Your Comment	My response
Would be good to see a holistic information model as is at the moment spread out across multiple images and details are lost.	(Missed point) Printing the 'Knowledge' model trying not to cross lines is a virtual nightmare. I tried this when I developed USER:Data and all we ended up with was wallpapering the wall. If someone then goes and add one more entity, you need to reprint the entire map. It would br great to have a holographic projection printer that will enable participants to 'walk around the model and react with it by touching an entity & having the details displayed. A Virtual Reality engine would also be great. The problem is the cost!. By the way Caspar produces a spreadsheet like file which places all the entities in a column and their implementation position in the appropriate column
2) "Convenient truth is based on need, desire and emotion." this is a pacifier of the belief that allows one be righteous with their point of view, and what in their mind gives them permissions to shove their idea down everyone's throat. This is what blocks people from receiving feedback and from learning others perspectives. It's a way to make a knowledge archetype once and not having to update it. And that's just a positive spin on its use. This is what Kevin does with his PragmaticEA. There is nothing that any mortal person can learn that makes them immune to learning new things. The more clarity one gets, the more they should pursue steel manning other peoples ideas to understand first then to seek to be understood. This also goes to the fundamental notion of maximums in claims, the more certain one gets, the more they understand how uncertain things are.	I understand your viewpoint. Probably the one thing that you seem to be missing is that I have had 2 cracks at solving the problem that caused the business-centric technology-centric gap. I also lived in the era of most of the pioneers of the approaches. If I had missed anything I would not have been able to produce a body of work that is as relevant today as it was 30 years ago. You may call me an egotist and possibly a 'know-all' but the questions I ask you is: 1) Who else is there in the world that has had the same experience as me and who developed an approach and wrote the software that covers every section of this universe of discourse? 2) What do you (or Kevin or Brian Seitz or Tom Graves or any of the baby boomer LI members) know that I do not?
4) Just going of definitions "Knowledge is a familiarity, awareness, or understanding of someone or something, such as facts, skills, or objects.", "Information is facts provided or learned about something or someone." makes Information a subset of Knowledge. When I speak to you I transmit information to you with these words, I use my knowledge about you and about the english language to construct a meaningful informational message that you can understand.	Definitions have a way of confusing and providing contradictory assertions This is why semantic modelling is prone to errors. If you were to look at using keywords you will soon notice a 'feedback' loop (aka deadly embrace) which will send you into a never ending spiral. My suggestion is to forget about dictionary definitions when dealing with knowledge and start by asking questions and then try to answer them as explicitly as possible. The more words you use the less likely you are to actually gain any knowledge. And just for the record when you speak to anyone it is not information that you are passing it is an image in your mind which may or not be the same as the one in their mind. If you were to read part of my book on my course you may just gain an insight to this phenomenon. This is on the page 18 on the subject of [Communication](#)

Your Comment	My response
6) It takes special people to learn other perspectives and even more special when learning is not mutual.	True enough but it takes more than being special. It requires the respect of the student for the teacher and the patience on the part of the teacher
7) From my perspective, everything has to align and be aligned as a systemic process of doing work. Any discretion becomes a measure to provide input to action.	I agree. Which is why during my research I found that none of the approaches came close to aligning their deliverables. If you read my article titled 'Factual Evidence Vs Convenient Truths' on page 10 I show how Ripose handles its inputs and outputs. If you then compare my deliverables with that of Agile's or Zachman's or TOGAF's you may just see why I claim what I claim
8) My working meta-model is here https://governance.foundation/gxp/model/business, work in progress still have a few frameworks to observe.	Yours is a WIP. Mine was completed 30 years ago. Yours has a number of possible feedback loops, mine has taken them all into account and sorted them out. Mine is backed by software the support the approach. I am not sure what yours does! If you are looking for role models to develop your own approach I suggest you steer clear of all of them. If you tried to use mine as an example you will end up copying my work (which is in essence plagiarism)
9) Maybe its wording, information captured by the organisation and its relationship and alignment to strategies creates transparency and really ties things together. If you look at an organisation, you know that is operation means that its a body of knowledge. Take for example a person working on their own doing a craft, making boots, they have a lot of knowledge but none of this is captured in any information. They get a new customer exchange information and customer pays for their knowledge, they do not pay for the information that would allow them to repeat the craft on their own. But in organisations, this is exactly what has to happen. Every person who comes to work should be influencing the socio-technical structure in a way that their job becomes obsolete. This then is a measure that they know what they are doing and can scale their knowledge beyond themselves.	If this is your viewpoint then you do not understand how knowledge works. This is the realm of the Ripose Information grade 2 architect (RA2 for short). I can draw you the model that will describe exactly what a person making boots does. Just as I can create a knowledge model of Miles Kington's paraprosdokian "Knowledge is knowing a tomato is a fruit. Wisdom is not putting a tomato in a fruit salad'. Are you able to model this?
10) Your point of view is your knowledge trapped in your head, once you write your knowledge down, I can review see if there are any gaps. Which document you believe has 5 fundamental knowledge classes and 23 fundamental entities listed?	If you took the time to view my TEDx Type presentation you may just gain some insight into my view of knowledge and how I implemented it in Caspar

