What are your main activities as an Enterprise Architect during the decision making process?

1. Get inputs, objectives, high level requirements. Create, discuss, adjust, present, communicate models and principles. Create future state and project start architectures
2. Seek the strategy, the strategic goals (qualitative) and objectives (quantitative) and then derive the information required to achieve them.
3. To discover, understand and verify the business goals/objectives as set by upper management. to determine and recommend the components of business processes, information(data) and technology that better align with those goals and get them approved as standards to plan a roadmap (precedence/timing/budget) for implementation if the components.
4. I think I understand what is being asked, however I want to be clear that EAs don't make strategic decisions. Rather, the use of Architecture Artifacts from a variety of disciplines and professions need to be harmonized into a consumable form (easily digestible and understandable) to guide / aid the decision process for a stakeholder (presumably a senior business person) who is responsible for strategy. When considering strategy, this falls in the space of the Business Architect (not necessarily the EA). That being said, there may be other models that need to be aligned with the Bus Architecture models to ensure value and impact analysis is clearly understood.
5. This is too general to answer, but I'll try. Primarily, gathering the information and creating the models for the decisions, specifically input for where the pain points are, what the risks are, which business capabilities are needed, which processes and applications need to be changed or created to implement the business capabilities, what will the changes cost, and what priority should be set for the implementation activiities.
6. Some main activities which contribute to enterprise decisions: - developing an architecture with explicit design decisions - creating awareness and commitment at management (decision-makers) level for a specific solution - creating support within the enterprise for a specific solution or specific solution paradigm, so that the decision-makers are confronted with this paradigm - second opinions about given architectures or decision proposals - participation in RFI/RFP or tenders
7. communication with stakeholders and 'deciders' investigation and comparison of scenario's
8. creating awareness, creating insight on impact. Advising on changes by doing impact analysis, creating alternative scenario's.
9. Leading discussions to prepare decision making. In these discussions EA models are used or drawn up. Results are written down in decision memo that list pro's and cons and formulates an advise.
10. - defining different scenario's (what could happen) - defining the different choices which can be made (what could we do) - defining the impact of different choices (impact on Processes, Organization, IT-Landscape and Governance) - defining the stakeholders and their concerns in regard to EA-aspects - defining advice (what should we do)

11. Often I frame the decisions to be made and then propose various options with supporting data. Usually the option that I feel is the best is clear through that data. However, the senior leaders who own the decisions need to be the ones who actually make it.
12. Illustrating and explaining issues or choices by making models, stories and/or memos. Also, talking a lot with various stakeholders (the 'soft side').
13. researching the main questions about the desired optimisation, like cost, copafith issues and consequences
14. Organising collective decision making on proposed changes, based on the proposals and know how available in the organisation.
15. I provide a degree of analysis of our businesses needs and requirements, the 'as is' state of our IT infrastructure and capabilities, and the near term plan for our IT Infrastructure and capabilities, and then use those as inputs to model a set of potential courses of action. These potential paths of action are a basis for changing or modify a strategic (generally longer term) and mid-time frame focused activities.
16. Drawing together relevant information to the decision domain, and creating models that communicate the elements of that domain Providing a recommended course of action if possible, highlighting any facts, assumptions made (with rationale for those assumptions), and the implications If agreed, driving the recommendation to a from by which it can be picked up by downstream activities and executed successfully
17. Review proposed implementation designs for use of best practices, overall design quality (i.e. secure, resilient/robust, etc.), compliance with site standards.
18. First it could be good to express what Enterprise and Entreprise Architecture (EA) are for me: - An Enterprise is any association of stakeholders shraing the same objectives. (An enterprise is not always a company or an organisation). - EA related activities are activities at Enterprise level working on an Architecture. - A architecture is what is defined in ISO-42010. --> "system fundamental concepts or properties of a system in its environment embodied in its elements, relationships, and in the principles of its design and evolution". I.e. for me, EA is __not__ the architrecture of the enterprise; or the Information System of the Enterprise. For me, EA decision making is done by the stakeholders of the Enterprise. The Architect is more a facilitator even if one of the stakeholders.
19. None
20. Decision for priorities in the IT programs Decision for priorities in the IT projects Decision for priorities in the IT sécurity Decision for priorities in the migration steps Decision for IT Infrastructure element
21. we use a tool called ALER from oracle vendor to make decision inside my enterprise
22. - Gather business strategy & goals - Gather current pain points and limitations (e.g. budget, timelines, organizational barriers) - Interview major business & IT stakeholders on their perceptions, priorities and expectations
23. Relate de content and the message to de strategic goals of the organisation. Describe the implication, risks and alternative.
24. I am an aspirant to EA.

