

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256453890>

A Comparison Enterprise Architecture Implementation Methodologies

Article · September 2013

DOI: 10.1109/ICIM.2013.9

CITATIONS

5

READS

386

4 authors:



[Pourya Nikfard](#)

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

24 PUBLICATIONS 58 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



[Babak Darvish Rouhani](#)

Payame Noor University

17 PUBLICATIONS 31 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



[Mohd Naz'ri Mahrin](#)

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

33 PUBLICATIONS 71 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



[Fatemeh Nikpay](#)

University of Malaya

14 PUBLICATIONS 19 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

A Comparison Enterprise Architecture Implementation Methodologies

Babak Darvish Rouhani
Advanced Informatics School
University Technology Malaysia
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
drbabk2@live.utm.my

Mohd Naz'ri Mahrin
Advanced Informatics School
University Technology Malaysia
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
mdnazrim@utm.my

Fatemeh Nikpay
Advanced Informatics School
University Technology Malaysia
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
nfatemeh6@live.utm.my

Pourya Nikfard
Advanced Informatics School
University Technology Malaysia
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
npourya2@live.utm.my

Abstract— A number of methodologies for implementing Enterprise Architecture (EA) have been proposed in the literature. Understanding methodologies' strengths and weaknesses play significant role in selecting appropriate methodology for each EA project. This paper reviews five EA implementation methodologies including: EAP, TOGAF, DODAF, Gartner, and FEA and compare them based on designed framework. Comparison framework is designed based on concepts, modeling, and processes criteria. This comparison provides vast information about selected methodologies based on defined criteria.

Keyword: Enterprise Architecture; Enterprise Architecture Implementation Methodology; Comparison Enterprise Architecture Implementation Methodologies

I. INTRODUCTION

Business and Information Technology (IT) integration is essential for enterprises to achieve their competitiveness. Enterprise Architecture (EA) is a structure for alignment Business and IT within enterprise. The key responsibility of EA is to provide appropriate Information Systems (ISs) based on enterprise business's demands [13][20].

For the first time EA was introduced by John Zachman in 1987. The purpose of the founder of EA was to use architecture like civil inside of enterprises to reduce complexity of developing ISs. At the first he presented the framework to create skeleton for his purpose. Zachman's Framework contains abstractions and perspectives [4][5].

In EA project, enterprise architect must select a framework and a implementation methodology. Although, there are some EA frameworks which represent a method for implementing EA, they are either use in specific enterprises or incomplete [13].

EA Framework (EAF) represents the structure to model enterprise's business and IT. In EAF, there are different models for various perspectives, each with different scope and activities. There is no doubt that modeling the business and IT are not sufficient for enterprise by they own. Enterprises are looking to find a plan to address their challenges on competitiveness. They utilize EA to provide appropriate solution for their business's demands and it needs to implement EA models [12][14].

EA Implementation Methodology (EAIM) describes structured methods in order to implement identified projects within EA project. Moreover, it can comprise some distinct methods [13].

II. ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE IMPLEMENTATION

Zackman's Framework (ZF) (as first EA framework) is limited to architecture and does not include a strategic planning methodology [4]. In 1992 Steve Spewak introduced the first methodology for implementing EA. Spewak presented the EA planning to complete EA lifecycle. In other word, EA methodology complement EA framework. EA contains three principal phases, As-Is architecture, To-Be architecture, and migration plan [10].

In As-Is architecture (also known as baseline, current, and initial architecture), EA will be defined current situation of business and IT of enterprise by means of set of definitions which illustrate the current state of the enterprise's mission, business processes and technology's infrastructure. The key role of this stage is vision of enterprise [13][19].

In To-Be architecture (also known as desired, future, target architecture) EA will be represented the desired architecture including future of business and IT based on vision of enterprise. This type of architecture is the result of enterprise's long-term strategies and plans. The key role of this stage is to identify appropriate ISs [13][19].

In EA migration plan (also known as transition plan) is the essential strategy that will be employed for Transition from the As-Is to the To-Be one. The key role of this stage is using the proper implementation method [13][19].

