

Enterprise Capability Documentation

*** Enterprise Architecture is NOT about information technology.

*** IT management benefits from EA, as does everyone in the enterprise, their customers, their partners, their authorities, their suppliers, and the public.

(Italic Underlines show IT-Specific EA Elements, with drivers from OMB FEA, Clinger-Cohen Act, OMB A-130 and A11, Investment Budget, etc.)

Enterprise Architecture Elements		Results	Controls	
Security Architecture (SA) (FISMA)	Business Architecture (BA)	Initial Business Architecture (IBA)	Enterprise Operation, Asset, Vulnerability, and Configuration Management (DoDAF AV)	
	(FEA BRM and PRM) (DoDAF OV)	Full Business Architecture (FBA)		
	Data Architecture (DA) (FEA DRM) (OV)			
	Application Architecture (AA) (FEA SRM)(OV)			
	Technology Architecture (TA) (FEA TRM) (DoDAF TV)			
	Functional Technology Types			
	Certification & Accreditation (FISMA)	Dynamic Executables Architecture (DoDAF SV)		
		Technology Development		
		Functional Operations with Technology		

GEM supports the development and maintenance of the enterprise architecture, and the enterprise intelligence and operations management functions that leverage that architecture.

This slide illustrates that, of all of the elements of a full-scale enterprise architecture, only a few relate to information technology. The CIO typically has the lead in EA because IT has measurable economies and efficiencies to gain in satisfying business, legal, and regulatory requirements. But the lead can also come from a functional, program or project manager, or another executive such as the CTO, CKO, CHCO, CSO, CFO, COO, CEO, or President.

However, the enterprise executive with the authority to implement the full enterprise architecture, operational enterprise architecture, and intelligent-enterprise management is usually the organization CEO, President, Director, or Commanding General, as an Executive Management Agenda initiative.

GEM extends the early “business systems planning/information strategy planning” (BSP/ISP) of IBM’s Dewey Walker, the later 1987 Enterprise Architecture Framework of IBM’s John Zachman, and the later 1992 Enterprise Architecture Planning methodology of Steven Spewak.

While BSP/ISP, Zachman Framework, and Spewak methodology are highly useful and parallel, and can substitute for, much of the initial phases of the GEM approach, they provide only a subset of the capabilities provided by GEM. Part of this is because of the basic model applied by these earlier EA efforts and by GEM. The early efforts are patterned on a “relational” or “matrix” model, while GEM is patterned on an “object” model, which has the inherent capability of working with more “dimensions” of information than the relational model. The organizations which have used BSP/ISP, Zachman Framework (or its derivatives of FEA/FEAF/TEAF, DoDAF/C4ISR, CADM, DIAD, TOGAF, NASCIO, etc.), or the Spewak Methodology (for pursuing the initial elements of the Zachman Framework) can apply the results of those efforts directly to the GEM implementation to shorten GEM implementation time.