ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE:
Questions and Answers

Chair: Olav Ostberg
Sweden

Olav Ostberg, Sweden. Question time.

Barry West, USA. There are many different types of enterprise architecture tools that are on the market that can be used as a repository and for modelling. I didn't hear any of the speakers talk about any of those tools. Are you using any of those tools?

We have looked at those tools and looked at the various different models out there, especially from the larger firms that are doing the analysis and find that they didn't quite fit what we are doing and how we are meeting it, so what we are really focusing on right now is the models that we have, doing that almost manually at this point and once we get a better understanding of how we use those models, then we will start looking at what tools are available, instead of allowing the tool to drive our architectural programme.

Neils Pagh-Ramussen, Denmark. We have been looking to these tools but we haven't made any choice between them. So what we have been doing is making a Danish paradyne for architecture and we have been inspired from the tools but I don't think it is a good thing for the public to choose one because you can't argue that one is the best and another not so good.

Peter Tan, Singapore. I don't think tools are necessary for what we are doing at this point in time, Traditional word processing is I guess what is suitable for what we are doing right now.

Jacob Navot, Israel. My question is to John. You mentioned that 70% of publication required authentication? How do you tackle the problem?

John Weigelt, Canada. I deal with this on Thursday. We tackled the problem through what we feel is an innovative use of public infrastructure. We are able to use public infrastructure with a anonymous certificates doing a binding of identity at the programmes where it is required so we can support a wide range from everywhere from anonymous type transactions where you simply need repeatability to very high assurance type transactions through a secondary identify proofing process. So that's how we have met that challenge.

Bob Assirati, UK. I wrote down the quote "departmental autonomy must give way to public interest and that certainly an issue for us. May I have some comments about how did you get over that hurdle and get the buy in from departments?

Peter Tan, Singapore. Let me take that question then. I guess one of the interesting ways that this happens is when you sit people together, once you have eleven agencies, if they individually trying to implement and integrate an e-service, one talk to another then there would be some maybe, one agency would use my standard versus the other. But once you sit the eleven together, I guess there is some peer pressure, make sure that you are so called approaching the common good. So, I guess it is important to have that session where you have these people all sitting together and then you wont have one person saying, just use my system because that's the best.

John Weigelt, Canada. In our department, I am from Treasury Board, and we are unfortunately the 'shoemaker's kids' on this side of Treasury Board. We make the standards but don't have any money and no way to enforce it, so it's through sheer spirit of will. There has been reluctance to come up with the big stick because you tend to chase more people away than anything else. So it is through collaboration, co-ordination, through providing what we feel are reasonable products. We productise what services we provide in common, show the common infrastructure that it works, we are going through a process now, of showing people those initial early adopters that it does work, that it does simplify things and hopefully that will egg on those other departments, and we are seeing more and more departments coming forward now. Authentication services being one of our key services that we provided we started off with one department, showed how it worked, showed that there was take up and we have 17 / 18 other departments clamouring to use it, so much so that we actually have to push some of them away because we don't have the capacity to enable them all at once at this point.

Luis Vidigal, Portugal. I want to ask you, but not from the technological point of view but the business level. The point of view for all architectures. How do you solve the paradox between the pressure that usually the politicians put on large number of service providers to society in e-Government under the pressure that you have put on link of the service to the citizen needs and of course, it is a reduction of services, because you have more services provide to the citizen have been created by bureaucracy like certificates, like filling declaration of taxes that the Swedish don't need, but in Portugal you still need it, or licences because you need different licences, but in the end you want to build a house or to build an enterprise. How do you put in the highest level of the architecture or to solve the problem the pressure mainly, for example in Canada you decided that you want to put on, I don't know, 120 I suppose, services online. I think that in USA 407 and in Germany I heard that there are 500 services. You should talk to the politics that you are going to reduce those services and the put the pressure on citizen needs. How do you solve this on the same architecture?

Olav Ostberg, Sweden. Did you wish to reply from Denmark?

Yih-Jeou Wang, Denmark. Just a short comment on the question asked by the UK. One thing that, of course, the problem about financing current structures is well known, but one thing that is quite interesting to observe is the fact that due to a very heavy budget pressure on each ministry in the government, the ministries are in fact coming themselves asking other ministries, should we do something in common? So one incentive in fact, the budget pressure, another thing is that what we are trying to do is to create support from other ministries, and create it in such a way that it is very hard for the bad guys in the Ministry of Finance to argue against the things that we then eventually suggest that should be done in common/jointly together with ourselves as facilitator with ourselves as an operator from some Ministry of Science Technology and Integration. So that is some of the strategies that we are using in trying to push forward the financing question on common architecture, in the case architectural projects or in other case that I will present on Thursday, our national digital sequencing project.

Olav Ostberg, Sweden. Do you remember the question from Luis?

