Response to Reviewers Post-Review Board 21 July 2005

MODAF Acquisition Deskbook
Issues Addressed by the Review Board

There were 208 issues raised against the MODAF Acquisition Deskbook. Many of these were typos, or were already fixed, or have plans in place to fix. The remaining, more serious issues, of which there were 20, were raised for Review Board consideration.

The Review Board sequentially reviewed each of these 20 issues, and either actioned them for resolution or provided an appropriate response to the Reviewer.

A record of all 208 issues and their responses is provided below. All these issues are now closed with the release of Version 0.9 on 29 July 2005 except one: issue ID 150 regarding use of the term 'architectures'. This issue relates to all of the Deskbooks, and will be addressed during August with the Deskbook integration work, prior to the issue of Version 1.0 at the end of August 2005.

Page: **Section:**

Issue: Mention StV-6 more explicitly?

Category: Minor Technical

Description: The StV-6 is shown in Figure 3-7 tying Operational suites of views together, but there\'s no mention in the latest version of the Acquisition Deskbook as to how this works in practice.

Evidence: SV-5 is described - why not StV-6?

User's Proposed Solution: Produce an example to show the value of this View.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: StV-6 is part of the URD and as such is described in the Customer 1 Deskbook. Acquisition CoI do not need to create StV-6s, and they are referred in the text to the Customer 1 Deskbook should they need more information on the URD Views. A reference to the URD Reference Guide has also been added.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:**

Issue: Sustain definition

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Definition of sustain is misleading

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Possibly use ' the process to maintain and dispose of a military capability within defined parameters throughout its operational life'

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:**

Issue: Section 3.4

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Excellent

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action:

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:**

Issue: Section 3.3

Category: Major Technical

Description: Whilst the previous draft did possess some significant limitation as to how it presented the use of DODAF in support of acquisition, it was relatively easy to see how the processes described mapped to CADMID cycle. This mapping has unfortunately largely been lost.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Indicate in section 3.3 and its subsections how the activities vary across the CADMID lifecycle.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: This should be remedied with the addition of the process diagram in each section, as per the latest Customer 1 Deskbook.
Diagrams have now been upated in the Deskbook.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:**

Issue: Section 3.3

Category: Major Editorial

Description: There is a great deal of good stuff in Section 3.3, it would be even better if there was more of an explaination as to how the individual views referred to were used in to practice to provide the benefits described.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Some expansion of text around use of views to describe how the views are used to provide the benefits referred to.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: This should be answered by the Worked Example section 4.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:**

Issue: TV1

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Define 'refine' to mean granularity

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Change made to refer to 'refine' as meaning different, equivalent standards being chosen and/or increasing granularity.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:**

Issue: Recommended / Mandated views at Gates

Category: Major Technical

Description: We appear to have lost the concept of mandated and recommended views. The difference is important to users.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Distinguish between thet views are mandatory and those which are simply recommended.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: As per agreement at the last Review board, we are using the more common MOD nomenclature of 'Essential' and 'Highly Desirable'.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:**

Issue: Figure

Category: Major Editorial

Description: It is difficult to read the figures / discern their contents since they are small and contain even smaller elements / text

Evidence: Eye strain

User's Proposed Solution: Enlarge figures

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 209

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:**

Issue: Change of document structure

Category: Major Editorial

Description: I personally found the document easier and more logical to follow when it was structured around the CADMID cycle, rather than around the Workstreams.

Evidence: For example, it seems odd to progress from 'Wind Down of IPT' to 'Requirements Management' on pages 16 and 17

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: A Workstream Manager can now pick up the document and follow his own process through without having to try and pick out bits of information ensconced within other information irrelevant to his own area of interest. For example, a requirements manager can now read through everything MODAF-related he needs to do without having to circumnavigate the project management and industry views in which he has no interest.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:**

Issue: Security modelling

Category: Major Technical

Description: There is no mention of a significant procedural hurdle that defence contractors have to overcome in achieving system acceptance, namely security accreditation. MOD requires use of a modelling notation called DIAN/08 for modelling security features of a proposed design - this is mandated for the security accreditation documentation. Currently there is no relationship between this and MODAF. UML approaches to DIAN/08 are only at the research stage.

Evidence: There is currently a misalignment between the views required for security accreditation (DIAN/08) and those required for system specification (MODAF). It is very difficult to achieve initial alignment with architecture documentation and even more difficult to maintain alignment over time. This lack of coherence is costing MOD money.

User's Proposed Solution: I propose this needs discussion at MODAF Technical Working Group (or a sub-group meeting)

References: DIAN/08 (Domain Approach techniques v1.0 Sept 2001)

Review Board Decision: Security accreditation will be included in the Deskbook. Reference should be made to the work ongoing within the DCSA into information assurance, DIAN/08 architectures and the CSG study. This should then be deferred , stating that the use of MODAF Views is highly desirable in the accreditation process but the way forward is yet to be agreed.

Action: Change made as per Review Board decision

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:**

Issue: Earlier Use of OV-5

Category: Major Technical

Description: Would like to endorse the view that I heard expressed at the workshop that OV-5 should be produced earlier.

Evidence: Good understanding of processes is essential to establish a clear requirement and develop a shared understanding between customer and supplier.

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: This is a discussion to be had for the Customer 1 community and Deskbook, as the URD is outside the scope of the Acquisition Deskbook - it is used but not produced by the Acquisition CoI

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:**

Issue: Principles and standards governing the development of MODAF architectures

Category: Major Technical

Description: The restructured section 3 is much better, however we do not seem to mention or list the principles / standards / constraints that apply to the production of MODAF architectures for use on MoD projects.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Please could we do so.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: It was discussed in the Review Board meeting that the Deskbooks are intended to provide examples for desk officers to understand how MODAF relates to their area - it is not intended to instruct in how to conduct Enterprise Architecture. Other documents will provide that information, along with training in architecting. Therefore this issue has been closed in relation to the Deskbook, as it starts to go down the line of instructing in how to architect, and as such is outside the scope of this document.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:**

Issue: OV7

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: First mention of OV7. Not in any diagram to show is mandated or needed

Evidence: What is the evidence for the issue.

User's Proposed Solution: If you have a suggestion for solving the problem please put it here.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Text changed to refer to developing the OV-7, rather than refining it as this is, indeed, the first time it is mentioned. However as it is only highly desirably and not essential it will not be illustrated. Text has been added to point the reader to the View Overview document for more information on OV-7.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:**

Issue: Each Section

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: A process flow chart of some kind at the beginning of each section would bring the sections into focus

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Add process flow charts to describe each section

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: This will be answered when the processes are added to each section, as for the current Customer 1 deskbook
Diagrams have now been upated in the Deskbook.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:**

Issue: General

Category: Major Editorial

Description: It is not clear as to the purpose of the deskbook and the level of familiarity with MODAF expected of the reader. Lots of views are quoted which may confuse the new reader who has no concept as to how they relate to each other.

Evidence: Absence of relevant text.

User's Proposed Solution: Include statements in Introduction or Forewords and refer out very early in the doucment to other MoDAF documentation.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: This becomes clearer once the whole suite of documents is available. This was discussed in the Review Board, and the Overview document etc will handle these types of concerns. Therefore this issue has been closed.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:**

Issue: Overall Comment

Category: Other

Description: A much improved document. The restructuring of Section 3 is excellent.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action:

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:**

Issue: Overview

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Can we have an overview of which views are expected

Evidence: It is not possible to read the document in its present form and determine which views are being recommended for which part of the CADMID/T lifecycle

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Having the process diagram in front of each section should solve this issue
Diagrams have now been upated in the Deskbook.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:** 3.1.3

Issue: Inconsistent references to responsibilities of 1C and 2C

Category: Minor Technical

Description: There is a reference to Customer 2 providing Operational Views in section 3.1.3. Elsewhere in the document these are owned by Customer 1.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: This has now been changed to refer to URD Views from Customer 1, to remove any ambiguity

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:** 3.3.4

Issue: Main Gate

Category: Major Editorial

Description: See initial gate comments

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: No comments to action - presume duplicate of Main Gate comment to which this one refers.

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:** 3.4

Issue: OV7

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Due to the fact that the SV6 has been mandated, it will need to reference information products which are specified in the OV7 or SV11

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Mandate or at least recommend OV7 or SV11

References: MoDAF Handbook

Review Board Decision:

Action: OV-7 has been made a highly desirable View within the SRD View set. This may be changed to Essential once the Acquisition community have started to use MODAF in earnest and identified the Views they really wish for mandation. In the meantime, it seems prudent to exercise caution before putting forward too many Views for mandation.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:** 3.4.3

Issue: Section 3.4.3

Category: Major Editorial

Description: There is excellent stuff in this section. Although all of the linkages and activities are useful in assessing the integrity of the requirement, this is probably because we are testing it against a developing solution.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: It may be better to split section 3.4.2 into two parts.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Not sure how 3.4.2 could be split as it is farily short in any case, therefore this issue has been closed.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:** 3.5

Issue: Integrated capability

Category: Major Technical

Description: 3.5.2/3 show lack of appreciation of the role of architecture early in the procurement cycle. While it is true the demonstration phase may be the first opportunity to actually prove delivery of integrated capability, architectural work in previous phases must allow tests forintegrability of the proposed solutions well before Main Gate. For instance, standards-based interface mechanisms and integration mechanisms need to be built in during the architectural design. Also technology insertion surely applies to the first increment not just during the in service phase (especially true for capability improvement projects).

Evidence: MOD require mechanisms (before commitment to development at Main Gate) to test contractor assertions of integrability and interoperability (cf 3.3.4). This may require design level models of the components to be integrated.

User's Proposed Solution: In contrast to Fig 3-17, the systems/technology workstream must also produce design level system architecture descriptions! I think 3.5 suffers from the myth that the views supporting the SRD actually specify what is to be built - in practice there will be lower level versions of SV1 etc that describe the component level for implementation purposes (these are crucial to prove how the integrated system

References: ISSE implementation viewpoint (component modelling)

Review Board Decision: MOD need to agree their policy with regards to use of MODAF by Industry Suppliers - this is not the job of the Deskbook. However, the references to use of MODAF by industry will be made more positive: "The supplier will find use of MODAF Views useful".

