
Page: **Section:** all footers

Issue: configuration

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Major Editorial

Description: all page footers must include doc ref and version number

Evidence: pages indistinguishable for each product

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: insert on all products a footer containing product number and version no.

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: All page footers will include doc ref and version number and will be actioned in next version of deskbook (integration)

Review Board Decision:

Page: 5 **Section:** 2.1 para 2

Issue: Implied MODAF View Usage

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: The doc reads that not all viewpoints and views are needed, which is a bit offputting. This should be followed by how this doc explains what this means for the COI (i.e. to end positively) as 2.2.1 denotes in the end

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: This is a minor change which affects all of the deskbooks as this is common material for all of them.

Solution:

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: The paragraph will be edited with a suitable form of words and this change implemented as part of the Deskbook integration work (Integration)

Review Board Decision:

Page: 5 **Section:** 2.1 para 3

Issue: Stronger wording

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Would be better to read 'applied appropriately MODAF is an enabler to the...'. This is stronger than current wording.

Evidence:

**Reviewer's
Preferred
Solution:**

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

**Suggested
Approach:** Change to be implemented in deskbook and reflected across all deskbooks (Integration)

**Review
Board
Decision:**

Page: 5 **Section:** front of doc

Issue: introduction

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: needs the generic into for purpose of doc

Evidence: agreed at last review board that products must explain what they are and are not

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: expand on headers example in the sustainment deskbook

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Agree the standard structure and format as to what the deskbooks are and are not (Integration)
Suggested solution is to restart the numbering with this Introduction being Section 1 and start the Section 2 with 'What is MODAF?'

Review Board Decision: Agreed to carry this forward as an integration issue for reconciliation across all the deskbooks. Simon King also wanted a reference to what an architecture is, and this will be addressed in some form in the new introduction piece to the deskbooks, albeit probably as a reference to the MODAF Overview document.

Page: 5 **Section:** section 1

Issue: foreward

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: product includes a para ref against foreward which is not standard practise

Evidence: marked as para 1

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: remove para 1 ref from all products

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: This will be addressed as described in Comment 4. The numberig for the Foreword will be dropped and restart the numbering with the Introduction to Section 2 being Section 1 and start the Section 2 with 'What is MODAF?' (Integration)

Review Board Decision: To be actioned as discussed above

Page: 6 **Section:** 2.2.2' and fi

Issue: consistent presentation

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Technical

Description: refernces view overview does not match product title

Evidence: confusion with MODAF overview and product called viewpoint overview

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: amend to redlect real product title

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Figure will be updated (Integration)

Review Board Decision:

Page: 7

Section: 1st bullet afte

Issue: 1

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Carrier Strike Concepts

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: I think should read Carrier Strike CONOPS

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Already been amended

Review Board Decision:

Page: 7 **Section:** 2.2.2

Issue: BMS link

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: We could mention here how MODAF can be expanded to cover more BMS elements if required.

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: For consideration

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Leave as is, as BMS is not a specific Concepts & Doctrine issue

Review Board Decision:

Page: 7 **Section:** fig 2.3 (p7) &f

Issue: consistent presentation

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Technical

Description: sustainment scope has now changed but not reflected here

Evidence: only covers implementation

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: amend to reflect sustainment d/book fig 2.3

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Need to align the diagrams and COI Scope. The Sustainment COI defined by the sustainment Deskbook has not been agreed and does not tie in with the content of the Deskbook. There is a possible integration issue here should changes need to be made across the Deskbooks that have already been reviewed (Integration)

Review Board Decision: This will be addressed as an Integration issue

Page: 8

Section: last bullet bef

Issue: 2

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Customer 2 definition

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: insert "and MOD Centre" after "Commands", "2005-08-12", "Open

References:

Status: Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Make change to deskbook and amend in other deskbooks (Integration)

Review Board Decision:

Page: 9 **Section:** 3.1.1

Issue: MODAR Central Registry

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: We speak of the Central Registry in the Figure 3-1. Whilst I recall why we phrased it that way when developing the 6-stage process; this may not be best phrased for the reader.

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Perhaps the registry service should just be considered another element of the overall MODAR service?

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Leave as is and add minor editorial to refer to Executive Summary for detail (Integration)

Review Board Decision:

Page: 9

Section: 3.1.1

Issue: Too many keys

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Everything is key. whilst this is true; perhaps a thesaurus would make it more readable.

Evidence:

**Reviewer's
Preferred
Solution:**

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

**Suggested
Approach:** Minor editorial (Integration)

**Review
Board
Decision:**

Page: 9 **Section:** 3.1.1

Issue: consistent presentation

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Major Editorial

Description: short section inconsistent with sustainment and acq deskbook

Evidence: no ref to MODAR etc

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: provide consistent information quality

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Input changes to this section which are contained in the sustainment deskbook and the remaining deskbooks if the selection of wording is confirmed as acceptable (Integration)

Review Board Decision:

Page: 9 **Section:** 3.1.1

Issue: products reference

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: incorrect doc ref for overview book

Evidence: quotes MODAF MO7 -020

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: amend to MODAF MO9 002

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Amendment completed

Review Board Decision:

Page: 10

Section: 3.1.2 para 1

Issue: 4

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: NOT Directorate LOD

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Defence Lines of Development

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Amendment completed

Review Board Decision:

Page: 10 **Section:** 3.1.2 para 3

Issue: 3

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Other

Description: Contact with IA

Evidence: This para does not sufficiently explain how the IA interaction will work.

