

23 Jan 2018

## My response to Relationship to TOGAF®, ArchiMate® and ITIL®



On the 23<sup>rd</sup> Jan 2018 a LinkedIn colleague of mine (Dr Nicolas Figay) posted the following:

*“Not always easy to know how the different frameworks fit together. Here the positioning of IT4IT, ITIL, TOGAF and ArchiMate, as explained by Open Group. What do you think?”*

I decided to tackle this issue as it is now clear to me as to the ‘strategy’ that the Open is following in their attempt to integrate the 4 disparate quadrants governing ‘information’ appears to be creating their version of the ‘anatomy of information’.

As the comment function on LinkedIn is restricted to 1,250 characters, I was forced to create this article in response to my colleague’s question.

The article can be read by [following this link](#).

My empirical view is that the explanation provided in the article is far too implicit. One can only imagine the ‘devil in the detail’ (aka traps) that lurks in the white spaces between the 4 quadrants and within each:

1) “IT4IT” is:

1.1) A Reference Architecture standard focused “on defining, sourcing, consuming, and managing IT services by looking holistically at the entire IT Value Chain”.

**Problem 1:** Value chain” is not a reliable strategic planning method of analysis. In the value chain approach, a “product passes through a chain of activities in order and at each activity the product gains some value”. The traps that value chains spring are relying on multiple brain storming sessions to identify every product (what about services and packages) as well as what the specific ‘value’ is and the order in which the activities are processed

1.2) Process-agnostic. **Problem 2:** Strategic planning is based on processes. Agnostic means “Uncertain of all claims to knowledge” or “Someone who is doubtful or noncommittal about something”. This springs the trap of unknown requirements and processing sequencing

1.3) “Focused instead on the data needed to manage a service through its lifecycle”.

**Problem 3:** Data is dependant on knowledge. There is a conflict with the next point

1.4) “Neutral with respect to development and delivery models”. **Problem 4:** Models are deliverables. Any approach that develops implicit models will never solve any problem. This springs the trap of not having a business knowledge model

2) ITIL (Information Technology Infrastructure Library). It is:

2.1) "Published as a series of five core volumes, each of which covers a different ITSM lifecycle stage". **Problem 5:** Are these books stand alone or integrated? This springs the trap of not having explicit information meta-model. **Problem 6:** As ITSM refers to the entirety of activities – directed by policies, organized and structured in processes and supporting procedures – that are performed by an organization to plan, design, deliver, operate and control information technology (IT) services offered to customers", is this what TOGAF is purported to deliver?

2.2) "ITIL describes processes, procedures, tasks, and checklists which are not organization-specific, but can be applied by an organization for establishing integration with the organization's strategy, delivering value, and maintaining a minimum level of competency". **Problem 7:** If ITIL is dependant on describing processes and IT4IT is process agnostic, how can they co-exist? This springs the trap of the lack of integration with the strategic plan (among others)

2.3) Available through certification "but only available to individuals and relates to their knowledge of the 5 books". **Problem 8:** How long does it take to master 1 of them? This springs the trap of imprecise requirements.

3) Archimate is

3.1) "an open and independent enterprise architecture modeling language to support the description, analysis and visualization of architecture within and across business domains in an unambiguous way". **Problem 9:** IT4IT is process agnostic and Archimate delivers "in an unambiguous way" surely there is a conflict! This has to spring the trap of having to run multiple brain storming sessions to resolve this issue

3.2) "Supported by various tool vendors and consulting firms". **Problem 10:** Will require not only training but also tailoring to address the TOGAF architecture. This springs the trap of implicit requirements, and having to hold multiple brainstorming sessions to resolve the issues

4)TOGAF is

4.1) "a high level approach to design. It is typically modelled at four levels: Business, Application, Data, and Technology. It relies heavily on modularization, standardization, and already existing, proven technologies and products". **Problem 11:** Is the Plan: Design: Deliver; Operate and; Control (PDDOC) cycle that manages information technology (IT) services the same as the TOGAF framework? This springs the trap of trying to gather the requirements in order to compare the two. **Problem 12:** The PDDOC approach is fraught with other traps such as trying to define data before gathering the business knowledge, implicit meta and detailed models

## **Conclusion**

So what do I think? With just these 12 problems I fail to see how Gartner research can possibly suggest that "The insights that IT4IT promises to deliver will enable opportunities for cost reduction to be identified, freeing up funding for innovation". The emphasis should be on the word 'promises'.

