

What's typically missing (and causes failure) is the **business implementation layer** — the part that turns Enterprise Architecture into *real organizational change and measurable outcomes*.

That's a **very mature question** — and the fact you're asking it means you're thinking like a **Chief Architect / Transformation Lead**, not just a technologist.

You already have **architecture, governance, security, data, platform, self-service, and tooling** covered. Below is a **complete gap analysis** of what is still missing for **successful business implementation using Enterprise Architecture**.

What You Have (Strong Technical Foundation)

You already built:

- Enterprise / Solution / Application architecture
- Data + AI architecture
- Security (ZTA, HIPAA, PHI)
- Governance & guardrails
- Self-service platform model
- OKRs, KPIs, metrics
- Program & portfolio risk model
- Technology stack
- Onboarding, templates, repos

 **80% of transformations fail even with this in place** because of missing business implementation elements below.

What Is Still Missing (Critical for Business Implementation)

1 Operating Model Transformation (MOST COMMON GAP)

What's missing

Architecture defines *what*, but not *who does what, how, and with what accountability*.

You still need:

- New role definitions
- New decision rights
- New incentives
- New ways of working

Required artifacts

- RACI by capability
 - Platform vs product operating model
 - Decision rights matrix
 - Funding model (capability-based)
 - Performance model aligned to reuse
-

2 Value Realization Framework - (Architecture without value tracking dies)

Missing

- How architecture investments translate into business value
- How value is measured quarterly
- How to kill low-value work

Required artifacts

- Value streams
- Benefits hypothesis
- Leading indicators (reuse, cycle time)
- Value realization dashboard
- Stop/continue criteria

3 Business Capability Enablement Roadmap

(Not a technical roadmap — a business one)

Missing

- Which business capabilities change first
- What business processes change
- How people adapt

Required artifacts

- Capability heatmap
 - Change impact analysis
 - Phased capability rollout
 - Process redesign
 - Training plans
-

4 Change Management & Adoption Model - *(Architecture fails if humans reject it)*

Missing

- Adoption strategy
- Communication cadence
- Training by role
- Adoption metrics

Required artifacts

- Stakeholder map
- Communication plan
- Training curriculum
- Adoption KPIs
- Resistance management plan

5 Business Process Architecture & BPM

(Tech changes but processes don't → no value)

Missing

- End-to-end process redesign
- Cross-product workflows
- Clinical & operational harmonization

Required artifacts

- Process maps (L2–L4)
 - Automation candidates
 - Workflow orchestration
 - KPI alignment to processes
-

6 Product Management Model (Business-Driven)

(Not project management)

Missing

- Business ownership of platforms
- Product managers for shared capabilities
- Backlog governance
- Outcome-based roadmaps

Required artifacts

- Product charters
 - Outcome-based roadmaps
 - Backlog prioritization model
 - Product funding model
-

7 Portfolio Governance Linked to EA

(EA without portfolio control is ignored)

Missing

- Portfolio gating using EA
- Architecture-based investment decisions
- Kill-switches for non-aligned work

Required artifacts

- Architecture compliance score
 - Portfolio intake rules
 - Funding guardrails
 - Investment review criteria
-

8 Organizational Design & Skills Transformation

(People must change with architecture)

Missing

- Skill gap analysis
- Career paths
- New roles
- Incentives

Required artifacts

- Role definitions
 - Skill matrix
 - Hiring plan
 - Upskilling roadmap
 - Communities of practice
-

9 Vendor & Partner Operating Model

(*Vendors must follow your architecture*)

Missing

- Vendor onboarding to EA
- Architecture compliance in contracts
- Vendor scorecards

Required artifacts

- Architecture clauses
- Vendor guardrails
- Compliance metrics
- Exit strategies

10 Business Metrics & Accountability Model

(*Tech metrics ≠ business success*)

Missing

- Business KPIs mapped to architecture
- Executive dashboards
- Accountability reviews

Required artifacts

- Business KPI → capability mapping
- Exec dashboards
- Quarterly business reviews

1 1 Regulatory & Audit Operating Model

(Not just controls — operations)

Missing

- How audits are run continuously
- Who owns evidence
- How changes are approved

Required artifacts

- Continuous compliance model
 - Evidence ownership
 - Audit runbooks
 - Regulatory engagement plan
-

1 2 EA Adoption & Enforcement Model

(The silent killer)

Missing

- How EA becomes non-optional
- How violations are handled
- How EA evolves

Required artifacts

- EA charter
 - Enforcement model
 - Exception escalation path
 - EA maturity model
-

The Final Missing Piece: Business Architecture

Everything above is anchored in **Business Architecture**, which is usually missing or weak.