The Enterprise Architecture Methodology supports advanced development techniques and technologies. It covers all aspects of the EA lifecycle- the planning for enterprise understanding projects, the analysis of business requirements, the design of systems, the evolution of systems, and the ongoing enhancements of all of the above. The methodology is both complete and concise, serving as a coherent guide for practitioner professionals. It allows paths and pieces of content to be selected and extracted for application on specific projects [9][13].

Well implemented EA helps a company innovate and change by providing both stability and flexibility. Today's there are several EA methods which they are introduced to provide a plan for developing tailored ISs. These ISs must address existing enterprise's challenges and update business structure of enterprise by ISs integrity [20]. EA implementing method can be independent or dependent to a framework. While EA framework tries to capture information from enterprise's business and IT and model them, EA method tries to utilize models for developing appropriate ISs and IT Infrastructure for enterprise [11][19].

III. THE METHODOLOGY

This study compares the following EAIMs:

- EAP
- TOGAF
- DODAF
- Gartner
- FEA

A. Enterprise Architecture Planning (EAP)

Enterprise Architecture Planning (EAP) was introduced by Spewak in 1992. EAP contains activities and processes in order to achieve To-Be architecture by considering four EA architectures including: Business, Data, Application, and Infrastructure. It is also known as the Wedding Cake. It covers two first perspective of ZF [9].

EAP specifies a plan for subsequent design and implementation EA. The ZF prepares the broad description for architectural layers, while EAP concentrates on

developing and managing the process for making alignment between business and IT. Moreover, EAP is planning that concentrates on the development of matrixes for comparison and analysis data, IS, and infrastructure. Significant part of EAP is an implementation plan [9].

EAP provides the process of using architectures for the utilizing ISs in order to support business and the plan in order to implement architectures. It comprises the following phases [8][9]:

- Initiation Planning;
- Preliminary business model;
- Enterprise survey;
- Current systems and technology architecture;
- Data architecture;
- Application architecture;
- Technology architecture;
- Implementation plan;
- Planning conclusion;
- Transition to implementation;

In 2006, EAP has been changed and some items were added into the prior model. The intent of this change was to refresh one part of the EAP approach and update the model. One of the added items was governance. The reason for adding governance into the new edition of EAP model was: through effective governance possible to become a real portfolio of approved transition plan projects. The revised EAP Wedding Cake model is an important part of the refreshment of the EAP approach. This refreshment helps to strengthen and reconnect EAP to the continually evolving stream of EA methodologies that are in use globally. In EAP update, it has presented several significant changes that reflect updates in how and when to do EA that it felt was needed to advance and refresh the originally defined process. This will help make EAP more current and hopefully still very useful in understanding how to do EA in the public and private sectors [10].

B. TOGAF

The TOGAF Architecture Development Method (ADM) provides a tested and iterative process for developing EA. It comprises instituting an architectural framework, transitioning, developing architecture contents, and governing the comprehension of architectures. Mentioned activities are fulfilled by employing an iterative cycle of continuous architecture description and comprehension that permits enterprises to transform themselves in a managed manner in accordance with business targets. TOGAF ADM is a methodology that describes an iterative method for EA development. Enterprise architect must be determined some features of TOGAF methodology such as: level of details, breadth of coverage, and extent of time horizon due to ADM

does not provide prescription on those. The ADM phases are [7]:

- **Preliminary** – It clarify the current architecture in an organization by way of using framework and concepts of EA.
- **ADM Cycle:** it consists of the following phases:
Architecture Vision consists of description of current architecture and desired architecture of business and IT views. *Business Architecture* depicts the current architecture of business and analyzes gaps between it and desired one. *IS Architecture* specifies the desired data and IS architecture by analyzing the requirements of them. *Technology Architecture* is employed to build up the basis implementation. It comprises eight sub-phases comprising: formation of current, considering perspectives, selecting services, creating architecture model, determining criteria, verifying business targets, conducting gap analysis, and defining architecture. *Opportunities and Solutions* comprises of assessment and choice of implementing options. *Migration Planning* concerns on prioritizing implementing projects in accordance with their dependencies. *Implementation Governance* concerns on governing of EA project particularly on implementing and deploying. *Architecture Change Management* concerns on future changes by using repeated surveillance process in business and IT which can cause new deployments.
- **Requirements Management** provides the place for identifying and keeping requirements for other ADM Cycle phases.

