Before Wave 1, the EA Leader should brief all Founding Team members using the following summary of what the practice will look like when all six Waves are complete.

AMBIT-1 Artefacts	AMBIT-2 Models	AMBIT-3 Processes	AMBIT-4 Meetings	AMBIT-5 Mechanics	AMBIT-6 Maturity
Factors Visions Outlines Designs Standards Landscapes	Operating Model Capability Model Alignment Spiral Initiative Types Art. Debt D-E-A Pattern	Strategic Alignment Initiative Alignment Technology Alignment + 6 info flows	Strategy Investment Technology Design + D-E-A rhythm	Languages Templates Tools Straw-man Measurement Debt log	Stage 1→2→3 Wave reviews Maturity signals KPIs Practice charter

PART II Six Waves — The Step-by-Step Playbook

— SIX WAVES: OVERVIEW

Six Waves: Overview

Each Wave is a discrete package of organisational work. Waves are executed sequentially. The output of each Wave is a permanent, institutionalised capability — not a document set, not a pilot — a permanently changed way of working.

Wave	AMBIT	What Is Established	Duration	EA Stage Unlocked
W1	AMBIT-3: Processes & Governance	Initiative Alignment process + two governance committees	3–6 months	Stage 1: Solution Architecture
W2	AMBIT-5: Mechanics & Artefacts	Artefact templates, tools, straw-man, training	2–3 months	(Deepens Stage 1)
W3	AMBIT-1: Alignment Matrix	All six artefact types in active use; Technology Alignment launched	4–6 months	Stage 2: Technology Architecture
W4	AMBIT-4: Alignment Meetings	Full D-E-A meeting rhythm; four governance types formalised	2–3 months	(Deepens Stage 2)
W5	AMBIT-2: Alignment Models	Conceptual models active; Strategic Alignment launched	4–6 months	Stage 3: Full EA
W6	AMBIT-6: Alignment Maturity	Formal maturity review cycle; practice self-sustaining	Ongoing	(Sustaining Stage 3)

— WAVE 1: PROCESSES & GOVERNANCE

Wave 1: Processes & Governance

Establish the Initiative Alignment process and the two governance committees.

Situation

The organisation has no consistent method for engaging architects in IT initiatives. Projects receive architectural input ad hoc, too late, or not at all. There are no governance bodies that formally review architectural decisions. Business stakeholders do not understand what architects do or when to involve them.

Objective

By the end of this Wave, the Initiative Alignment process is fully operational: every active IT initiative engages an architect at the Initiation step, produces a Business Outline before proceeding to Realisation, and has its Design reviewed before deployment. Two governance committees are established and meeting regularly.

Preconditions

- All four Part I preconditions are satisfied.
- At minimum, the EA Leader and two Solution Architects are in post.
- The CIO has nominated a list of all active IT initiatives.
- A target project portfolio review date has been agreed with the CIO.

Steps

Step 1 — Map the current initiative portfolio

Obtain the full list of active IT initiatives from the CIO and PMO. For each initiative, record: sponsor, business need, current phase, estimated cost, and delivery date. Identify which initiatives are in Initiation vs. Realisation. This inventory is the first working instance of an IT Landscape (portfolio view) and the first artefact of the practice.

Step 2 — Design the Initiative Alignment process

Define the two-step process: Initiation (Concept → Decision) and Realisation (Design → Delivery). Map it to the existing project lifecycle: identify the two mandatory control gates — the Investment Gate (end of Initiation) and the Design Gate (end of Design sub-step). Document as a one-page flow diagram and brief process definition. Circulate to the CIO and PMO lead for review.

> **v2.0 — Two initiative trigger types (source: EA Practice on a Page)**
> The diagram makes explicit that Initiative Alignment receives two structurally distinct types of business needs: (1) Planned Business Needs — initiatives that arise from the Strategic Planning process and appear on the approved project portfolio; and (2) Urgent Business Needs — initiatives that arrive directly from the External Business Environment, bypassing the Strategic Planning cycle entirely (e.g. a regulatory mandate, a market emergency, or a board directive). Your process definition must accommodate both. Urgent Business Needs enter at the same Initiation step but do not require prior Strategic Planning approval — they substitute it with a faster-track Investment Gate review by the Business Architecture Committee. Document both trigger types in the process definition from the outset. Do not treat all initiatives as if they are Planned.

Step 3 — Establish the IT Architecture Committee

Chair: EA Leader. Members: all Enterprise Architects, Solution Architects, CIO, PMO Lead, selected domain SMEs. Meeting cadence: monthly for Technology Governance; per-initiative for Project Governance. Draft a one-page Committee Charter: purpose, membership, quorum, decision types, escalation path. Obtain CIO signature.

Step 4 — Establish the Business Architecture Committee

Chair: CIO (or delegated EA Leader as secretary). Members: CIO, two to three senior business executives, EA Leader, one senior Enterprise Architect. Meeting cadence: monthly for Investment Governance; quarterly for Strategic Governance. Draft a one-page Committee Charter. Obtain CIO and business sponsor signatures.

Step 5 — Apply the process to the first three initiatives

Select the three most strategically significant active initiatives. For initiatives in Initiation: assign a Solution Architect; produce or retrofit a Business Outline; present to BAC for Investment Gate approval. For initiatives already in Realisation: assign a Solution Architect; retrospectively check for a Business Outline; review the IT Design at the ITAC.

> **v2.0 — Cancelled Projects as a first-class outcome (source: EA Practice on a Page)**
> The diagram shows "Cancelled IT Projects" as an explicit output of the Initiative Alignment Initiation step — not a failure, but an expected and documented outcome of a functioning Investment Gate. From Wave 1, your process definition must treat cancellation as a first-class outcome: it has its own record in the decision log, the Business Outline is archived (not deleted), and the cancellation rationale is documented. A practice that cancels a project on good architectural grounds and records it clearly is demonstrating value, not failure. Normalise this outcome from the start.

Step 6 — Mandate and communicate the new process

The CIO issues a formal directive: all new IT initiatives above a defined cost threshold must follow the AMBIT Initiative Alignment process, including the Investment Gate and Design Gate. The EA Leader presents to all project managers and business sponsors in a 45-minute briefing. Post the process definition and committee charters on the intranet.