You need:

- Capability maps
- Value streams
- Process architecture
- Organization alignment
- Strategy-to-execution traceability

Without this, EA becomes an IT exercise.

How All Pieces Fit Together (Business Implementation View)

Strategy

↓

Business Architecture (Capabilities, Value, Process)

↓

Operating Model

↓

Enterprise Architecture

↓

Platform & Solutions

↓

Products & Applications

↓

Metrics & Value Realization

↓

Feedback to Strategy

 **Executive Summary (use this)**

“Enterprise Architecture succeeds only when it is paired with operating model change, value realization, portfolio enforcement, and business ownership. Technology is the enabler — the business model is the transformation.”

Below is a **complete, enterprise-grade Business Architecture Model with Capability Model + Value Streams**, designed specifically for **healthcare multi-product transformation** and aligned to the **Enterprise Architecture you built**.

This is the missing bridge between **strategy → execution → value realization**.

I'll present it in **three layers**:

1. Capability Model (what the business does)
 2. Value Stream Model (how value flows)
 3. Mapping to products, platforms, and architecture (how it's implemented)
-

Business Architecture Model

1 Business Capability Model (L1–L3)

Capabilities are **stable, technology-agnostic**, and **owned by the business**
(Products and systems change; capabilities do not)

Level 1 – Core Capability Domains

Domain	Purpose
Care Delivery	Deliver safe, effective clinical care
Member Experience	Acquire, serve, and retain members
Provider Operations	Enable clinicians and staff
Claims & Finance	Monetize care and manage revenue
Digital Channels	Enable omnichannel engagement
Data, Analytics & AI	Generate insights and decisions
Platform Services	Shared enterprise capabilities
Security & Compliance	Protect data and ensure trust

Domain	Purpose
Enterprise Management	Strategy, finance, risk, HR

Level 2 – Capability Decomposition

Care Delivery

- Care coordination
 - Clinical documentation
 - Orders & results
 - Medication management
 - Population health
 - Remote care
-

Member Experience

- Acquisition & enrollment
 - Eligibility management
 - Benefits management
 - Service & support
 - Communication & engagement
-

Provider Operations

- Scheduling
 - Credentialing
 - Workforce management
 - Clinical workflows
 - Supply chain
-

Claims & Finance

- Claims intake
 - Adjudication
 - Payment
 - Billing
 - Revenue cycle
 - Financial reporting
-

Digital Channels

- Web experience
 - Mobile experience
 - Portal management
 - Notification & messaging
 - Accessibility & localization
-

Data, Analytics & AI

- Data ingestion
 - Data governance
 - Analytics
 - ML
 - GenAI
 - Decision support
-

Platform Services

- Identity & access
- API management

- Event streaming
 - Integration
 - Workflow
 - Observability
 - Configuration
-

Security & Compliance

- Zero Trust access
 - Audit logging
 - Consent management
 - Privacy
 - Threat detection
 - Compliance reporting
-
-

Level 3 – Example (Care Coordination)

Capability	Description	Owner
Patient identification	Identify correct patient	Clinical Ops
Risk stratification	Identify high-risk patients	Care Mgmt
Task orchestration	Coordinate actions	Care Teams
Communication	Engage patient	Member Ops
Outcome tracking	Measure care effectiveness	Quality

2 Value Stream Model (How Value Flows)

Value streams represent **end-to-end outcomes** delivered to members, providers, and the enterprise.

Value Stream 1: Member Lifecycle

Discover → Enroll → Onboard → Serve → Retain

Stage Business Outcome

Discover Member awareness

Enroll Membership growth

Onboard Reduced friction

Serve Satisfaction

Retain Lifetime value

Value Stream 2: Care Delivery Lifecycle

Schedule → Treat → Document → Bill → Pay

Stage Outcome

Schedule Access to care

Treat Clinical quality

Document Accuracy & compliance

Bill Revenue capture

Pay Financial closure

Value Stream 3: Population Health

Detect Risk → Intervene → Monitor → Improve

Stage	Outcome
Detect	Early identification
Intervene	Reduced cost
Monitor	Stability
Improve	Better outcomes

Value Stream 4: Product & Platform Delivery

Ideate → Build → Release → Operate → Optimize

Stage	Outcome
Ideate	Alignment
Build	Speed
Release	Reliability
Operate	Stability
Optimize	Efficiency

3 Capability ↔ Value Stream Mapping (Critical)

This is where **business architecture becomes executable**.