I would also like to draw your attention to another LI article I wrote on the 3 Sep 2017 called '[Proof positive](#)' in which I discuss the assertions made concerning the alignment with TOGAF and ArchiMate.

Charles Meyer Richter  
Principal information architect and diagnostician  
Ripose Pty Limited  
[charles.richter@ripose.com](mailto:charles.richter@ripose.com)

On the 24 Jan 2018 another colleague of mine commented on all 12 of the problems that I posed. I have updated this document to reflect his statements and my reply.

My responses to statements made by a LinkedIn colleague:

#	Original problem	Colleagues response	My response
1	“Value chain” is not a reliable strategic planning method of analysis.	I use value chains as a strategic alignment tool, not a detailed analysis tool. When used at a high level of discussion to get everyone on the same page before drilling into the details, I have found them to work quite well	The problem with the 'value-chain' is that it is the wrong tool used at the wrong time. Michael Porter assumed that value is added in a chain-like manner. This is false and a trap. The 'value-chain' is an implicit deliverable, the first cause of planning failures. A 'value' is a definite artifact in the anatomy of information (perhaps I could also call it the 'information chain' as a chain has a start and an end. Anyone with a bit of nous can make the value-chain appear to work. The problem is what comes next? Hence starting with a 'value-chain' causes the second planning failure, The incorrect starting point
2	Strategic planning is based on processes	IT4IT doesn't say you don't need processes, it simply says it does not provide them. It provides an IT Value Chain, a conceptual Data Architecture reference model and a conceptual Applications Architecture reference model. No business architecture or technology architecture	If IT4IT does not provide the sequence of processes and hence 'agnostic' but "provides the IT Value Chain, a conceptual Data Architecture reference model and a conceptual Applications Architecture reference model but not a business architecture nor a technology architecture" then IT4IT has provided 3 causes as to why planning fails
3	Data is dependant on knowledge	There are many ways to develop a data architecture, at least at conceptual level, without first developing a business architecture. Eventually you need both, but you can start with either.	We will just have to agree to disagree. Data is a number of facts grouped together in a logical order. A concept is basically a dream which may or may not contain any logic. I have proven that data architecture depends on a component of the conceptual business architecture
4	Models are deliverables	Fair point. Does IT4IT solve a problem without filling in some of its gaps? Maybe	There is no ‘maybe’ about this. IT4IT can never solve any problem without the use of a ‘model. The problem is which model is the right one and when does the model appear.
5	Are these books stand alone or integrated?	Great point. I wasn't involved but my sense is that they were developed (and edited) at different times by different people without an information model to hold them together	All religious books and fairy stories were written by different people at different times. How does anyone prove whether the content is valid?

#	Original problem	Colleagues response	My response
6	As ITSM refers to the entirety of activities – directed by policies, organized and structured in processes and supporting procedures – that are performed by an organization to plan, design, deliver, operate and control information technology (IT) services offered to customers", is this what TOGAF is purported to deliver?	I would position ITIL as processes and best practices attempted to cover a scope across the entirety of IT, but doing really well against IT Operations and not nearly as good anywhere else. TOGAF, is probably best described as processes and best practices covering a scope across Enterprise Architecture and maybe Solution Architecture. But it is not trying to cover all of IT. Fair to argue quality of either framework, fair to argue if TOGAF is really only or even processes and best practices, but for comparison sake, it is a straightforward way to think about the two.	If the basic interaction between ITSM (in this case TOGAF) and ITIL cannot be resolved satisfactorily then this whole discussion is meaningless. Who decides on what is 'best practice'?
7	If ITIL is dependant on describing processes and IT4IT is process agnostic, how can they co-exist?	Actually, I think this is the statement I disagree with the most. IT4IT provides the IT Value Chain, which gives you the overall strategic view of the work of IT. Then you can choose which process / best practice framework to take advantage of for each of the value streams or components and plug them in. The conceptual information systems (data and application) architecture tries to give you a way to hold the process pieces together regardless of which framework you use. So I think they actually fit very nicely together. Axelos just released a white paper that talks more about these relationships from an IT4IT and ITIL perspective and the Open Group has a white paper in final review for release soon that also talks about the relationships from an IT4IT and TOGAF perspective.	<p>My argument is that the 'value-chain' is at fault. IT4IT may think they provide the IT Value-chain (which I will call the project plan), but the sequencing of delivery leaves much to be desired. Without a business architecture (specifically the business knowledge model) IT have no idea as to the business priorities. I have proven that the business knowledge model is a 3 dimension representation of the business requirements where as the data model is only in 2 dimensions. The 4<sup>th</sup> dimension is added when taking the relationships between the 'entities' into consideration.</p> <p>Hence as TOGAF does not (at this time) produce a comprehensive explicit business knowledge the integration between IT4IT, ITIL, TOGAF and ArchiMate will never be achieved.</p>
8	How long does it take to master 1 of them?	Mastery of all of the ITIL books can take a very long time, in fact an entire career for some. But that doesn't necessarily imply imprecise requirements. It could imply considerable scope. To be clear, the statement that ITIL provides imprecise requirements is not one I am disputing. Just that the scope of ITIL doesn't imply it.	Until such time as someone maps the contents of the books to the relevant phases of TOGAF, this will never be solved and training will take too long. I have proven I can train an objectives architect in less than 2 weeks