Artefacts Established

Artefact	Purpose	Owner	Cadence
Portfolio Inventory	First-pass list of all active initiatives with status, sponsor, cost, and phase	EA Leader	Updated monthly
Process Definition	Initiative Alignment process flow with two steps, two gates, two trigger types, and actor roles	EA Leader	Reviewed annually
Committee Charters	One-page charter per committee: purpose, membership, cadence, decision scope	EA Leader	Reviewed annually
Business Outlines	One Outline per initiative at Initiation step. Archived on approval or cancellation.	Solution Architect	Created at Initiation; updated at Investment Gate
IT Designs	One Design per project at Design sub-step. Technical blueprint, requirements, compliance.	Solution Architect	Created in Design sub-step; approved at Design Gate

Governance Actions

ITAC — first meeting	Adopt Charter; review Portfolio Inventory; review first IT Design (if available).
BAC — first meeting	Adopt Charter; review first Business Outline; confirm Investment Gate for first initiative.
Escalation path	Architect/sponsor disagreement escalates from ITAC to BAC. CIO resolves.

Wave 1 Done-When Criteria

- The Initiative Alignment process is documented, mandated in writing by the CIO, and applied to at least three active initiatives.
- Both trigger types (Planned and Urgent Business Needs) are documented in the process definition.
- Cancelled projects are recorded in the Decision Log with archived Business Outlines.
- The ITAC and BAC have each held at least two regular meetings with quorum.
- At least three Business Outlines and two IT Designs have been produced, reviewed, and formally approved.
- Every founding team member can describe the Initiative Alignment process accurately without notes.

— WAVE 2: MECHANICS & ARTEFACTS

Wave 2: Mechanics & Artefacts

Establish the working tools, templates, language, and habits of the practice.

Situation

The Initiative Alignment process is running but producing inconsistent outputs. Business Outlines and IT Designs vary in quality between architects. There are no standard templates, no shared repository, no agreed language, and no training programme. Governance committees receive documents they cannot reliably compare.

Objective

By the end of this Wave, the EA practice has a complete, standardised working toolkit: templates for all six artefact types, a shared repository, a common language glossary, a lightweight straw-man pattern, and an orientation module for participants. Artefact quality and predictability is materially improved.

Preconditions

- Wave 1 Done-When criteria are fully met.
- At least five Business Outlines and three IT Designs have been produced.
- The EA Leader has reviewed all existing artefacts and compiled a list of quality gaps.

Steps

Step 1 — Design artefact templates for all six types

Using existing Outlines, Designs, and the artefact type descriptions from AMBIT-1, produce minimal viable templates for all six types: Business Factors, Business Visions, Business Outlines, IT Designs, IT Standards, IT Landscapes. Each template must specify mandatory sections, identify the primary audience for each section, and include a one-sentence description of each section's purpose. Pilot each template on one real initiative before finalising.

Step 2 — Establish the shared artefact repository

Select a repository platform: SharePoint, Confluence, or equivalent. Avoid specialised EA tools at this stage. Create a folder structure: one folder per artefact type, with sub-folders per initiative (Outlines, Designs) and per topic (Standards, Landscapes). Migrate all existing artefacts. Establish a naming convention. Ensure architects have write access; all committee members have read access.

Step 3 — Create the AMBIT language glossary

Compile a one-page glossary of the 20–30 most important terms. Write definitions in plain English — a senior business executive unfamiliar with EA should understand every definition. Distribute to all committee members and initiative sponsors. Post on the intranet.

Step 4 — Introduce the straw-man architecture technique

Straw-man architecture is the technique of presenting an intentionally imperfect initial solution to provoke productive discussion and accelerate planning. The EA Leader runs a 90-minute workshop demonstrating the technique: produce a one-page straw-man in 30 minutes, then 60 minutes of facilitated discussion. Document as a standard practice in the Process Definition at the Concept sub-step of Initiative Alignment.

Step 5 — Deliver the EA orientation module

Produce a 45-minute orientation module for all non-architect participants: project sponsors, project managers, business leads, and governance committee members. Contents: what the EA practice is for; what the Initiative Alignment process requires; what Business Outlines and IT Designs are; what the committees do; what to do if you disagree with an architect. Deliver to all committee members and active initiative sponsors within this Wave.

Step 6 — Introduce architecture debt logging

Start a simple Architecture Debt Log: a shared spreadsheet listing known technical problems in the IT landscape. Each entry: item name, category (application/infrastructure/data/integration), risk level (High/Medium/Low), recommended action, and estimated effort. This log is the precursor to the Technology Alignment process (Wave 3). Starting it now prevents knowledge loss and primes the organisation for Wave 3.

Artefacts Established

Artefact	Purpose	Owner	Cadence
Artefact Templates	Standardised section structure for all six types	EA Leader	Reviewed annually; updated after each pilot
Artefact Repository	Structured shared storage for all practice artefacts	EA Leader	Maintained continuously by all architects
AMBIT Language Glossary	Plain-English definitions of 20–30 core practice terms	EA Leader	Reviewed annually
Straw-Man Pattern	One-page technique description with a worked example	EA Leader	Referenced in Process Definition
Architecture Debt Log	Live log of known technical problems in the IT landscape	EA Leader / Enterprise Architects	Updated at least quarterly

Wave 2 Done-When Criteria

- Templates for all six artefact types are in active use — every new artefact uses the appropriate template.
- The shared repository is populated with all existing artefacts and all new artefacts are stored there on creation.
- The AMBIT Language Glossary has been distributed to all committee members and sponsors and is published on the intranet.
- Every active architect has participated in at least one straw-man architecture exercise.
- The EA orientation module has been delivered to all current committee members and sponsors.
- The Architecture Debt Log has at least five entries and is reviewed at the ITAC monthly.

— WAVE 3: ALIGNMENT MATRIX

Wave 3: Alignment Matrix

Activate all six artefact types and launch the Technology Alignment process.

Situation

Initiative Alignment is running well, but Technology Alignment does not yet exist. The IT landscape is growing more complex with each delivered project. Nobody has a comprehensive view of the current technology stack, existing applications, or rationalisation candidates. The Architecture Debt Log is growing but has no governance. IT Standards do not exist formally.

Objective

By the end of this Wave, all six AMBIT artefact types are in active institutional use. The Technology Alignment process is launched: IT Standards and IT Landscapes are produced, reviewed at the ITAC, and used to inform initiative-level decisions.

Preconditions

- Wave 2 Done-When criteria are fully met.
- At least one Enterprise Architect (in addition to the EA Leader) is in post and has capacity for Technology Alignment work.
- The Architecture Debt Log has at least 10 entries and has been reviewed at least twice by the ITAC.
- The CIO has approved a time allocation for Technology Alignment work.