Capability	Value Stream
Scheduling	Care Delivery
Claims Adjudication	Revenue
Analytics	All
Identity	All
Consent	All

Capability	Value Stream
Notifications	Member lifecycle
Data ingestion	Population health
Workflow	Care delivery

4 Mapping to Products & Platforms

Capability Product Examples Platform

Scheduling Digital Front Door API, Workflow

Televisit Virtual Care Identity, Events

Claims Claims Platform Data, Integration

Analytics BI Platform Lakehouse

GenAI Clinical Assist AI Gateway

Identity IAM Platform

5 Why This Business Architecture Matters

Without it:

- Strategy cannot be executed
- Platforms are ignored
- Funding is misaligned
- Metrics don't matter
- EA becomes IT-centric

With it:

- Funding aligns to capabilities
- Products align to outcomes

- Architecture enables business
 - Value is measurable
 - Change is manageable
-

6 How This Drives Enterprise Architecture

Business Strategy



Capabilities & Value Streams



Target Operating Model



Enterprise Architecture



Platforms & Products



Metrics & Value Realization

⌚ Executive one-liner (use this)

“Our business architecture defines what we do and how value flows, so enterprise architecture can focus on enabling outcomes — not just systems.”

Below is a **complete Target Operating Model (TOM)** for a **large healthcare, multi-product enterprise** using **Enterprise Architecture as the execution backbone**.

This is **board-ready, C-suite ready, and implementation-ready** — not theory.

I'll structure it in **9 clear layers** so it can be directly turned into a diagram or operating manual.

Target Operating Model (TOM)

Healthcare Multi-Product Digital Enterprise

1 Operating Model Principles

(These guide every design decision)

1. Platform-first, product-led
 2. Capabilities funded, not projects
 3. Teams own outcomes, not outputs
 4. Self-service with guardrails
 5. Automation over approval
 6. Federated ownership, centralized governance
 7. Security & compliance by design
 8. Data is a product
 9. Architecture is mandatory, not optional
-

2 Organizational Structure

(Who does the work)

Board / CEO



CIO / CDO / CISO



| | | |

Product Orgs Platform Orgs Data Orgs Security & GRC

| | | |

Domain Teams Platform Teams Data Product Teams Security Engineering

Team Types

Team	Purpose	Examples
Product teams	Deliver member/provider value	Care, Claims, Digital
Platform teams	Build shared services	Identity, API, Data
Data teams	Own data products	Analytics, ML
Security teams	Guardrails	ZTA, SOC
Enablement teams	Accelerate adoption	DevEx, SRE

3 Decision Rights (RACI)

(This prevents chaos)

Decision	Accountable	Consulted	Informed
Business capability	Business Owner	EA	All
Platform standards	EA	Platform	Teams
Product roadmap	Product	EA	Portfolio
Security policy	CISO	EA	Teams
Data ownership	Domain Owner	Data Gov	Consumers
Exceptions	EA + Security	Product	Exec

4 Funding Model

(Most transformations fail here)

Three funding streams

1. **Run** – Keep lights on (fixed)
2. **Grow** – Product innovation

3. Transform – Platforms & capabilities

Rules

- Platform funding is **multi-year**
 - Product funding is **outcome-based**
 - Capability funding replaces project funding
 - 10–15% innovation buffer
-

5 Delivery Model

(How work flows)

Portfolio Intake



Capability Prioritization



Product Backlogs



Platform Enablement



Continuous Delivery



Value Measurement

Delivery Cadence

- Sprint: 2 weeks
 - Program increment: 8–12 weeks
 - Portfolio review: quarterly
 - Board review: quarterly
-

6 Governance Model (Lightweight & Automated)

Area	Mechanism
Architecture	ADR + OPA
Security	DevSecOps
Data	Contracts + lineage
Financial	FinOps
Risk	Continuous compliance
Portfolio	EA gating

