

Enterprise Architecture

Enterprise Design Objectives: Complexity and Change



*John A. Zachman
Zachman International
2222 Foothill Blvd. Suite 337
La Canada, Ca. 91011
818-244-3763*

© 2008 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

Introduction

Enterprise Architecture presently appears to be a grossly misunderstood concept among management.

It is **NOT** an Information Technology issue.
It is an ENTERPRISE issue.

It is likely perceived to be an Information Technology issue as opposed to a Management issue for two reasons:

- A. Awareness of it tends to surface in the Enterprise through the Information Systems community.
- B. Information Technology people seem to have the skills to do Enterprise Architecture if any Enterprise Architecture is being or is to be done.

© 2005 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

Origins of Ent. Arch.

Frederick Taylor "Principles of Scientific Management" 1911

Walter A. Shewhart "The Economic Control of Quality of Manufactured Product" 1931 (Dr. Edward Demming's Mgr.)

Peter Drucker "The Practice of Management" 1954

Jay Forrester "Industrial Dynamics" 1961

Peter Senge "The Fifth Discipline" 1990

Eric Helfert "Techniques of Financial Analysis" 1962

Robert Anthony "Planning and Control Systems: A Framework for Analysis" 1965

Sherman Blumenthal "Management Information Systems: A Framework for Planning and Development" 1969

Alvin Toffler "Future Shock" 1970

George Steiner "Comprehensive Managerial Planning" 1972
Etc., etc., etc.

© 2005 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

"Enterprise"

There are two implications to the word "Enterprise":

I. Scope

The broadest possible boundary of the Enterprise.
The Enterprise in its entirety.
Enterprise-wide in scope.
The whole thing.

II. Content

ENTERPRISE Architecture is for ENTERPRISES.
Enterprise Architecture has nothing to do with the Enterprise's systems or its information technology (except as they may constitute Row 4 constraints).
The end object is to engineer and manufacture the ENTERPRISE, NOT simply to build and run systems.

"ENTERPRISE" ACTUALLY MEANS "ENTERPRISE"

© 2005 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

"Architecture"

Architecture ... what is it?

Some people think this is Architecture:



**That is a common
MISCONCEPTION**

(Note: This same misconception about Enterprises is what leads people to misconstrue Enterprise Architecture as being big, monolithic, static, inflexible and unachievable and ... it takes too long and costs too much.)

© 2007 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

"Architecture"

This is the RESULT of architecture.

In the RESULT you can see the Architect's "architecture".
The RESULT is an implementation, an instance.



"Architecture" IS the set of descriptive representations relevant for describing a complex object (actually, any object) such that an instance of the object can be created and such that the descriptive representations serve as the baseline for changing an object instance (assuming that the descriptive representations are maintained consistent with the instantiation).

© 2007 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

"Architecture"

If the object you are trying to create is simple, you can see the whole thing all at one time, and it is not likely to change, (e.g. a log cabin, a program, etc.), then you don't need Architecture. All you need is a tool (e.g. an ax, a compiler, etc.), some raw material (e.g. a forest, some data, etc.) and some time (then, build log cabins, write programs, etc.).

On the other hand, if the object is complex, you can't see it in its entirety at one time and it is likely to change considerably over time (e.g. a hundred story building, an Enterprise, etc.), now you need Architecture.

In short, the reasons you need Architecture:

COMPLEXITY AND CHANGE

"Architecture"

COMPLEXITY

If you can't describe it, you can't create it
(whatever "it" is).

CHANGE

If you don't retain the descriptive representations after you create them (or if you never created them in the first place) and you need to change the resultant implementation, you have only three options:

- A. Change the instance and see what happens.
(High risk!)
- B. Recreate ("reverse engineer") the architectural representations from the existing ("as is") implementation. (Takes time and costs money!)
- C. Scrap the whole thing and start over again.

"Architecture"

There is not a single descriptive representation for a complex object ... there is a SET of descriptive representations.