Action: Change made to document as agreed by Review Board.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:** 3.5.3

Issue: Technology Insertion

Category: Major Editorial

Description: TLMP should have been written using SV9 and TV2. Any changes need to be within DEC defined parameters, not simply responding to technology changes

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed to refer to the fact that changes, upgrades etc would be initiated through Customer 1, which should alleviate this issue.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:** 3.6.4

Issue: Design work

Category: Major Technical

Description: I found the statement 'the supplier may find it helpful to use some of the MODAF Views as part of their detailed design work, although this is not essential..' extremely surprising. While I agree contractors will want to use supplementary views, it is only by asking them for standard views that MOD has the ability to test to coherence of the solutions being offered. Industry should NOT simply be offered an opt out (they will simply revert to current practice of ad hoc design methodologies).

Evidence: Testing integrability and interoperability of the solution capabilities requires a deep understanding of the implementation level design. If this is not provided mostly through MODAF views ability to test these aspects will be diminished.

User's Proposed Solution: I suggest this needs discussion at Technical Working Group. If there are additional views that are needed to cover this, let us identify them and include them in MODAF.

References:

Review Board Decision: This is the same as issue ID 7, and so will be resolved in the same manner.

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 7.

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:** 3.7.1

Issue: TLMP

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Among other things there should be a connection made between the TLMP and CIP, i.e. much more emphasis on the role that architectures potentially have to support co-ordination across LoDs.

Evidence: This looks like a case of fitting existing DoDAF views to TLMP rather than deriving the need for views from the business requirements inherent in the TLM processes. There is an opportunity to do better than that. Since TLMP is key to ensuring cohesion between the different communities, this is a subject area that should have been given more weight in the deskbook.

User's Proposed Solution: As one example, I would have thought that the plan to use facilities and other resource through the life of the programme could be captured with suitable views. Similarly views could cover the stakeholder mapping etc. This is a wide subject that requires, I believe, more thought.

References:

Review Board Decision: The TLMP and CIP were originally envisaged as being parts of the same document, therefore there should be an intimate link between the two. This does not always occur in practice - however a cross-reference should be made between the TLMP in the Acquisition Deskbook and the CIP in the Customer 2 Deskbook.

Action: Reference to Customer 2 Deskbook added. Was going to add reference to the relevant section of AMS, however the CIP is not mentioned on AMS.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:** 3.7.2

Issue: ILS

Category: Major Editorial

Description: The opening statement is highly contentious as much time and effort is put into WLCs prior to both initial and main gates and options for support solutions must be considered at that time (albeit more detail is included post MG). No reference to Sustainability Deskbook.

Evidence: This is an especially weak section of the deskbook that will do nothing to promote the integration of the operational and support aspects of capabilities developed for MOD and support co-ordinatation of the associated LoDs.

User's Proposed Solution: Logistic support involves people, technology and process and can be modelled in a similar way to operational systems. There is surely a lot more that can be said about how this links into the core equipment development work. What about modelling the Use Study in MODAF etc.? This needs significant work.

References: Sustainability Deskbook (this should be referenced I think)

Review Board Decision:

Action: Reference added to Sustainment deskbook. Wording as suggested by Peter added to show that WLCs are worked on for initial and main gate.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:** Fig 3-2

Issue: Customer 1 / Customer 2 interface with Acquisition

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: In the light of the more detailed descriptions in Section 3.2 onwards, Figure 3-2 looks over-simplified. There are a great number of products produced by other COIs that will impact on the Acquisition process. One example (3.5.1) is the Capability Phasing view (StV-3). Not only should the relevant products (and associated MODAF views) be clearly identified but it should also be made clear what MUST be provided and what COULD be provided. Clearly this must tie in with other deskbooks.

Evidence: One of the current failings is inadequate or untimely direction from Customer 1/2. One of the benefits of MODAF should be better tying in of products meaningful to these COIs (with standard views). This is a two way street of course, so it is important to specify the acquisition MODAF output products.

User's Proposed Solution: Revise Figure 3-2 or use a table to indicate inputs and outputs. IPTs can then flag up early when required direction has not been provided and assess the risks to the acquisition processes they are responsible for.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: The process diagram helps to show these inputs and outputs more clearly. Work will also be undertaken once all the Deskbooks are complete to ensure that they are properly aligned and cross-referenced. Diagrams have now been upated in the Deskbook.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: **Section:** Many Section

Issue: Quality of English

Category: Other

Description: The overall quality of English in some parts of the document could be improved. There are numerous examples where nouns are used as adjectives and the preposition used does not really match well with the verb with which it is associated.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Proof read

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Individual comments should have removed any typos.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 10 **Section:** 3.1.2

Issue: Figure 3.1

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Para 1 refers to issues, which are not in the table. Refers to \\\'architectural activities\\\', when it should be architects or project team.Is it key data sources or documentsHow can interfacing systems be a key data source?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Table would be useful if had MODAF views against it - otherwise why bother, just a repeat of AMS

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of Issue ID 2

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 10 **Section:** Figure 3.2

Issue: General Process

Category: Minor Technical

Description: There is no indication what the icons mean

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Provide a key

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: The diagram is explained more fully (including what the icons mean) in the MODAF Overview document, to which there is already a reference.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 10 **Section:** Table 3-1

Issue: CADMID

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: This table neglects the architecture decisions that need to be taken and products that need to be produced at each stage in the life-cycle (it simply reflects the requirements-driven life-cycle). It does not therefore reflect the \'key objectives\' from an architecture stand point

Evidence: Experience of architecture based development projects

User's Proposed Solution: Concept: high level architecture concepts and selection thereof; outputs include concept definitions (through MODAF views)Assessment: more detailed architecture options and trade off (it is not just about technology); outputs include architecture design documentation etc.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Table has now been removed to align with the Customer 1 and Customer 2 deskbook intros.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 10 **Section:** Table 3-1

Issue: Application to Acquisition Process

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Need to reassess the Key Data Sources to the Concept, Assessment and Demonstration stages. Current detail in the Concepts Handbook (Draft 2005) indicate that CONOPS would be developed for 'C', CONEMP for 'A' and CONUSE for 'D'.

Evidence: JDCC Concepts Handbook 2005 (Working Draft)

User's Proposed Solution: Need to discuss this process with Deskbook Author and identify a common meesage between Deskbooks

References: Draft Concepts and Doctrine Deskbook

Review Board Decision:

Action: This has been updated in Table 3-1.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 10/11 **Section:** Sections

Issue: Introduction update

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Sections re-ordered to facilitate readability

Evidence: Customer 1/2 Deskbook

User's Proposed Solution: Edit as proposed

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Sections 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 have been swapped.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 11 **Section:** 3.1.3

Issue: Use of term Architectures

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Line 3 : get a set of views or products, not architecturesThis is a general comment throughout the document

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Throughout the MODAF Documentation the term architectures is used. This may be something for review during August when consistency checks across the documentation suite will be undertaken.

Status: Open **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 11 **Section:** 3.1.3

Issue: IA as MODAR Custodians

Category: Procedural

Description: MODAR does not existWho has defined that the IA will be the custodians?Governance/management not defined

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: This stems from Adrian's dislike of the IA - see issue ID 179.

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 11 **Section:** 3.1.3 para 4

Issue: Industry involvement

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: In line with some of IAGL comments it is worth being more specific about how indistry are contacted wrt MODAF

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: We need to be clear in stating that the IPTs are supported by Industry and that their engagement is initiated by the IPT.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Statement added as suggested

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 11 **Section:** Para 1

Issue: 3.1.3 Architectural Data Sources

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Need to review this in the light of the comments at Ser 19 above.

Evidence: as above

User's Proposed Solution: as above

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Not sure to what this refers, therefore has been closed.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 12 **Section:**

Issue: Grey Box

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Need a better definition of grey box modelsIndustry should be following the standards, data formats etc defined in the SRD, not defining them

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Reword

References:

Review Board Decision: "Grey box" model can be used but it needs to be defined in a footnote.

Action: Footnote added defining the term "grey box"

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 12 **Section:** 3.1.1

Issue: Grey box model

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Grey Box? All that is needed from industry is a black box design i.e. it will expose the public functions and interfaces but no internal workings

Evidence: Definition from the Free Online Dictionary of Computing: Black box is an abstraction of a device or system in which only its externally visible behaviour is considered and not its implementation or "inner workings".

User's Proposed Solution: Suggest replacing the term grey box with the more widely accepted Black Box

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 154

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 12 **Section:** 3.1.3

Issue: Specification modelling

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Last paragraph would benefit from reference to 'specification level modelling' (this is meaningful to industrial contractors). The specifics of what this level of modelling entails should be left to the contractual negotiations between IPT and industry (as it may vary from project to project). It would, however, exhibit the characteristics described in that paragraph.

Evidence: Work on novel UML-based procurement approaches for CSIS IPT explored levels of modelling and gauged industry responses

User's Proposed Solution: See above

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 154

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 12 **Section:** 3.2

Issue: Acquisition SoS

Category: Major Editorial

Description: How are we dealing with the future SoS processes? Should we have developed some of our own thinking on this? (see SEMP comment above)

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: We need to let the community know about the intending SoS nature of future acquisition (this deskbook will be read by new IPTs and FBG. How working in an SoS is approached using MODAF needs a small mention at least/

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: This has been mentioned as per the discussion in the Review Board relating to information that might be provided to an IPT at the start of the process, which should be enough to cover this issue.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 12 **Section:** 3.2

Issue: Fig 3-2

Category: Minor Technical

Description: I loke the concept of Figure 3-2, but am surprised at some of the detail, e.g.: The CIP should link in with the In-service phase as well as operations and the capability does not derive solely from industry which usually on supplies the equipment pillar for integration by the MoD with the other DLODs. It is also not clear as to why the themes of PM, Reqts, Sys / techn, Industry and TLM are there.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Review and correct as necessary.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Figure is being read too literally, it is just a representation. This comment has been repeated by several sources, so the text "The interface documents are the focus of this diagram, the time element is not represented. The CADMID / CADMIT cycles are to represent acquisition as a whole and not intended to show exactly where the documents fit in to a particular process stage. This type of information can be found on the Acquisition Management System (AMS)" has been added to hopefully stop people looking in minute detail at what is supposed to be a high-level representative diagram.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 12 **Section:** 3.2

Issue: Interfaces with Other COIs

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Would be clearer if defined as Inputs and Outputs

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Added the words inputs and outputs to augment the 'provides' and 'is provided by' already present in the text

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 12 **Section:** 3.2

Issue: Figure 3.2

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Misleading diagram:i) within the Acquisition box, we have the CADMID cycle, in the Acquisition circle we only have CADM.ii) SRD appears under I/DWhat value does this diagram add?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: i) Align CADM to CADMIDii) place under A as is produced during Assessment

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue 60. Text added to stop people reading this diagram so literally, when it is a high level representation of the interfaces between COIs.

