

Study Plan — TOGAF: User Story Card Template & Full Chapter Cards

Standalone workbook for planning, executing, and evidencing TOGAF study via user stories.

How to Use This Template

Create one card per **chapter/phase**. Each card captures purpose, value, risks, acceptance criteria, and hands-on evidence you will produce.

Story Card Definition (required fields)

- **ID & Title** (e.g., TOGAF-A1 - Architecture Vision)
- **Epic / Feature**: capability this story contributes to (e.g., *ADM Mastery*)
- **Business Value**: why mastering this chapter matters
- **Priority / Estimate**: e.g., *Priority: Must, SP: 3*
- **Persona**: learner role (EA, solution architect, candidate)
- **Dependencies**: readings or concepts to complete first
- **Assumptions**: context and constraints
- **Risks**: pitfalls (e.g., confusing artifacts vs deliverables)
- **Story**: *As a <persona>, I want <capability> so that <outcome>.*
- **Non-Functional**: quality bars for your output (e.g., Accuracy Traceability)
- **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**: *Scenario / Given / When / Then*
- **Definition of Ready**: entry conditions
- **Definition of Done**: exit conditions and evidence

User Story Template (copy/paste)

As a [persona] I want [capability] so that [business outcome].

Scenario [name]

Given [preconditions]

When [action you take]

Then [verifiable result].

TOGAF-00 — Getting Started

| | | |
|-------|----------------------------|--|
| | Epic / Feature | TOGAF Foundations & ADM Overview |
| | Business Value | Create a mental model of the standard so later chapters connect cleanly; reduce confusion between phases, artifacts, and deliverables. |
| bblbl | Priority / Estimate | Priority: Must SP: 3 |
| | Persona | New EA practitioner / certification candidate |
| | Dependencies | None |
| | Assumptions | Access to TOGAF PDFs and note repository |
| | Risks | Over-memorizing terms without understanding input-s/steps/outputs |

Story *As a learner, I want an ADM “at-a-glance” so that I can place each chapter in context and study efficiently.*

Non-Functional Accuracy Clarity Traceability

Acceptance Criteria (BDD)

Scenario Happy path

Given the PDFs and a study workspace are available

When I create a one-page ADM map showing purpose, inputs, outputs for each phase

Then I can explain each phase in one sentence and cite one artifact per phase

Definition of Ready: Materials available; 60 minutes blocked. *Definition of Done:* One-page ADM map saved; glossary started; next chapter chosen.

Tasks

- ☐ Confirm access to EA tools (repository, modeling tool, ticketing, wiki).
- ☐ Create an EA working calendar (governance boards, review cadences, standups).
- ☐ Draft a one-page EA operating model for the product/org (engagement model, response SLAs).
- ☐ Create/refresh the stakeholder map and communication plan.
- ☐ Set up a baseline kanban/board for architecture work intake and triage.
- ☐ Publish templates for StoryCard, ADR, Principles, Capability Map, and Roadmap.
- ☐ Align with PMO on how EA artifacts map to stage gates and release cadence.

TOGAF-01 — Core Concepts

| | | |
|--------------|----------------------------|---|
| | Epic / Feature | Foundations Mastery |
| | Business Value | Distinguish Business, Data, Application, Technology domains and understand how they interrelate within TOGAF. |
| <i>bblbl</i> | Priority / Estimate | Priority: Must SP: 3 |
| | Persona | Learner seeking big-picture clarity |
| | Dependencies | TOGAF-00 |
| | Assumptions | Basic familiarity with enterprise change initiatives |
| | Risks | Mixing up “view” vs “viewpoint”; artifacts vs deliverables |

Story *As a learner, I want to summarize the four architecture domains and key TOGAF terms so that I can navigate later chapters precisely.*

Non-Functional Terminology Clarity Traceability

Acceptance Criteria (BDD)

Scenario Happy path

Given the glossary and Part 0 are available

When I write concise definitions and an example for each key term

Then I can map a real project element to its correct domain and artifact type

Definition of Ready: Glossary indexed; note template ready. *Definition of Done:* One-page glossary saved with examples; quiz self-test (10 Q) passed.