Descriptive representations (of anything) typically include "Abstractions":

- A. Bills of Material (What)
- B. Functional Specs (How)
- C. Drawings (Where)
- D. Operating Instructions (Who)
- E. Timing Diagrams (When)
- F. Design Objectives (Why)

as well as Perspectives:

1. Scope Boundaries (Strategists)
2. Requirement Concepts (Owners)
3. Design Logic (Designers)
4. Plan Physics (Builders)
5. Part Configurations (Implementers)
and the
6. Product Instances (Operators)

© 2007 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

	INTERROGATIVE PERSPECTIVE	WHAT	HOW	WHERE	WHO	WHEN	WHY	TARGET CONTRIBUTORS
SCOPE		→						STRATEGISTS
BUSINESS			Requirements (Concepts)					EXECUTIVE LEADERS
SYSTEM			Design (Logic)					ARCHITECTS
TECH-NOLOGY			Plan (Physics)					ENGINEERS
COMPONENT			Part (Configurations)					TECHNICIANS
OPERATIONS			Product (Instances)					WORKERS
AUDIENCE PERSPECTIVES	INVENTORY	PROCESS	NETWORK	ORGANIZATION	TIMING	MOTIVATION		TARGET DOMAINS

© 2007 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

Perspectives

"Architecture" In General

"Architecture" (for anything) would be the total set of descriptive representations (models) relevant for describing a complex object such that it can be created and that constitute a baseline for changing the object after it has been instantiated. The relevant descriptive representations would necessarily have to include all the intersections between:

the "Abstractions":

- A. Bills of Material (What)
- B. Functional Specs (How)
- C. Drawings (Where)
- D. Operating Instructions (Who)
- E. Timing Diagrams (When)
- F. Design Objectives (Why)

and the Perspectives:

- 1. Scoping Boundaries (Strategists)
- 2. Requirement Concepts (Owners)
- 3. Design Logic (Designers)
- 4. Plan Physics (Builders)
- 5. Part Configurations (Implementers)
- 6. Product Instances (Operators)

Reification

INTERROGATIVE PERSPECTIVE	WHAT	HOW	Where	WHO	WHEN	WHY	TARGET CONTROLLERS
SCOPE			Identification				STRATEGISTS
BUSINESS			Definition				EXECUTIVE LEADERS
SYSTEM			Representation				ARCHITECTS
TECHNOLOGY			Specification				ENGINEERS
COMPONENT			Configuration				TECHNICIANS
OPERATIONS			Instantiation				WORKERS
ADDRESS PERSPECTIVES	INVENTORY	PROCESS	NETWORK	ORGANIZATION	TIMING	MOTIVATION	TARGET DOMAINS

"Enterprise Architecture"

Therefore "**Enterprise Architecture**" would be the total set of descriptive representations (models) relevant for describing an Enterprise, that is, the descriptive representations required to create (a coherent, optimal) Enterprise and required to serve as a baseline for changing the Enterprise once it is created. The total set of relevant descriptive representations would necessarily have to include all the intersections between the

Abstractions:

- A. Inventory Models (Bills of Material)
- B. Process Models (Functional Specs)
- C. Geographic Models (Drawings)
- D. Work Flow Models (Operating Instructions)
- E. Cyclical Models (Timing Diagrams)
- F. Objective Models (Design Objectives)

and the Perspectives:

- 1. Scope Boundaries (Scoping Boundaries)
 - 2. Business Models (Requirement Concepts)
 - 3. System Models (Design Logic)
 - 4. Technology Models (Plan Physics)
 - 5. Tooling Configurations (Part Configurations)
- resulting in the
- 6. The Enterprise Implementation (Product Instance)

© 2007 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

"Enterprise Architecture"

The total set would necessarily have to include

Abstractions:

WHAT

Inventory Models equal Bills of Materials

(Entity Models

and Data Models ARE Bills of Material)

HOW

Process Models equal Functional Specs

(Transformation Models)

WHERE

Network Models equal Drawings

(Geographic Models)

(Geometry)

(Distribution Models)

WHO

Organization Models equal Operating Instructions

(Work Flow Models)

(Presentation Architecture)

WHEN

Timing Models equal Timing Diagrams

(Control Structures)

(Cyclical Models)

(Dynamics Models)

