# Anatomy of information

A better way of designing
Business Requirements
&
Integrating them with
Technology

LESS IS MORE

# Overview

**Purpose**
The purpose of these courses is to introduce a better way to use time to design and develop information systems from the plethora of business and technology objects.

In the immortal words of Warren Buffett "There is no way that I will be able to buy more time".

Time management is of the utmost importance and thus far, according to my research, just about all of the approaches that I have studied fail to deliver the results of manipulating the plethora of business and technology objects.

Another way to look at this approach is -=+ (less is More)

# Strengths and Weaknesses

Ripose

Let me start with the simple step of trying to identify business objectives which lie at the core of the matter and why the main stream ('best practice' and others) approaches fail to achieve this in a timely and cost effective manner.

| Method | Strengths | Major weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| TOGAF | None | 1) Based on USA DoDAF<br>2) Multiple versions<br>3) Implicit deliverables |
| Zachman | None | 1) Ontology based on an incorrect representation of a 2 dimensional classification system<br>2) No clear starting point<br>3) Implicit deliverables |
| Others (900+) | None | 1) Too many to mention<br>2) Starting points too haphazard<br>3) Implicit deliverables |
| Anatomy of objectives | Explicit deliverables:<br>1) Taxonomy<br>2) Ontology<br>3) Heuristics | None |

# Why TOGAF fails

TOGAF fails due to the inability of its originators to recognise the anatomy of information which leads to the following major factors:

1) Questionable genealogy. Based on the USA Department of Defence Framework Architecture, first released in 1996 to "It establishes data element definitions, rules, and relationships". By starting off with 'data' it indicates a wrong starting point in the evolution of setting baselines for setting a "set of products for consistent development of systems, integrated, or federated architecture". Hence TOGAF's claim that it was "First published in 1995, TOGAF was based on the US Department of Defence Technical Architecture Framework for Information Management (TAFIM). From this sound foundation" is fallacious and misleading.

2) There have been multiple updates to TOGAF versions (culminating in version 9.1 – current as at the time of my writing this). As their basic starting premise was flawed, every new version has and will inherit the same basic flaws

3) The structure of the repository is not well defined

4) One of the first steps in TOGAF is 'tailoring the TOGAF to your specific needs' but this can be quite a daunting ask and is not as easy as it might sound

# Why Zachman fails

The Zachman framework fails due to following major factors:
1) Based on a 6X6 matrix with no clear starting position

2) No step-by-step procedure for creating a new architecture

3) No help in deciding if the future architecture is the best for an organisation

4) Falls short at prescribing detailed solutions for enterprise problems

5) Often implies solutions that are idealistic at best

6) Needs to be combined with other methods in order to be of optimal use

# Why Other frameworks fail

Other frameworks fail due to the inability of its originators to recognise the anatomy of information which leads to the following major factors:

1) Incorrect starting point – some start off with:
   a) A mixture of objectives (vision, mission, key performance indicators (KPIs) and then move on to strategies
   b) Brainstorm strategies and then try to identify KPIs

2) Have IT develop the "conceptual data model" (CDM) which is an oxymoron as data is logical (built on known facts) whilst the term conceptual implies "An abstract or general idea inferred or derived from specific instances"

3) No clear integration between the CDM (which is illogical) and the business concepts – which at best are unclear and haphazard

# Why another approach?

**The legacy systems time 'e-bomb' is slowly ticking**.

The failure of the aforementioned methods to address the decommissioning of the legacy systems by trying to develop or re-develop the past using catch phrases such as agile, lean, scrum, ideate etc are merely wasting valuable time. Consider this: Why is it acceptable to learn and follow the implicit approaches of the following only to have projects spin out of control:
1) TOGAF – whose developers are unable to clearly state what their explicit deliverables are and charge a fortune for the course material
2) Zachman – whose developers provide a 6x6 matrix with hardly any guidance whatsoever
3) Balanced Scorecard – whose developers provide an attempt to distinguish between a 'goal' and a 'measure' but deliver duplicated objects and no means of proceeding forward
4) Business canvases – whose developers provide over 180 objectives to choose from, distribute them across 9 domains and no means of proceeding forward
5) Design thinking – whose developers dislike the 'waterfall approaches' and re-introduce the time wasting approaches ('ideate') of the 1970 RAD approach and no means of proceeding forward
6) Agile/lean – whose developers try to integrate a number of the above techniques in an attempt to 'save time'

If you are unable to make up your mind, please read my article "The right and wrong ways". I establish a new benchmark and then compare a number of the above approaches to it. Their lack of explicit deliverables should cause anyone to rethink their support for these time wasting approaches.

If you still disagree with me then my courses will be of no use to you. So thank you for your interest and best of luck with your use of the approach you need to hang on to. In parting see why this new approach succeeds where others fail.

# Ripose conceptual modelling

Based on

- Taxonomy
  - Encapsulation
  - Extended polymorphism
  - Inheritance
  - Relationships
- Ontology
  - Synonyms – 'Two words that can be interchanged in a context'
  - Hyponyms - 'A word that is more specific than a given word'
- Heuristics/rule based
  - Built on the anatomy of information

# Conceptual modelling training course

**_What:_**
This course is designed to teach how to identify the fundamental classes of business objectives and the relationships that exist between their artifacts.

**_Who:_**
Any person interested in seeking how to full express their business objectives and a way to categorise what they discover. They include all levels of business managers [especially the chief (x) officers namely the executive (CEO), finance (CFO), operational (COO), Information (CIO), human resources (CHRO)], strategic planners, project managers, enterprise architects, business architects and business analysts.

_How:_
Content
1. Conceptual conventions
2. The Generic Goal Model
3. Workshops
4. How to undertake a successful strengths, weakness, opportunities & threat (SWOT) analysis
5. Workshop
6. Develop a sound key performance indicator structure fully integrated with the lowest level artifact in the goal model & produce a more thorough cost benefit analysis
7. Workshops

**_Why:_**
You will learn:
1. What a goal is
2. A better SWOT approach based on goals
3. How to build a cost benefit analysis