

WEBINAR

**BIAN Business Capability Model**

Statement of Alignment with the BIAN Service Landscape

August 29, 2023 | Q&A

Question	Answer
<p>How would you relate BIAN to domain driven design, where ubiquitous language tends to focus on bottom-up natural language? There can be linguistic challenges mapping into BIAN service domain models from our natural language, which can seem very abstract.</p>	<p>A BIAN Service Domain can map very well to a Domain in DDD. There is an excellent paper written by Biao Hao of IBM that describes the mapping and maybe that will help with the natural language issue. Separately, it is interesting that DDD does not provide specific rules as to how to define a domain boundary, whereas the BIAN Service Domain partitioning approach is explicit.</p>
<p>Would like to understand the rules used to develop the BCM and if it is also based on a business object and functional pattern.</p>	<p>In most cases in the BIAN Business Capability Model each level 1 capability is based on a business object. All the lower-level capabilities under that are also related to that business object. Currently there are a few capabilities that are not based on business objects. These are being reviewed over the next couple of months as we endeavour to align the BIAN BCM more closely with the Business Architecture Guild Financial Services Reference Model.</p>
<p>Human Resource Direction lists the word Direction twice on the BCM Slide, FYI.</p>	<p>Thanks, we have corrected the error.</p>
<p>The biggest challenge with adoption of BIAN capabilities within my organization is a lack of other products Pan African Retail Banks. Will you be looking into a view of expanding the current product view?</p>	<p>Business capabilities do not break down into other capabilities based on product or type. For example, there is not a “Lending Product Management” or a “Savings Product Management” but rather just “Product Management”.</p> <p>The Product Fulfilment Service Domains represent an area of the landscape where we anticipate any bank would ‘adapt’ the Service Domains to match their own product hierarchy. We try to detail a representative cross-section of ‘vanilla’ products as a starting point knowing that a specific deployment may add or remove features (by adding/removing Behavior Qualifiers). There may be product fulfilment features that are specific to Pan African retail banks that we have not yet captured and for which you can define additional BQ’s as needed</p>
<p>The BIAN Portal still has Capability (in parenthesis) as part of the Service Domain Definitions. Will there be an</p>	<p>Hopefully over time we will remove inconsistencies in all documentation. The use of the term “business capability” is particularly problematic however because some members distinguish between</p>

<p>effort to clean up the portal to help avoid confusion?</p>	<p>business capabilities (as represented in the BCM) and refer to Service Domain’s having “business functional capacities” in contrast. Other members refer to the Service Domains as business capabilities directly. This is not incorrect as long as you understand that a Service Domain represents a ‘constrained’ business capability (As mentioned it applies a pattern of behaviour/control to instances of a type of asset for the complete lifecycle as often as required). Balancing these two slightly conflicting interpretations is difficult to do consistently...</p>
<p>How do you decide which capability model object or functionality?</p>	<p>As the discipline of business architecture evolves the predominant model is object-based and not functional. This is supported and promoted by the Business Architecture Guild in BIZBOK (Business Architecture Body of Knowledge).</p>
<p>Are there plans to complete the descriptions that are missing in the BIAN Business Capability Model? Is there a rationale why some are missing?</p>	<p>Yes, over the next several months as we review the capabilities and endeavour to align more closely with the Business Architecture Guild Financial Services Reference Model, we will review and update the descriptions.</p>
<p>How value stream mapping would help to build business capability model for Risk sectors?</p>	<p>There is some quite advanced work going on to expand the risk management aspects of the Service Landscape in the Fraud Working Group right now. This is focused on developing a supporting wireframe and example business scenarios. As yet the use of value stream mapping has not been considered, but we will float this as a suggestion to the working group. Unfortunately, we do not anticipating the results of this work will be completed in time for the upcoming release, but BIAN members can get an update of work in progress by following the usual channels</p>
<p>Does BIAN define anywhere how the MECE technique is applied to ensure capabilities/ service domains are MECE?</p>	<p>Defining business capabilities on a set of primary business objects helps to ensure they are not redundant and mutually exclusive. For Service Domains the general approach is described in the BIAN Semantic API Practitioner’s Guide and some other documents. In summary the breakdown of the Asset Types applies a MECE Hierarchical decomposition, coupled with the design constraint that any Service Domain applies only one of the 19 available functional patterns, taken together ensures Service Domains are discrete. There is an additional design concept that is applied to ensure Service Domains are elemental (i.e. can’t be subdivided into finer grained Service Domains) called the ‘Threshold or Decomposition’ - but this is getting into the inner workings of the BIAN approach that few people need to get into. Key to note that</p>

