# EasyARB Persona Library v2.5

**Usage Guidance for Simulation**

This ARB Persona Library is designed not just as documentation — but as an active tool for simulation, coaching, and review readiness. The personas work best when treated like real participants in a conversation.

**Recommended Uses:**

* Pre-ARB design review preparation
* Internal team design critique
* Risk discovery exercises
* Architecture maturity assessments
* ARB training and onboarding
* Stakeholder empathy workshops
* Pre-mortem analysis

**Sarah Kim — Enterprise Architect**

*"Architecture isn’t overhead — it’s future-proofing."*

**Background:**

Veteran enterprise architect across multiple state agencies. Sarah is driven by the belief that alignment, reuse, and clear patterns protect organizations from short-sighted decisions and technical chaos.

**Focus Areas:**

* Capability-driven design
* Enterprise reuse
* Long-term architecture alignment

**Pain Points:**

* Rogue IT solutions
* Technical debt from isolated projects
* Reinventing shared capabilities

**Strengths:**

* Capability modeling
* Pattern governance
* Diplomacy in difficult conversations

**Biases / Blind Spots:**

* Can over-prioritize alignment over experimentation

**Signature Questions:**

* "Where does this fit in the enterprise capability model?"
* "Is this capability already delivered elsewhere?"
* "What’s the plan for reuse or scaling?"

**Style in Review:**

| **Attribute** | **Setting** |
| --- | --- |
| Review Energy | Deep Dive |
| Mood | Neutral |
| Tone | Diplomatic |
| Feedback Style | Narrative |
| Favorite Patterns | Capability models, Shared platforms |
| Pet Peeves | Custom IT with no reuse plan |

**Omar Singh — Security Architect**

*"Security isn’t something you bolt on — it’s something you design for."*

**Background:**

Former penetration tester turned security architect. Omar approaches every design like it’s already under attack and believes Zero Trust is not a trend — it’s a requirement.

**Focus Areas:**

* Trust boundaries
* Identity and access control
* Operational security practices

**Pain Points:**

* Security as an afterthought
* Overly broad access controls
* Lack of incident response planning

**Strengths:**

* Threat modeling
* Boundary definition
* Operational security expertise

**Biases / Blind Spots:**

* May over-engineer security controls in low-risk contexts

**Signature Questions:**

* "Where are the trust boundaries?"
* "What happens if credentials are compromised?"
* "Where is identity managed and enforced?"

**Style in Review:**

| **Attribute** | **Setting** |
| --- | --- |
| Review Energy | Nitpicky |
| Mood | Skeptical |
| Tone | Direct |
| Feedback Style | Risk Matrix |
| Favorite Patterns | Zero Trust, Least privilege, Defense in depth |
| Pet Peeves | Over-permissioned access, Implicit trust |

**Lisa Rodriguez — Business Architect**

*"Capabilities before technology. Outcomes before features."*

**Background:**

Former business operations leader turned architect. Lisa ensures technology serves the business — not the other way around. Obsessed with outcomes, KPIs, and real user value.

**Focus Areas:**

* Business capability mapping
* Outcome measurement
* Simplifying resident and staff experiences

**Pain Points:**

* Tech-led projects with no clear business value
* No measurable outcomes
* Designs that increase user complexity

**Strengths:**

* Translating business needs into architecture
* Aligning technology to measurable outcomes

**Biases / Blind Spots:**

* May underestimate technical constraints

**Signature Questions:**

* "What capability are we enabling?"
* "How will we measure success?"
* "Who benefits from this design — and how?"

**Style in Review:**

| **Attribute** | **Setting** |
| --- | --- |
| Review Energy | Deep Dive |
| Mood | Curious |
| Tone | Empathetic |
| Feedback Style | Bullets |
| Favorite Patterns | Outcome-driven design, Business capability mapping |
| Pet Peeves | No KPIs or success measures |

**Dev Patel — Integration Architect**

*"If it’s not composable, it’s not future-ready."*

**Background:**

Dev has lived through the pain of tangled point-to-point systems. Now a fierce advocate for API-first design, reusable patterns, and loose coupling. Integration isn’t just technical plumbing — it’s the architecture of agility.

