

18 Sep 2017

Keyword logic - An essay on my reasoning



I was having a messaging conversation with a colleague of mine and realised that I needed to address his comments in such a way as to make sure I addressed every issue.

So In order for me to explain my point of view I decided to 'diagnose' his statements to find (what in my opinion) was the 'key' word in each of them. I was then able to make all my assertions based on this word and hence logic dictates that the truth or falseness of the sentence or paragraph hinges on my (or anyone else's) understanding of the definition of the word or on reasoning.

By continuing to 'agree to disagree' on these keywords will only result in hiding the risks, leaving the disagreement to (please excuse my next metaphor) 'fester like an open wound that would eventually, if not addressed, lead to gangrene and the possible loss of a limb or life'.

The next few pages are an example of one such diagnosis.

If you study my comments clearly, you will find 3 matters arising from this discussion:

- 1) All 7 of the original assertions and 7 of the follow up statements have significant risks associated with the lack of understanding the keywords/issues
- 2) The revelation that my colleague was a member of a rival 'standards' group. If these 2 groups had originally agreed to agree perhaps a better standard would have been established
- 3) To ignore these risks or to find a suitable mitigation will only exacerbate the situation.

Conclusion

The solution to this enigma is to settle on an approach that eliminates as many risks as possible. It all starts by knowing where to start (the first process), what the essential flows (inputs and outputs) are and what to do next.

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

Their comment	My diagnosis		
	Keyword	Definition	Comment
1) A Solution Architect role assumes a certain level of abstraction, i.e. compartmentalisation is not a risk here.	Assume	“Take on a certain form, attribute, or aspect”	What if the ‘take on’ is incorrect? Without an explicit business knowledge model, the ‘solutions architect’ will always have to assume that they know how abstract a strategy from a series of words that management have brainstormed. These words may be right and they may be wrong. Therein lies the risk.
2) ”Real world effect” is a term standing for a (any) change - tangible or intangible - in the world state caused by an execution of capability/business service (OASIS SOA RAF standard).	Effect	“An impression (especially one that is artificial or contrived)”	What if that impression is wrong? Without a clear understanding of all of the ideas in the collective minds of management the impression can lead to disastrous outcomes. Therein lies the risk.
3) This absence of agreement is based on a wrong approach: people tend to _define_ things via what they do with them, not via what the things are. Everyone performs different activities and has different goals - no common agreement is possible in such case. I still have to read your articles...	Approach	“Ideas or actions intended to deal with a problem or situation”	What if the approach is wrong? Doing the right thing at the wrong time or doing the wrong thing at the right time could, even with all the best skills/capabilities, turn out to be disastrous. Therein lies the risk
4) I do not think that "RA0" should be able to "carrying out every task the RA1 through RA6 needs to do", let them do their job. However, IMHO, "RA0" is the one who understands all those tasks and knows how to combine them for different cases and contexts.	Think	“Expect, believe, or suppose”.	What if the thought was wrong? Either you will need time to pass after which you will be able to examine the outcomes or you have to gain an understanding of knowledge. In order to identify the skills of the RA1 through RA6 , there has to be at least 1 person with the capability of ensuring that all the pieces of the puzzle is in the right place at the right time (ie the RA0). Any assumption that the approach is right could lead to an effect that will prove disastrous. Therein lies the risk.

Their comment	My diagnosis		
	Keyword	Definition	Comment
5) “Times have changed” in my context means that market dynamics have changed for the last 5-7 years and the operating models developed 15-20 years ago have become inadequate to the modern mark dynamics (together with related experience and best practices). For me, this means that the relationships between operating managers and architects who architect business have changed and now require new models/methods/instruments.	Change	“Become different in some particular way, without permanently losing one's or its former characteristics or essence”	What if the change is not for the better? Effective learning depends on understanding the basics. If someone in authority alters the basic underlying principles, they had better be sure of what they are doing otherwise the effects could be catastrophic. Therein lies the risk.
6) Architects of Business are those who architect the business of their organisations. This unrelates to IT Dept. and its EA/SA/IA/DA, etc. Almost full information about the concept of an Architecture of Business and its Practice (conducted by Architects of Business) may be found at architectureofbusiness.com Architecting business means defining what the business system has to include and what should it do in order to implement the corporate strategy in the given business (technology) execution context.	Architecture	“The complex or carefully designed structure of something”	What if the architecture is wrong? I looked at the site you gave me and all I saw was another set of people offering another set of ideas based on “The Theory of Business Systems” which is in itself an assumption of inputs, processes and outputs. One incorrect flow or process could lead to a catastrophic effect. Therein lies the risk.