WHY

Motivation Models equal Design Objectives

© 2007 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

SCOPE	INTERROGATIVE PERSPECTIVE	WHAT	HOW	WHERE	WHO	WHEN	WHY	TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS
BUSINESS		Inventory Models equal Bills of Material	Process Models equal Functional Specs	Network Models equals Drawings	Organization Models equal Operating Instructions	Timing Models equal Timing Diagrams	Motivation Models equal Design Objectives	STRATEGISTS
SYSTEM								EXECUTIVE LEADERS
TECH-NOLOGY								ARCHITECTS
COMPONENT								ENGINEERS
OPERATIONS								TECHNICIANS
AUDIENCE PERSPECTIVES								WORKERS
								TARGET DOMAINS

Abstractions

© 2007 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

"Enterprise Architecture"

The total set would necessarily have to include Perspectives: **STRATEGISTS**

Scope Boundaries equal Scope Boundaries
("CONOPS" or Concepts Package)

EXECUTIVE LEADERS

Business Models equal Requirement Concepts
(Concepts Models) (Customer's Usage)
("Computation Independent")

ARCHITECTS

System Models equal Design Logic
(Logic Models) (Engineering Descriptions)
("Platform Independent")

ENGINEERS

Technology Models equal Plan Physics
(Physics Models) (Mfg. Eng. Descriptions)
("Platform Specific")

TECHNICIANS

Tooling Configurations equal Part Configurations
(Vendor Product Specific) (Machine Tool Specific)

WORKERS

Enterprise Implementation equals Product Instance
(Operations Instances)

© 2007 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE

THE ZACHMAN FRAMEWORK™



© 2005 John A. Zachman, Zachman International. All rights reserved. For more information, visit www.zachman.com. This document is a trademark of Zachman International.

Go to www.ZachmanInternational.com, register for the Zachman Framework Standards, print out a free color copy of the Zachman Framework graphic.

Perspectives

INTERROGATIVE PERSPECTIVE	WHAT	HOW	WHERE	WHO	WHEN	WHY	TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS
SCOPE							STRATEGISTS
BUSINESS	Business Models equal Requirement Concepts						EXECUTIVE LEADERS
SYSTEM	Systems Models equal Design Logic						ARCHITECTS
TECHNOLOGY	Technology Models equal Plan Physics						ENGINEERS
COMPONENT	Tooling Configurations equal Part Configurations						TECHNICIANS
OPERATIONAL	Enterprise Implementation equals Product Instances						WORKERS
AUDIENCE PERSPECTIVES	INVENTORY	PROCESS	NETWORK	ORGANIZATION	TIMING	MOTIVATION	TARGET DEMANDS

Architecture Is Architecture

I learned about architecture for Enterprises by looking at architecture for:

Airplanes, Buildings, Locomotives, Computers,
... Complex Industrial Products

It is all the same ...

Bills of Material, Functional Specs, Drawings, ... etc.
Requirements, Schematics, Blueprints, ... etc.

ENTERPRISES have:

Bills of Material, Functional Specs, Drawings, ... etc.

ENTERPRISES have:

Requirements, Schematics, Blueprints, ... etc.

The Engineering Design Artifacts (the descriptive representations of anything) fall into a two dimensional classification system:

- A. The focus of the description (Abstraction)
(What, How, Where, Who, When, Why)
- B. The usage of the description (Perspective)
(Owner, Designer, Builder)

© 2007 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

Architecture Is Architecture

I simply put Enterprise names on the same descriptive representations relevant for describing anything.

**Why would anyone think
that the descriptions of an Enterprise
are going to be any different
from the descriptions of anything else
humanity has ever described?**

ARCHITECTURE

IS ARCHITECTURE

IS ARCHITECTURE

I don't think Enterprise Architecture is arbitrary ...
and it is not negotiable.

My opinion is, we ought to accept the definitions of Architecture that the older disciplines of Architecture and Construction, Engineering and Manufacturing have established and focus our energy on learning how to use them to actually engineer Enterprises.

© 2007 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

Ontology

The Zachman Framework schema technically is an ontology - a theory of the existence of a structured set of essential components of an object for which explicit expression is necessary (is mandatory?) for designing, operating and changing the object (the object being an Enterprise, a department, a value chain, a "sliver," a solution, a project, an airplane, a building, a bathtub or whatever or whatever).