#	Original problem	Colleagues response	My response
9	IT4IT is process agnostic and Archimate delivers "in an unambiguous way" surely there is a conflict!	Not sure of the point here. One is a modeling language or a metamodel. The other is a value chain and reference architecture. That doesn't really imply conflict. That said, having been a part of the team trying to work through both and bring them into better alignment, there are absolutely confusion and conflict between the two. They were created by two completely different groups of people at two different times for two completely different purposes. There are absolutely misalignments. An attempt is currently underway to revise both standards to clear up any misalignment and confusion and make it easier for them both to work together. In fact, that working group also includes TOGAF in its scope and is trying to better align all three at a detailed level rather than just a conceptual level. So there are absolutely problems today but there is a path to improvement in place.	Until the specifics of the deliverables are understood (ie no implicit deliverables) this problem will continue to plague both the business and IT
10	Will require not only training but also tailoring to address the TOGAF architecture.	Yes, Archimate (just like almost anything else) requires training. Yes, Archimate currently requires tailoring to work with TOGAF. As mentioned above, that is currently under improvement.	Who is going to provide the training? The developers of ArchiMate do not understand the nature of information therefore how can they hope to develop a computer system to help others develop computer systems. I have over 47 years experience and expertise in this field, therefore I know what I talk about, write and deliver
11	Is the Plan: Design: Deliver; Operate and; Control (PDDOC) cycle that manages information technology (IT) services the same as the TOGAF framework?	I don't think TOGAF is trying to cover the management of IT. It is a much smaller subset.	Perhaps if the TOGAF developers understood the full development cycle better they would have been able to accommodate this requirement. I catered for this in the original design of Ripose and hence was able to implement he concept in a computer system. It is no wonder why TOGAF developers had to leave it to the developers of ArchiMate. The two causes of planning failures could have been avoided

#	Original problem	Colleagues response	My response
12	<p>The PDDOC approach is fraught with other traps such as trying to define data before gathering the business knowledge, implicit meta and detailed models</p>	<p>PDDOC is from ITIL and takes a process view. It doesn't really try to define data much at all. The data you mention is likely coming from IT4IT.</p>	<p>Sorry but the discovery of data is part of the PDDOC cycle. The problem is in which cycle?</p>
	<p>With just these 12 problems I fail to see how Gartner research can possibly suggest that "The insights that IT4IT promises to deliver will enable opportunities for cost reduction to be identified, freeing up funding for innovation". The emphasis should be on the word 'promises'.</p>	<p>Conclusion - I think the thing that Gartner's research is suggesting that you are ignoring is that most IT shops (at least at the time of the study) don't have a lot of formal processes or best practices in place. As such, in most organizations, you can garner a lot of improvement from utilizing any of the four frameworks mentioned individually (not to mention any number of other IT Management frameworks) as a reference to evaluate how you currently work and drive improvements. I think you are accurate that these frameworks, that were designed by separate people / organizations at different times over the last 20 years don't all fit together to solve every problem of IT. They also do not align at a detailed level, with numerous conflicts and disagreements and holes. That said, they do align strategically and work reasonably well together. They are also much better than designing your IT Management processes and architecture from scratch.</p>	<p>27 years ago I laid the foundation stones for a better method of planning (both strategic and IT). It encompassed every aspect of the conceptual and logical domain of any business. For 20 years before that I battled with the problems faced by IT (and still relevant today). Collaboration has only ever delivered 1 thing for certain, and that is 'compromise'. It is this compromised attitude that has led to the 5 causes of planning failures. Something working reasonably well is just not good enough to handle these causes</p>