Your Comment	My response
11) Prototype: A prototype is an early sample, model, or release of a product built to test a concept or process. It is a term used in a variety of contexts, including semantics, design, electronics, and software programming. If this is not the case, then both works knowledge and prototype means adding data to Casper, I would expect this to be a given when you do all the work on Objectives and Strategies. This also opens the issue why isn't the other links have labels?	I provide 3 types of 'prototypes' for 1) business-centric individuals with The structure of 'Goals' which is the 1-4-11 2) Business-centric and technology-centric individuals with the structure of the generic knowledge model (the 23 fundamental entities) 3) Business-centric and technology-centric individuals with the structure of their strategies with the 5 core fundamental entities. I see no one else's approach coming close
12) I am yet to find anyone who can build anything of an LDM, that requires special people that are 1% of the workforce.	I can train a RA 5 to do just this. My software creates LDMs based on 1 factor is the entity going to be logical or remain a concept. The software does the rest by allocating all the attributes a RA4 placed in a knowledge class which is to remain a concept and redistributing it to the appropriate logical entity. But as I need to train 10 RA0 this will have to wait for when the RA0 student learns all about LDMs
15) CDM if anything is a zoomed-out view of a Logical Data model. This seems to be a Database related concept.	I have proven that the CDM is the LDM nothing more nothing less
19) What about the business process? Customer journey? Plant operation process? Security process? SDLC? Project Delivery? ...	1) Business processes: These are all catered for in the relational links between the knowledge entities. Michael A Jackson would approve of this 2) Customer Journey: The customer journey starts with their objectives, continues with their knowledge of their business and followed up with their strategies, Facts & Applications 3) Plant operation processes: These are catered for in the knowledge model and the LDM 4) Security Process: This is managed via the 'navigation file' which is the skeletal framework of the knowledge model 5) SDLC: Handled by the Information formula 6) Project delivery: Handled by the LDMJ
21) All of the frameworks I have experienced, have the same approach the data is isolated to architects. And there are a bunch of artifacts that organisation will need to keep moving I've put some examples here https://governance.foundation/gxp/model/collaboration	Perhaps if you look more closely at my approach you may just see I have handles every facet of the examples that you have mentioned. Ripose delivers its explicit deliverables by targeting the right person at the right time. Objectives Deliverable is targeted at the business-centric person. The Proof of Concept is targeted at the business-centric & technology-centric person. The Proof of Logic and Proof of Physical are targeted at the technology-centric person

Your Comment	My response
21.1) Can an organisation do other perspectives to test their plans?	With my approach every plan is signed off by the appropriate management level. There is no need for ant other tests
21.3) What about proof of work?	Delivered by the 3 proofs as well as 4 presentations. Agai unless you have witnessed the documentation that a RA0 produces you will not understand why I can claim this
Do you have any ER diagrams for me to review aside from high-level diagrams I've seen on the site? You can see my conceptual modelling here https://governance.foundation/gxp/ as an example.	ER diagrams need entities My highest level diagram can be viewed at which shows the relationships between the approach the architects and how they interface with Caspar. An ER diagram showing the lower level models are on my website and can be viewed by using the Navigation icon on the first web page. For example clicking on 1. Objectives will bring up the next set of relationships.