Steps

Step 1 — Produce the first Technology Reference Model

A Technology Reference Model is the most impactful first IT Standard. It documents the approved technology stack: preferred platforms, databases, integration middleware, cloud providers, and programming languages. Facilitate a two-hour workshop with the CIO and key technical SMEs to identify the current stack, marking each item as Strategic/Current/Deprecated/Retiring. Produce using the IT Standards template. Approve at the ITAC.

v2.0 — Technical Rationalisation Suggestions flow into Initiation (source: EA Practice on a Page)

The diagram labels a specific flow from Technology Optimisation into Initiative Alignment: "Technical Rationalisation Suggestions (How to implement projects)." This flow arrives at the Initiation step — not just at the Design step. This means that once Standards and Landscapes exist, architects must brief the Solution Architect on the current landscape, known debt, and preferred technologies at the very start of Initiative Alignment (during Concept, not just during Design). From Wave 3 onward, update the Process Definition: every Initiation engagement begins with a 30-minute landscape briefing from the Enterprise Architect to the assigned Solution Architect, covering applicable Technology Reference Models, relevant Landscape sections, and active debt items that this initiative might address or worsen.

Step 2 — Produce the first Landscape Diagram

A Landscape Diagram is a visual map of the major IT applications, their categories (business capability they support), and their key integrations. Produce an initial draft using information from the Portfolio Inventory and Architecture Debt Log, supplemented by interviews with IT operations and application owners. Target scope: cover at least the top 20 applications by strategic importance or operational risk. Review and approve at the ITAC. Flag debt items on the diagram.

v2.0 — New Working IT Solutions update the Landscape (source: EA Practice on a Page)

The diagram shows "New Working IT Solutions" as a flow from Project Implementation back to the Organisational IT Landscape. This means every project completion is a mandatory trigger for a Landscape update — not just the quarterly review cycle. From Wave 3 onward, the IT Design template must include a post-delivery obligation: within four weeks of go-live, the Solution Architect submits a brief "Landscape Update" to the Enterprise Architect, identifying which Landscape Diagram entries must be added, changed, or removed as a result of the delivery. This update is reviewed at the next ITAC meeting.

Step 3 — Formalise the Technology Alignment process

Document the Technology Alignment process, extending the Wave 1 Process Definition. Define process properties: continuous, internally driven by architects, reviewed periodically by the ITAC, resulting in updates to Standards and Landscapes and, where warranted, Architectural Initiatives. Define the Architectural Initiative type: an initiative whose primary purpose is to improve the IT landscape rather than address a business need.

Step 4 — Integrate Standards and Landscapes into Initiative Alignment

Update the IT Designs template to include a mandatory Architectural Compliance section: the architect must reference the Technology Reference Model and Landscape Diagram and explain how the Design complies with both. Update the Business Outlines template to include an Architectural Context section. The landscape briefing at Initiation (see v2.0 callout above) precedes both.

Step 5 — Produce the first IT Principles

IT Principles are five to ten organisation-wide rules for how IT should be built and governed. Facilitate a two-hour workshop with the CIO, the EA team, and one or two senior IT managers. Each Principle: name, rationale, implications for project teams, and examples of compliance and non-compliance. Approve at the ITAC. Sponsor as mandatory compliance requirements for all Designs.

Step 6 — Grow Landscape coverage and run the first rationalisation cycle

Over the course of this Wave, extend the Landscape Diagram to cover at least 80% of business-critical applications. Using the Landscape and Debt Log, identify at least one Architectural Initiative. Present to the ITAC, then to the BAC for investment approval. Executing at least one funded Architectural Initiative within this Wave is essential — it proves the business value of Technology Alignment.

Artefacts Established

Artefact	Purpose	Owner	Cadence
Technology Reference Model	Approved technology stack with strategic/current/deprecated classification	EA Leader / Enterprise Architect	Reviewed annually; updated on technology adoption
IT Principles	Five to ten organisation-wide rules for building and governing IT	EA Leader	Reviewed and re-approved annually
Landscape Diagram	Visual map of major IT applications, capabilities, and integrations	Enterprise Architect	Continuously updated (project go-lives + quarterly review)
Architecture Debt Log (formalised)	Full debt inventory with priorities, owners, and remediation roadmap	Enterprise Architects	Updated at every ITAC meeting

Wave 3 Done-When Criteria

- The Technology Reference Model and IT Principles are approved at the ITAC and actively referenced in all new IT Designs.
- The Landscape Diagram covers at least 80% of business-critical applications and is updated at project go-live and quarterly.
- The Process Definition includes the Landscape Update obligation triggered by project delivery.
- All new Solution Architects receive a landscape briefing (Technical Rationalisation Suggestions) at the start of every Initiation engagement.
- At least one Architectural Initiative has been formally proposed, approved by the BAC, funded, and is in execution.
- All six AMBIT artefact types have at least one instantiated artefact in the repository.

— WAVE 4: ALIGNMENT MEETINGS

Wave 4: Alignment Meetings

Establish the full D-E-A meeting rhythm and the four governance patterns.

Situation

Governance committees are meeting but their agendas are inconsistent. Some meetings are overly technical; others skip important topics. Architects are spending too much time preparing for ad hoc meetings. The D-E-A meeting rhythm has not been explicitly established, and meeting outputs are not reliably linked to artefact updates.

Objective

By the end of this Wave, every recurring meeting in the practice follows the D-E-A pattern. The four governance patterns (Strategic, Investment, Technology, Project) are explicitly defined with standing agendas, participant lists, decision logs, and links to artefacts. Meeting quality improves measurably.

Preconditions

- Wave 3 Done-When criteria are fully met.
- Both governance committees are meeting regularly (at least three meetings each since Wave 1).
- The EA Leader has reviewed meeting minutes from all committee meetings and identified recurring quality problems.

Steps

Step 1 — Audit current meetings and identify gaps

Review all meeting records from both committees: Were decisions documented? Were artefacts referenced? Were the right participants present? Were actions tracked? Produce a two-page Meeting Audit Report. Identify the top three quality gaps. Present at the next ITAC meeting.

Step 2 — Define the D-E-A meeting pattern

D-E-A structures every substantive architectural meeting into three phases: Discover (understand the problem), Explore (examine options and evidence), Agree (reach a decision or agree next actions). Run a 60-minute workshop with all architects practising the pattern. Update the Process Definition. Create a standard meeting agenda template incorporating D-E-A structure, a decision log, and an artefact update register.

Step 3 — Define the four governance meeting types

Strategic Governance (BAC, quarterly)	Review and update Business Factors and Business Visions; assess strategic relevance of the portfolio. Duration: 90 minutes.
Investment Governance (BAC, monthly)	Review Business Outlines and business cases for initiatives seeking approval; approve, reject, defer, or cancel. Duration: 60 minutes.
Technology Governance (ITAC, monthly)	Review and approve changes to IT Standards and Landscapes; approve Architectural Initiatives; review Landscape updates from completed projects. Duration: 60 minutes.
Project Governance (ITAC, per-project)	Review and approve IT Designs before build commences; handle exemption requests. Duration: 45 minutes per Design.