7 People & Skills Model

Core Roles

- Business capability owner
- Product manager
- Platform product manager
- Solution architect
- Data product owner
- SRE
- Security architect

Enablement

- Communities of practice
 - Reference implementations
 - Mandatory onboarding
 - Architecture academy
-

Metrics & Accountability

Business

- Cost per member
- Clinical quality
- Experience score

Delivery

- Lead time
- Deployment frequency
- Change failure rate

Platform

- Reuse %
- Self-service %
- Cost per integration

Risk

- PHI violations
- Audit findings
- MTTR

Transformation Phasing

(How to implement the TOM)

Phase 1 (0–3 months)

- Stand up platform teams
- Define standards
- Launch self-service portal
- Train leaders

Phase 2 (3–9 months)

- Migrate priority products
- Enforce guardrails
- Introduce capability funding
- Measure value

Phase 3 (9–18 months)

- Optimize cost
 - Scale AI & data
 - Mature governance
 - Board-level reporting
-

TOM Visual Summary (text form)

Strategy

↓

Capabilities

↓

Products & Platforms

↓

Teams

↓

Delivery

↓

Governance

↓

Metrics

↓

Value

 **Executive one-liner (use this)**

“Our target operating model aligns funding, teams, and governance around business capabilities, using enterprise architecture as the execution backbone — enabling speed, safety, and scale.”

Below is a **clear, board-ready Cost vs Value Financial Model** integrated into your **Target Operating Model (TOM)**.

This shows **where money is spent, where value is created, and when the business breaks even** — exactly what CFOs and boards ask for.

I'll present it in **4 layers**:

1. Cost structure (what we invest)

2. Value levers (what we get back)
 3. 3-year cost vs value view
 4. How the TOM drives financial outcomes
-

Target Operating Model – Cost vs Value Financial Model

(EA-driven business transformation)

1 Cost Model (Investment View)

Annual Cost Breakdown (Typical Large Healthcare Org)

Cost Category	% of Total	Year 1 (\$M)	Description
Platform & Shared Services	40%	20	IAM, API, data, events, observability, security
Product Delivery	30%	15	Clinical, member, provider products
Data, Analytics & AI	12%	6	Lakehouse, ML, GenAI, analytics
Security & Compliance	8%	4	ZTA, audit, SOC, tooling
Change & Enablement	10%	5	Training, onboarding, adoption
Total	100%	50	

 **Key point:** Platform spend is front-loaded (Year 1), then declines as reuse increases.

2 Value Model (Benefits View)

Value Levers Enabled by the TOM

Value Lever	Mechanism	Annual Value (\$M)
Platform reuse	Shared services replace duplication	12–18

Value Lever	Mechanism	Annual Value (\$M)
Faster time-to-market	Self-service + automation	8–12
Operational efficiency	SRE, observability, automation	7–10
Risk avoidance	ZTA, audit automation, fewer breaches	5–8
Data & AI enablement	Trusted analytics & GenAI	10–15
Vendor rationalization	Fewer tools, better contracts	3–5
Total Annual Value (steady state)		45–68

👉 Risk avoidance is real value in healthcare — boards care deeply about this.

3 3-Year Cost vs Value Projection

Year	Investment (\$M)	Value (\$M)	Net (\$M)	Cumulative
Year 1	50	20	-30	-30
Year 2	35	50	+15	-15
Year 3	25	70	+45	+30

Financial Highlights

- **Break-even:** Mid Year 2
 - **3-year ROI:** 130–180%
 - **Payback period:** 18–24 months
 - **Risk-adjusted ROI:** 90–130%
-

4 Cost vs Value by TOM Layer

(This is the board slide everyone understands)

TOM Layer	Cost Driver	Value Created
Platform teams	Shared services build	Reuse, speed, lower cost
Product teams	Feature delivery	Revenue, experience
Data teams	Lakehouse, ML	Better decisions, savings
Security teams	ZTA, tooling	Breach avoidance
Governance & EA	Standards, guardrails	Reduced rework & risk
Enablement	Training, onboarding	Faster adoption

5 What Happens If TOM Is NOT Implemented

(Important board comparison)

Area	Without TOM	With TOM
Delivery speed	Slow, inconsistent	Predictable, fast
Cost	Rising YoY	Flattening
Risk	High	Controlled
Reuse	<20%	>70%
Audit cost	Manual	Automated
AI value	Low trust	Scalable

6 Funding Model Recommendation (Critical)

To protect value:

- Fund **platforms for 3 years**
- Fund **products quarterly**
- Fund **capabilities, not projects**
- Protect **security & data budgets**

- Tie funding to **reuse & outcome KPIs**
-

7 Board-Level Message (Use This)

“This operating model converts upfront platform investment into sustained cost reduction, faster delivery, and reduced regulatory risk. Break-even occurs in Year 2, and value compounds every year after.”