Tasks

- ☐ Assemble a glossary (capability, value stream, SBB/ABB, roadmap, principle).
- ☐ Map internal SDLC/PMO language to TOGAF terms (crosswalk cheat sheet).
- ☐ Curate reference examples for each artifact (vision, capability map, heatmap, roadmap).
- ☐ Provide a ‘how-to’ micro-guide for each artifact and where it lives in the repo.
- ☐ Run a 30-min enablement session with product/engineering leads on ‘how to engage EA’.
- ☐ Set up linting/checklists for EA deliverables (minimum content, traceability).

TOGAF-CAP — EA Capability & Governance

| | | |
|--------|----------------------------|---|
| bblbbl | Epic / Feature | Operating the Practice |
| | Business Value | Stand up a durable architecture practice with metrics, accountability, and governance calendar. |
| | Priority / Estimate | Priority: Should SP: 5 |
| | Persona | EA Practice Lead |
| | Dependencies | TOGAF-P & G |
| | Assumptions | Leadership sponsorship exists |
| | Risks | Missing metrics; unclear accountability |

Story *As a practice lead, I want a charter, operating model, and metrics so that the EA function delivers measurable value.*

Non-Functional Accountability Transparency Metrics

Acceptance Criteria (BDD)

Scenario Practice charter

Given organizational context

When I define roles, processes, metrics, and governance calendar

Then an EA Charter and accountability matrix are published

Definition of Ready: Sponsor identified. *Definition of Done:* Charter approved; metrics baseline set; governance calendar live.

Tasks

- ☐ Define decision rights/RACI for architecture decisions and waivers.
- ☐ Stand up the Architecture Review Board (ARB) charter, cadence, and intake form.
- ☐ Publish principle adoption policy and exception handling workflow.
- ☐ Define EA KPIs (cycle time for reviews, % decisions with ADRs, compliance trend).
- ☐ Set quarterly roadmap/portfolio alignment reviews with PMO and Finance/FinOps.
- ☐ Document escalation paths to CTO/CIO for cross-cutting risks.

TOGAF-CONT — Content (Deliverables, Artifacts, Repository, Meta-model)

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Epic / Feature | Content Mastery |
| Business Value | Standardize outputs; enable reuse and governance via a clear repository and metamodel. |
| Priority / Estimate | Priority: Must SP: 5 |
| <i>bblbl</i> Persona | All architects |
| Dependencies | TOGAF-A-D |
| Assumptions | Tooling supports catalogs/matrices/diagrams |
| Risks | Confusing deliverables vs artifacts; inconsistent meta-data |

Story *As an architect, I want a content model and repository structure so that artifacts are consistent and discoverable.*

Non-Functional

Findability

Consistency

Reuse

Acceptance Criteria (BDD)

Scenario Repository setup

Given selected tools and templates

When I define deliverables, artifact types, and repository sections

Then artifacts from each phase are filed with consistent metadata

Definition of Ready: Template set chosen. *Definition of Done:* Repository map + sample artifacts (catalog, matrix, diagram) saved.

Tasks

- ☐ Stand up the architecture repository structure (domains, products, artifacts).
- ☐ Define the metamodel (artifact types, relationships, identifiers, traceability rules).
- ☐ Implement naming/versioning conventions; add changelog/owners to each artifact folder.
- ☐ Create reusable reference models (security baseline, integration patterns, landing zone).
- ☐ Automate TOC and cross-links in the repo (index pages, search).
- ☐ Add ADR template and register with unique IDs and tags.