The Zachman Framework is NOT a methodology for creating the implementation (an instantiation) of the object (i.e. the Framework is an ontology, not a methodology).

A Framework is a STRUCTURE.

(A Structure DEFINES something.)

An Ontology is a theory of existence - what IS

An Ontology IS a Structure.

A Methodology is a PROCESS.

(A Process TRANSFORMS something.)

A Structure IS NOT A Process

A Process IS NOT a Structure.

© 2008 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

Process

A Process TRANSFORMS something.

This is a Process:

Add Bleach to an Alkali and
it is transformed into Saltwater.

© 2009 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

Ontology

A Structure DEFINES something.

This is a Structure:

Standard periodic table

Group ? ? Period	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1	1 H																	2 He
2	3 Li	4 Be											5 B	6 C	7 N	8 O	9 F	10 Ne
3	11 Na	12 Mg											13 Al	14 Si	15 P	16 S	17 Cl	18 Ar
4	19 K	20 Ca	21 Sc	22 Ti	23 V	24 Cr	25 Mn	26 Fe	27 Co	28 Ni	29 Cu	30 Zn	31 Ga	32 Ge	33 As	34 Se	35 Br	36 Kr
5	37 Rb	38 Sr	39 Y	40 Zr	41 Nb	42 Mo	43 Tc	44 Ru	45 Rh	46 Pd	47 Ag	48 Cd	49 In	50 Sn	51 Sb	52 Te	53 I	54 Xe
6	55 Cs	56 Ba	*	72 Hf	73 Ta	74 W	75 Re	76 Os	77 Ir	78 Pt	79 Au	80 Hg	81 Tl	82 Pb	83 Bi	84 Po	85 At	86 Rn
7	87 Fr	88 Ra	**	104 Rf	105 Db	106 Sg	107 Bh	108 Hs	109 Mt	110 Ds	111 Rg	112 Uub	113 Uut	114 Uuq	115 Uup	116 Uuh	117 Uus	118 Uuo
* Lanthanides			57 La	58 Ce	59 Pr	60 Nd	61 Pm	62 Sm	63 Eu	64 Gd	65 Tb	66 Dy	67 Ho	68 Er	69 Tm	70 Yb	71 Lu	
** Actinides			89 Ac	90 Th	91 Pa	92 U	93 Np	94 Pu	95 Am	96 Cm	97 Bk	98 Cf	99 Es	100 Fm	101 Md	102 No	103 Lr	


This is a Structure, an ontological structure ... a fixed, structured set of elemental components that exist of which any and every compound must be composed.

The Periodic Table provides precise DEFINITION.

Process

A Process TRANSFORMS something.

This is a PROCESS:




Chemistry - A Science

A Process TRANSFORMS something.

This is a PROCESS:

(Compounds are virtually infinite)
These are compounds



These are elements

(Elements come from the Ontology - finite)

A Process based on an ONTOLOGICAL structure will be repeatable and predictable - A SCIENCE.

Process

A Process TRANSFORMS something.

This is a Process:

Add Bleach to an Alkali and
it is transformed into Saltwater.

A Process with no ontological structure is ad hoc, fixed and dependent on practitioner skills. This is NOT a science. **It is ALCHEMY.**

Ontology vs Process

An Ontology


Standard periodic table

Group ? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18
? Period

1 H He
2 Li Be B C N O F Ne
3 Na Mg Al Si P S Cl Ar
4 K Ca Sc Ti V Cr Mn Fe Co Ni Cu Zn Ga Ge As Se Br Kr
5 Rb Sr Y Zr Nb Mo Tc Ru Rh Pd Ag Cd In Sn Sb Te I Xe
6 Cs Ba La Ce Pr Nd Pm Sm Eu Gd Tb Dy Ho Er Tm Yb Lu Rn
7 Fr Ra Ac Th Pa U Np Pu Am Cm Bk Cf Es Fm Md No Lr

* Lanthanides
** Actinides

IS NOT



A Process

and a Process IS NOT an Ontology.

