

O-DA Version Up Project

TOGAF, Open, Reusable,
Dynamic Architectures
collaborative to Agile

O-DA 2.0

- Is for Real-Time Assured, Dependable Systems
- Seeks the Answer for the NIST 2002 Report
- Challenges To 60% Reduction System Development Cost

What is O-DA

- O-DA is a standard which defines a Framework and guidance for developing an Assured and/or Dependable Architecture. ([The O-DA Standard](#))
- The standard has the concept of modeling dependencies, building assurance cases, achieving agreement on accountability in the event of actual or potential failure and doing so within the architecture process. ([The O-DA Standard Press Release](#))

For more information

- [The O-DA Standard](#)
- [The O-DA Standard Press Release](#)

Why O-DA 2.0?

We, Open Group as the leader of EA standard, has to have challenge actions to answer to NIST 2002 report and Japan METI Government report using O-DA 2.0 solution guides with new view points and 9 Grids including Best Practices of Test Systems, Agile-DevOps and Open Data lake among collaborative partners network.

Reason 1

- NIST 2002 report warned us 70% of Software errors were from Architecture time but self recognized D2C error only 3.5% before coding.
- Worst thing is 20.5% errors are detected at the Customer premises.
- "IF D2C done at Architecture time , cost is X1 but If D2C (Detect to Collect) at Customer site ,“ Cost & time is X30~X44 depending on complexity.“
- Can we improve by having intra company review by Dependability Architects (TOGAF with ArchiMate plus O-DA 1.0 trained) challenge to increase **3.5%** to Max **70%**?
- If we increase D2C up **63.5%**, Customer site incident % is going down to 6.8% from 20.5%. Customer Sat should go up and **58%** of Test cost could be logically possible.
- Can we do it?

- Upon Saison IS Co. President Mr. Uchida's top down decision, TOGAF and O-DA 1.0 to his Hulft product ' Data logistic Technology) division (now 35 certified now over 280 people 12.5%).
- Hulft pre-release Quality review were traditionally executed jointly by Product Development division manger and Support service division manager but rather Product led logical reviews.
- So , Service division Director Mr. J . Yoshihara (TOGAF & ArchiMate certified) made offer to do "independent O-DA D2C assurance work" in accordance to TOGAF ADM principle, in advanced to the formal pre-release review meeting. He used The product division FS and independent quality review intensively prioritized focus in line with Jun's Support Service division's data frequency analysis of Call center claims, FAQ data, log tickets data stored on the former releases in relation to what major product functions and its sub functions by product version and release, operation configuration, places, all from customer centric pain point analysis views (CCRM).

Reason 2

Reason 3

- After I reviewed Hulft 2nd POC results by 18 Dec. as 133% improved,, also studied METI Report of Japan ICT system Incident report on 2009,2010,2011 report on 2000 companies surveyed for all industries including hardware and network and software (Application , DB and OS) and asking about the type of reasons of failures which gave me a triggering idea to create 9 Grids and Open Data Concept of O-DA 2.0.
- The difference from USA NIST 2002 report to METI report ,I judged after comparative element analysis , all architecture related reasons are smaller than USA by 10% which could be justifiable by adjusting the difference of application complexity caused by higher new application % of USA cases versus a fewer new but much hardware conversion ratio is higher in Japan especially after 2008 financial shock.
- Japan EA education jumped from 2016, #34th country in the world by number of TOGAF certified but 2019 Jan. 1st, we, Japanese companies world wide became total number 1059 and became No. 20th country now and will be more.

- 2nd Use case validation was executed in good result by our WG Task leader, Yoshio Kawakami TCS-J,(who educated TOGAF almost equal to Saison SI co.,) presented at Denver on the “RPG to Java Conversion project” which started 2016 and installed at customer on 2019 Jan, using completely 3rd party reviewer approach ,only looking their final Architecture master book updated 2017 April, by 2 persons , only total 24 man hours review with O-DA 2.0 base model, increased 16 % of D2C before coding up to 44% D2C out of 70% logical max .
- We proved by these two cases ,realistic assurance existed even without Grids available yet.
- To go up 63.5% as our target, still 18.5% has to be further detected before coding , thus we need to design effective 7~9 Grids which has to work with the progress of EA Cycle as a inline process ,not as a batch assurance cases.
- That is our design goal.

Reason 4

Reason 5

- New business case to justify TOGAF Based Governance Reviews by data and view points with Grids.
- Value for User, Value for Vendor, Value for Society : For vendors Increasing the D2C incident at customer premises force the customers SAT so badly down and customer trust on vendors become critical , which could result loosing their business.
- Some time it delay the cut over which could loosing customer's competitiveness and Vendor 's bottom lines by spending unnecessary ,redundant Muda tests comparing other vendor' using O-DA 2.0 having earlier D2C at the stage of Architecture phase.

Leaders and Members

Our Leaders



Junkyo (Jack) Fujieda

Founder, President & CEO, ReGIS Inc.



Shuichiro Yamamoto

Professor of Nagoya University



Shoji Kajita

Professor of Kyoto University



Akira Fukushima

Advisor, ReGIS Inc



Kiichi Kawano

Advisor, ReGIS Inc



Yoshio Kawakami

Senior IT Architecture Leader
Tata Consultancy Services



Jun Yoshihara

Department Manager
SAISON INFORMATION SYSTEMS CO.,LTD

Our Members

Tomohiko Tagami (Asahi Techneion Co.,Ltd)

Makoto Yamaguchi (Asahi Techneion Co.,Ltd)

Masaki Domukai (NTT COMWARE Corporation)

Takuya Inoue (NTT COMWARE Corporation)

Takashi Kubota (NTT COMWARE Corporation)

Sho Saito (NTT COMWARE Corporation)

Takaaki Aoki (Kyoto University)

Hisaya Sakashita (LTS, Inc.)

Saki Miyata (LTS, Inc.)

Keisuke Nagae (SOMPO Systems, Inc.)

Nobuhide Kobayashi

Kenchi Kobayashi

Kyoichi Matsuzawa (IBM Japan, Ltd.)



Riu Kondo (Tata Consultancy Services)

Taichi Hasegawa (Tata Consultancy Services)

Kazuya Hirose (Tata Consultancy Services)

Shingo Omata (Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation)

Narumasa Suzuki (Fujitsu Limited)

Yu Aoki (Fujitsu Limited)

Nobuaki Kusunoki (Mizuho Securities Co., Ltd.)

Kensuke Saito (Mizuho Securities Co., Ltd.)

Jiro Kanayama (Rabukasoft)

Hirobumi Kawamura (Rococo Co.,Ltd.)

Yoshihiko Tobe (Rococo Co.,Ltd.)

Daisuke Tadenuma (Rococo Co.,Ltd.)

Yoshifumi Miyahara (Rococo Co.,Ltd.)

Keiji Horie ((Rococo Co.,Ltd.)