FRAMEWORK #1

Fragmented Control Plane

DEFINITION

Infrastructure authority splits across platform boundaries — governance, tooling, and audit evidence included — with no unified model governing the estate as a whole.

FRAMEWORK FLOW

01
The Condition
A multi-hypervisor estate persists as a permanent operational topology, not a transitional migration state. Every dimension of operational management splits at the platform boundary.

02
The Boundary
Whether workload placement is governed by an explicit authority model defining which platform owns each workload class and why, or emerges opportunistically through local operational convenience.

03
Failure State
Ad hoc arbitration — platform ownership resolves reactively, cross-platform governance stays a conversation rather than a process.

04
Consequence
Operational and governance debt compounds independently across RBAC models, DR runbooks, observability stacks, and audit evidence — surfacing at incident or audit time, when it's most expensive to close.

Failure State: Ad Hoc Arbitration

`Provisioning request arrives` → `Placement decided by whoever's handling it` →
`Governance defined independently within each platform boundary` → `Gap surfaces at audit or incident`
→ `Team reverts to platform-specific tribal knowledge` →
`Governance debt compounds across both platforms, undetected`

THE DIAGNOSTIC SIGNAL

PLATFORM OWNERSHIP
Ask either platform team if they own their own RBAC model, DR runbooks, and audit evidence — yes, correctly, for their platform.

COMPOSITE OWNERSHIP
Ask who owns consistent governance across the estate as a whole — nobody, by absence of design, not neglect.

TRIGGER CONDITION
Coexistence outlasts its original migration timeline. The 18–36 month transition window becomes the permanent operating state, not a milestone en route to consolidation.

REMEDIATION SHAPE
An explicit, documented authority boundary — defining workload ownership, placement rules, and decision rights across platforms — assigned and reviewed as placement decisions arise, not left as a migration backlog item.

THE SIX DRIVERS OF PERMANENT COEXISTENCE

01
Application Dependency Reality
Undocumented integrations and platform-specific behavior that worked in VMware's execution environment do not survive a clean hypervisor swap.

02
Compliance Constraints
Requirements tied to VMware-specific DR tooling have no equivalent replacement that produces the same certification evidence without significant re-validation.

03
DR Asymmetry
Years of validated recovery procedures on one platform against an alternative platform estate that's 18–24 months old at most.

04
Operational Retraining Cost
Teams operating two platforms simultaneously must maintain deep competency in both — cost that doesn't amortize quickly at the pace most programs execute.

05
Tooling Divergence
Backup, SIEM, observability, and ITSM integrations rebuilt for the alternative platform run in parallel with their originals — the tooling surface doubles.

06
Executive Migration Fatigue
Multi-year migration programs compete with new priorities for the same engineering capacity — migration becomes a background initiative.

The same fragmentation duplicates the cost surface — support contracts, licensing, backup and SIEM integrations, DR validation labor, and operational certifications all run in parallel rather than converging.

ARCHITECTURAL RELATIONSHIPS

No architectural relationships are currently mapped for this framework in the registry.

ANCHOR /vmware-coexistence-era/

FRAMEWORK HOME

The same authority fragmentation pattern may appear beyond virtualization environments, including hybrid infrastructure and multi-account cloud estates.

"Every platform team can correctly explain its own governance model. Nobody can explain the estate's combined authority — not because anyone neglected it, but because it was never anyone's to answer."