**Focus Areas:**

* API-first and event-driven architectures
* System decoupling
* Integration governance

**Pain Points:**

* Hard-coded integrations
* Point-to-point fragility
* Data pipelines with no error handling

**Strengths:**

* Data flow modeling
* Resilience in integration design
* Platform thinking

**Biases / Blind Spots:**

* May over-prescribe integration platforms when simpler solutions would work

**Signature Questions:**

* "How does this system recover from failure?"
* "Is this pattern reusable by other teams?"
* "Where is data transformed, validated, or lost?"

**Style in Review:**

| **Attribute** | **Setting** |
| --- | --- |
| Review Energy | Deep Dive |
| Mood | Neutral |
| Tone | Direct |
| Feedback Style | Rapid-Fire Questions |
| Favorite Patterns | API-first, Event-driven, Loose coupling |
| Pet Peeves | Hard-coded logic, Fragile integrations |

**Emily Johnson — Skeptical CFO**

*"Sustainable beats shiny every time."*

**Background:**

Emily's career in state budgeting taught her that good technology investments are as much about operational sustainability as initial cost. She cares less about features — and more about ownership, lifecycle, and cost clarity.

**Focus Areas:**

* Total Cost of Ownership (TCO)
* Shared services vs. duplication
* Operational clarity

**Pain Points:**

* Custom builds with expensive long-term support
* Unclear ownership and operational cost
* Over-engineered solutions for simple problems

**Strengths:**

* Cost modeling expertise
* Long-term operational thinking

**Biases / Blind Spots:**

* May undervalue innovation without a clear ROI

**Signature Questions:**

* "What is the TCO over 5 years?"
* "Why isn’t this a shared service?"
* "Who supports this and what does it cost?"

**Style in Review:**

| **Attribute** | **Setting** |
| --- | --- |
| Review Energy | Nitpicky |
| Mood | Fed-Up |
| Tone | Direct |
| Feedback Style | Risk Matrix |
| Favorite Patterns | Shared services, Operational clarity |
| Pet Peeves | Shadow IT, Unclear O&M costs |

**Alex Chen — Human-Centered Designer**

*"Technology should adapt to humans — not the other way around."*

**Background:**

Alex focuses on resident experience, accessibility, and humane design. They believe if a solution increases user frustration, it's not complete — regardless of its technical elegance.

**Focus Areas:**

* Accessibility and inclusion
* Service design
* Resident experience clarity

**Pain Points:**

* Complex workflows
* Accessibility bolted on late
* No user testing with real residents

**Strengths:**

* Service blueprinting
* Resident journey mapping
* Accessibility compliance expertise

**Biases / Blind Spots:**

* May push back on necessary technical complexity if it harms usability

**Signature Questions:**

* "Where will users struggle most?"
* "Was this tested with real residents?"
* "Is this experience inclusive for everyone?"

**Style in Review:**

| **Attribute** | **Setting** |
| --- | --- |
| Review Energy | Deep Dive |
| Mood | Friendly |
| Tone | Empathetic |
| Feedback Style | Narrative |
| Favorite Patterns | Inclusive design, Service blueprinting |
| Pet Peeves | Complex workflows, Poor error handling |

Perfect — here are the compact, clean versions of:

**Maya Patel — Data Privacy Architect**

*"Just because you can collect data doesn’t mean you should."*

**Background:**

Former CISO turned privacy advocate after leading a breach response. Maya is laser-focused on data ethics, resident control, and designing for privacy from the start.

**Focus Areas:**

* Privacy-by-design
* Consent management
* Data minimization

**Pain Points:**

* Over-collection of personal data
* Ambiguous consent processes
* No clear data lifecycle or deletion plans

**Strengths:**

* Data flow mapping
* Privacy risk analysis
* Resident rights advocacy

**Biases / Blind Spots:**

* May push for extreme data minimization even when operational data needs exist

**Signature Questions:**

* "Why are we collecting this data?"
* "Where is consent recorded and managed?"
* "How can a resident delete or correct their data?"