TOGAF-P — Preliminary Phase

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|
| | Epic / Feature | Architecture Capability Setup |
| | Business Value | Tailor method, define principles, and set up tools so ADM work is consistent and governable. |
| blblbl | Priority / Estimate | Priority: Must SP: 5 |
| | Persona | EA lead / candidate |
| | Dependencies | TOGAF-01 |
| | Assumptions | Org context (hypothetical is fine) |
| | Risks | Skipping principle quality (rationale/implications) |
| Story <i>As an EA practitioner, I want to tailor the method and draft principles so that delivery is aligned and repeatable.</i> | | |
| Non-Functional Governance Repeatability Traceability | | |
| Acceptance Criteria (BDD) | | |
| Scenario Happy path | | |
| Given a target organization context | | |
| When I define 8–12 principles with rationale & implications and a tooling/repo approach | | |
| Then a mini “Architecture Practice Setup” pack exists and is reusable in later phases | | |
| <i>Definition of Ready:</i> Context chosen; template ready. <i>Definition of Done:</i> Principles, tailoring notes, and repo structure saved. | | |

Tasks

- ☐ Document business drivers, constraints, and scope boundaries.
- ☐ Baseline current EA capability maturity; identify readiness gaps.
- ☐ Define/refresh enterprise principles (security, privacy, cost, resilience, interoperability).
- ☐ Confirm stakeholders and sponsorship; agree on success metrics.
- ☐ Publish EA compliance approach and integration with delivery lifecycle.

TOGAF-R — Requirements Management

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|
| blblbl | Epic / Feature | Continuous Requirements |
| | Business Value | Provide a single requirements thread through all phases for traceable decisions. |
| | Priority / Estimate | Priority: Must SP: 3 |
| | Persona | All architects |
| | Dependencies | TOGAF-A through H |
| | Assumptions | Simple catalog format available |
| | Risks | Uncontrolled changes; poor traceability |
| Story <i>As an architect, I want a living requirements catalog so that changes are traceable to phases and decisions.</i> | | |
| Non-Functional Single Source Traceability Auditability | | |
| Acceptance Criteria (BDD) | | |
| Scenario Catalog lifecycle | | |
| Given incoming/changed requirements | | |
| When I log, baseline, and assess impacts | | |
| Then decisions and affected artifacts/phases are recorded | | |
| <i>Definition of Ready:</i> Catalog template ready. <i>Definition of Done:</i> Catalog exists with status fields; two sample changes processed. | | |

Tasks

- ☐ Stand up a traceable backlog linking business outcomes → requirements → architecture decisions.
- ☐ Adopt BDD acceptance templates for requirements; enforce non-functional requirements (NFRs).
- ☐ Implement change control workflow for evolving requirements with impact analysis.
- ☐ Integrate backlog with ADRs and roadmaps; ensure bidirectional links.
- ☐ Prioritize using a transparent method (e.g., WSJF) and publish rationale.

TOGAF-A — Phase A: Architecture Vision

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|---|
| bblbbl | Epic / Feature | ADM Mastery |
| | Business Value | Align stakeholders, define scope and success, and set the change program up for traceable outcomes. |
| | Priority / Estimate | Priority: Must SP: 5 |
| | Persona | Enterprise Architect |
| | Dependencies | TOGAF-P |
| | Assumptions | Practice initiative identified |
| | Risks | Confusing Vision with detailed solution; skipping KPIs |
| Story <i>As an EA, I want to produce an Architecture Vision so that stakeholders share a common picture of scope, value, and KPIs.</i> | | |
| Non-Functional Stakeholder Alignment KPIs Concise | | |
| Acceptance Criteria (BDD) | | |
| Scenario Happy path | | |
| Given initiative and stakeholders are known | | |
| When I draft problem, objectives, scope, constraints, KPIs, and risks | | |
| Then a one-page Vision and draft Statement of Architecture Work are produced | | |
| <i>Definition of Ready:</i> Stakeholders listed; session booked. <i>Definition of Done:</i> Vision + SoAW saved; KPIs accepted; risks logged. | | |

Tasks

- ☐ Write problem statement and business outcomes; define success metrics.
- ☐ Produce solution concept sketch and initial scope/assumptions.
- ☐ Draft value proposition and high-level benefits/risks.
- ☐ Create initial transition roadmap strawman and socialize with key stakeholders.
- ☐ Run a Vision checkpoint with sponsors; capture decisions in ADRs.

