

4 Nov 2015

## Why EA may be questionable



Here's another thought of mine as to "why EA may be questionable". Perhaps there are 3 major categories of reasons as to the 'why':

- 1) Incomplete definition of business objectives
- 2) Hidden knowledge
- 3) Putting strategies front and centre

### 1) Incomplete definition of business objectives

The ea must have the major stakeholders and these include the board members and the 5 major C-Type operatives - CEO, CFO, COO, CIO and CCO (chief community officer) articulate their explicit business objectives and these include the 'purpose', the 'benefits' contained within their agreed upon 'purpose', the 'values' that the said benefits provide (including their strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) as well as the approximate 'worth/measure' (in terms of the income or expenditure - both capital and operational) of the said 'values' and hence provide an approximate earnings before income tax, depreciation and apportionment (EBITDA) the enterprise delivers to its stakeholders.

### 2) Hidden knowledge

The ea is missing out on a wealth of 'information' by only asking the major stakeholders 6 questions (who, what, when, where, how and why) when trying to uncover the explicit 'knowledge' all the relevant stakeholders (including the 5 C-Types and their line managers) have locked away in their collective minds, when they should be asking at least 19 of the possible 46 (eg who does what to whom and when) that could be asked, as well as ensuring that all these questions can be traced back to at least one 'worth'.

### 3) Putting strategies front and centre

By using the current systems and trying to brain storm business strategies prior to or in parallel with (silo mentality) uncovering the explicit business knowledge and linking the strategies and tactics directly to the business knowledge, the ea runs the risk of exploring ambiguous, redundant and overlapping strategies and tactics.

### Conclusion

Perhaps if the ea could at least address, record and document these 'hidden' information artifacts, then perhaps the 'why' will no longer be the issue as it moves the whole debate away from 'IS-IT' and focuses the architecture squarely on the 'business'.

All the rest of the issues (such as the practice of EA, what legal issues need to be satisfied etc) would then be more easily addressed as then the enterprise would at least have 'a place for everything and everything in its place'. Where 'everything' is the 'information' (business centric) the enterprise needs as a whole rather than the 'data' (IT-IS centric which would be far too voluminous to be of any real help at this juncture).

Just my humble opinion.

Charles Meyer Richter  
Principal information architect  
Ripose Pty Limited  
charles.richter@ripose.com