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 12 **Section:** 3.2 Capability

Issue: CRD

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Responsible for the CRD also

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Update

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: CRD added

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 12 **Section:** Figure 3-2

Issue: Key Elements

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: The CADMID symbol inside the acquisition box is confusing as it looks as if is sited in relation to the products i.e. SRD looks as if it is happening in the Disposal stage

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Remove the CADMID icon as it doesn't really add anything to this diagram

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 60. Additional text added to stop people reading diagram literally when it is a high-level view of the CoI interfaces

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 12 **Section:** Figure 3-2

Issue: Print clarity

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Borderline print clarity.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Use bolder colours for lines.

References: Review of Customer 2 deskbook provides more guidance on print clarity issues.

Review Board Decision:

Action: This seems fine all the times it has been printed by the author, therefore issue has been closed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 12 **Section:** Last

Issue: 3.1.3 Architectural Data Sources

Category: Major Editorial

Description: The issue of how Commercial-in-Confidence and other similar caveated data is to be handled both in terms of views and also within MODAR should be defined - even if it is just an outline at this stage of development. This issue has also been raised by MOD Research partners conducting OA, who need access to information held by commercial competitors.

Evidence: This has been raised by the C&D pilot participants as a concern about MODAF

User's Proposed Solution: Need to provide suitable guidance of this issue in all the deskbooks and will probably require direction from the IA

References:

Review Board Decision: Add statement that data will be handled as per current procedures. Refer that it should be a consideration when publishing an architecture.

Action: Change made as per Review Board decision.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 12 **Section:** N/A

Issue: Introduction update

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Overview of view use and compliance setions need adding as new sections - 3.1.4/3.1.5

Evidence: Customer 1/2 & C&D Deskbook

User's Proposed Solution: Edit as proposed

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Sections have been copied from v0.9 of Customer 1 Deskbook into Acquisition Deksbook.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 13 **Section:**

Issue: CIP

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: The Capability Integration Plan seems like a key document on the interface between the Acquisition and Customer 2 COIs. Since the MODAF view of architecture encompasses all LoDs, this should be regarded as a product of architectural interest and recorded in Table 3-1

Evidence: Experience with MOD projects has shown organisational failings regarding LOD co-ordination - it is important that this addressed through MODAF deskbooks

User's Proposed Solution: It must be clear who is responsible for creating the CIP and what the involvement of the Acquisition COI is in producing or ratifying it. The CIP will include a roadmap of future development and integration activities for which the AcQ views ought to be appropriate (except these are currently pegged naively to CADMID milestones)

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Reference to CIP has been added to TLMP section with reference to Customer 2 Deskbook, as per Review Board decision.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 13 **Section:**

Issue: Figure 3.3

Category: Major Editorial

Description: What doe sthe figure show? Does not show a process so cannot show how it supports it

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Diagrams have now been upated in the Deskbook.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 13 **Section:**

Issue: Project Management

Category: Procedural

Description: PRINCE 2 is mandated for MOD project management. We should be showing how MODAF supports this and current processes. Elaborate why an AcV2 is better than a Gantt chart. Also, it is defined as being for programmes and not projects.AcV2 diagram is not correct - no DLoDs

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Paragraph on PRINCE 2 added. Information added to explain that AcV-2 will summarise the more detailed information in the Gantt charts, so that it can be used for reporting higher up the chain.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 13 **Section:** 3.2

Issue: TLMP typo

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: TLPM should be TLMP

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Corrected.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 13 **Section:** 3.3

Issue: Fig 3-3

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: It is not easy to read Fig 3-3, please could we enlarge.

Evidence: Eye strain

User's Proposed Solution: Enlarge Fig 3-3

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: The View is illustrative and does not need to be read in detail. This will in any case be replaced by a process diagram as per the Customer 1 Deskbook in due course.
Diagrams have now been upated in the Deskbook.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 13 **Section:** 3.3

Issue: 3.3

Category: Minor Technical

Description: When I first read this section I thought that the text and figure on page 13 were the entirety of the information relating to PM and felt let down (uncessarily as it turned out).

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Signpost forward to following sub-sections

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Referred forward to describing the activities in this section.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 13 **Section:** 3.3

Issue: Drawings / Figures

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Drawings on too small a scale (Illegible) are of limited value

Evidence: Fig 3.3 AcV2

User's Proposed Solution: Enlarge scale to enable title of ACV2 at leat to be seen

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: This is an illustrative View. An example AcV-2 is given later on. This is to be replaced with process diagrams in due course anyway.
Diagrams have now been upated in the Deskbook.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 13 **Section:** 3.3

Issue: Terminology

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: If the first ref to AcV should be spelt out in full also

Evidence: AcV-2 SoS Acq Prog

User's Proposed Solution: At first mention of AcVs include in full

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: SoS changed to System of Systems, and added 'Acquisition View' before 'AcV-2'

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 13 **Section:** 3.3.1

Issue: Standardisation Officer

Category: Procedural

Description: The standards officer is looked upon as a dedicated person who has to come into a project. It should be a role of someone within the project, this would make it easier to have someone fulfil this as a sub-role in smaller projects

Evidence: AMS defines this as a role

User's Proposed Solution: Tone down the emphasis to make it look like a sub-role that could be undertaken by someone on the project.

References:

Review Board Decision: Mention of the person should be removed, but the tasks should remain. A footnote could be added to reference the relevant section of AMS.

Action: Change made as per Review Board Decision.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 13 **Section:** 3.3.1

Issue: Technical Standards

Category: Minor Technical

Description: Technical Standards in the TV1 may be replaced from time to time but the should rarely evolve.

Evidence: Evolving Technical standards will hinder the goals for NEC, they should be centrally defined and managed

User's Proposed Solution: Give responsibility to the IA for managing this view.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: 'evolve' changed to 'increase in detail' for clarity

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 13 **Section:** Figure 3-3

Issue: Project Management Activities

Category: Minor Technical

Description: The picture shows a GANT chart not an AcV-2

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Replace with the picture of the AcV-2

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Diagrams have now been upated in the Deskbook.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 13 - 17 **Section:** 3.3

Issue: Project Management

Category: Major Editorial

Description: MoDAF is not a project management tool it does have some views that may or may not aid the project management process.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Tone down the section and show how it might help. Mention that Prince 2 is the project management method for the MoD

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 161.

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 14 **Section:**

Issue: Technical Views

Category: Procedural

Description: What is meant by evolution of the TV1? The standards do not change. Do you mean the granularity changes?Showing a TV1 is not relevant to the title 'Form the IPT'

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 324

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 14 **Section:** 2nd Para

Issue: 3.3.1 Form the IPT

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Wouldn't existing views for current systems that may be part of the new capability come out of MODAR or from within the Acquisition COI if MODAF is still immature

Evidence: Extant systems can be part of new capabilities

User's Proposed Solution: Amend as relevant

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed to "Any MODAF Views created relating to the system so far (for example the URD Views) "

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 14 **Section:** 3.3.1

Issue: Standardisation Officer

Category: Other

Description: The third para of this section introduces a Standardisation Officer, it is not clear where this role fits is it within FBG, the IA or within the IPT or even within the Customer 1 community.

Evidence: What is the evidence for the issue.

User's Proposed Solution: If you have a suggestion for solving the problem please put it here.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Added 'for the IPT' to make this clearer.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 14 **Section:** 3.3.1

Issue: Forming the IPT

Category: Minor Technical

Description: Previous draft referred to specific views which support the formation of new IPTs. This material has been lost from the new draft.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Be specific as to which views assist with the identification as to whether a new IPT is required.

References:

Review Board Decision: Re-word the paragraph relating to the IPT receiving information from Customer 1 to include the possibility that in the future the IPT might also receive Views from FBG; programmatic or cluster governance organisations; and/or AfNEC.

Action: Paragraph added to describe future possible sources of information as per Review Board decision.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 14 **Section:** 3.3.1

Issue: Standardisation Officer (SO)

Category: Procedural

Description: The SO tends to be a role rather than a individual post. We must be careful not to expand this role to cater for MODAF governance requirements and also remember that for small projects this would be a major overhead.

Evidence: What is the evidence for the issue.

User's Proposed Solution: If you have a suggestion for solving the problem please put it here.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 325

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 14 **Section:** 3.3.1 para 3

Issue: Standardisation Officer

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Is this in / referencable from the Acquisition Handbook?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Obtain reference

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: This was received from PDG Standardisation (David Ambler). Duplicate of issue ID 325

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 14 **Section:** 3.3.1 para 4

Issue: TV-1

Category: Major Editorial

Description: It seems unlikely to me that the only part of Form the IPT activity is based solely around standards? Develop an outline plan (AcV-2 update), AcV-1? Further develop scenarios / vignettes in OV series?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Consider further MODAF Activities in this Form the IPT stage

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 65

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 14 **Section:** 3.3.2

Issue: Initial Gate

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Initial Gate submission - has this process been mandated yet? Who has governance? Does not the IAB define whether the IA is consulted?MODAR will not have most systems at this timeWill the SV-1 exist at IG?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: This stems from Adrian's dislike of the IA - see issue ID 179.

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 14 **Section:** 4th para

Issue: 3.3.1 Form the IPT

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: TV-1 is stated to evolve throughout the CADMID cycle but this para only discusses what happens to it up to the end of the Acquisition phase. For roundedness, perhaps a brief mention of its life in Sustainment would be appropriate?