Step 4 — Introduce the pre-meeting distribution protocol

For every governance meeting, the relevant architect must distribute a meeting pack to all participants at least five working days in advance. The pack must include: the relevant artefact in its latest form, a one-page summary of the decision being requested, and any pre-reading required. A meeting where participants have not received the pack five days in advance is automatically rescheduled. The EA Leader enforces this rule without exception.

Step 5 — Implement the Decision Log

Create a shared Decision Log in the artefact repository: a running record of every formal decision made by either committee, including: decision date, committee, decision text, artefacts affected, and names of approvers. Populate retrospectively with all committee decisions since Wave 1.

Step 6 — Run one complete D-E-A cycle per governance type

Within this Wave, run at least one meeting for each of the four governance types explicitly following the D-E-A structure, using the new agenda template. After each meeting, facilitate a 15-minute retrospective: what worked, what didn't, what to improve. Update meeting templates and the Process Definition accordingly.

Artefacts Established

Artefact	Purpose	Owner	Cadence
Meeting Audit Report	Two-page analysis of current meeting quality gaps	EA Leader	One-off at start of Wave 4
D-E-A Meeting Agenda Template	Standard agenda with Discover/Explore/Agree phases, decision log, artefact register	EA Leader	Used for all committee meetings
Governance Meeting Schedules	Agreed standing meeting schedules for all four governance types	EA Leader	Reviewed annually
Decision Log	Running record of all formal committee decisions with artefact cross-references	EA Leader	Updated after every committee meeting

Wave 4 Done-When Criteria

- All committee meetings use the D-E-A agenda template and distribute a pre-meeting pack at least five working days in advance.
- At least one meeting of each of the four governance types has been completed using the new structure.
- The Decision Log is populated with all committee decisions since Wave 1 and is updated after every meeting.
- Meeting retrospective feedback shows improvement in preparation quality, focus, and decision clarity compared to the Meeting Audit Report baseline.

— WAVE 5: ALIGNMENT MODELS

Wave 5: Alignment Models

Activate the conceptual models and launch Strategic Alignment.

Situation

Initiative Alignment and Technology Alignment are well established. However, the practice is still reactive — architects respond to initiatives and landscape problems but have no shared strategic picture of where the business is going and what IT should become. Business Factors and Business Visions exist nominally but are not the product of genuine strategic planning dialogue.

Objective

By the end of this Wave, the Strategic Alignment process is genuinely operational: Business Factors and Business Visions are produced through real collaborative dialogue between senior business leaders and Enterprise Architects, and they actively inform Investment Governance and Technology Alignment decisions.

v2.0 — The External Business Environment as formal process input (source: EA Practice on a Page)

The diagram shows the External Business Environment — economy, technology, society, demography, legislation, regulation, customers, competitors, partners, suppliers and vendors — as a named, explicit input to the Strategic Planning process via "Fundamental Environmental Factors." This is not merely a contextual backdrop; it is the formal trigger that initiates Strategic Alignment. Wave 5 must therefore be structured around a genuine Environmental Scan activity — not an internal strategy conversation. The scan should explicitly cover at least six dimensions: (1) economic trends affecting the business; (2) technology changes affecting the competitive environment or IT delivery; (3) societal and demographic shifts; (4) legislative and regulatory changes; (5) competitive landscape shifts; (6) changes in the partner and vendor ecosystem. Business Factors produced without reference to this scan are not Strategic Alignment outputs — they are IT planning documents.

Preconditions

- Wave 4 Done-When criteria are fully met.
- The EA Leader and at least one Enterprise Architect have established a working relationship with the Business Architecture Sponsor.
- The BAC has been meeting for at least six months and has established trust with its business members.
- The CIO and business sponsor have agreed to a Strategic Planning workshop series.

Steps

Step 1 — Introduce the AMBIT-2 conceptual models

Run a 90-minute conceptual briefing for all architects and BAC members on the four most important AMBIT-2 models: the Operating Model, the Business Capability Model, the D-E-A Pattern, and IT Initiative Types. Use plain English and business examples relevant to the organisation. If the organisation already uses analogous frameworks, explicitly bridge to those.

Step 2 — Conduct the Environmental Scan

The Enterprise Architect facilitates a structured Environmental Scan with the EA Leader and two or three senior business executives. Using the six dimensions above, produce a written scan report identifying the five to ten most significant environmental factors affecting the organisation's IT requirements. This scan report is the primary source input for Business Factors. It is reviewed and approved at the BAC's first Strategic Governance session.

Step 3 — Map the Operating Model

The Operating Model describes how the organisation creates value. Facilitate a two-hour workshop with the Business Architecture Sponsor. Using the quadrant (Unification/Coordination/Replication/Diversification), agree on where the organisation sits today and where it wants to be. Document as a Business Factor derived explicitly from the Environmental Scan. Approve at the BAC Strategic Governance session.

Step 4 — Develop the Business Capability Model

Identify 20–40 capabilities at Level 1. Heat-map them: which capabilities are strategic investment priorities, which are adequate, which are underfunded. The heat-map is used immediately in Investment Governance. Document as a Business Vision. Approve at the BAC Strategic Governance session.

Step 5 — Run the first Strategic Planning workshop series

Workshop 1 (half-day): Environmental Scan review — present the scan report findings and their implications for IT. Workshop 2 (half-day): Strategy-to-portfolio — given the Business Capability Model and Operating Model, what IT investments should be made in the next three years? What should be stopped or deferred?

Outputs: updated Business Factors (reflecting the scan findings) and a Business Vision (portfolio roadmap reflecting prioritised investments). Approve both at the next BAC Strategic Governance session.

> **v2.0 — Two named output flows from Strategic Planning (source: EA Practice on a Page)**
> The diagram shows Strategic Planning producing two distinct, named outputs that both flow into Technology Optimisation: (1) "Strategic Directions and Requirements" — the directional decisions and capability priorities that Technology Alignment must align Standards and Landscapes to; and (2) "Strategic IT Capabilities and Constraints" — the technology boundaries and enabling conditions set by strategic intent. In practice, your Business Factors and Business Visions should be explicitly tagged as carrying one of these two output types when they flow into Technology Alignment. At each Technology Governance meeting, the Enterprise Architect should explicitly identify which active Business Factors are Directions/Requirements (shaping what the technology stack should become) and which are Capabilities/Constraints (defining what the technology stack must be able to do or must not do).

