

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 these 20 issues and their responses is provided below. All of these issues are now closed with the release of Version 0.9 on 29 July 2005.

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 for integrability 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)

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

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".

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:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 7.

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

Status: Duplicate **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)

Action: Change made as per Review Board decision

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.

Status: Closed

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:

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.

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.

Status: Closed

Refer to Review Board

Page: 12

Section:

Issue: Grey Box

Category: Minor Editorial

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

Evidence:

**User's
Proposed
Solution:** Reword

References:

Action: Footnote added defining the term "grey box"

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

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:

Action: Change made as per Review Board decision.

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.

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:

Action: Change made as per Review Board Decision.

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.

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:

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

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.

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 this is not documented 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:

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.

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.

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 'From the IPT' isn't the only thing that happens in Concept Stage before initial gate, it also talks about trade offs

References:

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.

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

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:

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

**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.

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

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 7.

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

Status: Duplicate

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:

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.

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.

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:

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

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.

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:

Action: Footnote added to this effect.

**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.

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:

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

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.

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:

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.

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.

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:

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

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

Status: Closed

Refer to Review Board

Page: 7

Section: 2.2.2/3

Issue: CSISSCCE3

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:

Action: Duplicate of issue ID 214.

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

Status: Duplicate

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:

Action: No action necessary.

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

Status: Closed

Refer to Review Board