25. Typically I work as an external consultant. My role is to make assessments create models and suggestions.
26. Find the low hanging fruit: lower costs or improve efficiencies.
27. Helping investment decision makers consider alternative future change to their business, and monitoring the impact of the change as its being created and implemented. It may, or may not, include an IT investment decision.
28. Ensure that decisions are made only after taking enterprise wide requirements into account as opposed to making decisions based on a particular scenario or singular bussiness requirement
29. Detailed review of: What business problem are we solving? Collaborative Decision Making (CDM) • New Investments or business as usual changes • Formal or Informal changes • Tactical or Strategic changes • Secret or well known changes • Business or IS/IT changes
30. learn / survy the domain related theory tool selection - functional considerations integration considerations network and availbility factors technology specific pros & cons
31. Capabilities gap analysis App, infra and data current and future state views Roadmap analysis and estimations Decision making process between solution and needs
32. Gather and creatie architecture principes, specific for the organization. Apply those principes to organizational issues. Present those architecture decisions to the decision making process. Assist in decision making.

What modeling languages and techniques do you use?

1. ArchiMate, Visio, PowerPoint
2. Science of Informational Management (ScIAM) and SAINT (Scientific Artificially intelligent Neural Technology).
3. simple diagrams, text and tables that can be understood by all stakeholders a tool like ARIS that can be a repository for the components
4. What is important is that the organization settle on a consistent modeling language to assure interoperability amongst the models (alignment, impact, causal lineage). The artifacts that are used (control charts, diagrams, models, etc) need to provide insights within each domain and architecture concern (snapshots help convey understanding). Which artifacts are used depends on what is being requested. Typically, Business Architects will rely on Value Streams, Capability Maps aligned to Customer Needs & Desired Outcomes, Information Mapping of Information & Business Objects to Process & Service Models, alignment of the above artifacts into a federated understanding (perhaps using a variety of tools) to support scenario modeling by the business (ideal, rarely achieved without significant manual intervention).
5. Primary tool for communicating is PowerPoint. Primary tool for documenting the architecture is Enterprise Architect and Planning IT.
6. Archimate Free format drawing techniques Drawing (figurative) to illustrate an idea Teaching, awareness trainings and sessions
7. archimate powerpoint presentations excel comparison sheets