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Is desk officer access to the MODAR going to be by phone to a contact in the IA (not sustainable) or through a user friendly web browser (much better idea) or something else?

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Need an enduring email address and contact telephone number for the IA (integration)

Review Board Decision: Direct readers to the IA Website - MODAF PM took an action to ensure that the IA are appraised of the need for IA8 to keep the MODAF/MODAR links updated

Page: 10 **Section:** 3.1.3

Issue: consistent presentation

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Major Editorial

Description: more detail on process included up front instead of para 3.2

Evidence: extensiv diagrams link to 7 step process

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: ensure all deskbooks are presented in similar format

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Simplify section 3.1to bring this in line with the other deskbooks and redo diagrams

Review

Board

Decision:

Page: 10 **Section:** 3.1.3

Issue: Incorrect use of acronym

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: DLOD = Defence Lines of Development (not Directorate ...)

Evidence: What is the evidence for the issue.

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

Solution:

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Amendment completed

Approach:

Review Board

Decision:

Page: 11 **Section:** Table 3-1

Issue: Undefined acronyms

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Many acronyms used without a definition of what they mean.

Evidence: As above.

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Include definition at first usage of acronym or else include a list of them as an annex.

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: The table was included in the draft Deskbook to ensure that all the processes were captured and are agreed by the COI. It has now served its purpose and will be removed in subsequent versions to bring it in line with the structure of the other deskbooks..

Review Board Decision:

Page: 12

Section: Analytical Co

Issue: 5

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Procedural

Description: Don't believe Prioritised draft CONOPS and Risk Register are key products of the Analytical stage

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: remove

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: These are clearly articulated as key products by the Concepts Paper produced by JDCC. The table was included in the draft Deskbook to ensure that all the processes were captured and are agreed by the COI. It has now served its purpose and will be removed in subsequent versions to bring it in line with the structure of the other deskbooks..

Review Board Decision:

Page: 12

Section: Applied Conc

Issue: 6

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Procedural

Description:

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Remove both references to CONOPS - is a product of this stage not a Data source

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: JDCC identifies extant CONOPS as being a data source for the development of new Concepts. The CONOPS may be higher level than the one being worked on. The table was included in the draft Deskbook to ensure that all the processes were captured and are agreed by the COI. It has now served its purpose and will be removed in subsequent versions to bring it in line with the structure of the other deskbooks..

Review Board Decision:

Page: 13 **Section:** 3.1.4

Issue: Unnecessary words

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: 'to a lesser degree' not required

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Delete

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Deletion complete

Review Board Decision:

Page: 13 **Section:** 3.1.4

Issue: Bespoke views

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: This paragraph (probably repeated in all deskbooks) gives the impression that only MODAF views are appropriate for architecture descriptions. This is incorrect. The use of standard views is for sharing and re-using architecture descriptions. This should not totally preclude other types of views (e.g. use case diagrams) where there is no standard equivalent. This is for advanced users who understand the consequences of using non-standard views.

Evidence: Experience shows that it is frequently necessary to use views outside the standard set to achieve a particular purpose. This should not be discouraged (otherwise MODAF will be seen to be too rigid) but justification will need to be given in each case. [Where particular non-standard views are used frequently they should be considered for inclusion at a future release]

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Append the sentence: "If a non-MODAF view is used, the user must justify use of a non-standard view and be aware that such views may not be shared."

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: This sub-section has been substantially reworked since the draft issue and the suggested action incorporated into the new wording

Review Board Decision:

Page: 13 **Section:** 3.1.4

Issue: refernces

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: no explanation of view process mapping covered in appendix 1

Evidence: Appendix 1 explains the use of Essential and Highly desirable

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: include ref to App 1

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Amend to reflect appendix 1

Review Board Decision:

Page: 14 **Section:** 3.1.4 / 5

Issue: Tidy up view usage and types

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Info comes quite quickly here on views and how to use them. It is stated that any other view can be used in addition to essential and highly desirable. Perhaps it is better to say 'any other MODAF view'? Otherwise we may need to describe not only hybrid views but how to do new views and the full MODAF Change Management process. IS there a diagram that could help the reader?

Evidence:

**Reviewer's
Preferred
Solution:**

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Change made as suggested

Approach:

**Review
Board
Decision:**

Page: 14 **Section:** 3.1.5

Issue: Views and visualisations

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: This is a very confused paragraph (probably repeated in all deskbooks). Since the visualisation offered in the handbook is not as important as the data content, it does not make sense to talk of 'modified' views with the required data content. The examples in the handbook are just example presentations of the required data - in many cases these may not actually be realisable with a particular (or indeed any) tool support.

Evidence: Need to decide whether visualisation is an essential aspect of a MODAF product - my opinion is that any guidance implied by the pictured views are probably unenforceable. This is a critically important issue for MODAF tool certification.