Chemistry Certification
The Science

Standard periodic table

Group ? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18
? Period


1 H He
2 Li Be B C N O F Ne
3 Na Mg Al Si P S Cl Ar
4 K Ca Sc Ti V Cr Mn Fe Co Ni Cu Zn Ga Ge As Se Br Kr
5 Rb Sr Y Zr Nb Mo Tc Ru Rh Pd Ag Cd In Sn Sb Te I Xe
6 Cs Ba La Ce Pr Nd Pm Sm Eu Gd Tb Dy Ho Er Tm Yb Lu Rn
7 Fr Ra Ac Th Pa U Np Pu Am Cm Bk Cf Es Fm Md No Lr

* Lanthanides
** Actinides

Certified Chemist

Note: The question is, was the Practice scientifically defined?

Chemical Manufacturing Certification
The Practice



Ontology vs Methodology


The Framework does not imply anything about:

- whether you do Architecture or whether you simply build systems (that is, whether you build Primitive Models, the single variable intersections between the Abstractions and the Perspectives or whether you build multi-variable, composite models made up of components of several Primitive Models)
- how you do Architecture (top-down, bottom-up, left to right, right to left, where to start, etc., etc.)
- the long term/short term trade-off relative to instantiating the expression of the components of the object (i.e. what is formalized in the short term for implementation purposes versus what is engineered for long term reuse).
- how much flexibility you want for producing composite models (Enterprise implementations) from your Enterprise Architecture (primitive models), that is, how constrained (little flexibility) or unconstrained (much flexibility) you make the horizontal, integrative relationships between the Cell components across the Rows and the vertical, transformational relationships of the Cell components down the Columns.

(These are significant, identifiable methodological choices ... not prescriptions of the Framework.)

© 2008 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

Architecture Certification The Science



Zachman Certified
Enterprise Architect

Methodology Certification The Practice

TOGAF
Certified Architecture Requirements
Architect

DODAF
Certified Application Development
Architect

MODAF
Certified British Application
Development Architect

BSP
Certified Architecture Planning
Architect

ENTARCO
Certified Information Engineering
(Derivative) Architect

Etc., etc., etc.

© 2009 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

Note: The question is,
was the Practice
scientifically defined?

The Framework Is a Schema

The Fmwrk is a two-dimensional classification system for ENTERPRISE descriptive representations NOT I/S.

The classification scheme for each axis grew up quite independently from the Framework application.

The classification for each axis is:

- a. Comprehensive
- b. Non-redundant

Therefore, each cell of the Framework is:

- a. Unique
- b. "Primitive" (one single Abstraction by one single Perspective)
and the total set of cells is complete.

The Framework logic is universal, independent of its application - totally neutral relative to methods/tools.

**The Framework is a "normalized" schema ...
... NOT a matrix.**

That's what makes it a good analytical tool.

© 2001-2006 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

Introducing a Metaphor

A reasonable metaphor for the Framework is the Periodic Table. The Periodic Table is an ontology ... a schema ... a normalized schema ... one element goes in one and only one cell. The Periodic Table doesn't do anything. It reflects nature. The Periodic Table (an ontology) is used by Chemists (practitioners) to define a Process (a methodology) for producing compounds (results, implementations, composites). If an alchemist uses the Periodic Table to define the process, the process can be dynamically defined (or re-defined) and will be repeatable and produce predictable results ... and the alchemist will become a Chemist. On the other hand, if the alchemist ignores the Periodic Table, they can define a process (a methodology) that will produce results, point-in-time solutions, based on their own skills and experience. The process (methodology) will be fixed (not changeable) and the alchemist will forever remain an alchemist.

Practitioners (methodologists) are constrained
by time and results.

Theoreticians (scientists) are constrained
by natural laws and integrity.

© 2008 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

The Periodic Table Metaphor

Before Mendeleev figured out the Periodic table, Alchemists (practitioners) could create compounds based on their experience ... whatever worked. After Mendeleev figured out the Periodic Table, Chemistry became a science. Creating compounds became predictable and repeatable based on the natural laws (Physics) expressed in the Periodic Table. Within 50 years, the Chemists and Physicists (practitioners) were splitting atoms.

If I am right that Architecture is Architecture is Architecture, and if my work understanding the underlying primitives (elements) of Architecture correctly reflects the natural laws of classification and has integrity, maybe my Framework will form the basis for making Enterprise Architecture a science ... and maybe in 50 years, the methodologists (practitioners) will be able to engineer Enterprises to be assembled to order from reusable "primitive" components dynamically. I don't know. I hope so. We'll probably know in 50 years.