Below is a **board-grade sensitivity analysis** added to your **Cost vs Value Financial Model**, showing **best case / base case / worst case** outcomes.

This is exactly what CFOs, boards, and audit committees expect before approving multi-year transformation funding.

8 Sensitivity Analysis – EA-Driven Target Operating Model

1 Assumptions by Scenario

Dimension	Worst Case	Base Case	Best Case
Platform reuse	40%	70%	85%
Time-to-market improvement	10%	30%	45%
Ops efficiency gain	10%	25%	40%
Risk avoidance realized	50%	80%	100%
Data/AI value capture	30%	60%	85%
Adoption speed	Slow	Planned	Accelerated

Dimension	Worst Case	Base Case	Best Case
Governance automation	Partial	Full	Full + optimized

2 3-Year Financial Outcomes by Scenario

Worst Case (Slow adoption, partial reuse)

Year Cost (\$M) Value (\$M) Net (\$M) Cumulative

Year 1	50	12	-38	-38
Year 2	35	28	-7	-45
Year 3	25	45	+20	-25

Outcome

- Break-even: **Not achieved in 3 years**
- ROI: **~40–60%**
- Risk: High
- Board action: **Intervene**

Base Case (Expected execution)

Year Cost (\$M) Value (\$M) Net (\$M) Cumulative

Year 1	50	20	-30	-30
Year 2	35	50	+15	-15
Year 3	25	70	+45	+30

Outcome

- Break-even: **Mid Year 2**
- ROI: **130–180%**
- Risk: Managed

- Board action: **Continue**
-

Best Case (High reuse, fast adoption)

Year	Cost (\$M)	Value (\$M)	Net (\$M)	Cumulative
-------------	-------------------	--------------------	------------------	-------------------

Year 1	50	30	-20	-20
Year 2	35	65	+30	+10
Year 3	25	95	+70	+80

Outcome

- Break-even: **Early Year 2**
 - ROI: **220–300%**
 - Risk: Low
 - Board action: **Accelerate**
-

3 Key Sensitivity Drivers (What Moves the Needle Most)

Driver	Impact	Control Lever
Platform reuse %	Very high	Enforce standards + self-service
Adoption speed	High	Training + incentives
Governance automation	High	Policy-as-code
Data trust	Medium–high	DQ + ownership
Security automation	Medium	DevSecOps
Vendor rationalization	Medium	Contract governance

Insight:

Reuse and adoption speed matter more than cost cutting.

4 Risk-Adjusted Value View

(Board language)

Scenario Probability Risk-Adjusted Value

Worst	20%	Low
Base	60%	Expected
Best	20%	High

👉 This makes the transformation a **risk-managed investment**, not a gamble.

5 Board Guardrails (Trigger Points)

Metric	Threshold	Board Action
Platform reuse	<50% by Q4 Y1	Mandate enforcement
Adoption	<60% teams onboarded	Add enablement funding
Delivery speed	<20% improvement	Review operating model
Security findings	>0 critical	Freeze releases
Cost variance	>15%	Re-baseline

6 Executive Narrative (Use This)

“Even in the worst case, we reduce risk and stabilize costs. In the expected case, we break even in Year 2. In the best case, this becomes a compounding value engine. The outcome depends on adoption and reuse — which we control through governance and operating model design.”

7 Why This Wins Board Approval

- Shows downside is **controlled**
- Shows upside is **significant**

- Shows levers are **manageable**
 - Shows architecture is **financially disciplined**
 - Shows leadership understands risk
-

Below is a **Scenario-Based Funding Plan** that completes your **board-level financial + operating model**.

This is how mature enterprises **protect downside, unlock upside, and keep transformation alive even under pressure**.

This funding plan is explicitly designed for **healthcare, regulated environments**, where **stopping midstream is more dangerous than continuing incorrectly**.