Evidence: NA

User's Proposed Solution: Amend as relevant

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed to discuss through-life

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 15 **Section:**

Issue: LoDs

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Inconsistent use of LoD/DLOD/DLoD etc

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: LoD was used throughout the document except for one instance of DLOD, which has now been changed.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 15 **Section:**

Issue: AcV2

Category: Major Editorial

Description: DLoDs - can only see status not maturityShows where to look for potential risk, cannot analyse AcV2 for risks themselves.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: The maturity can be seen as more of the LoDs turn green, this indicates the increasing maturity through time. At the early Stages of the lifecycle, the LoDs will mostly not be planned to be green, and the plan will show more and more of them turning green through time, thus showing the maturity. It is not just current status that is shown, but planned status, hence the maturity of the project can be derived from this planned status indicator. Text has been added to explain this further, though for the detail the reader will still need to refer to the Handbook.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 15 **Section:**

Issue: URD Development

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Refers to 'section above describing URD development' - this does not exist

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed to refer to Customer 1 Deskbook and URD Reference Guide.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 15 **Section:** 2nd para

Issue: 3.3.2 Initial Gate

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: There is no section on URD deelopment above this section

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Take out 'above' and replace with 'below' or 'see section 3.4.1'

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed to refer to Customer 1 Deskbook and URD Reference Guide.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 15 **Section:** 3.3.2

Issue: terminology

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: refernces an explanation elsewhere in the doc but no guide as to where

Evidence: line 4 - see section above describing URD dev.)

User's Proposed Solution: include para reference

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed to refer to Customer 1 Deskbook and URD Reference Guide.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 15 **Section:** 3.3.2

Issue: Terminology

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: If the first ref to Ovs and SVs should be spelt out in full also

Evidence: line 7 - eg through OV2 and SV1

User's Proposed Solution: First ref include in full

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed to read through Operational View OV-2 and System View SV-1

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 15 **Section:** 3.3.3

Issue: Manage dependency risks

Category: Procedural

Description: The 3rd para states that the StV-5 Capability to Systems Deployment mapping may not be available. If this is not available it could introduce risk to the programme through differing understandings of the deployment.

Evidence: When a programme commences the Customer 1 makes an assessment of what is required, what will be deployed and where the shortfall in capability is. If thsi is not documentsed and maintained under configuration control, when the Customer 1 staff change the understanding is lost, and when reviews are carried out there will be disagreement as to what the baseline was.

User's Proposed Solution: remove the text "(if available from Customer 1)"

References:

Review Board Decision: There are several Views that, especially during the initial implementation of MODAF, will be useful to an organisation or community but are not being produced by any other community. In this case, the community that wishes to use the View will need to obtain the information pertaining to that View and generate it itself. MODAF is not intended to change existing processes, and so can not force a community to create a View if that community has no use for it, or does not see the benefit in doing so.

Action: Text added to indicate that if StV-5 is not available from Customer 1, the IPT is at liberty to create the View themselves should it be useful to them, as per Review Board discussion.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 15 **Section:** 3.3.3

Issue: Manage dependency risks

Category: Minor Technical

Description: Many of the dependencies and risks that a project must manage are internal to it. The text is ambiguous in that it appear to be referring to all dependencies and risks.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Remove ambiguity

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed to refer to dependency risks for clarity

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 15 **Section:** 3.3.3 para 2

Issue: Dependencies in AcV-2

Category: Minor Technical

Description: What level of dependency are we looking at? When were they set? Which DLoDs were affected? Plus there are no examples on the diagram shown

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Change

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: New AcV-2 has been added showing all Lines of Development. Annotation added to highlight the dependencies.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 15 **Section:** Figure 3-5

Issue: AcV-2 SoS Acquisition Programmes

Category: Other

Description: This view introduces LoD Hexagon, which has 6 lines

Evidence: The NEC LoD in the AMS has 8 lines, there needs to be consistant.

User's Proposed Solution: Modify the diagram

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 35

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 15 **Section:** Figure 3-5

Issue: AcV-2 representation

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: no. of LoD's

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Update as before (previous Editorial Board has determined way ahead).

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 35

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 15 **Section:** Figure 3-5

Issue: Line of Development

Category: Minor Technical

Description: More lines of development may exist. Diagram doesn't display clearly.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Revise representation of LOD. Use darker colours for lines and larger font sizes.

References: This issue has arisen in an earlier product review.

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 35

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 15 **Section:** NA

Issue: Figure 3-5

Category: Major Editorial

Description: This figure needs to be reworked to show the 8 LODs and not 6 as currently represented.

Evidence: This has been commented on by a number of COIs and the example needs updating

User's Proposed Solution: All deskbooks using this should be updated, and a new version developed for insertion into the Technical Handbook

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 35

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 15 **Section:** section 3.3.3

Issue: Value of OV-5 in risk reduction

Category: Major Technical

Description: I am unable to see from the text how OV-5 from the URD will help identify risks of changing the procurement scope. Wouldn't OV-1/ OV-2 (as 'top of the tree' URD views) be more helpful àas they show the dependency and complexity of the requirement?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Consider using OV-1/2 instead

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: OV-5 shows all the activities and usages shown at a high-level in the OV-1 and OV-2. I would suggest that Ovs-1/2 are at far too high a level of detail to be useful in risk analysis, and the increased information and detail in OV-5 is necessary for showing the risks. The importance of OV-5 will be brought out in the Worked Example.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 15 and throughout **Section:** Throughout

Issue: Acquisition Handbook

Category: Major Technical

Description: Have we done our own cross-check against the Acquisition Handbook? Have we asked for a reciprocal reference in their next edition?Also have we informed the NEC booklet producers what we would like in their next edition? We may wish to consider getting a SoS / MODAF sheet in the next edition of the good practice guide to project management.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Cross-check potential MODAF activities (from our internal knowledge - possibly beyond IPT level) against those that are undertaken / recommended by the Acq Handbook. We can then determine what is useful for them now or in the future. For example, in their words 'Form the IPT' isn;t the only thing that happens in Concept Stage before initial gate, it also talks about trade offs

References:

Review Board Decision: This is something for the MODAF Project Board to discuss how to take forwards and engage with these other communities.

Action: Action has been Closed in relation to the Acquisition Deskbook and is to be taken forwards by the IA and the MODAF Project Board as per the Review Board Decision.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 16 **Section:**

Issue: Greater level of detail on interoperability

Category: Major Technical

Description: Page 16 seems to me to be an inadequate specification of what is required to ensure interoperability.

Evidence: For example, there is no mention of data standards and use of OV-7, etc

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: The assurance process is still being defined. As discussed at the Review Board, this will need to reference IOCA once their process is clearer. In the meantime, a footnote has been added to contact the IA for further information regarding IOCA assurance.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 16 **Section:** 3.3.4 para 2

Issue: Main Gate Scenario checks

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Would we be now hoping these are checked against the original scenarios? Should this get a mention?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: For consideration

References:

Review Board Decision: This is part of the IOCA process - MODAF needs to align with IOCA ensuring that they understand the use of MODAF in their assurance checks.
Once the IOCA process is available it will need to be cross-referenced in the Acquisition Deskbook.

Action: To be taken forward initially by IOCA, in defining their processes, as per Review Board Decision

Status: On Hold **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 16 **Section:** 3.3.5

Issue: Contracting for development

Category: Major Technical

Description: While accepting the SRD will be the key vehicle for specifying the MOD's capability need to contractors, this paragraph could usefully refer to the role of the high-level specification model (views from which will illuminate the SRD). It should be a contractual requirement for contractors to provide a lower-level specification model (with agreed changes to the MOD's higher level specification model) describing the technical capabilities they propose to build in advance of implementation.

Evidence: This would aid the IA to do the technical assurance activities referred to elsewhere as well as encouraging the wider use of models to shape development (under MOD control). Experience shows that the SRD is typically not sufficiently unambiguous to provide a specification for implementation purposes.

User's Proposed Solution: See above (the provision of the model itself is the only way to meet the objectives set out in this paragraph, the SRD is not sufficient since it will only contain a partial set of views and not the underlying models themselves)

References: The above seems consistent with the spirit of 3.6.3

Review Board Decision: This is the same as issue ID 7, and so will be resolved in the same manner.

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 7.

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 16 **Section:** 3.3.6

Issue: Wind Down IPT

Category: Major Editorial

Description: What is the relevance of MODAF to Wind Down of the IPT?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: The IPT Programme or Project Manager needs to ensure that the architecture remaining in MODAR reflects the state left after disposal of the system, so that MODAR accurately reflects the overall systems landscape remaining

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 16 **Section:** 3.3.6

Issue: Wind down the IPT activities

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Disposal is an Acquisition Process? Development of how to deal with it is, but actioning it isn't necessarily

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Probably endlessy debatable!

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: It was agreed in the Acquisition workshops that the Acquisition deskbook should cover the entire CADMID cycle right through to disposal

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 17 **Section:**

Issue: URD

Category: Procedural

Description: DEC owns the URD but rarely develop it. Need to take account of this.No authority to reference DCBM(A) URD guide. This has not been agreed wider than DCBM(A).Figure 3.7 implies that the URD is substantionally changed up until the demonstration phase. There should be a set of baselined views to support the URD, a second set of views should be developed to support the SRD.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Agreed at the Review Board that changes to the Customer 1 process will be outside the scope of the Acquisition Deskbook - this will be covered in the Worked Example showing the importance of OV-5. The Acquisition Deskbook can not change what another CoI has committed to delivering for MODAF. DCBM(A) have given authorisation to reference their document.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 17 **Section:**

Issue: Figure 3.6

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Misleading diagram. What value does it add? No SV-5 shown but referred to in later text.Reorder paragraphs in section 3.4 to have URD and SRD before maintaining the linkage

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Produce SRD before 'Maintaining the linkage'

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Figure to be changed to include process. Will make clearer the section order too. Diagrams have now been upated in the Deskbook.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 17 **Section:** 3.4

Issue: List on page 17

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: The items "URD" and "SRD" are not activities.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Suggest changing to something like "develop and maintain SRD",",14th July,,"Open

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: changed as per suggestion

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 17 **Section:** 3.4.1

Issue: references to other docs

Category: Minor Technical

Description: This ref to the DCBM(A) guide at this point implies some provenance above any ref in the AMS

Evidence: last para mentions view usage in URDs described in DCBM(A) URD guide

User's Proposed Solution: It might be better placed to put the whole DCBM(A) ref (with link) as a footnote if it is specifically MODAF views but not an authorised MODAF product.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed to footnote

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 17 **Section:** Figure 3-6

Issue: Mapping views to documents

Category: Minor Technical

Description: This figure shows how views contribute to documents such as the SRD. This is good but the same information could also be tabulated somewhere for reference so it is all in one place and not spread out.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Add table to this deskbook or another appropriate document.