TOGAF specifies a Technical Reference Model (TRM) for Enterprise Continuum (EC). TRM model base on *Application*, *Application Platform* and *Communication Infrastructure* and their *interconnectivity* depicts a system. Moreover, it describes quality of services that organized by the system and the Standard Information Base in the EC provides integrated information, management and IS standards for architecture development [7].

TOGAF ADM supports evolution of EA by way of EC as its knowledge base. Although, processes of each ADM phase are defined appropriately, ADM leaves flexibility of implementation to EA architects to decide needed activities for EA project from distinct set of possible results. In order

to trace designing and deciding on architecture ADM suggests documenting of design rationale [7].

C. DODAF

The Department of Defense Architecture Framework (DODAF) is the holistic framework and conceptual model for enabling the development of EA particularly for DOD agencies. As conceptually DODAF is an EAF-in-practice like FEAF, but it was developed for a specific domain and enterprises, and was not designed to be used beyond those bounds. In contrast to more abstract methodology like Gartner, and TOGAF which were designed to solve general issue with EA development across a wide array of enterprises, DODAF was designed to solve a wide array of specific issues within a singular organizational context, the DOD.

The DODAF method is Model-driven, that is specific templates of data that are used to aggregate and communicate data on a specific architectural issue. When these models are complete they become a “View” of a facet of the current DOD architecture. In DODAF 2.0, there are eight prescribed perspectives [6]:

- All;
- Capability;
- Data and Information;
- Operational;
- Project;
- Services;
- Standards;
- Systems;

DODAF, by using given perspectives focuses on the supporting decision makers guide the development of EA within the DOD whether the effort is on a strategic or tactical level.

D. Gartner

Gartner methodology believes that EA is about bringing together three constituents: business owners, information specialists, and the technology implementers. Bringing given groups together and merge them into the one vision based on values of business, cause project has succeeded; otherwise project has failed. In Gartner point of view success could be measured by pragmatic term [3].

According to Gartner point of view EA project must be started with understanding enterprise direction on business, not with finding its current position. This activity needs to listen to the enterprise strategic plan and understanding how it response to this plan. In order to obtain pure and concise information about enterprise, Gartner tries to achieve them in simple words, without concerning about recommended standard documents, or technical babbling. The result of this method is providing common understanding about enterprise situation and strategic plan [3].

E. FEA

The Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) method is mainly concentrated on creating architectural method for governmental agency and is described in the FEA Practice Guidance. The segment-architecture development process consists of four steps including [1][2]:

- Architectural Analysis- describes explicit vision of enterprise, and related to the organizational plan.
- Architectural Definition- provides the To-Be architecture of the enterprise, considering design alternatives, documenting the performance targets, and developing an EA for enterprise, comprising business, data, services, and technology architectures.
- Investment and Funding Strategy- considers how the project will be funded.
- Program-Management Plan and Execute Projects - Creates a plan for managing and executing the project, including milestones and performance measures that will assess project success.

FEA, like DODAF is an EAF-in-practice, but its enterprise encompasses Federal Government of the USA. FEA is one of the more fragmented EAF's and currently spans five documents: a five-part Reference Model (RM), a methodology, a maturity model, a best-practices guide as well as considerations as to how to have FEA complement Service Oriented Architecture. The FEA Reference Model consists of the following models:

- **Performance RM**– for identifying and Standardizing measurement of EA output;
- **Business RM**– for alignment the Federal EA beside practical;
- **Service Component RM** – for organizing hidden component and service for reprocess;
- **Technical RM** – for organizing current standard and technology in use
- **Data RM** – for providing a standard technique for description, categorization and allocation the information inside the Federal Government.

