

MEETING NOTES

GC Business Arch Sub Working Group - MVP

Date: Tuesday, July 26, 2022

Time: 1:00 PM-2:30 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)

Attendees: Beaudin, Nadine; Cameron, James; Eikenberry, Adam; Elattar, Kareim; Chow, Melissa; Parliament, Len

Meeting Purpose

- Create an agreement/guidance for a minimum viable business architecture practice

General Notes

- (Cameron, James) **Action:** Should identify which accelerators to focus on
- Beausoleil, Anne is collected capability models, creating a repository to go up on the wiki page
 - When groups are looking at creating capability models within their department, they are able to follow existing models
- (Elattar, Kareim) Instead of simply asking departments to provide their own BCMs, how should we create a departmental BCM
 - What are the logistics/concepts involved in building their own BCM?
 - Clients/stakeholders are finding it difficult to manage
 - (Eikenberry, Adam) Providing links to the BCM is not a replacement
 - Chow, Melissa is in the process of rebuilding a framework
- (Elattar, Kareim) Connecting the BCM to the Application Portfolio Management tool is a key concept that we're quite keen on understanding and implementing
- (Cameron, James) Need to find a platform to do mapping in the absence of Clarity
 - Use application and task-based capabilities in Clarity's data model for portfolio rationalization
- (Elattar, Kareim) There seems to be a closed loop of people dedicated to following the BCM and connecting it with the APM
 - Rest of the department does not follow that loop
 - Different people have different ideas of what business capabilities were
 - Need to be presented in a way that is sellable to everyone
 - Might end up the same as TBS, pushing ideas that works well for GCRB and a close group of like-minded individuals but not anyone else
 - Why do we want to map the BCM into the APM?
 - Categorize applications for better search functionality
 - Map business capabilities to the APM for investment decisions
 - (Eikenberry, Adam) Come up with both Definitions and Use Cases
 - Give some form of exemplar to create consistency
 - Further education on Architecture is needed

- Business Engagement Strategy group is the go-between creating digital roadmaps for different program sectors
 - An example of people misunderstanding BCM as cataloguing tool to find things in the APM
 - Not the true purpose of Business Architecture
 - (Cameron, James) Administrative, Client services, do not have the technical or enterprise architecture lens
 - (Eikenberry, Adam) Some are using CS, UX methodologies instead
 - Rudimentary understanding of Business Architecture
- (Eikenberry, Adam) After initial endorsement from DARB, clients get assigned an architect to work with them
 - Before they can see funds for purchasing or watching anything, they must go through that gate process
 - Need to provide value-added statements so people do not view it as an obstacle
 - Ensure it is a promising, coherent idea before it is considered
 - There are fallouts to creating too many barriers
- (Elattar, Kareim) Department started creation of the conceptual target state architecture to mirror what the GC has
 - Starts with working with your clients to figure out what are the services we are offering, who is using their data, data-entity relationship diagrams
 - (Eikenberry, Adam) We talk using abstraction that people are not used to viewing. It takes time to bring the conversation there.
 - Start with a conceptual target state, what business concepts need to be captured from a data perspective, then can think about what those would look like, then how can we deliver on capturing that using the technology we possess
- (Elattar, Kareim) When figuring out what our current state is, conversation always wants to go towards the infrastructure and technology layer. How do we shift that conversation back to the business side?
 - Gravitates towards What technology do we have to solve that problem? Instead of, Why do we have that problem?
 - People prefer practical and tangible as opposed to abstract
- (Eikenberry, Adam) Not all business capabilities need solution capabilities
 - Program design, a solution is not going to design a program
 - There is a whole series of business capabilities outside of that
- (Parliament, Len) A Business Architect is the translator between the business and the solution
 - They need to talk to businesses solely in business language, then use the same capability model with software capabilities underneath it
 - Too often we are trying to explain the application capability model to the business
 - Often do not get to do the translation, the separation between Bas and the Business is not helpful
 - Business Architects are the salesmen, if BAs don't do it, then the vendors will
 - BAs must talk directly to the business
 - Understand what is the value/endgame they're trying to get, then turn to the solution architect
- (Eikenberry, Adam) Our organization structures reflect our legacy in custom, on-premises development. We don't reflect the modern, agile approach of delivering that without organization structures of embedding resources together and looking at solutioning rather than customizing. We are 5-7 years behind adapting to the new reality of how things are delivered

- (Parliament, Len) Is it important that the Business Process Owner understand a BCM or APM or is it the Business Architects duty to understand the Business Processes and KPIs of the Business?
 - (Eikenberry, Adam) Shared ownership is the ideal, but it is difficult to get there
- (Elattar, Kareim) Should we include limitations within the outcomes or principles? Limitations as in how GC departments are structured and how often business programs function in terms of funding these tend to derail certain EA plans and processes
 - (Eikenberry, Adam) Business Architectures should facilitate Solution Architects in options analysis and demonstrating capabilities possible/existing.
- (Elattar, Kareim) Often we do not have a solution architect, business architect, etc. It ends up falling on the EA to do option analysis
 - (Eikenberry, Adam) The EA can be involved in option analysis, but it is ultimately the business' responsibility
 - EA can relate to overall enterprise, how it addresses capabilities
- (Eikenberry, Adam) To change how architecture is viewed, we must change the culture

Action Items

- Before the next meeting, go through the outline and come to an agreement on the big concepts to expand out
 - Produce Guidelines or Use Cases, find references of people who have had success
 - Consider change management tools, as well as the mechanics and definitions of architectural practice
 - Discuss how to change the organizational culture to make Enterprise Architecture become a part of decision-making as opposed to an obstacle
-