References:

Review Board Decision: Whilst this is fairly well-defined for the Customer 1 and Acquisition Deskbooks, it would not be possible to include the other Deskbooks, as they contain more input Views. Some Views (for example OV-1) can be used and created by many communities for many different purposes.
The Quick Start guides may help provide this information.

Action: Not to be undertaken as not possible due to diverse nature of View creation and usage (potentially every community could create every View for their own purposes), as per Review Board Decision.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 17 **Section:** Figure 3-6

Issue: Clarity

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Expand URD out as SRD was done for clarity of diagram overlay

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Update

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Diagrams have now been upated in the Deskbook.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 18 **Section:** 3.4.2

Issue: Linkages

Category: Procedural

Description: SV-5 manages the linkages between the operational activities and the system functions. Linkages between URD and SRD are managed in a requirements management tools. I can see where you are coming from but the way it is stated is going to upset many of the established requirements managers who use DOORS

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: State that the SV5 links operational activities and system functions and include the statement about DOORs at the same time rather than at the end of the section

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed last paragraph to appear at start of the section

Status: closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 18 **Section:** 3.4.2

Issue: SV-5 use

Category: Major Editorial

Description: SV-5 maintains the linkage between the URD views and the SRD view, not explicitly betwwen the URD and SRD

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Reword

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed to refer to URD and SRD Views

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 18 **Section:** 3.4.2 para 2

Issue: Clarity of advice

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: It is possible - but do I need to do it / want to do it? Why should I do it?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Remember they should be building models from which the information is derived - they aren't building views per se; they just end up with them. They should then get both these views anyway? Perhaps we make this clearer in the 6 step process?

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Footnote added to reference the fact that the SV-5 data should be automatically updated as data in the model is changed.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 18 **Section:** Figure 3-7

Issue: Mandated StV-6

Category: Minor Technical

Description: Given that StV-6 requires a list of activities, how can it be possible to generate an StV-6 without first generating an OV5 albeit at a high level? OV5 is not mandated until Main Gate

Evidence: MoDAF Handbook

User's Proposed Solution: Mandate OV5 in the Concept stage

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: The importance of OV-5 will be brought out in the Worked Example. This can not at this point in time be changed in the Acquisition Deskbook, without first being updated in the Customer 1 Deskbook with agreement from Customer 1.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 18 **Section:** Figure 3-8

Issue: Immature URDs

Category: Major Technical

Description: OV 5s generate functional requirements at URD level. A URD should be chilled (should have minor changes only) by Initial gate. Without this essential behavioural modelling the URD will be full of gaps and loaded with solution.

Evidence: Business Use Case modelling is widely used by the software industry for the purposes of requirements engineering at this level.

User's Proposed Solution: Mandate OV5 in the Concept stage

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue 326. To be discussed with the Customer 1 community as outside the scope of the Acquisition Deskbook.

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 18 - 24 **Section:** 3.4

Issue: Requirements General

Category: Minor Technical

Description: Because of the ECC reluctance to mandate most of the key operational views, almost all of mandated views are going to be the responsibility of the system requirements team. This is likely to cause concern to IPTs and may discredit MoDAF due to the significant amount of work it entails at this often politically charged stage

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Mandate the Operational views to the ECC

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 326

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 18 , 30 **Section:** 3.4.1 and fig

Issue: terminology

Category: Major Technical

Description: Fig 3.7 and fig 3-23 use the rejected terminology 'mandated' 'recommended'

Evidence: also appears throughout text

User's Proposed Solution: replace with the agreed terminology - Essential, Highly Desirable and Desirable if appropriate. - the guide cannot mandate (yet)

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: These have already been changed.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 18,20, 22, 24, 30, 31 **Section:** figures on

Issue: drawings - generally

Category: Major Editorial

Description: the text is either too small / blurred or diagram overall too small to be legible and add value

Evidence: on all pages as detailed

User's Proposed Solution: increase drwg size or font size to ensure legibility

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: As decided at Review Board, drawings have been added to an annex in large-scale, such that the contextual representation is in the right place in the document, but then a larger version can be easily read if so desired.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 19 **Section:**

Issue: System Viewpoints

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: What is meant by experimentation? Could lead to interpretation that involves solutioneeringOV5 is not mandated at this point yet is said to provide a key input

Evidence: What is the evidence for the issue.

User's Proposed Solution: If you have a suggestion for solving the problem please put it here.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: The importance of OV-5 will be brought out in the worked example. This is a source of disagreement between Customer 1 and Acquisition, and will not be resolved for MODAF 1.0.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 19 **Section:** 3.3

Issue: Use cases Anlysis in support of OV5

Category: Procedural

Description: Having seen the review board comments for the handbook I note that use cases are going to be removed as they can be covered by activity diagrams; however the metamodel will be modified to support them. Use cases are a quick and structured way of gathering behavioural information and presenting it to SMEs for review (SME time is nearly always limited). Following SME validation we then develop UML activity diagrams. This will reduce the time spent with SMEs and prevent rework of activity diagrams which can be a significant overhead.

Evidence: See review board decision for Use Cases for OV5 in MoDAF Handbook to indicate that M3 will handle use cases.

User's Proposed Solution: Sugest this method in the text.

References: Issue log Pre Baseline Version 1.0 14th July 2005

Review Board Decision:

Action: Use Cases will be used as examples, as provided by Robbie, in the Worked Example section. This should make the point that they are valid ways of representing Views.
This should be answered now in the Worked Example section

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 2 **Section:** NA

Issue: Record of Changes

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Update table to reflect recent revisions on 13 Jul

Evidence: Not present

User's Proposed Solution: update

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Draft number only increases with issue - last issue was 0.3 therefore this is 0.4

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 20 **Section:**

Issue: SRD Development

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Phrase 'At this stage' - what stage are we talking aboutWhat is the term 'Procurement boundaries' supposed to mean, and how is it defined by the key external interfaces?How does the SV1 show the relationship to ConOps?How does it show interdependencies?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed 'At this stage' to read 'Prior to Main Gate'
Removed reference to procurement boundaries (identification of closely coupled functions to be procured together, and loosely coupled functions that may be tendered for separately).
The SV1 relates to Conops as it will get the needlines from the conops as to what information is needed where. Added 'through identification of the information needlines' to explain this further.
It shows interdependencies as each needline denotes an interface. This has been described through

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 20 **Section:**

Issue: SV2 Use

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Should SV2 be defined as key, as this implies they are mandated. For the majority of projects, these go to too low a level for SRD development

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Reword

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: SV-2 was agreed with the CoI workshop to be a candidate for mandation as its Views are essential for interoperability. The worked example shows how these are being used in the FRES SRD which should then close this issue.
This is covered now in the Worked Example.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 22 **Section:**

Issue: Figure 3-15

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: The figure caption has overrun onto the next page

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: edit

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Corrected

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 22 **Section:**

Issue: Network Analysis and System Design

Category: Major Editorial

Description: If you are doing network analysis, you may need SV2 views, so mention theseOV3 is not mandated before MG, too late to use to populate SV6 SV6 should be stated by the customer not the supplierThese views imply the system is being designed before the SRD is developed

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: The URD Views mandated by Main Gate will still need to be completed before the SRD. This is one of the areas to be resolved between the Customer 1 and Acquisition communities - however this is an MOD process issue (when will the finalised URD be available for the IPT to commence the SRD) not one to be resolved by the Deskbook. SV-6 and all the SRD Views will need OV-3 and all the URD Views before they can be completed.
SV-6 will be stated by the customer in the SRD. This may then be taken by the supplier and increased in

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 22 **Section:**

Issue: IA Services

Category: Major Technical

Description: Selling the IA again. We do not know MODAR will be available.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision: The IA Services already exist and can be called on. DPA policy states that the IA must be engaged for interoperability analysis by every IPT.
The Repository already exists and can be accessed through the IA. This is to be made clear in the Deskbooks.
There needs to be a clearer explanation of what MODAR is and how to use it - this will be referenced in the MODAF capping paper.

Action: IA Service and MODAR status clarified as per Review Board Decision.
See also issue IDs 136, 132, 167 and 152.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 23 **Section:** 2nd para

Issue: SRD

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Re draft opening sentence

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Suggest replacing with "Finally, refining the TV-1 is essential during SRD development to define the system constraints and to ensure the system conforms to the standardsà.etc.",",2005-07-19,,"Open

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 23 **Section:** 3.4.4

Issue: StV2 Gibberish

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Para 2 is poorly worded.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Footnote added to explain that StV-2 can contain performance attributes, and reference to the Technical Handbook should further information be required. Every Capability Object has attributes and metrics associated with it that may be populated and so used to provide acceptance criteria when confirming the Capability has been delivered.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 23 **Section:** 3.4.4

Issue: SRD misuse

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Para 3 (SV7) should read ITEAP for second use of SRD

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 23 **Section:** 3.4.4 para 1

Issue: Positivity about the IA

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: It may also be useful to liaise with the IA

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: No - it WILL be useful. Or if you aren't as sure: 'If information is required to assist development of the ITEAP it will be usefulà.'

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: changed to 'will be useful'

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 23 **Section:** 3.4.4 para 7

Issue: SV-7 and ITEAP

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: In the ITEAP not SRD?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Edit

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 23 **Section:** 3.4.5

Issue: Acceptance

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Acceptance is part of ITEA and so should not be a separate section

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Section on Acceptance removed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 23 **Section:** 3rd para

Issue: SRD

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: use of words " level of detail emerging regarding the the data","Suggest replacing with "à.to reflect the increased level of detail regarding the data and information exchanges emerging during the SRD development, althoughà.",",2005-07-19,,"Open

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 24 **Section:**

Issue: Figure 3-17

Category: Major Editorial

Description: What does the diagram give? Implies only do SV9,SV8 and TV1 if doing Systems/Technology.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Diagrams have now been upated in the Deskbook.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 24 **Section:** 3.4.5 para 2

Issue: CRD

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: CRD comes in cold here. Reader needed warming up to it.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Edit

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Not sure how to 'warm up' to CRD therefore this para has been removed to avoid confusion.