	<p>the BIAN design approach is empirical - meaning that any Service Domain specified using the above partitioning techniques is then tested out in practical/real-world scenarios where any errors in the design would be quickly exposed.</p>
<p>If both models are in fact built using the same rules then are the differences simply the business objects and functional patterns recognized / chosen during their construction?</p>	<p>Granted there is similarity in the rules that are used – i.e. for business capabilities: an action on a business object and for service domains: an action on an asset type. However, an asset type is not synonymous with a primary business object. An asset type often is a subset of one or more business objects or the intersection of two or more business objects.</p>
<p>I think the answers here will strike right to the heart of why they are different. The other obvious difference is simply that the landscape goes deeper by providing a semantic layer to provide guidance on how to operationalise a business capability.</p>	<p>Good observation. To embellish a little - a Business Capability allows a fairly flexible description of something a business can or wishes to be able to do. In contrast a Service Domain (in supporting the realization of one or more business capabilities) defines a business control mechanism that implements a commercial behaviour (functional pattern) to instances of an involved asset. The Service Domains as stated can be thought to 'operationalise' business capabilities</p>
<p>How would data/information be represented within the service domains? For example, what would DaaS be represented as?</p>	<p>BIAN maintains two related models of business information. The BIAN Business Object Model (BOM) provides a conceptual definition of the business information referenced by any part of the specification. It can be described as a sophisticated business dictionary that ensures business information is consistently defined and interpreted. The second representation is the Service Domain's Control Record. This extracts information definitions from the BOM in order to create the structured collection of business information needed to support the working of the Service Domain - it provides a specific business context for interpreting that business information. It is important to note that the make-up of a Control Record may use selections of attributes taken from many objects in the BOM</p>
<p>Can we see the service domains in application layer to analysis and design this layer for banking software?</p>	<p>Probably! The Service Domains represent conceptual designs of discrete functional partitions and these can be mapped to many different application architectures used in banking software. For example, Service Domains can be aligned/mapped to legacy systems acting as 'wrappers' that present a standard service interface. Service Domains can also be considered as high-level conceptual designs for containerised service centres in a composable application architecture. BIAN will hopefully be</p>

	publishing a guide for an opinionated use of Service Domains for this latter approach in the near future
Do you have any ongoing program to publish service domains belongs to application layer to analysis and design this layer for banking software?	As referenced in the previous answer - there is a considerable effort within the BIAN AF&F community to define an example/opinionated approach that applies Service Domain design in a 'composable architecture'. This includes modelling Service Domains as 'state machines' supporting event driven collaboration and considering information interactions that support transactional traffic, decision support and analysis and command and control exchanges. Watch this space!
<b>Answered IN-SESSION</b>	
I see "Fraud" but I don't see "Anti-Money Laundering" called out in the BIAN BCM - where do you see AML fitting into the BIAN BCM, value stream, and/or service landscape?	Anti-Money Laundering is an activity that may be done on several objects, typically financial transactions. Therefore, capabilities such as Financial Transaction Risk Management would be utilized along with other Risk Management capabilities. These would be seen in value streams such as Execute Transaction.
Does the Generic artifact in BIAN map to the Information concept in BIZBOK?	In one or two cases there appears to be some similarity. However, these do not directly map to each other.
What would be the links, if any, between Business Services (that manipulate Business Object and are associated with Business Capabilities), and Service Domains? What does Service Domains here means to you? Is it similar to Business Function?	To repeat as best as possible - Business Services mapped to business objects associated with business capabilities can align with Service Domains and their service operations. But note that a Service Domain does not necessarily act on a single business object nor does it necessarily implement all possible services for any object it does act upon. For example, the Customer Relationship Management Service Domain may refer to the product business object in order to review a customer's product usage as part of relationship planning. This access to the product business object would clearly only require a sub-set of available services and would also not represent the 'system of record' for that object
Hi, is there any on-going/planned alignment between BIAN value streams and BIAN BOM and the Financial Reference model by BizArch Guild?	Over the next couple of months, we are reviewing the BIAN BCM endeavouring to align it more closely with the Business Architecture Guild Financial Services Reference Model. We will also look to adopt some of the value streams from the Business Architecture Guild.
Is there any advantage to do a view that separate Manufacture from Distribution? to distinguish capabilities support each one of them	The overall business capability model does not separate by business line, product, or type. However, it can be useful for communicating and socializing a model to selectively omit some parts that are not of interest to the audience.

<p>When will the work you doing to reviewing the BIAN Business capabilities complete?</p>	<p>We hope that over the next three to six months we will have reviewed and aligned the BCM more closely with the Business Architecture Guild Financial Services Reference Model.</p>
<p>How does BIZBOK Information Concept correlate to BIAN Business Object</p>	<p>As per BIZBOK, an Information Concept is a representation of a business object. This representation includes a set of types and states for the objects.</p>
<p>Are there any new or emerging capabilities the working group is planning on adding in the future?</p>	<p>As we review the BIAN BCM endeavouring to align it more closely with the Business Architecture Guild Financial Services Reference Model, we expect to add some capabilities, particularly the supporting ones such as Incident, Inquiry, Content, Submission etc.</p>