Scenario-Based Funding Plan (Board-Grade)

Aligned to EA, Target Operating Model, and Sensitivity Analysis

1 Funding Philosophy (Board Guardrails)

We do not fund projects. We fund capabilities, platforms, and outcomes — with scenario-based controls.

Non-negotiables

- Platform funding is **multi-year and protected**
- Security & compliance funding is **never cut**

- Product funding is **variable by outcome**
 - Transformation funding is **released in tranches**
 - Funding decisions are **reviewed quarterly**
-

2 Funding Streams (Always On)

Funding Stream Purpose	Flexibility
Run	Keep systems operational
Grow	Product innovation & revenue
Transform	Platform, data, architecture
Protect	Security, compliance, resilience
	None (locked)

3 Scenario-Based Funding Matrix

● Worst-Case Scenario (Slow adoption, low reuse)

Goal: Stabilize, protect, correct

Trigger conditions

- Platform reuse < 50% by Q4 Y1
- Adoption < 60% teams onboarded
- Value realization < 60% of plan
- Cost variance > 15%

Funding Actions

Area	Action
Platform	Protect funding (no cuts)
Product	Pause low-value initiatives

Area	Action
Enablement	Increase (training, onboarding)
Governance	Increase automation investment
Data/AI	Focus on trust & quality
Vendors	Renegotiate / pause
Innovation	Freeze

Funding Shift

Transform: 40% → 45%

Grow: 35% → 25%

Run: 20% → 20%

Protect: 5% → 10%

📌 **Board intent:** Fix execution, don't kill transformation

🟡 Base-Case Scenario (Planned execution)

Goal: Sustain and scale

Trigger conditions

- Reuse ≥ 70%
- Adoption ≥ 80%
- Break-even on track
- Risks stable

Funding Actions

Area	Action
Platform	Continue planned funding
Product	Fund by outcome

Area	Action
Data/AI	Scale proven use cases

Enablement Maintain
Innovation Selective bets

Funding Split

Transform: 35%
Grow: 35%
Run: 20%
Protect: 10%

📌 **Board intent:** Maintain momentum and discipline

● **Best-Case Scenario (Fast adoption, high reuse)**

Goal: Accelerate and compound value

Trigger conditions

- Reuse \geq 85%
- Adoption \geq 90%
- Value > plan by 20%+
- Risk trending down

Funding Actions

Area	Action
Platform	Accelerate roadmap
Product	Expand digital & AI products
Data/AI	Aggressively scale AI

Enablement Reduce (self-sustaining)

Area	Action
Innovation	Increase venture bets
M&A	Enable integration capability

Funding Shift

Transform: 30%

Grow: 45%

Run: 15%

Protect: 10%

📌 **Board intent:** Turn platform into growth engine

4 Quarterly Funding Release Model (Critical Control)

Funding is released in **quarterly tranches**, not annually.

Quarter Release Criteria

Q1 Architecture compliance $\geq 80\%$

Q2 Platform reuse $\geq 60\%$

Q3 Adoption $\geq 75\%$

Q4 Value realized $\geq 70\%$

If criteria not met \rightarrow **automatic reallocation** to enablement/governance.

5 Capability-Based Funding Example

Capability Funding Type Review Cadence

Identity Platform (locked) Annual

Data ingestion Platform Annual

Scheduling Product Quarterly

Capability	Funding Type	Review Cadence
Analytics	Capability	Quarterly
GenAI	Venture-style	Monthly
Security	Protected	Continuous

6 Board Dashboard (Funding Control View)

Board sees **one slide**:

Metric Status Action

Reuse %	●	Continue
Adoption	●	Increase enablement
Value	●	Focus products
Risk	●	Maintain
Cost	●	Monitor

7 Why This Funding Model Works

- Prevents premature cuts
 - Forces accountability
 - Protects compliance
 - Encourages reuse
 - Enables acceleration
 - Aligns money to outcomes
 - Makes EA financially real
-

8 Board-Level Narrative (Use This)

“This funding model protects the downside, controls risk, and lets us accelerate only when value is proven. Architecture investment is never wasted — it either stabilizes or compounds value.”

Below is a **clear, board-grade Governance Workflow** defining **who approves what, when, and how**, fully aligned to your **Enterprise Architecture, Target Operating Model, and Scenario-Based Funding Plan**.

This removes ambiguity, prevents delays, and is exactly what boards ask for when approving large transformations.