8. DEMO, archimate, visio, powerpoint
9. Mix of togaf, archimate, management models, proces models, data model, all depending on type of decision to make and type of audience.
10. - Archimate - Free format drawings
11. I use UML and BPMN quite a bit. My frame of reference is the Enterprise Business Motivation Model (motivationmodel.com) which is an open source metamodel for EA. The techniques are widely described in business and enterprise architecture textbooks, although I find the methods that focus on taking advantage of the Zachman framework to be a waste of time.
12. Archimate, flowcharts, datamodels.
13. plain language, powerpoint
14. ArchiMate, BPMN
15. a variety of tools and techniques are used which range from IBM Rational Enterprise Architect, homegrown models and standards, borrowed vendor tools (such as Oracle Enterprise Architecture Method) and artifacts, techniques and models from TOGAF
16. Visio diagrams: primarily Information Flow models to explain business and technical components in a domain; visual explanations of the domain problem; technical diagrams Tables, mainly in Excel, for assumptive models Scenario Analysis
17. UML, James-Martin Methodology, Yourdon Methodology, data model diagrams, process flow diagrams, data flow diagrams, topology/deployment diagrams
18. Languages and techniques have to be selected according to the architecture kind, system type, the objectives of the Enterpise and many other concerns. However, most of the time, I use the folowing environment: - EA landscape based on TOGAF -including an adaptation of ADM and the Enterprise continuum- - NAF, DoDAF or MODAF as formalisms - CAD environment for description of the physics - BPMN, IDEF, SADT, SysML/UML, etc as functional-oriented language - Domain Specific Languages for non-functional aspects and description of the multi-physics (Modelica, altarica, etc).
19. DNDAF, SCOR
20. Urbanisation UML IAF
21. Service Oriented Architecture (SOA)
22. BPMN, UML, but really powerpoint, excel and visio are more suitable for a non-technical audience
23. In dialogue with management I do not use modeling languages or technigues.
24.
25. TOGAF, ArchiMate
26. Resource Description Framework (RDF)
27. Methods like decision matrixes, portfolio decision-models, roadmaps, budget buckets, business capability models, all over multiple time frames.
28. Flow charts and decision trees where options are identified that align with strategy overall EA guiding principles
29. BPMN modelling
30. system diagram mind map & Flow charts partialy - Zachman

31. Uml 4+1 view
32. ArchiMate. Free Format modelling.

Do you have experience with other architecture fields such as software or information architecture? If so, to what degree do you find the decison making process to be different than in Enterprise Architecture?

1. Yes, scope is different.
2. Extensive experience (c.30 years). The EA incorporates - in descending order of hierarchy - the IA (Information Architecture), BA (Business Architecture), SA (Systems Architecture) and defines the layout and specs for the TA (Technical Architecture - software and hardware) and NA (Network Architecture). The IA is the MOST important part of the EA and defines all decision making in a scientific manner. If executed correctly it is ALWAYS 100% effective and flexible.
3. I came up in the data/information architecture domain and have lots of experience in the business domain (strategic planning, function/process modelling, etc.), The 2 main differences between Enterprise and domain specific decision making is that the enterprise level is judgemental as to what are the better components that align with business goals (i.e. you can't "prove" it is the "best" fit) and that the perspective is more holistic and at a higher level of abstraction. Domain specific models must follow standards once you are below level 0/1
4. The other disciplines of architecture vary by "consulting practice" as this is still an emerging and evolving discussion amongst architect and practitioners (many of whom are not architects). That being said, let's explore how decisions need to be made using a model-driven approach for capturing and aligning measures (calculations) to clarify understanding about WHAT, WHY, WHEN, & HOW things happened and are currently happening (regardless of architecture domain). Once these perspectives can be addressed, then we can move on to WHO should be engaged to outline options for moving forward (set and/or adjust strategy if you will) and then use the same perspectives (WHAT, WHY, WHEN, & HOW) things need to change based on the pursuit of one of one of the options. Decision making is a process and should be consistently applied irrespective of any architecture practice.
5. Software Architecture. The decisions are at much more of a business level in Enterprise Architecture (business capabilities, strategy, etc.). Decsions for software architecture are typically much more technical (frameworks, interfaces, etc). Both share decisions about costs, risks, etc., but they are two different levels of abstraction.
6. Yes, I have experience in software, information as well as business and enterprise architecture. Fundamentally the decision making process is not different. In software and information architecture, most decision proposals have a high degree of rationality and blueprint character. In enterprise architecture more psychological techniques play a role, e.g. creating support by addressing emotions, sharing ideas, creative collaboration etc.

