

OASIS Transformational  
Government Technical Committee  
Members

t: +44 (0)845 465 4683  
e: [impact@cstransform.com](mailto:impact@cstransform.com)  
w: [www.cstransform.com](http://www.cstransform.com)

**London Office**  
100 Pall Mall  
London  
SW1Y 5NQ

Dear all

## Proposed changes for TGF v2

There are quite a few changes here, of both structure and content, so the purpose of this note is to give an overall introduction and rationale for the changes that you will not already have seen.

### **A new top-level diagrammatic depiction of the TGF**

We have updated the main TGF diagram (the “arrow diagram”). The changes involved are:

a) Taking out some of the detail, so it now only shows the Core Patterns, plus the higher-level “wrappers” we’ve put round these (eg business management). This helps to clean it up – some of the more detailed elements on the original diagram are sub-components of patterns, but some didn’t end up in the pattern language at all. By focusing it on patterns only in this way, the diagram is better suited as act as a guide to navigation.

b) Merging the “customer management” and “channel management” wrapper into one: “service management”. As colleague may recall, this is something that the SCF did, but which I had originally not wanted to do recommend for the TGF. But on reflection, I think it helps – particularly if the TC agrees we should focus this diagram as a guide to the patterns. Previously, channel management had been an anomaly: it was both a “wrapper” on the diagram and also a pattern in its own right – unlike business, customer and technology management. And this change results in a good audience mapping: CEO and board level focus on Business Management; Heads of Service Transformation/Service Delivery focus on the combined customer and channel management; and CIOs/CTOs focus on Technology Management.

c) Some recommended name changes. These all flow from changes which came out of the SCF process, and which I believe represent good user feedback which is just as relevant to the TGF. The changes are:

- “Engagement with Stakeholders” becomes “Stakeholder Collaboration”
- “Technology Management” becomes “Technology and digital asset management”
- “Customer Identity Management” becomes “Identity and Privacy Management”
- “Transformational Business Model” becomes “Transformational Operating Model. (This is the only change which I guess might be not self-explanatory. The issue we had on the SCF was most of the stakeholders felt that “business model” was a narrower concept than the TGF actually meant, and was focused specifically on financial flows around a system – rather than all aspects of doing business. Operating model was deemed a better term technically for what we were trying to describe.)

### **Thumbnail navigation diagrams**

In the context of discussing the TC's feedback on the SCF, we spoke about the potential value of some sort of diagram or breadcrumb trail to help the reader keep a clear idea of where he or she is in the overall structure. So we've had a go at doing some diagrams to help give a sense of place as we go through: see the first three patterns on guiding principles, vision and program leadership. If the TC thinks these are helpful, we can produce the rest. Or does anyone have ideas for a different approach?

### **Critical Success Factors**

These have been expanded slightly, although in substance are still the same. The changes reflect CS Transform's experience of using the original TGF CSF list as a checklist with clients. And in a number of areas, the language needs making crisper in order to give a verifiable statement which you can give a yes/no answer in respect of whether or not a particular program is applying the CSF.

### **Conformance clauses**

We have expanded almost all of the conformance clauses from the original Core Pattern language. Originally, many of the clauses were highly telegraphic: eg "Must have a Roadmap for Transformation". The new clauses give more detail on what a conformant implementation of that would involve. The expansion does not create new content though: we have simply used text from either the body of the pattern or the primer in order to give more substance and "testability" to the conformance clause.

### **Areas of substantive new content**

Finally, there are some areas where we are recommending significant new content.

First, on benefit realization, where the original intention was to have a single pattern, this has now been broken down into more detailed sub patterns.

Second, some of the patterns have been expanded with new content, prompted by the experience of working with UK stakeholders to develop the Smart City Framework. This is absolutely not a case of the city-level SCF tail wagging the government-level TGF dog. But I believe there are several areas where the TGF approach needs updating – and where I had the luxury of being paid by the UK government to do that updating in the context of the SCF!

In particular:

- I am recommending we expand the pattern on Transformational Operating Model (Transformational Business Model as was) in order to give more explicit recognition to the importance of the open data agenda in opening up the public sector to externally-driven innovation. This was always present previously, but in a lower profile way which I think is now much clearer.
- I am recommending some significant changes to the old Supplier Partnership pattern, which for me now reads very much as a pre-Cloud model of how to manage your engagements with a few big System Integrators, rather than how to manage the much more heterogeneous supply environment which the Cloud is opening up.

I hope that's a helpful introduction to the proposed changes, and look forward to discussing them with you next week.

Yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Chris Parker". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial "C" and "P".

**Chris Parker**  
**Managing Partner**