Governance Workflow (Decision Rights & Approvals)

Healthcare Multi-Product Enterprise Transformation

1 Governance Principles

1. Decisions are made at the lowest safe level
 2. Automation replaces manual approval where possible
 3. Only irreversible, high-risk decisions go to committees
 4. Architecture, security, and funding are inseparable
 5. Quarterly cadence, not ad hoc escalation
 6. Exceptions expire automatically
-

2 Governance Layers & Forums

Level	Forum	Purpose	Cadence
Board	Board / Audit / Risk	Strategy, risk, funding envelopes	Quarterly
Executive	Exec Steering Committee	Priorities, funding release, risk	Monthly
Portfolio	Portfolio Council	Intake, prioritization, gating	Biweekly
Architecture	Architecture Review Board (ARB)	Standards, exceptions	Weekly
Security	Security Review Council	High-risk security items	On-demand
Delivery	ART / Program Sync	Execution coordination	Biweekly
Operational	Platform Ops Review	Stability, cost, SLOs	Weekly

3 Approval Matrix (Who Approves What)

■ Strategy & Investment Decisions

Decision	Owner	Approver	Informed
Enterprise strategy	CEO	Board	All
Transformation budget	CFO	Board	Exec
Capability funding		CIO/CDO Exec Committee	Portfolio
Platform roadmap	CIO		Exec Committee Teams
Scenario-based funding shifts	CFO	Board (if >10%)	Exec

■ Architecture & Technology Decisions

Decision	Owner	Approver	Informed
Enterprise standards	Chief Architect	ARB	Teams
Reference architectures	EA	ARB	Portfolio
Solution design		Solution Architect	ARB Product
Architecture exceptions	EA + Security	ARB	Exec (if critical)
Technology adoption	EA	ARB	Platform

■ Security & Compliance Decisions

Decision	Owner	Approver	Informed
Security policy	CISO		Exec Committee Teams
ZTA enforcement	CISO	CIO	Board (summary)
PHI access exceptions	Security	CISO	Audit
GenAI approvals (clinical)	CISO + Clinical	Exec Committee	Board

Decision	Owner	Approver	Informed
Incident closure	CISO	Exec	Board (if Sev-1)

Delivery & Change Decisions

Decision	Owner	Approver	Informed
Release to production	Product Owner	Platform	Ops
DR readiness	SRE	CIO	Risk
Go-live for clinical	Business Owner	Exec	Board (major)
Rollback	SRE	Product	Exec (if critical)

Data & AI Decisions

Decision	Owner	Approver	Informed
Data product approval	Domain Owner	Data Gov Council	Consumers
Certified metrics	CDO	Data Gov Council	Exec
ML model release	ML Owner	Model Review Board	Risk
GenAI model use	AI Gov Council	CISO/CDO	Exec
Data access	Domain Owner	IAM	Audit

Approval Automation (Default Path)

If it can be enforced by policy, it does not need approval.

Area	Automated Tool
Architecture standards	OPA
Security controls	CI/CD gates

Area	Automated Tool
Data policies	Catalog enforcement
Infra provisioning	Terraform + policy
Access approvals	JIT workflows
Evidence collection	Pipeline automation

5 Exception Workflow (Only When Needed)

Request → Risk Review → Approval → Expiry → Auto-Close

Rules

- Max duration: 90 days
 - Must include mitigation
 - Auto-expire
 - Tracked as technical debt
 - Reported quarterly to execs
-

6 Scenario-Based Funding Workflow

Metrics Review → Scenario Assessment → Funding Adjustment → Board Notification

Scenario	Approver
Worst-case	Exec Committee
Base-case	CIO/CFO
Best-case (acceleration)	Board

7 RACI Summary (Single View)

Layer	Accountable	Responsible
Strategy	CEO	Exec
Funding	CFO	Portfolio
Architecture	Chief Architect	EA
Security	CISO	Security
Data	CDO	Domain teams
Delivery	Product	Teams
Ops	SRE	Platform

8 Board-Level Assurance (What Board Gets)

Quarterly:

- Funding vs value dashboard
- Architecture compliance score
- Risk heatmap
- Security posture
- Exception aging report
- Adoption metrics

Executive Narrative (use this)

“We’ve eliminated ambiguity by defining exactly who approves what, automating everything else, and tying funding decisions to measurable outcomes. Governance now accelerates delivery instead of slowing it.”