7. Experience in software architecture. EA decusion making process has more political, personal etc. influences. Demands more communication and soft-skills. Software architecture decision making is (much) more straightforward fact based.
8. yes. The main difference are the topics and issues, it is much less focused on technology. Because of my IT work context it is not easy to convince colleagues of the relevance. On the other side of the table it is hard to convince business players of the skills/insights IT people have about business processes.
9. Yes, both. It is more management driven and less model driven. Most managers are not used to design their organisation, therefore do not value the designbased approach of modelling. They perceive models to be technical and therefore not something they could use.
10. EA is different in regard to the scope and impact of choices Where software architecture focusses on the (internal) structure of a scoped piece of software, information architecture focusses on the definition, location and flow of data/informatie, Enterprice Architecture focusses on the organization as a whole (processes, information, organization, products, IT-landscape) as well as the external implications (customers, marketplace, ecossystem)
11. Absolutely. I've performed in roles as a software architect and as an information architect many times. Being an EA means being able to "go deep" as well as "go broad".
12. Enterprise architecture is a rather vague thing which stakeholders hardly understand sometimes, let alone use it in the (theoretical!) prescribed way. In other architecture fields, issues and choices are more practical and easier to understand. Another important difference is that the stakeholders involved in making the enterprise architecture are more likely to include political motives in their decision making process which makes it much more 'fuzzy'. Creating a software architecture for example is in my experience a far more 'objective' process.
13. yes, application architecture (landscape level), information architecture. I do not make a real difference, only the topic under investigation may require i different way of presentation
14. Yes, I used to be active in software architecture. The process is not that much different, the documentation of what is to be decided is.
15. Yes. I have been a certified IT Architect in the integration, infrastructure, and application disciplines. Largely the Enterprise Architect has a great depth (broader level) of analysis and the Enterprise Architects focus is more pervasively driven by Business Objectives and Expected Outcomes
16. "pure" software and information architecture decisions are, in my experience, much more based towards technical decision making. EA decision making has a much wider involvement, e.g fiscal, business strategy, key stakeholders. Secondly EA decisions tend to be more conceptual and thus affected by levels of understanding, and personal bias. Hence softer skills are required e.g. language skills, emotional intelligence, consensus drawing.

17. Yes. Application design includes several underlying architectures (e.g. database design, performance and scalability, production operations) over which Enterprise Architecture superimposes itself.
18. In the past I worked as software and hardware architect, before moving to system and enterprise architect positions. In theory, the decision making process is the same in these different architecture scopes. But, the nature of concerns and decision criteria are completely different.
19. No
20. For software and data this is part of the project. The décision are part of the project
21. No
22. In my experience software & information architecture processes are too much internal (IT) focussed. Too little involvement of business stakeholders.
23. EA decision making needs to be in the lead and needs to be done by the senior user, by business management.
24.
25. Yes, I have experience with application and IT technology architectures too. I think there are differences in decision making process. In application and technology domains existing affordable solutions and their technical parameters are directly affecting decision making.
26. yes... many
27. Yes. Software decisions around where to locate data (e.g., in a remote device, in-house server, cloud) are details in the development of the solution. The information flow may be hit by security and privacy laws, outside the control of any of these efforts, but built into and adhered to by those creating the information architecture. It's the EA team that may help these other software or information architecture understand that their choices must be ultimately support the business process and business outcome the company or government is seeking (e.g., reducing lighting costs via IoT implementations, increasing wallet share of customers via an Internet solution). The EA team is working on how the first phrase (e.g., reduce lighting costs, increase wallet share) will impact the whole of the business, business processes, information flows, technology choice, software choice, people skills, and more over time. The second part, worked on the others, is much more granular and done in the context of the conceptual advice (and sometimes logical) given to them from the EA team.
28. Other then the scope of the decision (domain specific) i find most other aspects are very similar.
29. Software architecture is Solution of a problem, IT enabled business change. EA is EA Enabled Strategic Change
30. it's a different level of abstract ,, Plus EA has more to do with busines targets & startegy.
31. Yes I Do, and yes I can find some differences for instance EA is based on envisioned strategic and software arch is more tactical
32. Information architecture and Enterprise architecture I find rather the same; certainly in practice. No experience with software architecture decision making.