Step 6 — Connect Strategic Alignment to the other two processes

Update the Process Definition to document the six information flows between the three AMBIT processes. Specifically: at the next Investment Governance meeting, the EA Leader explicitly references the Business Capability Model heat-map when advising on initiative approval decisions. At the next Technology Governance meeting, the Enterprise Architect references the Operating Model and Business Factors when reviewing proposed changes to Standards and Landscapes.

Step 7 — Embed the Strategic Planning cycle into the annual calendar

Work with the CIO and business sponsor to establish a standing annual Strategic Planning workshop in the calendar, timed to precede the annual IT budget submission. Add Strategic Planning workshops as an annual item in the Governance Meeting Schedules (from Wave 4), with a quarterly Strategic Governance meeting in between to track progress.

Artefacts Established

Artefact	Purpose	Owner	Cadence
Environmental Scan Report	Written analysis of 5–10 external factors across 6 dimensions affecting IT requirements	Enterprise Architect	Produced annually before Strategic Planning workshops
Operating Model	Agreed quadrant positioning and strategic implications for IT	Enterprise Architect + Business Sponsor	Reviewed annually; updated on material business model changes
Business Capability Model	Level-1 capability map with strategic heat-map of investment priorities	Enterprise Architect + Senior Business Leaders	Reviewed and re-approved annually before budget cycle
Business Factors (substantive)	Business Factors derived from Environmental Scan and business strategy dialogue	Enterprise Architect	Updated after each annual Strategic Planning workshop
Business Visions (substantive)	Portfolio-level roadmap of IT investments aligned to business strategy	Enterprise Architect + CIO	Updated annually; reviewed quarterly

Wave 5 Done-When Criteria

- An Environmental Scan covering at least six dimensions has been completed with genuine business executive participation and its findings have been approved at the BAC.
- At least two Strategic Planning workshops have been completed with genuine participation by senior business executives.

- A Business Capability Model heat-map has been approved by the BAC and is actively used in Investment Governance decisions.
- An Operating Model document has been approved as a Business Factor by the BAC.
- Business Factors and Business Visions explicitly reference the Environmental Scan.
- Strategic output flows to Technology Alignment are tagged as either Directions/Requirements or Capabilities/Constraints.
- The annual Strategic Planning workshop is embedded in the organisation's standing calendar.

— WAVE 6: ALIGNMENT MATURITY

Wave 6: Alignment Maturity

Establish the practice review cycle and the maturity management system.

Situation

All three alignment processes are operational. All six artefact types are in active use. Governance committees are functioning well. However, the practice has never been formally reviewed against its own standards. It is running on momentum — but momentum is not the same as maturity.

Objective

By the end of this Wave, the EA practice has a formal annual review cycle, a maturity dashboard, a set of leading and lagging indicators, and a practice improvement backlog. It is no longer dependent on the personal energy of the EA Leader alone — it is institutionalised.

Preconditions

- Wave 5 Done-When criteria are fully met.
- At minimum, one full annual cycle of all four governance types has been completed.
- The practice has been running for at least 12 months since Wave 1.
- The EA Leader has the support of the CIO to dedicate a portion of an upcoming BAC meeting to a formal practice review.

Steps

Step 1 — Run the first Annual Practice Review

A structured half-day session involving the EA Leader, all architects, and the BAC members. Agenda (D-E-A structure): Discover — present a factual summary of the year's activity (artefacts produced, initiatives reviewed, governance decisions made, Architectural Initiatives completed, debt items resolved). Explore — discuss quality against the maturity questions. Agree — identify the top three improvements for the next 12 months. Document findings in a Practice Review Report. Publish to all committee members.

Step 2 — Establish the maturity dashboard

A one-page monthly snapshot of EA practice health, tracking: initiative coverage (% of initiatives with assigned architects); artefact health (% of artefacts reviewed in the last 12 months); governance attendance (average committee attendance rate); debt log movement (items resolved vs. added); engagement index (self-rated monthly by EA Leader and at least one senior business executive); landscape freshness (% of Landscape entries updated since last project go-live batch). Update monthly. Present at every ITAC meeting.

Step 3 — Create the Practice Improvement Backlog

A prioritised list of improvements to the EA practice itself. Populate from the Annual Practice Review findings. The EA Leader reviews and reprioritises quarterly. The top three items are always in active progress. Visible to all committee members.

Step 4 — Review and optimise the artefact portfolio

Evaluate every artefact type currently in use: Is it used in decisions? Do stakeholders find it valuable? Is the effort to maintain it justified? Retire any artefact type that scores poorly on all three questions. Add artefact types from the AMBIT-1 frequency tiers that address currently unaddressed problems. Update templates for all retained types.

v2.0 — The Updates and Learned Best Practices feedback loop (source: EA Practice on a Page)
The diagram shows a flow labelled "Updates and Learned Best Practices" from Project Implementation (the Realisation step of Initiative Alignment) back into Technology Optimisation. This is the mechanism by which what architects learn in project delivery improves the technology standards and landscape approach of the organisation. By Wave 6 this loop should be formalised: at each Technology Governance meeting, the Enterprise Architect presents a standing agenda item called "Lessons from Project Delivery" — a brief summary of any technology, integration, or

> vendor findings from projects completed in the previous quarter that have implications for existing Standards or Landscapes. Architects should record these learnings in the Project Post-Delivery Notes section of the IT Design document. This ensures that the practice improves from its own experience, not just from external inputs.

Step 5 — Review and evolve the architecture function structure

After 12–18 months of operation, review the two-tier structure: are the right numbers of Enterprise Architects and Solution Architects in post? Compare actual workload against the AMBIT-3 4–5% ratio benchmark. If domain specialisation is needed, this is the moment to make the case to the CIO.

Step 6 — Embed the annual maturity cycle

The Annual Practice Review, dashboard update, and backlog review must be standing items in the organisational calendar. The EA Leader proposes, and the CIO endorses, the annual maturity review schedule. The practice is now self-sustaining: it reviews itself, improves itself, and reports on itself. The EA Leader's role shifts from builder to steward.

Artefacts Established

Artefact	Purpose	Owner	Cadence
Practice Review Report	Annual half-day review findings: activity summary, quality assessment, top three improvements	EA Leader	Produced annually; distributed to all committee members
Maturity Dashboard	One-page monthly health snapshot: coverage, artefact health, attendance, debt movement, engagement, landscape freshness	EA Leader	Updated monthly; presented at ITAC
Practice Improvement Backlog	Prioritised list of improvements to processes, artefacts, governance, and team	EA Leader	Reviewed and reprioritised quarterly
Practice Charter	Formal one-page document: purpose, scope, principles, team structure, success criteria	EA Leader + CIO	Produced in Wave 6; reviewed annually

Wave 6 Done-When Criteria

- The first Annual Practice Review has been completed with participation of senior business executives and all architects; findings are documented and distributed.
- The maturity dashboard is populated for the past six months, updated monthly, and presented at ITAC.
- The "Lessons from Project Delivery" standing agenda item is operational at Technology Governance meetings.
- The Practice Improvement Backlog has at least ten items; the top three are in active progress.
- At least one artefact type has been retired and at least one has been added or substantially revised.
- The Practice Charter is signed by the EA Leader and the CIO.
- BAC members can positively answer at least four of the five AMBIT maturity questions.