The Federal Segment Architecture Methodology (FSAM) is offered as a means to implement FEA within a manageable segment of the Federal Enterprise, and follows a logical progression through project launch, strategic intent, system requirements, conceptual solutions, and preliminary planning. Moreover, FSAM offers a separate document delineating guidance to implement and adapt these initial plans to the specific context of the Federal Segment. *A Practical Guide to the Federal Enterprise Architecture* provides a process for developing an EA. The process steps

overlap with those in the Spewak EAP processes. The Practical Guide adds governance, more on tools, establishing a Program Management Office (PMO), transitioning, and marketing the EA. The practitioner can combine Practical Guide and EAP process ideas [1][2].

IV. COMPARISON FRAMEWORK

This section describes a framework for evaluation selected EAIMs. It comprises a set of criteria that addresses both generic EA attributes and features that are uniquely found in EAIMs. It covers three major aspects of each EAIM: Concepts, Modeling, and Process [21].

Concepts: EA concepts are importance for enterprises generally and for EAIMs particularly. According to literature research, a number of considerable EA concepts that are generally addressed, including: definition of EA, alignment between business and IT, importance of repository, the association and communication among artifacts and EAIM strategy, governance, EAIM roles and process are identified [13][15][16].

Modeling: since EA concepts provide basis for EAIM, thus the modeling for portray designs regarding to those concepts is generally the main part of any EAIM. A typical modeling comprises of the following major components: notation, syntax and semantics. Modeling different perspectives of enterprise are significant part of modeling that need to utilize in EAIM. Consequently, by using an appropriate modeling the EAIM could reduce the complexities of current and desired architecture, and transition plan effectively [13][15][16][18].

Process: As mentioned above, the modeling is considered as a compulsory part of any EAIM. However, EAIM emphasizes the set of process and parts performed as part of the EA life cycle. These activities and steps form the process which guide enterprise architect and business analyzer in EA implementation. A useful EAIM should cover the following stages, enterprise modeling, current architecture analysis, desired architecture analysis, managing and providing detailed design of projects, describing controlled transition plan, and implementation. EAIM that covers all parts of the EA development by considering EA concepts is a consistent and complete methodology [13][15][16][18].

V. FINDING

Based on the above comparison framework a review on related research papers ([1][3][6][7][8][9][10][17][22][23][24][25][26][27]) and particular guideline of each selected EAIM was conducted in order to specify selected

EAIMs based on comparison criteria. The results are summarized in table I and are discussed below.

Concepts: TOGAF provides appropriate governance and repository rather than the other by utilizing a specific model for them. Although, TOGAF describes required business and IT architecture in ADM, it more focus on IT development and could not provide appropriate alignment between business and IT. Since FEA is derived by EAP, almost their attributes are same. However, EAP had some changes in 2006, but significant part of EAP still is strategy plan that designed based on four architecture layers including: business, data, application, and infrastructure. Although, DODAF is designed for specific domain, it almost considers all EA concepts in acceptable manner. In contrast of other EAIMs, Gartner more focus on development process and support adequate EA concepts.

Modeling: utilizing appropriate modeling for both business and IT domains is essential for EAIM. Gartner and DODAF do not present a method for consistency and traceability. Although, FEA, EAP, and TOGAF provide appropriate method for modeling, they are different in learning and using. TOGAF provides broad documents about its method and process but access and employing of them need more time rather the others. TOGAF mentioned that EA architects must select needed process for project from TOGAF phases and this is the place that causes difficult using due to its provide complexity on project. Dynamic EA aspect and complexity are the new issue which do not support by all selected EAIMs.

Process: TOGAF views EA implementation as continual process, thus it more focus on continuum and repository. Moreover, TOGAF use requirements process in order to support ADM phases which other EAIMs do not use this feature. EAP and FEA like previous criteria have same condition, but, since EAP made for generic purpose, it updates in 2006 and support continual process. DODAF uses required activities in each process attribute in order to support EA implementation in DOD organization, but it does not use requirements process properly. Although Gartner does not consider all concepts attributes efficiently, it considers EA implementation by efficient plan that it comes from their vast experiences.