© 2007 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

ZachmanInternational.com

I have provided Enterprise Architecture resources to help you with your Enterprise Architecture endeavors including:

- a. Zachman Enterprise Framework Standards (detailed contents for the Enterprise Framework Cells).
- b. Printable A4 version (8 1/2 X 11) of the Enterprise Framework graphic.
- c. Several topical articles I have written including, "Why Framework Standards", "What is Enterprise Architecture", "My Definition of the Zachman Framework", etc.
- d. Calendar for my public appearances and seminars.
- e. Information about my electronic book, "The Zachman Framework: A Primer for Enterprise Engineering and Manufacturing".
- f. A biography for John A. Zachman
- g. Links to other Zachman International activities.
- h. Zachman Certification Program

The only website containing Zachman-related material that is created by or specifically approved by me is:

ZachmanInternational.com

© 2008 John A. Zachman, Zachman International

Enterprise Architecture

Conclusions



1965 Systems Problems

1. Didn't meet Requirements. (not "aligned")
2. The data was no good:
 - Not consistent from system to system.
 - Not accurate.
 - Not accessible.
 - Too late.
3. Couldn't change the system. (Inflexible)
4. Couldn't change the technology. (Not adaptable)
5. Couldn't change the business. (Couldn't change the system or the technology so couldn't change business.)
6. Little new development (80% \$ for maintenance)
7. Took too long.
8. Cost too much.
9. Always over budget.
10. Always missed schedules.
11. DP budget out of control.
12. Too complicated - can't understand it, can't manage it.
13. Just frustrating.

(Adapted from Doug Erickson)

2009 Systems Problems

1. Don't meet Requirements. (not "aligned")
2. The data is no good:
 - Not consistent from system to system.
 - Not accurate.
 - Not accessible.
 - Too late.
3. Can't change the system. (Inflexible)
4. Can't change the technology. (Not adaptable)
5. Can't change the business. (Can't change the system or the technology so can't change business.)
6. Little new development (80% \$ for maintenance)
7. Takes too long.
8. Costs too much.
9. Always over budget.
10. Always missed schedules.
11. IT budget out of control.
12. Too complicated - can't understand it, can't manage it.
13. Just frustrating.

(Adapted from Doug Erickson)

It's Funny ...

COBOL didn't fix those problems!

MVS didn't fix those problems!

Virtual Memory didn't fix those problems!

IMS, DB2, Oracle, Sybase, Access, Fortran, PL/1, ADA, C++, Visual Basic, JAVA 2, 360's, 390's, MPP's, DEC VAX's, H200's, Crays, PC's, MAC's, Distributed Processing, didn't fix those problems!

Word, Excel, Powerpoint, Outlook Express, eMAIL, DOS, Windows 95, 98, 2000, NT, ME, XP, Unix, Linux, Object Oriented, COM, DCOM, CORBA, EDI, HTML, XML, UML, the Internet, B2B, B2C, Portals, Browsers didn't fix those problems!

IEF, IEW, ADW, ERWIN, POPKIN, Rational, PTECH, Rochade, Platinum, Design Bank, Data Warehouse, SAP, Baan, Peoplesoft, Oracle Financials, BSP, ISP, EAP, EAI didn't fix those problems!

And, I doubt that Web Services, .Net, Websphere, Extreme Programming, Service Oriented Architecture or Component Development (whatever that is) is going to fix the problems!

IT MAKES ONE WONDER IF THERE ACTUALLY IS A TECHNICAL SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM!!!

Engineering Problem

I'm not saying that there is anything wrong with any of these technologies.

In fact, any or all of them may well be very good ...

In fact, you may not be able to solve the Enterprise problem without employing some of these technologies.

However,

The Enterprise problem is an ENGINEERING problem,
NOT a technical problem.

My perception is that it is going to take actual work, ENGINEERING work, to solve the problem. My plan would be to start building out models, PRIMITIVE models, engineering them for alignment, integration, flexibility, reduced time-to-market, etc., etc., etc.

What would be YOUR plan for solving the problems???