PART III Sustaining Maturity

— SUSTAINING MATURITY

Sustaining Maturity

Completing Wave 6 does not end the work — it changes its nature. The practice transitions from a building project into a living institution.

III.1 The Annual Practice Rhythm

Annual Strategic Planning Workshop (Q4)	Half-day workshop with senior business leaders and Enterprise Architects. Begins with a structured Environmental Scan review. Produces updated Business Factors and Business Visions. Timed to precede the IT budget submission.
Annual Technology Review (Q1)	Full review of Technology Reference Models, IT Principles, and Landscape Diagrams. Includes a consolidated "Lessons from Project Delivery" synthesis. All Standards re-approved or updated.
Annual Practice Review (Q2)	Half-day session with BAC. Maturity assessment, artefact portfolio review, improvement backlog refresh. Produces Practice Review Report.
Annual Function Review (Q3)	EA Leader reviews team structure, capacity, and specialisation against portfolio demands. Produces staffing recommendation for CIO.
Monthly ITAC	Technology Governance and Project Governance. Includes maturity dashboard review and "Lessons from Project Delivery" item.
Monthly BAC	Investment Governance and Strategic Governance.

III.2 The Five Maturity Questions

A mature EA practice is measured by the quality of understanding it creates between business and IT. Ask these five questions to senior business executives at every Annual Practice Review.

Q1	Do you understand what IT is doing?
Q2	Do you understand how IT contributes to the achievement of your business goals?
Q3	Do you understand where and on what particular initiatives your IT budget is spent?
Q4	Do you understand how IT is transforming your business?
Q5	Do you understand what business value IT brings to your organisation?

III.3 Signs of Genuine Maturity

- Business leaders ask for architects. Architects are invited to business conversations they were not instructed to attend.
- Artefacts drive real decisions. Business Visions and Business Factors are visibly referenced in Investment Governance discussions, not just filed in the repository.
- Governance is routine. Committee meetings start on time, have quorum, and end with clear decisions.

- Debt is actively reducing. The Architecture Debt Log shows more items resolved than added over any rolling 12-month period.
- All six artefact types are mastered. Stakeholders understand what each artefact is for, who produces it, and how to use it in decisions.
- Architects are trusted partners. Business leaders describe architects as business partners, not gatekeepers or technical reviewers.
- The practice survives personnel change. When an architect leaves, the processes continue without disruption.

III.4 Common Failure Modes and Remedies

Architects as gatekeepers	Architects perceived as blockers. Remedy: shift governance from approval-before-engagement to engagement-from-the-start. Architects should shape Outlines, not judge them.
Artefact production as an end in itself	Artefacts that no one reads or references. Remedy: retire unused artefact types. Ask: "What decision does this artefact inform?" If the answer is unclear, the artefact should not exist.
Governance without business engagement	Business executives attend sporadically or send delegates. Remedy: shorten agendas, improve pre-reading quality, demonstrate that the committee makes decisions that matter to the business.
Strategic Alignment collapsing to IT	Business Factors gradually become IT documents with no business input. Remedy: the Environmental Scan must be a genuine business activity led by architects, not an IT planning exercise.
EA Leader as single point of failure	Practice stalls when the EA Leader leaves. Remedy: document everything, cross-train architects, maintain the Practice Charter and Process Definition as living documents.
Debt log growing without resolution	Architecture debt accumulates faster than it is addressed. Remedy: increase the frequency and funding of Architectural Initiatives. The debt log must have a resolution rate target.
Lessons from delivery not captured	Project learnings do not improve Standards or Landscapes. Remedy: the IT Design template must include a mandatory Post-Delivery Notes section, reviewed at Technology Governance.

Appendix A: Artefact Starter Templates

Each template defines the mandatory section structure for its artefact type. [D] = decisions artefact. [F] = facts artefact. All templates should be adapted to organisational language and context.

A.1 Business Factors [D]

1. Factor Title	Short name identifying this Business Factor.
2. Business Driver	What environmental or strategic factor makes this Business Factor necessary? Reference the Environmental Scan by dimension (economic/technology/social/legislative/competitive/ecosystem).
3. Business Factor Statement	The decision itself, in plain language: what the organisation has agreed to do or not do.
4. Rationale	Why this decision was made. What alternatives were considered and rejected.
5. Implications for IT	What this means for IT design, selection, or governance. At least three specific implications.
6. Compliance Requirements	What must change in existing systems or processes to comply.
7. Owners and Approvers	Business owner (senior executive), IT owner (Enterprise Architect), approving committee.
8. Review Date	When this Business Factor will next be reviewed and re-approved.

A.2 Business Visions [D]

1. Vision Title	Short name (e.g. "Three-Year Digital Transformation Roadmap 2026–2028").
2. Strategic Context	What Business Factors and business strategy does this Business Vision respond to?
3. Target State Description	In plain language: what will IT look like when this Vision is realised?
4. Business Capability Priorities	Reference to the Business Capability Model heat-map: which capabilities does this Vision address?
5. Portfolio of Required Initiatives	The list of IT initiatives needed, grouped by initiative type (Fundamental, Strategic, Local).
6. Investment Envelope	Approximate total investment required, by year.
7. Sequencing and Dependencies	Which initiatives must precede which? Critical path.
8. Owners and Approvers	Business sponsor, CIO, Enterprise Architect, approving committee.
9. Review Date	Annual review aligned to budget cycle.

A.3 Business Outlines [D]

1. Initiative Title and ID	Unique identifier and descriptive title.
2. Trigger Type	NEW IN v2.0: Planned Business Need (originating from Strategic Planning) or Urgent Business Need (direct from business environment). Affects the fast-track path at the Investment Gate.
3. Business Need	The specific business or technical need this initiative addresses.
4. Initiative Type	Fundamental / Strategic / Local / Urgent / Architectural (AMBIT-3 types).
5. Solution Options	Two to four implementation options with a brief description of each.
6. Recommended Option	The preferred option, with rationale.
7. Business Value	Quantified or qualified business value.
8. Architectural Context	How does this initiative fit the current Landscape Diagram and Technology Reference Model? Does it reduce or add to architectural debt? Reference the landscape briefing (Technical Rationalisation Suggestions) provided at Initiation.
9. Indicative Cost and Timeline	Rough order of magnitude cost and delivery timescale.
10. Key Risks	Top three risks to value realisation.
11. Outcome	NEW IN v2.0: Approved / Rejected / Deferred / Cancelled. If Cancelled: cancellation rationale to be documented and Outline archived.
12. Approvers	Business sponsor, CIO, approving committee (BAC — Investment Gate).