TABLE I. COMPARISON EAIMs [1][3][6][7][8][9][10][17]

	EAP	TOGAF	DODAF	Gartner	FEA
Concepts					
Alignment	L	M	M	M	L
Artifacts	M	H	M	M	M
Governance	M	H	M	M	L
Repository	M	M	M	M	M

	EAP	TOGAF	DODAF	Gartner	FEA
Strategy	H	H	H	M	H
Modeling					
Easy to use	M	L	M	M	M
Easy to learn	M	L	M	M	M
Traceability	M	H	L	L	M
Consistency	M	H	L	L	M
Different Views	M	M	M	L	M
Complexity	L	L	L	L	L
Dynamic	L	L	L	L	L
Process					
Requirement	L	H	L	L	L
Step by Step	M	M	M	M	M
Detailed Design	M	M	M	M	M
Implementation	M	M	M	M	M
Guidelines	M	H	M	L	H
Maintenance	L	M	L	L	M
Continual	M	H	L	L	L

Notation:

H: high consideration or detailed and clear description.

M: medium consideration or little description

L: low consideration or high level description

As result, the following results are achieved based on this research:

- In concepts: almost most of mentioned EAIMs cover all concepts. Strategy and Artifacts are supported by most EAIMs; in contrast Alignment and Repository are not utilized in most EAIMs.
- In modeling: EAP and FEA are in same situation (high grade) and TOGAF has fluctuates situation (in some attributes has high grade and in the others has low grade). Moreover, DODAF and Gartner are located in the last respectively. Selected EAIM do not have specific plan for depiction complexity and dynamic aspects of EA.
- In process: although, step by step structure, detailed design, and implementation are most usable attributes in EAIMs, requirement, maintenance, and continual need to consider more due to lack of consideration in most EAIMs.

VI. CONCLUSION

This study presents the framework for comparing EAIMs. Based on proposed framework we carry out comparison in three aspects: concepts, modeling, and

process. According to the results of this study there is no complete methodology which covers all demands of EA implementation. Although, some EAIMs such as TOGAF have a highest grade in all mentioned aspects, they are still need to decrease complexities of process and modeling. Moreover, lack of consideration on maintenance, requirements and continual process are notable items which need to consider.

Although this research does not cover all existing EAIMs, selected EAIMs are most popular in EA project and some others EAIMs are inspired from them. We will continue this research in future by providing holistic comparison framework and selecting more EAIMs. The aim of this research can be used for those who are looking for find appropriate EAIM for theirs project by provided information.