Simon Gauthier, Canada. Can I tackle Luis' questions first? I have been in my job for three months so what I tell you maybe totally wrong, but here is one answer.

The concept of transformation of government is complex and difficult. Not only had the technology at architecture level but also, as you point out, at the high level service delivery and its impact on government's structure as such. What we have done, and I hope that answers partly the question, is that we started doing in looking at the transformation of the future, and transformation also has different level of intensity depending upon the service itself, we've developed, we are in the process of developing three service divisions headed by Helen McDonald, we have a service division for Canadian's, a service division for businesses, and a services division for non-Canadian or people wanting to come to Canada. We can look at these three services, try to identify which areas are common and also try to see what, John used a word, 'key catalytic initiatives' can be supported, can be initiated and can really lead to a better understanding of what transformation actually means. Because right now I think arguably nobody really knows the long-term end point of what things could be.

John Weigelt, Canada. It's key to not that those high level service strategies are part of the architecture. There are captured as artefacts at the highest level of the architecture. From there you will see the 130 some programmes stemming from those government priorities. Our hope is that as we go down to the lower levels of that chart that we will see some coming together. There might be 10 / 12 enabling infrastructures that support that. The big challenge is going from layer two to layer three where the architects and the engineers have to take their magic wand and do that attribution to a design or go to the systems and services type model. That's always where the challenge lies, is to walk, make that magic between the business, which inevitably is what the politicians want to do and what is technically feasible, or how are you going to divide the systems.

Neils Pagh-Ramussen, Denmark. I could say that we in Denmark are only in the beginning of the process. Our White Book about architecture is from the Spring this year and now we are trying to use the sort of message from this architecture book in projects and we are trying to use it make comment demands for newer systems. I think the vision or we think that full implementation of this vision is some years out in the future. So our first step is trying to transform the idea into some concrete demands that can be used in actual projects where they are making updating for existing systems.

Last question

Helen McDonald, Canada. I had a question around compliance. We are all going through these efforts that are not strictly aimed at just one slice of the service offering, but the full end to end and I am wondering whether you see the ability to get departments, or encourage programme managers to comply with your architecture programmes. Whether you see that as a self interest will rule, and people will want to go there, or whether you see it more problematic in some areas than others, that all programme managers may benefit from common technology architecture or an IM architecture and information architecture, but might be less and less willing. The closer it gets to the core of their programme would distinguishes one programme from another?

Olav Ostberg, Sweden. If you have no answer I will cut here….

Helen McDonald, Canada. Could I ask Singapore, since you have compliance standards that vary a little by programme by interagency, how difficult do you see compliance? Do you think all departments are willing to comply. You've obviously made some decisions that it'll be easier in some instances than in other instances, how did you make those kind of decisions. What kind of criteria were you using?

Peter Tan, Singapore. I guess compliance can be a very scary word. But in actual fact it may not need to be. If you look at what I talked about, about the interoperability standards, this set is actually pretty small, so the way we do this is to make sure that the compliance requirements are light, we don't over engineer our architectures so to speak. We don't specify things that you don't need for interoperability. So, so far we have not actually received negative feedback from agencies. So they have no difficulty complying, or this architecture is ridiculous. So everything is fine.

Choy Peng Wu, Singapore. I would like to add to what Peter was saying. Because he is talking about the technical architecture, I think that the technical standards are as he said, we only specify a very minimal set. Only those that are absolutely required for interoperability and integration those are absolute, compliance is mandatory. But, I think your question is actually higher level. Your initial question was talking about even programme and getting agencies to give up perhaps what they are doing for the larger good. I guess I am just a down to earth pragmatist. The real instrument that has worked time and again for us is money. Either giving more, incentivising behaviour that you want, decisions that you want or penalty. Removing money if they do not comply. That is the most effective instrument that we have used apart from, of course, persuasion, working on the ground, collaboration, communication, and education. As one was saying, budget cuts was very effective, suddenly everybody didn't have enough money to do what they want on themselves, but now they say, can we share. So budget cuts is effective. We also make it gentle, just to very quickly answer this whole issue about share infrastructure. We now have Ministry of Finance to agreement on how we will fund centre infrastructure. The development of centre infrastructure is centrally funded, then we asked for recurrent funding of three years on a sliding scale down, so we commit to 0% zero central funding from the third year onwards. From the third year onwards, it will be 100% cost recovery from agencies which actually use the shared systems and the common infrastructure on a user pay principle. So whichever user, whichever agency use most computing resources they pay more. So it is operated very much like a business unit with its own profit and loss centre. The only thing the Minister of Finance has agreed is to give us funding recognising that share infrastructure needs time to ram up usage. You don't get 100% utilization in year 1 so central funding is given typically over 3 years on a downward sliding scale and we commit to recover 100% of recurrent costs from the third year onwards based on user pay principle.

Olav Ostberg, Sweden. Thank you very much, all of you, for your contributions. This brings our session to a close.