Status: closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 24 **Section:** Section 3.4.5

Issue: Expansion on explanation

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Paragraphs don't provide much depth of explanation on their own. Specifically last one - OV-6 is mentioned, but doesn't form part of URD or SRD views. It is difficult to see how these views are used in acceptance from text.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Expand final paragraph to explain how views are used in test cases, especially OV-6 not previously created in URD/SRDExplicitly link the views mentioned in section 3.4.5 back to URD/SRD respectively so their uses can be referenced

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Acceptance paragraph has been removed as per comment from DCSA - this section duplicated that in the ITEAP section.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 25 **Section:** 3rd para of

Issue: 3.5.1

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: remove the "-" which follows short and medium in the opening sentence of this para

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Replace with " ...short, medium and long-term.",",2005-07-19,,"Open

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: short-, medium- and long-term is the correct grammatical way of writing this, other than 'short-term, medium-term and long-term' which would be too long-winded.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 25 **Section:** Figure 3-18

Issue: SV-9 / TV-2 periods of time

Category: Minor Technical

Description: We need to consider whether these need standardising in anyway

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: For consideration

References:

Review Board Decision: Make it clear that the timeframe shown in the diagram (short term = 0-6mths, medium term = 6-12mths, long term = 12mths+) are examples only, and that the architect can define his/her own timeframes depending on the content of the architecture. This could be in a footnote to the diagram.

Action: Footnote added to this effect.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 25 **Section:** Section 3.5.1

Issue: Options, AcV-1/2

Category: Major Technical

Description: Wouldn't AcV-1 and 2 form a key part of the procurement options side of this process ...in terms of structuring and scheduling options? If AcV-1 is not used here, then I am concerned that it is not a valid view in the overall MODAF viewpoint suite.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Maybe the 'procurement options' activity can be added to the Project Management workstream if the focus on Systems/Technology is the reason that AcV-1 is missing here? For Consideration

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 65

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 26 **Section:** 3.5.1

Issue: SO Role and Industry

Category: Procedural

Description: Last para - should we be allowing industry to determine future standards in our architectures? Will the typical SO be able to carry out this role - this is a specialist job carried out centrally.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Added " in so far as they relate to the system manged by this IPT" to be clearer that this is a specific monitoring activity for this piece of technology and not a general overarching role.
PDG Standardisation confirmed that SOs do carry out this role, and this activity came from their workshop representative, therefore using PDGs version as the more authoritative.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 26 **Section:** 3.5.1 para 7

Issue: TV-1 / TV-2

Category: Minor Technical

Description: Work is being undertaken as part of JSP602 series to develop high-level TV-1 / TV-2 these could be used as a filter mechanism?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Need to check whether we could mention this yet?

References:

Review Board Decision: There is a requirement on the assurance team as to how they apply parts of TV-1 / TV-2.
There should be a family of overarching TV-1s covering, for example, IT standards, health & safety, etc.
The IPT will then be able to filter these constraints to those relevant for their system, and add their own where appropriate.

Action: Added paragraph explaining future vision for a family of Technical Views.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 26 **Section:** 3.5.2

Issue: Misleading use of OV3, SV1

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Wording saying the OV3 and SV1 can show how IERs are met at the physical level is incorrect - debate

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: This is a point for further discussion - SV-1 shows physical pieces of kit and how they need to connect, which is the meaning here. Wording has been changed to reduce ambiguity.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 27 **Section:** 3.6. para 1

Issue: Sustainment definition

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: I suspect this is a point of debate as well, however, carrying out any agreed upgrades or improvementsonce the system is in the In-Service stage (earlier we alluded to this as Sustain). So can we at least be crystal clear on the differences?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Edit

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Both 'Technology Insertion' and 'Carry out agreed upgrade' sections now refer to changes going through Customer 1.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 27 **Section:** 3.6.1

Issue: Procurement strategy

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Refer to 'initial procurement strategies' . Can be read to imply industry defines our overall strategy for procurement. Do you mean a technical strategy?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: This text is taken straight from the Smart Acquisition Handbook, therefore should be discussed with Smart Acquisition team: not a MODAF issue.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 27/28 **Section:** last

Issue: Wording

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Second sentence "For example, industry opions on the practicalityà" is too long

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Suggest fragmenting sentence for clarity

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 27-28 **Section:**

Issue: OV1c requirement

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Make clear when you are involving Industry. Process for showing industry OV1c prior to formalising the requirement could lead to solutioneering by industry or a downgrading of the requirement.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision: The Deskbook should align with the process of early industry involvement, but acknowledge that not all IPTs will follow the process, by indicating that these are the Views that help involvement, should the IPT wish to do so.

Action: Added the sentence "This section describes the Views that are useful in early Industry involvement, should an IPT wish to engage with Industry during the early Stages of Acquisition." to make it clear that this is not a policy document, but is providing the tools should the IPT wish to use them, as per the Review Board Decision.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 28 **Section:** Figure 3-20

Issue: Use of OV-1b

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Description needs to be in - new OV-1b (free text as agreed)

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Edit

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: OV-1b has been added to the Deskbook

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 28 **Section:** First

Issue: Wording order

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Paragraph "The Operational Viewpoint is particularly usefulà" - this is mentioned having already discussed OV-1c above.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Suggest an intro to the Operational Viewpoint first and then talk about views in sequence - OV-1 followed by OV-2.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 28 **Section:** section 3.6

Issue: Typo

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: First bullet refers to 'Initial Industry Involvement'. This differs from the revised process diagram and the section heading 3.6.1

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Make naming consistent

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Removed word 'Initial'

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 29 **Section:** Section 3.6.5

Issue: Upgrades & improvements

Category: Major Technical

Description: I can't see that SV-2 would spawn upgrades anymore than using SV-1, OV-3 or SV-7 as support to some kind of ongoing C2 analysis of capability performance ...and therefore I question its individual merit as a mapped view

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Suggest that this section omitts SV-2, but retains reference to C1 views and TLMP views. Also, add explicit reference to TLMP section for clarity.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Removed reference to SV-2. TLMP already referenced.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 3.5.1 **Section:**

Issue: What process?

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Para says 'undertaking of this process' - what process?StV3 may be provided by customer 1, is not mandated.SV9 - who maintains this? Should it be a central view maintained as part of the research programme? Same for TV2

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: The process is that defined in this section. Diagrams have now been upated in the Deskbook to show the process, which should make this clearer.
StV-3 is essential for Customer 1 according to the Customer 1 Deskbook, meaning it is recommended for mandation (nothing is mandated as yet).
It is yet to be finalised who will be responsible for updating SV-9 and TV-2, but it is likely that it will be similar to the TV-1 where a family of Views will be looked after by appropriate authorities within MOD. This

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 30 **Section:**

Issue: Figure 3.23

Category: Major Editorial

Description: How can an SV9 be produced before the concept phase, unless it's a centrally maintained view, in which case the Acquisition community will not need to produce it.SV8 cannot be produced

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Is the intention to show the documents should be initiated at project startup? If so, change diagram to show this

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Added wording as perviously to describe the central maintanence longer term.
SV-8 will need to be produced for Whole Life Costing prior to Initial Gate.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 30 **Section:** NA

Issue: 3.6.5

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Remove additional line space between sections 3.6.5 and 3.7

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: edit

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 31 **Section:**

Issue: Wording

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Para 1 sentence 1 is not English.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed "The Through-Life Management Plan (TLMP) is initiated during the Concept Stage, and revised and refined throughout CADMID cycle, as shown in Figure 3 23 below" to "The Through-Life Management Plan (TLMP) is initiated during the Concept Stage, and is revised and refined throughout the CADMID cycle, as shown in Figure 3 23 below"

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 31 **Section:** 3.7.1

Issue: TV use

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Wording should be that the TLMP must/will make reference to the TV1 and possibly 2.

Evidence: What is the evidence for the issue.

User's Proposed Solution: If you have a suggestion for solving the problem please put it here.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 31 **Section:** 3.7.2

Issue: Figure 3.25

Category: Major Editorial

Description: If we are saying that ILS is important, we should be mandating OV1c and what information it contains i.e the 'ility' attributes

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: OV-1c is proposed for mandation by virtue of it being Essential in the Deskbook. The Deskbook has no authority to mandate anything, only to propose candidates for mandation, which will be picked up in the MODAF policy paper (to be written). Any policy is outside the scope of the Deskbook.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 31 **Section:** figure 3-25

Issue: Diagram usage

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: This is the same as Figure 3-21, elsewhere we have not repeated diagrams for ease of reading - here we have - consistency.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Edit

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Not quite the same as here it is showing how it is used for sustainability, rather than showing straightforward performance, attributes.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 31 **Section:** Section 3.7.2

Issue: OV-5 value

Category: Minor Technical

Description: Would ILS activity really use OV-5 alone? ...without also using OV-1a/b to give them the context of the whole picture?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Suggest OV-5 is ommitted, or used in conjunction with OV-1a/b

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: OV-5 shows how the system will actually be used, whereas OV-1 is too high level to really be of use in planning logistics. The Worked Example might help highlight the importance of OV-5.
Worked Example hangs around the creation of the OV-5, hopefully thi has answered this query.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 32 **Section:**

Issue: Blank Page

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Why a blank page?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Removed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 32 **Section:** None

Issue: Blank page

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: This looks like a document formatting problem.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Amend format to avoid blank page.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Removed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 34 **Section:** para 5

Issue: refernces

Category: Major Technical

Description: names a person as a reference

Evidence: document maintenance

User's Proposed Solution: delete the reference to the Project manager as the project ends in Aug 05. The poc (at the moment) is EC CCII Cap Strat at Main Building.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 5 **Section:** 1

Issue: What is MODAF intro

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: conducting enterprise architecture - does not make sense.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: conducting or undertaking Enterprise Architecture activties?

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 5 **Section:** 2.1

Issue: Introduction update

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: An additional paragraph has been added after Figure 2-1 to describe the views

Evidence: Customer 1/2 Deskbook

User's Proposed Solution: Edit as proposed

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Added

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 5 **Section:** 2.1

Issue: What is MODAF

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: The purpose ascribed to MODAFseems to miss the point in that it provides a framework within which to integrate the elements necessary to develop a capability.