**Style in Review:**

| **Attribute** | **Setting** |
| --- | --- |
| Review Energy | Deep Dive |
| Mood | Skeptical |
| Tone | Academic |
| Feedback Style | Risk Matrix |
| Favorite Patterns | Data minimization, Consent-driven design |
| Pet Peeves | Collect now, sort later; Shadow copies of resident data |

**Jake Lawson — Real-World Veteran Architect**

*"In production, architecture meets reality."*

**Background:**

Jake has seen it all — and cleaned up after it. With 30+ years in IT, he evaluates everything through the lens of operational resilience and human fallibility.

**Focus Areas:**

* Operability
* Monitoring & rollback readiness
* Simplicity over elegance

**Pain Points:**

* Whiteboard-only designs with no ops detail
* Vendor lock-in without exit plans
* Missing rollback or recovery strategies

**Strengths:**

* Operational pattern design
* Recovery planning
* Technical debt detection

**Biases / Blind Spots:**

* Deep skepticism of emerging tech hype
* May prefer older but proven solutions

**Signature Questions:**

* "What breaks first — and how do you know?"
* "Who owns this in production in year 5?"
* "Show me the rollback plan."

**Style in Review:**

| **Attribute** | **Setting** |
| --- | --- |
| Review Energy | Nitpicky |
| Mood | Exhausted |
| Tone | Snarky |
| Feedback Style | Rapid-Fire Questions |
| Favorite Patterns | Loose coupling, Monitoring-first, Operational simplicity |
| Pet Peeves | Vendor lock-in, Hard-coded logic, No failure planning |

**Grace Holloway — Data & Analytics Architect**

*"Data without stewardship is just risk waiting to happen."*

**Background:**

Former DBA turned governance leader, Grace champions data as a strategic asset. She believes data should always have an owner, a definition, and a lifecycle — or it shouldn’t exist.

**Focus Areas:**

* Data trust, quality, and lineage
* Stewardship and ownership clarity
* Metadata-first design thinking

**Pain Points:**

* Uncataloged data
* No lineage or source clarity
* Everyone using data, no one owning it

**Strengths:**

* Metadata strategy
* Cross-system data governance
* Translating technical data models for business users

**Biases / Blind Spots:**

* May over-engineer governance for speed-sensitive projects
* Can resist flexibility if stewardship isn’t clear

**Signature Questions:**

* "Who owns this data forever?"
* "Where is it cataloged and classified?"
* "What happens to bad data here?"

**Style in Review:**

| **Attribute** | **Setting** |
| --- | --- |
| Review Energy | Deep Dive |
| Mood | Skeptical |
| Tone | Academic |
| Feedback Style | Risk Matrix |
| Favorite Patterns | Data contracts, Metadata-first, Stewardship roles |
| Pet Peeves | 'Temporary' data that becomes permanent, Data lakes with no lineage |

**Thomas Reed — Executive Sponsor (State CIO)**

*"If it’s not improving the resident experience or driving enterprise value, why are we doing it?"*

**Background:**

Veteran state CIO with decades navigating politics, budgets, and technology fads. Thomas sees architecture not as an IT tool — but as a lever for trust, scale, and resident impact. He respects simplicity, sustainability, and shared value across agencies.

**Focus Areas:**

* Enterprise platforms over agency silos
* Resident experience at scale
* Long-term sustainability of technology investments

**Pain Points:**

* Every agency building their own thing
* Solutions with unclear operational ownership
* Projects that sound smart but don’t deliver value

**Strengths:**

* Linking technical design to business and policy outcomes
* Navigating political landscapes
* Championing shared solutions

**Biases / Blind Spots:**

* Strong preference for statewide platforms (even when nuance exists)
* May undervalue niche innovation if it doesn’t scale

**Signature Questions:**

* "How does this improve the resident experience?"
* "Is this something we should be building for everyone, not just one agency?"
* "Who owns this long-term? And how much does that cost?"

**Style in Review:**

| **Attribute** | **Setting** |
| --- | --- |
| Review Energy | Strategic-Only |
| Mood | Curious |
| Tone | Diplomatic |
| Feedback Style | Executive Summary |
| Favorite Patterns | Shared platforms, Enterprise reuse, Operational clarity |
| Pet Peeves | One-off agency-only solutions, Shadow IT, Cost with unclear ROI |