A.4 IT Designs [D]

1. Project Title and ID	Unique identifier. Must reference parent Business Outline.
2. Business Requirements Summary	The key business requirements this design must satisfy.
3. Technical Solution Architecture	The chosen technical approach: components, technologies, integrations, deployment model. Diagrams required.
4. Architectural Compliance	Explicit reference to Technology Reference Model and IT Principles: which standards are applied, which are deviated from, which exemptions are requested.
5. Data Architecture	Data entities created, modified, or consumed. Reference to Logical Data Model if applicable.
6. Integration Architecture	APIs, events, or data flows to and from other systems. Reference to Landscape Diagram.
7. Security and Compliance	Security controls applied. Regulatory requirements addressed.
8. Non-Functional Requirements	Performance, availability, scalability, recoverability targets.

9. Delivery Approach	Project phases, key milestones, team structure.
10. Post-Delivery Notes	NEW IN v2.0: To be completed within four weeks of go-live. Landscape Update: which Landscape entries must be added/changed/removed. Learned Best Practices: any technology, vendor, or integration findings with implications for existing Standards or Landscapes.
11. Approvers	Solution Architect, Enterprise Architect, ITAC — Design Gate.

A.5 IT Standards [D/F]

1. Standard Title	Short name (e.g. "Technology Reference Model 2026").
2. Scope	What domain or technology area does this Standard govern?
3. Standard Decisions	Approved/Preferred/Permitted/Deprecated/Prohibited. Table format recommended.
4. Rationale	Why these decisions were made.
5. Compliance Requirements	What projects must do to comply. What happens when they do not.
6. Exemption Process	How to request an exemption. Who approves (ITAC).
7. Owners and Approvers	Domain architect (owner), ITAC (approver).
8. Review Date	Annual review minimum.

A.6 IT Landscapes [F]

1. Landscape Title	Short name (e.g. "Application Landscape 2026").
2. Scope	Which business capabilities, domains, or units does this Landscape cover?
3. Asset Inventory	Table of IT assets: name, category, business owner, technical owner, status (Strategic/Current/Legacy/Decommissioning).
4. Landscape Diagram	Visual diagram showing assets, relationships, and integration flows. Colour-coded by status.
5. Health Assessment	Summary of architectural debt items visible in this Landscape.
6. Rationalisation Opportunities	Specific improvement actions recommended.
7. Architectural Initiatives Proposed	Any Architectural Initiatives arising from this Landscape.
8. Pending Updates	NEW IN v2.0: List of project go-lives since last review requiring Landscape updates. Cleared when updates are incorporated.
9. Owner and Review Date	Enterprise Architect (owner). Updated at project go-live; formally reviewed quarterly.

— APPENDIX B: WAVE PLANNER

Appendix B: Wave Planner

Use this grid to plan and schedule the six Waves. Fill in the start month, target completion month, EA Leader, and key milestones. Review and update at the start of each Wave.

Wave	AMBIT Focus	Starts	Target End	EA Lead	Key Milestone	Status
W1	AMBIT-3: Processes & Governance				ITAC and BAC first meetings held	Not Started
W2	AMBIT-5: Mechanics & Artefacts				All six templates in active use	Not Started
W3	AMBIT-1: Alignment Matrix				First Architectural Initiative approved	Not Started
W4	AMBIT-4: Alignment Meetings				D-E-A cycle run for all 4 governance types	Not Started
W5	AMBIT-2: Alignment Models				Environmental Scan approved at BAC	Not Started
W6	AMBIT-6: Alignment Maturity				Practice Charter signed	Not Started

Note: Do not compress Wave 1 below three months. Do not start Wave 5 until genuine business trust has been earned — premature Strategic Alignment efforts will collapse.

— APPENDIX C: GLOSSARY

Appendix C: Glossary

Plain-English definitions of the key terms used throughout this playbook. Distribute to all committee members and initiative sponsors.

Alignment Matrix (AMBIT-1)	The six-cell matrix organising EA artefacts by their role (Business/IT) and their type (Factors/Visions/Outlines/Designs/Standards/Landscapes).
Alignment Models (AMBIT-2)	The conceptual frameworks used to reason about business-IT alignment: Operating Model, Business Capability Model, Initiative Types, Architecture Debt, and D-E-A Pattern.
Alignment Management (AMBIT-3)	The three core processes: Strategic Alignment, Initiative Alignment, and Technology Alignment, plus their governance structures and information flows.
Alignment Meetings (AMBIT-4)	The D-E-A meeting pattern and four governance meeting types (Strategic, Investment, Technology, Project) that structure decision-making in the practice.
Alignment Mechanics (AMBIT-5)	The working tools of the practice: artefact templates, repository, language glossary, straw-man technique, architecture debt log, and training materials.
Alignment Maturity (AMBIT-6)	The practice review cycle, maturity dashboard, improvement backlog, and the five maturity questions that sustain and improve the practice over time.
Architectural Initiative	An IT initiative whose primary purpose is to improve the IT landscape (reduce debt, consolidate, rationalise) rather than address a business need. Proposed by architects; approved by governance.
Architecture Debt Log	A live register of known technical problems in the IT landscape, with priority, owner, and recommended action for each item.
BAC (Business Architecture Committee)	The senior governance committee for Strategic Governance and Investment Governance. Chaired by the CIO.
Business Capability Model	A map of the strategic capabilities the organisation must have to succeed, with a heat-map of investment priorities. A type of Business Vision.
Business Factor	An AMBIT artefact that documents a high-level, long-term decision about how the business and IT should work. Derived from the Environmental Scan. Examples: Operating Model, Cloud Strategy.
Business Outline	An AMBIT artefact describing a proposed IT solution: options considered, recommended option, business value, cost, risks, trigger type, and outcome. Approved or cancelled at the Investment Gate.
Business Vision	An AMBIT artefact describing what IT should deliver in the long term. Examples: Business Capability Model, Portfolio Roadmap, Target State.
Cancelled Project	NEW IN v2.0: A first-class outcome of the Investment Gate. The Business Outline is archived with cancellation rationale recorded in the Decision Log.
D-E-A Pattern	Discover–Explore–Agree: the three-phase structure for all EA meetings.