Evidence: 1st para

User's Proposed Solution: Suggest redraft 1st para - draw upon existing and accepted material

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Wording added to first paragraph.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 5 **Section:** 2.1

Issue: Fig 2.1

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: The inclusion of "All Views" is confusing

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Remove

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: All Views need to be included, as we are recommending that they be completed for every architecture.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 5 **Section:** 2.1

Issue: CSISCCE3

Category: Major Technical

Description: Benefits at bottom of page all depend on AF maturity. Sect 3.1.3 (Page 11) states that URDs, etc. will initially be used, but acknowledges some will be missing or incomplete. If such documents are to be backfilled (i.e. they are incomplete at the cycle start), and changes are only published when complete, there is no mandate to integrate with others during that cycle. Consequently, changes will occur that should have been shared with others earlier in the process; wrong assumptions will be made and worked upon by other IPTs and the cycle will be flawed.

Evidence: What is the evidence for the issue.

User's Proposed Solution: What needs to appear is a methodology to control the process and ensure some consistency.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: This is outside the scope of the Deskbook, and is more of an issue for MODAF Governance, covered in more detail in the MODAF Overview, and to be decided during the implementation phase. This issue is therefore closed in relation to the Acquisition Deskbook as it is out-of-scope.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 6 **Section:** 2.2.1

Issue: Specialist support

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Can we add in that it is also about where to obtain specialist support / expertise on architectures (will keep IA bods happier)

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: As left

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Added

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 6 **Section:** 2.2.2

Issue: MODAF Executive Summary Diagram

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: What is the MODAF Technical Handbook referred to in the figure 2.2? Also refer to MODAF COI deskbooks, just called deskbooks in the text

Evidence: Is this the Handbook Volume 2?Consistancy of naming of deskbooks

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: The MODAF Technical Handbook is the document whose full title is 'Handbook Volume 2 Technical Specification for MODAF', abbreviated to MODAF Technical Handbook so as to fit on the diagram. Document number MODAF-M07-022.
There are five MODAF Community of Interest (COI) Deskbooks - the MODAF Acquisition Deskbook is one of these, the others are the MODAF Customer 1 Deskbook, the MODAF Concepts and Doctrine Deskbook, the MODAF Customer 2 Deskbook and the MODAF Sustainment Deskbook (with the generic COI being

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 6 **Section:** 2.2.2

Issue: References

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Please could we include references and sources for the documents quoted

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: References for all documents are now included

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 6 **Section:** 2.2.2

Issue: Product ID

Category: Minor Technical

Description: new product included called MODAF overview

Evidence: not part of the original product set

User's Proposed Solution: needs a product description, ref and review etc. -

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: MODAF Overview is currently under development and will be reviewed at the next Review Board.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 7 **Section:**

Issue: Acronym definition

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: What is a SOP, TTP etc?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Define all TLA's on first use

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Done

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 7 **Section:**

Issue: Definition of Capability Management

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Should not read 'Capability gaps'

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Should just read 'Capabilities'

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 7 **Section:**

Issue: Definition of Acquisition

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Whole phrasing is misleading. Acquisition should imply through life

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Could read: ' the development and fielding of new or enhanced military capabilities'

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: But this is describing the scope of the deskbook not the whole of acquisition. Therefore changed to "the Acquisition Process is concerned with the development and fielding of new or enhanced military capabilities. The Acquisition Deskbook scope focuses up to the acceptance into service of a fully operational capability. "

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 7 **Section:** 2.2.2

Issue: USe of term architectures

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Phrase 'expected to utilise MODAF architectures to support...' - in this context should this refer to views or products rather than architectures

Evidence: What is the evidence for the issue.

User's Proposed Solution: If you have a suggestion for solving the problem please put it here.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 150.

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 7 **Section:** 2.2.2

Issue: Name of Sustainment COI

Category: Minor Technical

Description: 2 references on this page (text and diagram) to Sustain COI. I wasn't aware that the Sustainment COI had been thus renamed

Evidence: What is the evidence for the issue.

User's Proposed Solution: If you have a suggestion for solving the problem please put it here.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed to sustainment

Status: closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 7 **Section:** 2.2.2 para 3

Issue: coverage and linkage

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: We say we do not describe all processes - should we make a statement about future activities / possibilities?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision: This is expanded on in the MODAF Overview document.

Action: Added footnote to point the reader to the overview document if they wish to know more.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 7 **Section:** 2.2.2/3

Issue: CSISCCE3

Category: Other

Description: Figure 2-3 identifies the 5 COIs & their scopes, this is fine, however, there is no explanation of which COIs/stakeholders are responsible for production & ownership of which MODAF views.

Evidence: What is the evidence for the issue.

User's Proposed Solution: A highlevel diagram (or table) of COI/stakeholder group and their responsibility for the production & maintenance of the relevant views.

References:

Review Board Decision: This is the same as issue ID 214, and so will be resolved in the same manner.

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 214.

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 7 **Section:** Figure 2-3

Issue: Position with SEMP

Category: Major Editorial

Description: We make no reference to the SEMP throughout the entire documentation - this was menat to be a very useful document within the Acquisition Community

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Make references to SEMP and SoS approach.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Reference to SEMP has now been added in Project Management section, with reference out to the IA SoS SEMP as an example document.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 7 **Section:** Figure 2-3

Issue: Context

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Update figure to reflect rewording of Capability Mgmt

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Insert new figure

References: See updated Customer 1 Deskbook

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 7 **Section:** Here but

Issue: Glossary of terms

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: As before - convention is to describe acronyms in full at first usage (we still have a glossary of terms aswell).

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: As left.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: As far as aware acronyms are all described at first usage. Any I have missed please highlight.

Status: closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 8 **Section:**

Issue: Customer 2 definition

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Customer 2 is not just Front Line Commands

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Possibly use ' the planning and conducting of operational activities including core leadership...'

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 8 **Section:**

Issue: Section 4 definition

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Have already said this document is for Acqusition - refer to Acquisition rather than CADMID. DO we also mean a real-life worked example rather than architecture.Where are the documents referred to i.e. quick start guides

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: The document is for the Acquisition community, and as such relates to the CADMID lifecycle processes. The real-life worked example will be clearer once it is in place, it will be from the FRES pilot. An initial set of Views have been delivered for inclusion. This has now been included, and hopefully will answer this query.
Documents referred to are under development but references will be added - see issue ID 53 for progress on addition of document references.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 8 **Section:** 2.2.3

Issue: Ambiguity

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: The first sentence is ambigous in that it is not clear that the following text applies to this deskbook.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Remove ambiguity

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 8 **Section:** 2.2.3

Issue: Access to documentation listed

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: It is not clear as to where the quick start giudes are available from.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Suggest putting in references and sources.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 53

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 8 **Section:** 2.2.3

Issue: Section 3 definition

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Part ' this section ....acqusition process' is misleading. Only the second half of this paragraph is demonstrated with the section

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Lose the first sentence

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 8 **Section:** 2.2.3

Issue: Product ID

Category: Major Technical

Description: reference to a number of quick start guides being available

Evidence: Project Management Guide, Reqt's guide etc

User's Proposed Solution: needs to explain where they can be found, authority etc

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 55

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 8 **Section:** 2.2.3 para 3

Issue: Quick Start Guides

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Ou est la 'Quick Start Guides'? References?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Add in references

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 55

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 8 **Section:** Figure 2-3 &

Issue: Introduction update

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Capability Management COI has been renamed the Customer 1 COI

Evidence: Customer 1 Deskbook

User's Proposed Solution: Edit as proposed

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9 **Section:**

Issue: Role of MODAR - Governance or Resource?

Category: Minor Technical

Description: This equally well applies to the 2C deskbook, being part of the common text which is destined to be moved into the MODAF overview.I just want to make sure that the following point is captured, having discussed it briefly with Jon.MODAR appears in the '6-step' diagram in the Governance row, but not in the resources row. However the content of MODAR is a resource. It is the change control process of verifying and checking what is added to it, that is a 'governance' activity

Evidence: What is the evidence for the issue.

User's Proposed Solution: Add MODAR to resource row in step 3. Cchange the current publication references to it in Steps 4 abd 6 to say 'Publish to MODAR, having checked for consistency with other architectures'

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: changed

Status: closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9 **Section:**

Issue: Refernce to All Views

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Para 3 recommends producing All Views.i) There is no expansion on what these are i.e supporting diagrams, as for all other defined viewsii) There is no refernce in the ECC Handbook , so why in the Acqusitioniii) Scaling of projects. Nowhere does it say how the size of a project influences the products required. This is a wider issue for all the handbooks.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Expand on AV definition using diagramsLook at where the AV should be started, linking with other deskbooksInvestigate MODAF process with regard to project size

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Reference added to point the reader to the MODAF View Overview document. This text will be common to all Deskbooks, therefore it is irrelevant that the first place it is published is the Acquistion Deskbook, it will be in the ECC (now Customer 1 Deskbook) as well in due course.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9 **Section:**

Issue: MODAR

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: MODAR should probably not be described as a tool of governance but an enabler

Evidence: Currently unknown how MODAR will feature in MODAF policy, e.g. whether the input from 'extant architecture data' shown under Step 3 in Figure 3-1 is a mandated part of the process (i.e. architects cannot start from blank sheet of paper).

User's Proposed Solution: Para below Fig 3-1 needs amendment (most statements about MODAR are correct however). The phrase 'Important that all new architectures are lodged with MODAR...' should be phrased 'Important that all new architecture are lodged with MODAR when they reach a suitable stage of maturity...' (there is a case for AV1 to be lodged at an earlier date).