TOGAF-B — Phase B: Business Architecture

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Epic / Feature | Target Business Design |
| Business Value | Clarify capabilities, processes, and organizational changes required to realize the vision. |
| Priority / Estimate | Priority: Must SP: 8 |
| <i>bblbl</i> Persona | Business/Enterprise Architect |
| Dependencies | TOGAF-A |
| Assumptions | Value streams identifiable |
| Risks | Jumping to tech solutions before business capability gaps are clear |

Story *As an architect, I want to define target business capabilities and processes so that value realization is explicit and testable.*

Non-Functional

Clarity

Capability-Based

Traceability

Acceptance Criteria (BDD)

Scenario Capability-led

Given current business model and value streams

When I document baseline/target business capabilities, processes, org mappings

Then gaps and candidate work packages are identified with business owners

Definition of Ready: Value stream sketch ready. *Definition of Done:* Capability map + process high-level model + gap list produced.

Tasks

- ☐ Baseline capability map and heatmap by value stream.
- ☐ Define target capability deltas and MVP scope; identify process/people impacts.
- ☐ Model key business processes supporting target capabilities; identify controls/compliance impacts.
- ☐ Capture business requirements and acceptance criteria aligned to outcomes.
- ☐ Assess organizational change needs; outline training/communications.

TOGAF-C1 — Phase C: Data Architecture

| | | |
|--------|----------------------------|--|
| bblbbl | Epic / Feature | Information Systems — Data |
| | Business Value | Ensure data entities, flows, and qualities support business capabilities and compliance. |
| | Priority / Estimate | Priority: Must SP: 5 |
| | Persona | Data/Information Architect |
| | Dependencies | TOGAF-B |
| | Assumptions | Authoritative sources are discoverable |
| | Risks | Underspecified ownership and quality constraints |

Story *As an architect, I want to model baseline/target data and constraints so that interoperability and governance are explicit.*

Non-Functional

Lineage

Interoperability

Quality

Acceptance Criteria (BDD)

Scenario Entity/flow coverage

Given priority capabilities from Phase B

When I define data entities, relationships, flows, ownership, and quality constraints

Then a data view and constraint list exist and link to application/services

Definition of Ready: Critical entities identified. *Definition of Done:* Data views + constraints + governance/ownership recorded.

Tasks

- ☐ Define conceptual data domains and critical entities; map owners and stewardship.
- ☐ Describe data lifecycle (ingest, store, process, expose, retain, dispose).
- ☐ Identify data quality rules, MDM reference/master data, and golden sources.
- ☐ Map data flows and integration contracts; address privacy/regulatory requirements.
- ☐ Plan data catalog/governance enablement and lineage visibility.

TOGAF-C2 — Phase C: Application Architecture

| | | |
|--------|----------------------------|---|
| | Epic / Feature | Information Systems — Applications |
| | Business Value | Define application/services landscape and interactions to meet business and data needs. |
| bblbbl | Priority / Estimate | Priority: Must SP: 5 |
| | Persona | Application/Integration Architect |
| | Dependencies | TOGAF-C1 |
| | Assumptions | Integration constraints known |
| | Risks | Hidden interoperability constraints |

Story *As an architect, I want to model baseline/target applications and interactions so that interoperability constraints are explicit.*

Non-Functional Interoperability Resilience Security

Acceptance Criteria (BDD)

Scenario Service interaction

Given data and capability needs

When I map application components, interfaces, and interaction patterns

Then target application views and interface constraints are baselined

Definition of Ready: Data constraints documented. *Definition of Done:* App interaction views + interface/interop constraints recorded.