To what degree are you involved in the process of making EA design decisions?

1. I create future state architectures (FSA) in collaboration with stakeholders. The FSA needs to be approved by the business domain representative. So the business domain representative is the formal decision making person.
2. Have worked in this area for 60 years.
3. fully involved in the analysis and presentation/recommendation of target state components and roadmaps to the management level decision makers. As an EA my "decisions" are recommendations as to target state and roadmaps that best align with goals/objectives and the rational behind them
4. Depends on the nature of the decision. Rarely, do I ever have "sole" responsibility for a decision. An architect (EA or otherwise) is responsible for providing recommendations not decisions to the Board. The Board owns the accountability for decisions.
5. We are consultants to the business. The business managers make the decisions, as these are business and not technical decisions.
6. Within most projects I am working, I prepare the decisions to be taken by decision-makers. In the process of preparations a large amount of creating support and commitment is involved, so that the decision-makers are not confronted with unexpected resistance when they try to finalize the decisions and put them into action.
7. Mainly advice on decisions (as an external architect). To some extend responsible for decisions.
8. I'm advising the CIO. No decision power at all.
9. Al of them. I have a team to translate main decisions into more detail. Result have to be presented to various boards or stakeholders for decionmaking. The 'design' has to be broken up in smaller decisions and brought to the right stakeholder.
10. I participate in a team in making EA-models, defining EA-architecture, scenarios's, choices and advice, and make presentations to the board
11. Enterprise Architects make design decisions at a fairly high level. As an Enterprise Architect with a decade of experience, I am "involved" pretty much 100% in my own decisions.
12. I advice the parties responsible for running the organization in EA matters because ultimately, I believe that the business should understand and take decisions.
13. preparing the final proposal for management
14. Lead Architect of the entire organisation
15. Most generally I find my involvement to be central to EA design decisions. On larger impact issues there are strong degrees of collaboration with other IT leaders and and senior management, with me leading a process resulting in a EA decision. On less global or more tactical issues, I still make use of collaboration with interdepartmental peers, but ultimately I deliver a decision
16. My involvement is largely in explaining the domain, and the decision criteria, and then facilitating the decision making by the stakeholders.
17. Current Job: Presenter - I design solutions and document them according to the Enterprise Architecture requirements Prior Job: EA Board Member - I assisted with

review of presented materials from the perspective of computing resource usage efficiency and performance
18. Note: I do not like expression mixing Architecture and Design. Please refer to ISO-15288:2015(FDIS) to see the differences between Architecture and design. I am working on international standards (mainly ISO, NATO and EDA) expressing what EA activities are, including decision making. In my compagny, I am responsible to teach, coach and mantor system and enterprise architect.
19. I'm part of a steam that makes joint decisions on EA design. Design concepts are presented to various governance bodies for validation and implementation
20. Enterprise Architect Solution Architect
21. we,ve needed to be present in decisions
22. As an EA, I strive for consensus and compromise between all major stakeholders. It is the EA board (chaired by the CIO) that is the final authority taking the decision, but really everybody should be on board with the decision before it gets to the board.
23. Advice third parties to present advice for making deciosions.
24. The decisions are submited to a board.
25. I create suggestions to support decisions but the final decisions are made on board level.
26. I advise people who make decisions.
27. Present advice to investment decision boards, who make the decision about trade-off's.
28. Present decisions to a board
29. 70%
30. Medium / consulting to enterprize architects
31. 80% roughly because I involve and responsible for making the decision in my EA function further CIO support or provide feedback and decision updates
32. Present discussions to a decision making process (can be on different level like program/project, project execution, board, architecture board etc.

What makes an EA design decision difficult for you?

