How to achieve agility and flexibility using EA

By Richard Noon – Atos Consulting
Are *agility* and *flexibility* the same thing?

» A dictionary definition of *agility*

> “The ability of an organisation to respond quickly to demands or opportunities”

» A dictionary definition of *flexibility*

> “A measure of the ability of a Company to respond to changes in demand”

» Is *agility* more to do with an Enterprise’s *strategic* capability to change?

» Is *flexibility* more concerned with an Enterprise's ability to change *operationally* to meet strategic imperatives?

» No clear definition – this is what we can expect using metaphors all the time

The one thing which is constant is that they seem to be expressing the degree to which *change* from one state to another is either easy or difficult.

*Google Define:*
The Atos EA Framework: Its **CLEAR**

Can an EA framework change things?
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EA alone can’t help achieve flexibility & agility
(whether they’re the same thing or not)

» How is an EA framework used in operations? (from a service management perspective)

» What is already built into existing EA definitions which may assist?

» Which other (existing) organisations/processes can be integrated with EA activity?

» How do I integrate or use them?

» Which of them need to be integrated? / Which can I leave alone?

If EA is not used in an operational setting, it quickly atrophies, becomes lifeless and ‘withers on the vine’ – Its no good simply creating a model of the Enterprise and then – ‘hey presto’ job done.
What ‘change’ / IT management frameworks are out there?

However they ‘do it’, they all depend on knowing what’s out there. In our experience, service management projects which don’t implement a good ‘what’s out there’ programme experience degrees of failure.
What is the commonality?
> Configuration management?

If you don’t know what’s out there, you’re guessing. If you guess well, everyone thinks you’re doing your job. If you guess wrong……
So, how does this fit in with EA?

» ITIL, COBIT, MOF etc. representations of ‘what’s out there’ are typically *technical representations* (e.g. CIs, network elements etc)

» Telcos have been foremost in implementing these techniques *because* their products are essentially *technical* in nature

» EA is a better representation of ‘what’s out there’ because it includes Enterprise layers for *business, objective, organisation* *together* with the technologies which realise them

  *e.g. we can judge the impact of changing any Enterprise feature, process, objective, technology more accurately than with traditional CMDB)*
EA as Enterprise Configuration Management

- Change Management
- Capacity Planning
- Service Level Management
- Incident Management
- Problem Management
- Capacity Management

EA as Enterprise Configuration Management

- Information Item Register
- Service Qualities Interaction Register
- Participant Register
- Operational Requirements Business Register
- Business Process Register
- Business Context Register
- Information Item Attributes
- Organisational & Location Register
- As Built Design & Configuration Documents
- Architecture Principles & Business
- External Business Schedule
- Business Control Register
- Operational Requirements
- Service Quality Targets
- Interface Register
Increased flexibility can lead to greater agility but not vice versa.
Conclusions

» Consider your EA initiative as something to *facilitate change* in order to *make agility and flexibility possible*

>> *Don’t just consider “how I’m going to represent the Enterprise”*

» Consider EA frameworks and approaches which *already have service management* thinking built in (e.g. Atos Origin CLEAR approach)

» Consider *what your enterprise already uses from a Service Management perspective* and involve the owners as stakeholders in the EA governance and ownership cycles

Your representation is only *good* if it can facilitate change

Otherwise, what *use* is it?