Tasks

- ☐ Inventory current applications/services; identify redundancies and candidates for rationalization.
- ☐ Define target application/service map with key interfaces/APIs and SLAs.
- ☐ Select integration patterns (sync/async, eventing) and API standards/versioning.
- ☐ Decide build/buy/SaaS choices; document decision drivers in ADRs.
- ☐ Capture NFRs (availability, latency, security, observability) and test strategies.

TOGAF-D — Phase D: Technology Architecture

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|---|
| | Epic / Feature | Platform Enablement |
| | Business Value | Provide platforms and tech services that enable application and data designs. |
| blblbl | Priority / Estimate | Priority: Must SP: 5 |
| | Persona | Technology Architect |
| | Dependencies | TOGAF-C2 |
| | Assumptions | Hosting patterns (cloud/on-prem) in scope |
| | Risks | Underestimating NFRs like DR, observability, security |
| Story <i>As a tech architect, I want to define target tech services/components so that workloads are supported and governable.</i> | | |
| Non-Functional Scalability Availability Security Observability | | |
| Acceptance Criteria (BDD) | | |
| Scenario Service inventory | | |
| Given application and data needs | | |
| When I define platform services, standards, and constraints | | |
| Then a target tech service model and standards list are approved for planning | | |
| <i>Definition of Ready:</i> Hosting strategy chosen. <i>Definition of Done:</i> Tech services diagram + standards catalog saved. | | |

Tasks

- ☐ Choose target platforms (cloud regions, k8s, databases, messaging, identity).
- ☐ Apply standards/baselines (security hardening, encryption, network segmentation).
- ☐ Define reference infra patterns (landing zone, multi-account, VPC/VNET).
- ☐ Plan resiliency/DR objectives and SRE practices (SLOs, error budgets).
- ☐ Estimate TCO with FinOps; highlight tech-debt remediation opportunities.

TOGAF-E — Phase E: Opportunities & Solutions

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|
| bblbbl | Epic / Feature | Solution Shaping |
| | Business Value | Bundle work into feasible work packages and outline the initial roadmap. |
| | Priority / Estimate | Priority: Must SP: 5 |
| | Persona | EA / Portfolio Architect |
| | Dependencies | TOGAF-B,C,D |
| | Assumptions | Dependencies and constraints captured |
| | Risks | Over-committing without value/risk trade-off |
| Story <i>As an EA, I want to identify opportunities and group them into work packages so that a value-focused roadmap emerges.</i> | | |
| Non-Functional Value Feasibility Traceability | | |
| Acceptance Criteria (BDD) | | |
| Scenario Initial roadmap | | |
| Given gaps and candidate packages | | |
| When I group packages, define transitions, and outline the roadmap | | |
| Then an initial Architecture Roadmap exists with rationale and dependencies | | |
| <i>Definition of Ready:</i> Gap list ready. <i>Definition of Done:</i> Initial roadmap + transition states documented. | | |

Tasks

- ☐ Identify Solution Building Blocks (SBBs) and group into work packages.
- ☐ Evaluate solution options (fit/gap, cost, risk); recommend preferred approach.
- ☐ Map dependencies across work packages; confirm feasibility with delivery leads.
- ☐ Draft preliminary release roadmap and resource assumptions.

TOGAF-F — Phase F: Migration Planning

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|
| | Epic / Feature | Executable Plan |
| | Business Value | Prioritize and schedule work into an actionable program integrated with PMO/finance. |
| blblbl | Priority / Estimate | Priority: Must SP: 5 |
| | Persona | EA / Program Planner |
| | Dependencies | TOGAF-E |
| | Assumptions | Value/risk and cost drivers known |
| | Risks | Ignoring risk-weighted value; lack of funding alignment |
| Story <i>As a planner, I want an Implementation & Migration Plan so that change is funded, sequenced, and measurable.</i> | | |
| Non-Functional Feasible Measurable Aligned | | |
| Acceptance Criteria (BDD) | | |
| Scenario Portfolio prioritization | | |
| Given work packages and constraints | | |
| When I score value/risk, build a timeline, and align with PMO | | |
| Then an approved Implementation & Migration Plan is baselined | | |
| <i>Definition of Ready:</i> Roadmap in place. <i>Definition of Done:</i> Plan baselined; funding checkpoints identified; KPIs tied to releases. | | |