1. So many stakeholders....
2. Nothing. If the required detail is to hand it can be achieved quickly and effectively. Only human ignorance or spite can negatively affect this.
3. inability of business leaders to articulate their goals/objective specifically enough. rapidly changing business and technical environments how best to validate and communicate clearly and rationally the target state and roadmap recommendations domain experts who have "religion" about what "right vs wrong" or is "best". getting them to identify viable alternatives
4. Variability, Number of Variables, Amount of Uncertainty, Lack of Information, Delays in decision making, Shifting Dates & Boundaries
5. Conflicting goals, e.g. save money and implement quickly. Lack of knowledge about the business or available products that meet the needs of the business.

6. The most challenging part of EA design decisions is coping with resistance from conservative IT roles e.g. system operators, system engineers, system managers. While most EA decisions I am involved in are preparing for innovation and far reaching improvements for the business, most IT employees that have a preserving role for current systems are not very supportive for the change.
7. Conflicting interests from different stakeholders, some more politically motivated than fact based.
8. conflicting interests by different business stakeholders. With the IT context the focus is almost always based on facts and technology driven arguments. In an business context this is less the case. Talking about EA is an under appreciated and unknown topic. Being an senior IT adviser conflicts with being a junior EA adviser.
9. Some EA decision making require a lot of insight on all aspects that are impacted. Especially formulating principles lead to big questions when trying to get them decided. This requires you have to have a knowledgeble decionmaker, which is not always the case. Getting the right decion taken require a different approach.
10. - Dealing with great uncertainty - Dealing with complex organization structure and politics where lots of different stakeholders have different interests
11. The politics. Making a design decision based on principles and best practices is not difficult. Making it such that my stakeholders see the value in where I'm going, and see the benefit of going there with me, is much more difficult and interesting.
12. There is always a tension between short term problems and long term goals which are both important but can have mutually exclusive solutions.
13. finding a balance between breadth and depth of subtopics, knowing which subtopics require more depth
14. If it becomes difficult to gauge the effects of different options.
15. First and foremost, a lack of clear input on the businesses goals and objectives, unclear or poorly formed needs analysis from directly effected stakeholders, short time frames and unclear or undefined financial commitment.
16. Personal bias in the stakeholders, especially if the EA decision is tending towards being a wicked problem e.g. strategic decisions after M&A activities. Need to simplify information, and potential reification of that simplified scenario. "This stuff is complex guys!". Impact of that simplification, and the difficulty in communicating complex situations.
17. As a presenter, having to guess whether the solution approach will be accepted or rejected by an EA board member based on a requirement within the target environment or related to the technology in use that I was unaware of.
18. Currently the major difficulties about EA are poor scientific foundations. You can certainly play a role for improvement. - Lack of stable ontology. - Poor mehods - Poor languages, - Poor tools, - etc.
19. A conservative organizational culture which is highly change-resistant
20. Security Introduction of Industrial devices Agiles development
21.

22. Stakeholders pushing their own agenda and not working for the common good of the company
23. Conflicting concerns an mandates; priority to do the job; lack of clear strategy to prioritize which topic to elaborate. Concerns are not clear. In a political environment, clarity and directions are not always liked. Integrate it with other strategic decision. Not scoping to IT, but see it as integral organization engieneering.
24. Time constraints.
25. EA design decisions are always difficult. Lack of information and time constraint are typical reasons.
26. Lack of information is the biggest obstacle to making decision.
27. None.
28. Time constraints of a project
29. Collaborative Decision Making (CDM)
30. lack of real-life experiance with the sugested / optional altrernatives
31. The budget and time is the main challenge
32. Where there are no underlying principles of the principes are too vague to apply. (e.g. reuse before buy before make; to what extent remains reuse - reuse?)

Related to the last question, what are the most important (or critical) aspects of an EA design decision for you?