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: MODAR now referred to as a resource

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9 **Section:** 3

Issue: Readability

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: We dive down two levels with no linking text. It does not help the user to understand the flow through the document.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Add some signposting at the beginning of Sections 3 and 3.1

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Section order has been changed to counter this problem

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9 **Section:** 3.1.1

Issue: Use of General Process diagram

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Figure 3.1 is not clear as to what it is trying to achieve. There is no key to help in understanding the symbols. Does position within a box indicate time sensitivity?Where are the resources available/allocated ie. tiger teams. How does it show the interactions with the key governance processesWhere is the MODAF Overview document - cannot publish a summary without the underlying reference

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Use a proper process diagram to show flows, provide a detailed key

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: As discussed in the Review Board, this detail will be provided in the MODAF Overview document. The Acquisition Deskbook has not yet been published, merely released for review. The latter part of this comment will be taken on board, and the MODAF Baseline 1.0 is not intended to be formally published until all the component parts are developed.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9 **Section:** 3.1.1

Issue: Product ID

Category: Minor Technical

Description: drawing needs explanation of some objects in content

Evidence: Central Reg?, Avail data sources, MODAF taxonomy

User's Proposed Solution: On separate pull out include reference to new objects

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 130

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9 **Section:** 3.1.1

Issue: product ID

Category: Minor Technical

Description: architecture dev process chart was designed as a pull-out.

Evidence: It appears here as an insert drawing fig 3.1

User's Proposed Solution: Provide as a pull out quick start guide as originally agreed for all deskbooksand where to be found.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 130

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9 **Section:** 3.1.1

Issue: AV-2

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: May be worth noting that the object dictionary can usually be generated from the description fields as the taxonomy is defined. Most tools provide the necessary functionality for this.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Note added

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9 **Section:** 3.1.1

Issue: MODAR References

Category: Major Technical

Description: MODAR is not available at present and therefore cannot support the process as detailed in para 2. Where is the full justification and requirement for MODAR?Para 2 does not address the configuration management and governance issues surrounding the reuse of architectural data

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Until MODAR is specified and funded, remove references or at least state this is a proposed future way forward

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: This stems from Adrian's dislike of the IA - see issue ID 179.

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9 **Section:** 3.1.1

Issue: Understanding of Figure 3-1

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: The symbology is not explained. It is not clear as to whether the User executes the six stage process in each of the CADMID cycles or not.

Evidence: Lack of a key to linking symbols to meaning.

User's Proposed Solution: Provide a key and describe application of stages to each elements of CADMID.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 130

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9 **Section:** 3.1.1

Issue: Role of the IA

Category: Major Editorial

Description: The description of the IA is useful, however some more information would be helpful to the reader.

Evidence: Short description.

User's Proposed Solution: Suggest asking one of Peter's chaps to expand upon the para, but not so much as to unbalance the text. If a greater amount of text is agreed as necessary, a new but short section would probably be appropriate.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: I think this has been covered by the expanded explanation of the IA Services and the current status of MODAR. If further information is required, the MODAF Overview is probably a more relevant place, rather than repeating this information in each Deskbook.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9 **Section:** 3.1.1. para 2

Issue: Definition of new in this context

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: We talk of new architectures only here, we could be referring to development of existing architectures

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Add further clarity

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9 **Section:** 3.1.1. para 3

Issue: Use of Avs

Category: Minor Technical

Description: AV's should be produced early in the architecting process (the IPT may even have been passed some contextual information from ECC.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: I think we need to imply that they already exist and that they are being updated / completed at this point before publishing?

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Added

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9 **Section:** Figure 3.1

Issue: General Process

Category: Procedural

Description: The way in which this is presented makes it look as if all projects must follow this process, it would cause a significant overhead for some smaller projects.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Tone down the text slightly and couch it in terms of things to think about.

References:

Review Board Decision: This is covered in the Overview document.

Action: No action necessary.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9 **Section:** Figure 3-1

Issue: Central Registry explanation

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: We refer to the 'Central Registry' here; but we have not described this yet in any detail,

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Perhaps this is an integral part of MODAR Services (would make writing deskbooks and the like easier). However tha activity is about informing the Chief Technical Architect body that you are about to undertake Architecture work.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: This will be expanded in the MODAF Overview, which will explain the architecting process in more detail. The Overview would therefore be the relevant place for this discussion, rather than the Deskbook.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9 **Section:** Figure 3-1

Issue: Readability

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: This is an example of a diagram whose readability is borderline and would benefit from enlargement or larger font size. Other diagrams in this deskbook have similar or worse legibility.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Enlarge font or alow more space. Other diagrams may metit similar treatment.

References: A common problem with other deskbooks, e.g. Customer 2.

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 209

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9 **Section:** Paragraph

Issue: Introduction update

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: MODAR now referred to as a resource

Evidence: Customer 1/2 Deskbook

User's Proposed Solution: Edit as proposed

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: 9, 11, 22 **Section:** 3.1.1, 3.1.3,

Issue: MoDAR

Category: Major Editorial

Description: The nature of MoDAR is not yet bottomed out. At the moment it is ISSE which is not MoDAF compliant and has significant issues regarding the exchange of architectural data and version control etc. A better solution in the future may be virtual repository.

Evidence: The differences between ISSE Metamodal & M3, White Paper Implementation Strategies for the MoDAF Taxonomy IA/02/16-ERMcm01

User's Proposed Solution: Be honest and talk about MoDAR with regards to the future of MoDAF and its aspirations.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 179

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: all **Section:**

Issue: Overall

Category: Major Technical

Description: The selection of mandated views are probably applicable to large scale projects. There is no guidance to scaling the architecture so it is relevant to smaller pieces of work.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Provide guidance to how much modelling should be undertaken for different types and scales of acquisition projects

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: This will be covered in the MODAF Overview Document.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: All **Section:** All

Issue: View Names

Category: Other

Description: The view name frequently accompanies the less meaningful short title. A good practise for which the product authors should be commended.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Keep up the good practise!

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action:

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: Cover page **Section:**

Issue: MOD Architectural Framework Acquisition Community of Interest Deskbook Draft 0.4 dated 6

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Update draft number and date (13 July 2005)

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Draft number will not be updated until next formal release (when it will be version 0.9)

Status: closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: General **Section:**

Issue: MODAF Processes

Category: Procedural

Description: There is a feeling of trying to shoehorn MODAF into AMS processes rather than looking for where MODAF can best be used to derive greatest benefit.

Evidence: MODAF views allow the projects to validate their processes giving a 'check and balance' against their documented outputs

User's Proposed Solution: Show how MODAF supports the 'check and balance' process

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Scope of MODAF for initial release, at least, is to support as-is processes rather than bring in new ways of working. Therefore MODAF will be closely aligned to AMS at least to start with.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: Many **Section:**

Issue: References to the IA

Category: Major Editorial

Description: The IA are not the only organisation that provide support to the MODAF initiative. This document assumes them taking control or contributing towards many key stages of the MODAF development process i.e MODAR control, services to the Acquisition community.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Remove references to the IA. For the handbook to be taken seriously, it needs to concentate on the Acqusition proceeses and MODAF.

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 179

Status: Duplicate **Refer to Review Board**

Page: N/A **Section:** N/A

Issue: Requirements development process diagram

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Comment applicable to acquisition process annex released after tranche 2 - URD view development sequence in 'requirements management annex' is of a different format to that used in Deskbook text - confusing

Evidence: Figure 3-7, page 18 shows sequence of mandation by phase - repeats mandated views at each phase. Process annex does not repeat mandated views at each phase

User's Proposed Solution: Align process annex with Figure 3-7 OR for Review Board to consider preferred representation - alternative would be to amend Figure 3-7 as process annex across deskbooks

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: I think the process diagram would be too crowded to repeat the Views all the way through - especially if it is to fit in the new format expanding on the workstream at the start of each section. Not sure it matters if two separate nomenclatures are used as the diagrams are showing different things - this diagram is to show when Views should be created, and the other to show which Views should be available.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: N/A **Section:** N/A

Issue: General

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Introduction of each Acquisition section needs to include diagram to link COI scope to Acquisition process

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Edit as proposed

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Diagram linking COI Scope to acquisition process is already in place. Process diagrams as per Customer 1 Deskbook are to be added
Diagrams have now been upated in the Deskbook.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: Page 15 **Section:** 3.3.2

Issue: No title

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: the fourth sub-para of 3.3.2 states, in parenthesis, "see section above describing URD development" - the paragraph is technically below, in para 3.4.1

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed to refer to Customer 1 deskbook and reference guide

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: Page 16 **Section:** 3.3.6

Issue: No title

Category: Major Editorial

Description: para 3.3.6, why is "architectural repository (MODAR)" used, as opposed to just putting "MODAR

Evidence: which has been explained

User's Proposed Solution: and used

References: earlier in the document (e.g. para 3.3.4)?"

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: Page 25 **Section:** Fig 3-18

Issue: No title

Category: Minor Technical

Description: Figure 3-18, I realise it's only an example table, but is there such a thing as a "thin screen CRT" as detailed in the External Environment, User Interface, Mid-Term box?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Example comes from the DoDAF Handbook. This will be updated with a MODAF example once one is available. In the meantime it is not possible to edit the picture due to the DoDAF Handbook formats.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: Page 26 **Section:** 3.5.1

Issue: No title

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: sub-paras 6 & 7 of para 3.5.1, as "TV-1 Technical Standards Profile" is written in full in para 6, surely, it's only necessary to put "TV-1" at the beginning of sub-para 7.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: Page 28 **Section:** 3.6.1

Issue: Con use explanation

Category: Major Editorial

Description: sub-par 6 ofá para 3.6.1, ConUse has been used, but not explained, earlier in the document i.e. in Figure 3-2 on p12.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Is now explained in the table in page 10.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: Page 7 **Section:**

Issue: No title

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: in the red circles, acquisition and sustain do not sound right. Surely it should be either, acquisition and sustainment, or acquire and sustain. Sustainment is used later in the document (p12). If a change is made then the definition underneath would need amending to read: Sustainment - the process of maintaining and upgrading

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Changed

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: Page 8 **Section:**

Issue: No title

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Although this document is aimed at the acquisition community, practically all of whom will understand the acronym CADMID, to conform to Service Writing, on first use, an acronym should be written in full with the acronym, in parenthesis, immediately following.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: Added

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: Page 9 **Section:**

Issue: No title

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Where it states "...required with the MODAF governance processes

Evidence: would "...required within the MODAF..." not read better?"

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision: 2005-07-12

Action: Interaction of Acquisition with the governance processes, not interaction within the governance processes themselves.

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**

Page: Section 3 **Section:** Section 3

Issue: Section 3 examples

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Still feel some examples need more description to understand the full context of diagrams

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Provide slightly more detail (I understand that there is a balance to be struck).

References:

Review Board Decision:

Action: The worked example should help with this

Status: Closed **Refer to Review Board**