REFERENCES

- [1] A Practical Guide to Federal Enterprise Architecture by the CIO Council, Version 1.0, February 2001.
- [2] "FEA Practice Guidance," December 2006, published by the Federal Enterprise Architecture Program Management Office, Office of Management of Budget.
- [3] James, Greta A., Robert A. Handler, Anne Lapkin, and Nicholas Gall. "Gartner Enterprise Architecture Framework: Evolution 2005." October 25, 2005. Gartner ID: G00130855
- [4] Zachman, J.A. "A Framework for Information Systems Architecture." *IBM Systems Journal*, Volume 26, Number 3, 1987.
- [5] Zachman, J.A., and J.F. Sowa. "Extending and Formalizing the Framework for Information Systems Architecture." *IBM Systems Journal*, Volume 31, Number 3, 1992.
- [6] DOD Business Systems Modernization: Long-Standing Weaknesses in Enterprise-Architecture Development Need to Be Addressed. GAO-05-702. July 22, 2005
- [7] The Open Group. Version 9.1: an Open Group Standard, 2011. <http://pubs.opengroup.org/architecture/togaf9-doc/arch/index.html>
- [8] Sessions, R. "A Comparison of the Top Four Enterprise Architecture Methodologies". 2007, MSDN.
- [9] Spewak, Steven H., Enterprise Architecture Planning, New York: John Wiley and Sons
- [10] Spewak, S. H., and Michael Tiemann. "Updating the Enterprise Architecture Planning Model." *Journal of Enterprise Architecture* 2.2 (2006): 11-19.
- [11] Arnold, Heinrich, Michael Emer, Peter Möckel, and Christopher Schläffer. "Enterprise Architecture in Innovation Implementation." In *Applied Technology and Innovation Management*, pp. 132-144. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010.
- [12] Rouhani, Babak Darvish, Hossain Shirazi, Ali Farahmand Nezhad, and Sadeqh Kharazmi. "Presenting a framework for agile enterprise architecture." In *Information Technology, 2008. IT 2008. 1st International Conference on*, pp. 1-4. IEEE, 2008.
- [13] Hagan, Paula J. "Guide to the (Evolving) Enterprise Architecture Body of Knowledge." MITRE Corporation (2004).
- [14] Zachman, John A. "Concepts of the framework for enterprise architecture." *Zachman International, Inc., La Cañada, Ca* (1997).
- [15] Winter, Robert, and Ronny Fischer. "Essential layers, artifacts, and dependencies of enterprise architecture." *Journal of Enterprise Architecture* 3.2 (2007): 7-18.
- [16] Bernus, Peter. "Enterprise models for enterprise architecture and ISO9000: 2000." *Annual Reviews in Control* 27.2 (2003): 211-220.
- [17] Hirvonen, Ari P., Tietoenator Oyj, and Mirja Pulkkinen. "A practical approach to EA planning and development: the EA management grid." 7th International Conference on Business Information Systems. 2004.
- [18] Sembiring, Jaka, Edi Nuryatno, and Yudi Gondokaryono. "Analyzing the Indicators and Requirements in Main Components of Enterprise Architecture Methodology Development using Grounded Theory in Qualitative Methods." *Society of Interdisciplinary Business Research (SIBR) 2011 Conference on Interdisciplinary Business Research*. 2011.
- [19] Hjort-Madsen, Kristian. "Enterprise architecture implementation and management: A case study on interoperability." *System Sciences, 2006. HICSS'06. Proceedings of the 39th Annual Hawaii International Conference on*. Vol. 4. IEEE, 2006.
- [20] Lange, Matthias, Jan Mendling, and Jan Recker. "A comprehensive EA benefit realization model--An exploratory study." *System Science (HICSS)*, 2012 45th Hawaii International Conference on. IEEE, 2012.
- [21] Lagerström, Robert, Ulrik Franke, Pontus Johnson, and Johan Ullberg. "A method for creating enterprise architecture metamodels--applied to systems modifiability analysis." *International Journal of Computer Science and Applications* 6, no. 5 (2009): 89-120.
- [22] Aier, Stephan, Bettina Gleichauf, Jan Saat, and Robert Winter. "Complexity Levels of Representing Dynamics in EA Planning." In *Advances in Enterprise Engineering III*, pp. 55-69. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.
- [23] Aier, Stephan, and Jan Saat. "Understanding processes for model-based enterprise transformation planning." *International Journal of Internet and Enterprise Management* 7.1 (2011): 84-103.
- [24] Saat, Jan, Stephan Aier, and Bettina Gleichauf. "Assessing the Complexity of Dynamics in Enterprise Architecture Planning-Lessons from Chaos Theory." *AMCIS*. 2009.
- [25] Riege, Christian, and Stephan Aier. "A contingency approach to enterprise architecture method engineering." *Service-Oriented Computing-ICSOC 2008 Workshops*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.
- [26] Chen, David, Guy Doumeingts, and François Vernadat. "Architectures for enterprise integration and interoperability: Past, present and future." *Computers in industry* 59.7 (2008): 647-659.
- [27] Magoulas, T., Hadzic, A., Saarikko, T., & Pessi, K. "Alignment in Enterprise Architecture: A Comparative Analysis of Four Architectural Approaches." *Electronic Journal Information Systems Evaluation* Volume 15.1 (2012).