Tasks

- ☐ Sequence waves/releases and define cutover strategy.
- ☐ Create dependency network and critical path; align with PMO plans.
- ☐ Develop risk register and mitigations; include change-management activities.
- ☐ Plan decommission/retirement of legacy systems and data migration.
- ☐ Publish migration plan with entry/exit criteria per wave.

TOGAF-G — Phase G: Implementation Governance

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|--|
| | Epic / Feature | Delivery Oversight |
| | Business Value | Ensure delivery remains aligned to architecture via reviews and waivers. |
| <i>bblbbl</i> | Priority / Estimate | Priority: Should SP: 3 |
| | Persona | Architecture Governance Lead |
| | Dependencies | TOGAF-F |
| | Assumptions | Delivery projects underway |
| | Risks | Token compliance without evidence |
| Story <i>As a governance lead, I want a compliance review approach so that deviations are visible and decisions recorded.</i> | | |
| Non-Functional Accountability Evidence Traceability | | |
| Acceptance Criteria (BDD) | | |
| Scenario Architecture compliance | | |
| Given project plans and designs | | |
| When I run compliance checkpoints and log decisions/waivers | | |
| Then a compliant status and action list exist with artifacts as evidence | | |
| <i>Definition of Ready:</i> Review calendar set. <i>Definition of Done:</i> Checklists, minutes, and decisions filed in governance repo. | | |

Tasks

- ☐ Define architecture compliance checkpoints and artifacts required at each gate.
- ☐ Establish Design Authority/ARB routines and waiver process.
- ☐ Instrument fitness functions/controls to enforce NFRs in CI/CD.
- ☐ Run periodic solution reviews; log issues and decisions in ADRs.
- ☐ Report compliance trend and escalate systemic blockers.

TOGAF-H — Phase H: Architecture Change Management

| | | |
|--------|----------------------------|--|
| | Epic / Feature | Sustained Alignment |
| | Business Value | Adapt architecture responsibly as drivers change; trigger re-entry to ADM when needed. |
| blblbl | Priority / Estimate | Priority: Should SP: 3 |
| | Persona | EA Practice Lead |
| | Dependencies | TOGAF-G |
| | Assumptions | Change drivers monitored |
| | Risks | Uncontrolled drift; stale standards |

Story *As a practice lead, I want clear re-entry triggers and maintenance processes so that change remains governed.*

Non-Functional Controlled Change Auditability

Acceptance Criteria (BDD)

Scenario Trigger-based

Given strategy, standards, and production feedback

When I evaluate impact and decide on maintenance vs re-architecture

Then re-entry to appropriate ADM phases and updates are documented

Definition of Ready: Change log feed enabled. *Definition of Done:* Trigger list, impact assessment template, and decision records saved.

Tasks

- ☐ Monitor business/tech drivers; maintain a watchlist of change triggers.
- ☐ Run roadmap review cadence; adjust scope and priorities with sponsors.
- ☐ Curate refactoring/modernization backlog and value hypotheses.
- ☐ Sunset or evolve principles/standards as evidence shifts; communicate changes.
- ☐ Capture lessons learned and feed them back to techniques/templates.