Their comment	My diagnosis		
	Keyword	Definition	Comment
7) An "Architectural governance" - one of aspects of the concept of an Architecture of Business - is a governing discipline and practice that regulates what the architects and managers do, their rights and responsibilities, and defines the processes/procedures of controls for the implementation of architectural solutions. So, I am not sure this is at the level of "the complex evolving object" and "simple static objects".	Governance	“The persons (or committees or departments etc.) who make up a body for the purpose of administering something”	<p>What if the people get it wrong?</p> <p>Changing a complex evolving object into simple static objects is at the heart of governance. If the people on the governing body have no idea how to go from point ‘A’ to point “B” and when to start and complete the process, the end effect of poor ‘governance’ will produce catastrophic effects. Therein lies the risk.</p>

They then chose to respond, leaving me with a bit more work to do and I came up with the following diagnosis:

Keyword	Their further assertion	My diagnosis		
		New keyword	Definition	Comment
For "Assume":	A Solution Architect role assume certain level of abstraction over technology implementation, not over the wording of the strategy - they are untouchable. I.E. a Solution Architect defines what to do (because the strategy has to be decomposed in the separate tasks) and why, not how	Strategy	"An elaborate and systematic plan of action."	What if the strategy is wrong? The solution architect does not set the strategy, nor are they 'untouchable'. The use of the word 'assume' again highlights the potential dangers of the solution architect being 'untouchable'. Solution architects do not 'know'. They merely deliver! Therein lies the risk.
For "Effect":.	An expression "Real World Effect" (RWE) is defined in the OASIS standard and unrelated to someone's impression. A person can have any impressions, but the professionalism of the service designer is in the impression should be the consumer's impression should be the same as the service owner/provider has. To help with this, the RWE is explained in the special Service Description available to the consumer before the service is invoked. I am talking about services because they (according to OASIS) represent business capabilities to the consumers	Definition	"A concise explanation of the meaning of a word or phrase or symbol"	What if OASIS got the definition wrong? Who made OASIS the sole arbiter? OASIS is a consortium or collaboration of people with similar or very different backgrounds. This group is no different to The Open Group or even some religious group. If they get any part of their 'standard' wrong, they can cause incalculable hardships. Therein lies the risk.
For "Approach":	do not understand your comment. I describe the approach people take and say it is in fault of an absence of agreement.	Agreement	"Compatibility of observations"	What if people do not agree? This is probably the biggest hurdle of all. Use of language (the definitions of words, spelling and grammar) lies at the heart of the problem. Grammar includes sentence construction and punctuation. Get these wrong and all anyone will ever be able to do is to 'agree to disagree'. This leads nowhere. Therein lies the risk

Keyword	Their further assertion	My diagnosis		
		New keyword	Definition	Comment
For "Think":	to me, it seems the comment addresses a different topic. I am only saying that RA0 does not need to know HOW to carry every talk RA1 to RA6. It is enough to know what RA1 to RA6 does/can do and what the outcome should be for each. RA0 needs to know only the logic of its own task - WHAT to do WHEN and engage RA1 to RA6 accordingly. This is the beauty of Service Orchestration - I do not care how you do your work, I need the results only in the way I define. RA0 is responsible for arranging for all needed inputs and outcomes for the given orchestration and it does not matter whether RA1 to RA6 deliver them or BA1 to BA6. This is how solution architecture works with delivery. If any RAx or BAx are not professional and do not provide for what they promised to provide (according to the Service Description), in business they can be swayed. An example of this is Cloud providers.	Seems	“Give a certain impression or have a certain outward aspect”	What if the impression is wrong? Everyone has the right to their own opinion. However if the person does not have the experience or the expertise in a certain domain of discourse, then their opinion will be based on hearsay and innuendo. This will lead to a dangerous conclusion. So no, my original comment was not addressing a different topic. My only advice is to stop thinking and start knowing . Therein lies the risk.
		Service Orchestration	“The process of integrating two or more applications and/or services together to automate a process, or synchronize data in real-time. Often, point-to-point integration may be used as the path of least resistance”	What if the integration is wrong? Integration has to be built into the knowledge architecture otherwise the whole process will be based on impressions and who has the most power. This will nearly always lead to catastrophic results. Therein lies the risk.
		Care	“Be concerned with”	What if you should care? Your statement “I do not care how you do your work. I need the results only in the way I define” is the crux of the matter. If your definitions work for you and you can use them to create a better approach then please create an AI engine based on your definitions. One that will assist others to implement your experience and expertise. If you do not do this then you are doing the same thing that every other developer has ever done and that is to build silo upon silo of services that may or may not integrate to work as an ‘orchestra’. Therein lies the risk.
		Not care	“Be unconcerned with”	