1. To get agreement by all stakeholders
2. Belief that it CAN be done in a scientific way. This is no longer a dark art, it is a repeatable, universal approach.
3. managing effective collaboration among all domain experts and COMMUNICATION, COMMUNICATION,COMMUNICATION with the accountable management decision makers
4. At a simplistic level, you need a comprehensive understanding of current state and a clear articulation of what needs to be achieved for the future state along with a consistent process for prioritization.
5. EA decisions must always relate back to the business goals. It is critical to understand the business before making the decisions.
6. The most critical aspects of an EA design decision: - having the right rational arguments for which conservative IT operators and managers are sensitive for - having the right emotional and business image/impact for the business - getting the right position in project planning
7. Predicting consequences. As an external architect you cannot always influence the 'right' decision, but what you at least should do is predict consequences of the decision made.
8. EA is not demand management. In my case this results in limited access to business discussions. Access to senior business managers is limited to personal relations and a standing history as IT adviser.
9. Reasonable level of rational decionmaking allogeen by managers.

10. - Making clear the importance (or lack of importance) of decisions and drawing out scenarios and choices
11. EA design decisions are not software decisions. Software decisions are often dealing with things that can be stated often as Software Quality Attributes: reliability, scalability, security, maintainability, etc. EA decisions are about making an organization "fit for purpose", optimizing the structure of the company and it's processes to deliver on its business strategy. The most critical aspect of this is to make sure that you've played out the entire change management story, from the earliest stakeholders through the last laggard unwilling to change. Application architects move software boundaries. Enterprise Architects move human boundaries. Much more interesting and in many ways, more difficult to do well.
12. Translating the issues involved in terms that the business understands (for example, money or implementation time).
13. using the right criteria and constraints, this is largely management-driven
14. Getting all the relevant know how in the design process
15. Retaining or even strengthening fidelity to/of the enterprise's Reference Architecture and the Enterprise Wide Architectural Plan. Ensuring that the design decision does not create (either intentional or unintentional) tactical issues without some degree of warning and more ideally a mitigation plan in place.
16. Getting consistency in understadning across the stakeholders, and getting appropriate framing to enable the stakeholders to make decisions in comfort.
17. Ensuring that the EA requirements are met without impacting commitments around which the project is based. i.e. That the end result is delivered on time, within budget, of good quality, is compliant with all applicable standards and regulations, and meets the needs of the organization that funded it.
18. Having stable terms and concepts covering the subject.
19. Developing an EA that is consistent across the organization (+10K employees)
20. No coherency
21.
22. Enforcing the decision across all running initiatives, keeping the buy-in of the major stakeholders
23. Commitment, keep the gentlemensagreement and communicate and implement de formal decision.
24. predicing the consequences of the decision.
25. For me the most important aspect of an EA design decision it dealing with all the different stakeholders involved.
26. cost-benefit in the content of time to market/completion
27. Providing the right attributes for the decision makers (e.g., costs, ageing, skill sets, speed) to understand how change, or the lack of change, will impact the business model.
28. Predicting the consequences of a decision.
29. • System thinking / System Dynamics
30. predicing the consequences of the decisions

31. Clarify the long term impacts in the decision made
32. There are no EA design decisions! There are decisions to be made and with every decision you have to balance all stakes (and stakeholders) at hand. So the balancing of all stakes and perspectives is the most important.

What kinds of input do you use for EA design decisions, and of those, do you favor qualitative or quantitative data to base your decisions on?