TOGAF-T — ADM Techniques (Principles, Gaps, Risk, Migration, Stakeholders)

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Epic / Feature | Technique Proficiency |
| Business Value | Apply supporting techniques to produce higher-quality, defensible architectures. |
| Priority / Estimate | Priority: Should SP: 5 |
| <i>bblbbl</i> Persona | Practicing Architect |
| Dependencies | TOGAF-P & A-D |
| Assumptions | Templates available |
| Risks | Principles without implications; superficial risk analysis |

Story *As an architect, I want to master ADM techniques so that my artifacts are consistent, risk-aware, and implementable.*

Non-Functional

Consistency

Rigor

Defensibility

Acceptance Criteria (BDD)

Scenario Technique application

Given a sample initiative

When I apply principles, stakeholder mapping, gap/risk, and migration techniques

Then each technique yields a concrete artifact linked to the roadmap

Definition of Ready: Initiative selected. *Definition of Done:* Principles set, stakeholder map, gap list, risk register, and migration matrix saved.

Tasks

- ☐ Maintain and socialize the principle catalog with rationale and implications.
- ☐ Operate gap and risk registers with consistent scoring and owners.
- ☐ Keep stakeholder maps and engagement plans current; measure sentiment.
- ☐ Produce migration matrices/heatmaps and keep them tied to roadmaps.
- ☐ Ensure every major decision has an ADR and traceability to requirements.

TOGAF-AP — Applying the ADM (Iteration, Levels, Tailoring)

| | | |
|--------|----------------------------|---|
| | Epic / Feature | Contextualization |
| | Business Value | Use the ADM effectively across enterprise/segment/capability scopes and agile delivery. |
| blblbl | Priority / Estimate | Priority: Should SP: 3 |
| | Persona | EA / Method Engineer |
| | Dependencies | TOGAF-A–H |
| | Assumptions | Multiple delivery teams exist |
| | Risks | One-size-fits-all method; unclear iteration strategy |

Story *As a method engineer, I want a tailoring and iteration approach so that the ADM fits delivery cadence and scope.*

Non-Functional Pragmatic Lightweight Repeatable

Acceptance Criteria (BDD)

Scenario Tailored ADM

Given organization constraints

When I define scopes, iteration patterns, and touchpoints with agile/PMO

Then a “How We Use the ADM” guide exists and is referenced by teams

Definition of Ready: Delivery practices reviewed. *Definition of Done:* Tailoring guide approved; example iteration plan attached.

Tasks

- ☐ Define iteration levels (enterprise, segment, capability/product) and handoffs.
- ☐ Tailor ADM to agile delivery (dual-track discovery, architecture runway).
- ☐ Set rules for ‘just enough’ artifacts and timeboxes per iteration.
- ☐ Define scaling guidance for multi-team programs and shared platforms.
- ☐ Review tailoring effectiveness quarterly; adjust ceremonies and artifacts.

TOGAF-## — [Chapter / Phase Title]

Epic / Feature [e.g., ADM Mastery / Content Mastery / Governance]
Business Value [Outcome you gain by completing this unit]
Priority / Estimate Priority: [Must|Should|Could] SP: [1–8]
blblbl **Persona** [your role]
Dependencies [prior readings or cards]
Assumptions [context]
Risks [pitfalls to watch]

Story As a *[persona]*, I want *[capability]* so that *[business outcome]*.

Non-Functional [Tag 1] [Tag 2] [Tag 3]

Acceptance Criteria (BDD)

Scenario [name]

Given [preconditions]

When [action]

Then [verifiable result]

Definition of Ready: [entry conditions] *Definition of Done:* [exit checks and artifacts]

Tasks

- ☐ [hands-on task 1]
- ☐ [hands-on task 2]
- ☐ [hands-on task 3]
- ☐ [artifact to produce]
- ☐ [checkpoint to verify AC/DoD]

Tips for Writing Effective Study Stories

- **Make outcomes measurable:** e.g., “identify three artifacts produced in Phase B” beats “understand Phase B”.
- **Trace to TOGAF:** each task should map to inputs/steps/outputs of the chapter/phase.
- **Keep cards concise:** one page per story; file deep details as artifacts in your repo.
- **Use tags as quality bars:** Accuracy , Traceability , Clarity , etc.
- **Close the loop:** update dependencies for the next card and check DoD before moving on.