Environmental Scan	NEW IN v2.0: A structured review of the External Business Environment across six dimensions (economic, technology, social/demographic, legislative/regulatory, competitive, partner/vendor ecosystem). The formal trigger for Strategic Alignment and the primary source input for Business Factors.
ITAC (IT Architecture Committee)	The governance committee for Technology Governance and Project Governance. Chaired by the EA Leader.
Landscape Update	NEW IN v2.0: A mandatory post-delivery obligation: within four weeks of project go-live, the Solution Architect submits Landscape changes to the Enterprise Architect for review at the next ITAC.
Learned Best Practices	NEW IN v2.0: Technology, vendor, or integration findings from project delivery that have implications for existing Standards or Landscapes. Captured in IT Design Post-Delivery Notes and reviewed at Technology Governance.
Operating Model	A description of how the organisation creates value: what it standardises and what it integrates. Positioned on the Unification/Coordination/Replication/Diversification quadrant.
Planned Business Need	NEW IN v2.0: An initiative that originates from the Strategic Planning process and appears on the approved portfolio. The standard path through Initiative Alignment.
Strategic Directions and Requirements	NEW IN v2.0: One of two named output flows from Strategic Planning into Technology Alignment. The directional decisions and capability priorities that Technology Alignment must align Standards and Landscapes to.
Strategic IT Capabilities and Constraints	NEW IN v2.0: The second named output flow from Strategic Planning into Technology Alignment. The technology boundaries and enabling conditions set by strategic intent.
Technical Rationalisation Suggestions	NEW IN v2.0: The output flow from Technology Alignment into the Initiation step of Initiative Alignment. Delivered as a landscape briefing to the Solution Architect at the start of every Initiation engagement.
Urgent Business Need	NEW IN v2.0: An initiative that arrives directly from the External Business Environment, bypassing Strategic Planning (e.g. a regulatory mandate or market emergency). Enters at the same Initiation step but follows a fast-track Investment Gate path.

Appendix D: Process Reference (New in v2.0)

This appendix documents the three EA processes as shown in the EA Practice on a Page diagram (Kotusev, v2.2), including their input triggers, output flows, Related Documents, and Relevant Techniques. Practitioners should use this as a reference when designing process documentation and orienting new architects.

> **Source note**
> All content in this appendix is derived directly from the EA Practice on a Page diagram (v2.2), © 2025 Svyatoslav Kotusev (kotusev.com / eaonapage.com). No content in this appendix is extrapolated beyond what is visible in the source diagram.

D.1 Strategic Planning (AMBIT-3 Strategic Alignment)

Input Triggers

- Fundamental Environmental Factors — from the External Business Environment (economy, technology, society, demography, legislation, regulation, customers, competitors, partners, suppliers, vendors).

Output Flows

- Strategic Directions and Requirements — flows to Technology Optimisation (Technology Alignment).
- Strategic IT Capabilities and Constraints — flows to Technology Optimisation (Technology Alignment).
- Planned Business Needs (What projects to implement) — flows to Initiative Alignment.

Artefacts Produced and Used

- Considerations (Business Factors): Produced and used in Strategic Planning. Lifecycle: continuously updated to align with current business strategy and requirements; used by business leaders and IT specialists as governance bodies.
- Visions (Business Visions): Produced and used in Strategic Planning. Lifecycle: continuously updated to align with current business practice and requirements; used by IT specialists as governance bodies.

Related Documents (external inputs)

- Organisational Mission, Vision, and Values
- Strategy Maps, Objectives Cascade
- Corporate Strategic Plans
- Business Unit Plans

Relevant Techniques

- Business Architecture Planning
- Business Capability Modelling
- Business and Data Analysis
- Strategy Frameworks (e.g. SWOT, BCG Matrix, Porter Five Forces)

D.2 Initiative Alignment (AMBIT-3 Initiative Alignment)

Input Triggers

- Planned Business Needs — from Strategic Planning (what projects to implement).
- Urgent Business Needs — directly from the External Business Environment (bypassing Strategic Planning).
- Technical Rationalisation Suggestions — from Technology Optimisation (how to implement projects). Delivered at the Initiation step.

Output Flows

- Cancelled IT Projects — from the Initiation step. A first-class process outcome documented in the Decision Log.
- New Working IT Solutions — from Project Implementation (Realisation step). Updates the Organisational IT Landscape.
- Updates and Learned Best Practices — from Project Implementation back to Technology Optimisation.

Artefacts Produced and Used

Initiation step (Concept → Decision):

- Outlines (Business Outlines): Lifecycle: created during the Initiation step, approved by committee, subject to documentation and then archived. Includes both approved and cancelled Outlines.

Realisation step (Design → Delivery):

- Designs (IT Designs): Lifecycle: created during the Realisation step, approved by committee, subject to documentation and then archived.

Related Documents — Initiation

- Project Proposals
- Business Cases
- Stakeholder Objectives

Related Documents — Realisation

- Business Requirements
- Project Traceability Matrices
- Project Management Plans

Relevant Techniques — Initiation

- Customer Journey Mapping and Value Stream Mapping
- Point of Control and Impact Analysis
- Return on Questions (ROQ)
- Architecture Size Estimates

Relevant Techniques — Realisation

- User Story Mapping
- MoSCoW Prioritisation Framework
- Industry Technology Frameworks (e.g. RUP, Scrum)

D.3 Technology Optimisation (AMBIT-3 Technology Alignment)

Input Triggers

- Strategic Directions and Requirements — from Strategic Planning.
- Strategic IT Capabilities and Constraints — from Strategic Planning.
- Updates and Learned Best Practices — from Project Implementation (Realisation step).
- Structure of the Current IT Landscape — from the Organisational IT Landscape (baseline).

Output Flows

- Technical Rationalisation Suggestions (How to implement projects) — flows to Initiative Alignment Initiation step.
- Updated Standards and Landscapes — flows into the Organisational IT Landscape (maintained continuously).

Artefacts Produced and Used

- Standards (IT Standards): Lifecycle: continuously updated to keep up with technology programmes and industry; used by IT specialists to drive consistency across the landscape.
- Landscapes (IT Landscapes): Lifecycle: continuously updated to reflect the landscape at dates and after when changes are possible; used by IT specialists as governance bodies.

Related Documents

- Architecture Patterns
- Smart Tech Matrices
- Smart Cost Matrices

Relevant Techniques

- Application Portfolio Assessment
- Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Analysis
- Architecture Debt Management

Based on AMBIT Framework v3.0 · Grounded in Kotusev empirical EA research · For practitioner use