1. Kinds of inputs: -strategies, directives, policies -discussions and workshops with stakeholders I do not have a particular favor
2. See first answer. You cannot derive quantitative data unless you know what qualitative goals need to be satisfied (e.g. a strategy is rarely quantitative). Without numeric quantification results are a guess.
3. collaboration among all stakeholders and domain experts is essential to identify the better alternatives and criteria qualitative methods supported by "kepner/tregoe" types of techniques can be useful in making the discussion/analysis seem more rational
4. You need both sets of data. The challenge is introducing a disciplined process for capturing both types of input to align them for one decision and support dependent decisions in other areas. This is a more complex problem than what can be fully discussed in this one question.
5. Both qualitative and quantitative input, for example: Business strategy, goals, requirements and processes. Products in the market place. Ability to execute, e.g. capacity of resources, culture, etc. Risks of transformation. Costs of transformation.
6. All kinds of input, but mainly discussions with stakeholder and the documentation they take with them.
7. intervies, workshops. financial analysis desktop research (best practices, references, ...)
8. Discussions, theories, case studies are mostly giving qualitative data. Real quantitative data about business processes are scarce in my organisation.
9. Al of them, depence on the topic.
10. Input - Strategic businessplans - Research data (eg. Gartner) I do not favor qualitative of quantitive data in particular, in my opinion both are equally important
11. That depends on the organization and the culture of the leadership. Some organizations need data to make decisions but never use data once the decision is made. Others need appeals to emotion to make decisions but need data to drive them home and ensure that value is delivered. If the relationship between the EA team and the leadership is built on trust, you may not need to "move" a KPI, but more times than not, trust can only be developed by having a measurable impact more than once... even in organizations that don't measure any other inputs to executive decision making. Getting credibility is difficult. Once you have it, it can stick, as long as the senior leaders have time to buy in and stay bought in.

12. Ultimately, you should be able to translate all qualitative data into quantitative data. Otherwise, decisions will be based on good intentions and results are extremely hard to measure.
13. the question should be: using facts or opinions. The answer should be: both. You need opinions for acceptance of your advice. You need (relevant) facts in order to give advice that solves a problem.
14. Actual design proposals, such as project start architecture is the input for a decision. Such a proposal is often based on requirements, both for a project and organisation-wide
15. Firstly, one seldom can have too much information (be it qualitative or quantitative) so long as it is reasonably on point. But design decisions taken at an enterprise level need full traceability back to business needs and objectives, and this in turn mandates an understanding of the business's objective and/or need... at least in the area which most directly relates to the needed Design Decision.
16. Stakeholder factors that they express as pertinent to decision making. Literature, especially unbiased research e.g. IDC, Gartner etc. Personal responses from industry-wide peers who have acted in similar circumstances. Context. Cost/Benefit analysis, but including longer-term intrinsic benefits
17. Internet research for solutions to similar problem domains, industry best-practice documents, technical prototypes/proofs of concepts for high-value and high-risk items, and cost/benefit (ROI) analyses.
18. Inputs are decision criteria and a shared "Business Motivation Model" including a value system. These data are both qualitative and quantitative; always value-oriented.
19. All inputs noted in your "for example"
20. EA Referentiel Standardization vs specificity Functional coherency Flow optimisation
21. qualitative decisions. we planned a system totally in SOA culture
22. You really need both types. Some are hard to quantify but are crucial to future success. Discussions with stakeholders, analyst reports and risk analyses are most often used to compare alternative roadmaps and solutions
23. Strategic businessplans (goals, roadmap), businesse case, impact, discussion with stakeholders, site seeing.
24. cost/benefit analyses.
25. I use different kinds of inputs. I always try to use reference models if it is possible. Important input is the discussions with the most important stakeholders. Intuition is also necessary in some details.
26. always cost-benefit in the context of time to market/completion
27. Risk analysis, portfolio optimization analysis, cost/benefit, qualitative considerations and even intuitive choices can be made when planning. Once a decision is reached and the overall company is changing because of decisions made, these decision techniques must be re-visited for the solutions that are in-flight, versus new plans under consideration, and the ageing of existing solutions.
28. The EA guiding principles and the organization al goals and objectives are inputs to the decision making process

29. Operational excellence, cost/benefit analyse
30. studies & forums. I prefer qualitative data.
31. Requirements and capabilities Business processes docs
32. Discussions with stakeholders, reference architectures. Only qualitative.