Be warned, this path won't win you many friends. I've been in conferences where I've got into raging arguments with people trying to explain to me that agile works everywhere. This is often followed by other conferences and raging arguments with people trying to explain that six sigma works everywhere. In both cases, they'll often explain failure as "not doing it in the right way" or "using the wrong bits" and never that there exists a limit or context to the method. It's no different with the "better specification" problem. The failure is always blamed on something else and not that specification, agile or six sigma shouldn't have been used for those parts.

During my years of using mapping, the "use of appropriate methods" was just one of a long list of context specific gameplays, climatic (economic) patterns and doctrine (universally useful principles) that I had discovered through my use of maps. I turned to my list of doctrine to help write the "Governance of Technology Change" paper and to correct some of my failures in the original "Better for Less". I used these principles to propose a new form of governance structure that built upon the work that was already done. The key elements of doctrine used were: -

Doctrine: Focus on high situational awareness (understand what is being considered)
A major failing of "Better for Less" was the lack of emphasis on maps. I had to increase situational awareness beyond simple mental models and structures such as ILC. To achieve this, we needed to develop maps within government which requires an anchor (user need), an understanding of position (the value chain and components involved)