They then chose to respond again, leaving me with a bit more work to do and I came up with the following diagnosis:

Keyword	Your further assertion	My diagnosis		
		New keyword	Definition	Comment
Strategy	I've meant that the wording of the strategy are untouchable, not the architects. Also, solution architects do deliver; the risk of a wrong strategy is not their risk. It is the risk of the CxO, Board and Architects of Business. However, the latter only contribute to the strategy creation. The responsibility for the wrong strategy is on the CxO/Board.	Untouchable	"Not capable of being obtained"	What if the strategy was not 'untouchable? When you 'argue' (or have a discussion0 with me please "mean what you say not say what you mean". I have to keep trying to translate what it is you are actually referring to. Yes the people on the Board of Directors (or in the case of a Government, in the Cabinet) are ultimate responsibility for the enterprise's strategy. But who do these stakeholders turn to for advice? The very people who then dictate the strategy keep themselves at arms length from the strategy when it fails by claiming they only advised. What a cop out. Therein lies the risk
		Deliver	"provide (something promised or expected)"	What if the delivery is wrong? Solution architects can remonstrate all they like that they were not responsible for the monumental failure of the solutions. They simply pocket their overcharged fee for service and walk away from the mess. Therein lies the risk

Keyword	Your further assertion	My diagnosis		
		New keyword	Definition	Comment
Definition	There are no absolute truth. "Who made OASIS the sole arbiter?" - 40 companies participating the standard writing and 10 years of discussion in the industry including discussions with competing standard bodies. OASIS is reliable source and I have not seen one failure of its statement yet. In discussion with The Open Group, they admitted that OASIS provided the Foundational work, which resulted in the change of the OASIS standard - Reference Architecture Foundation for SOA. I and my colleagues in the OASIS standard team criticised The Open Group for violating their agreement to use and to refer to the RAF in their works (since 2009) and their SOA related documents now use the words in the right order though not all right words yet. Why should I care about a risk here and there? What is the goal you try to point me to?	Participation	"The act of sharing in the activities of a group"	<p>What if the activities being shared are wrong? You have now revealed that you were/are a member of the OASIS Group and that OASIS has disagreements with the Open group and that the OASIS Group changed a standard after discussions with TOGAF and I also note that you and some colleagues criticised the Open Group for violations.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The OASIS group is a group that sets standards without having a baseline understanding of the architectural issues 2) Not caring about a risk here and there is not part of the participation. You participate, you care 3) I do not understand your statement "What is the goal you try to point me to? I will make an assumption here that the 'Goal' I am pointing you to is to satisfy Benjamin Franklins purported statement "A place for everything, everything in its place" <p>Any deviation from any of the above is dangerous. Therein lies the risk</p>

Keyword	Your further assertion	My diagnosis		
		New keyword	Definition	Comment
Agreement	yes, people do not agree and this is the reason of the problem. I explain why they do not agree and why they cannot agree in their approach to the definition via views and practices. It is not about language or culture. People who take more theory and unified approaches unrelated "who does how" usually listen to the arguments and agree with me (so far)	Approach	“Ideas or actions intended to deal with a problem or situation”	<p>What if the approach is wrong? I addressed this issue at the beginning of our conversation (point 3) and hence this now becomes a circular argument. If your actions are based on your experience and expertise do not concur with mine, you have 3 options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Think that you are right and I am wrong. In which case we will never agree. I spent 15 years being barraged y my mentors that they thought they were right and yet in the end they were proven to be mistaken • Know that you are right and I am wrong. In which case you need to prove (explicitly) where you are right and I am wrong by finding one serious flaw in my approach and none in yours). I spent 2 years developing Ripose and Caspar and 30 years proving I was right • Simply walk away and enjoy you assertions <p>Therein lies the risk</p>