# Case Studies

In this section, we shortly describe the case studies that were conducted in three companies participating in the AISA project:

- Case Elisa
- Case IBM
- Case Osuuspankkikeskus (OPK)

The cases were twofold:

- First, the companies were considered as research targets: a study was conducted to chart the status (maturity) of architecture work in the first and the last year of the project. The results of these case studies are described in section Status of Architecture Work
- Second, some of the research results, especially the metrics and criteria for evaluating architecture work, were applied in the case companies.

## Case Elisa

| Primary Participants at Elisa | <ul><li>Ari Andersin</li><li>Juha Jantunen</li><li>Merja Kalttonen</li><li>Pekka Karppinen</li><li>Jarkko Lahtinen</li></ul> |
|---|---|
| Primary Objectives | <ul><li>To chart the status (maturity) of the architecture work at Elisa</li><li>To analyze how the architecture work has evolved and matured during the research project</li><li>To provide support for developing the architecture work practices at Elisa, especially in the area of evaluating the architecture work and its outcomes</li></ul> |
| Main Results | The confidential company-specific reports related to the case Elisa dealt with<br><br><ul><li>the current status of architecture work at Elisa, year 2006</li><li>the current status of architecture work at Elisa, year 2008</li><li>the measurement and evaluation of architecture work and architectures at Elisa</li></ul><br>See also the paper 'Enterprise Architecture Process of a Telecommunication Company - A Case Study on Initialization' in the Results section. |
| Lessons Learned | <ul><li>Architecture work has been initialized successfully and it is progressing.</li><li>Measurement and evaluation of the progress and the gained benefits of architectures and architecture work is also an important issue that cannot be neglected.</li></ul> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul><li>The adaptation of architecture framework should be done on the basis of the organization and business culture of the company. 'Ready-to-use' frameworks simply do not exist.</li><li>It is not a quick process to build an EA culture in an organization.</li></ul> |
| Further Development | <ul><li>Selecting the most relevant metrics and criteria for evaluating architecture work and architectures from the suggested set of metrics.</li><li>Putting the evaluation and measurement activities into practice in line with the existing performance measurement system in the organization.</li><li>Continuing the development of enterprise architecture practices and architectures as suggested e.g. by the company-specific architecture work status reports and existing in-house architecture roadmaps.</li><li>Improving the co-operation between enterprise architecture, projects and business management.</li><li>Developing an efficient and easy method to communicate on EA.</li></ul> |

## Case IBM

| | |
|---|---|
| Primary Participants at IBM Finland | <ul><li>Petri Ahveninen</li><li>Stina Carlsson</li><li>Kimmo Kaskikallio</li><li>Markus Kinni</li><li>Jouko Poutanen</li></ul> |
| Primary Objectives | <ul><li>What is the status of<ul><li>the architecture work practices IBM Finland can provide to its customers and</li><li>the architecture work practices of IBM customers as perceived by consultants and architects?</li></ul></li><li>What kind of tools or practices would enable a consultant or architect<ul><li>to identify and document the status of architecture work in a customer organization or</li><li>to support the customer to understand its own status in architecture work?</li></ul></li></ul> |
| Main Results | The confidential company-specific reports related to the case IBM dealt with:<br><br><ul><li>the status of architecture work, year 2006</li><li>the checklist for charting the architecture work status of a customer organization</li></ul> |
| Lessons Learned | <ul><li>The architecture work status study revealed that IBM has a lot of methods and practices, as well as knowledge and training possibilities for enhancing architecture work of its</li></ul> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | customers, but the customers are not necessarily ready to adopt these practices. Therefore, IBM could aim at increasing the architecture awareness of the customers, e.g. by accentuating the expected benefits of the architecture work in a particular customer case.<br>• The checklist developed in the project can be utilized as one possible tool to increase the customer's architecture awareness by indicating a wide selection of issues important in architecture development and management. |
| Further Development | • The checklist developed in the project needs to be tested in practice to evaluate its usability. Based on the test results, corrections and additions may be required. |

## Case Osuuspankkikeskus (OPK)

| | |
|---|---|
| Primary Participants at OPK | • Markku Korhonen<br>• Jouni Lähteenmäki<br>• Jari Vänskä<br>• Kari Makkonen<br>• Heikki Salo |
| Primary Objectives | • To chart the status (maturity) of the architecture work at OPK<br>• To analyze how the architecture work has evolved and matured during the research project<br>• To provide support for developing the architecture work practices at OPK, especially in the area of evaluating the architecture work and its outcomes |
| Main Results | The confidential company-specific reports related to the case OPK dealt with:<br><br>• the current status of architecture work at OPK, year 2006<br>• the current status of architecture work at OPK, year 2008<br>• the measurement and evaluation of architecture work and architectures at OPK |
| Lessons Learned | • As the architecture team is the bridge between the business and ICT, both up-ward communication (with the business) and down-ward communication (with the project architects and project managers) are essential. Especially, the communication between the architecture team and the project architects and project managers has been successful and the awareness, as well as the actual use, of the available architecture guidance has increased.<br>• Measurement and evaluation is conducted at some architectural levels, but evaluation of the whole EA program and its benefits will be more relevant as the architecture work will become more stabilized and mature. |
| Further | • Continuing the development of architecture work practices |

| Development | and architectures e.g. according to the suggestions provided by the company-specific reports and the existing in-house plans |
| --- | --- |