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: The end of the first paragraph needs rewriting. The third paragraph should be changed - if it is conformant with the meta model (i.e. data content and relationships) it is MODAF compliant, full stop. [From a collaboration point of view in some cases modelling the data without visualisation is acceptable]

References: MODAF Tool Certification White Paper

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Health warning to be included in all Deskbooks to describe that the Deskbooks do not provide authoritative guidance with respect to View content (integration)

Review Board Decision: Action accepted - PB (IA8) also to come up with a solution in the Tool Certification Paper as to how graphical views can certified for tool vendor software.

Page: 14

Section: 3.1.5 last par

Issue: 7

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Other

Description: same as comment 3 above

Evidence:

**Reviewer's
Preferred
Solution:**

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

**Suggested
Approach:** Need an enduring email address and contact telephone number for the IA (integration)

**Review
Board
Decision:**

Page: 15 **Section:** 3rd bullet

Issue: 8

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Procedural

Description: Customer 2 definition

Evidence: There are several references to Customer 2 written as 2nd Customer. There is also a misconception that only single service commands can be a C2 - this is wrong. An example of a Joint Customer 2 for Joint Command and Inform areas is D CBM/J6.

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Wash through deskbook to correct Customer 2 references (and other deskbooks?)

References: Also at p.21 3.4.1 para 2 last line. 3.4.2 para 1 line 11. page 26 line 2. page 29 1st para after buttets line 4.

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Amend Deskbook to reflect comment

Review Board Decision:

Page: 15 **Section:** Fig 3-3

Issue: COI Interfaces

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Figure 3-3 seems inconsistent with Figure 2-3 (which appears in several deskbooks). Latter suggests output from this Col is 'Future Op Needs', that suggests to me capability gaps. This type of output does not appear explicitly in Figure 3-3. Conversely analytic concept outputs shown in Figure 3-3 are missing from Figure 2-3.

Evidence: This is a critical issue because this COI interaction actually feeds the acquisition process. Moreover the acquisition process does need CONOPS etc. so this interaction needs to be acknowledged in Figure 2-3. A previous comment of mine indicated it was not clear where these products came from.

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Figure 2-3 and Figure 3-3 both need adjusting and they need to be made consistent. At minimum Figure 2-3 should include all key interactions affecting acquisition processes.

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Leave as is - Fig 2-3's 'Future Op Needs' identifies the capability requirements for operations, it is the ECC that determines whether capability gaps exist or not. In Fig 3-3, this provides the specific detail for this COI and it is not appropriate to capture this level of detail in Fig 2-3, which is a high level overview of all the COIs and their scope.

Review Board Decision:

Page: 16 **Section:** 3.3

Issue: Epoch usage

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Epochs defined by Concepts and Doctrine are used in this document, which are different from the generic term epoch (or timeframe / period of time) used in the M3. Clarity needs to be shown throughout or spelled out more clearly for the MODAF reader.

Evidence:

**Reviewer's
Preferred
Solution:**

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

**Suggested
Approach:** Remove references to epochs and state the time frame instead

**Review
Board
Decision:**

Page: 16 **Section:** 3.3.

Issue: Unnecessary paragraphs?

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: What purpose do the second and third paras serve. After introducing the activities we then add a bit more straight from the BDD which I am sure someone in this COI will have access to anyway?

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Remove?

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Leave as is - these paragraphs are used to set the scene and address precisely what the high level doctrine is. This is relevant to a Deskbook addressing the needs of the Concepts & Doctrine community, who are not likely to be specialists in this area when they are first posted into the COI

Review Board Decision: Recommended action accepted

Page: 17 **Section:** 03/03/2001

Issue: Annotation of Figure 3-5: StV-3 Capability Phasing

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: The screenshot of the Capability View used to depict elements of an StV-3 contains data, that when initially captured was classified RESTRICTED, but would now be UNCLASSIFIED since a full Capability Audit has taken place which will have changed the profile of the View. That said, it should be made clear that the screen shot does not represent the actual capability position for the CBM areas shown.

Evidence: What is the evidence for the issue.

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Annotate the figure with a statement along the lines of - (Data shown in this figure is for demonstration of the St-3 concept only and should not be interpreted as showing the present position for the CBM capability area) - Similar statements should be used alongside all such diagrams in any on the MODAF publications, or a 'catch-all' statement at the front of each publication.

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Editorial -Add a footnote to the figure caption (integration)

Review Board Decision:

Page: 17

Section: Fig 3-5

Issue: StV-3 example

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: This is not an StV-3

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Get a better example

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Editorial - explain in the footnote that it is a Capability View not a Capability Phasing - it is the closest example to an StV-3 that has been produced to date
(integration)

Review Board Decision:

Page: 17

Section: figure 3-4

Issue: 9

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: HLOC figure is Draft

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Replace with non draft version.

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Replace and update with a more recent version of the HLOC.

Review Board Decision:

Page: 18 **Section:** 3.3.2 (4)

Issue: AcV-2 description

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: AcV-2 will be updated by IPTs as well as collated by Customer 1. Also the programme dependencies are not 'illustrated' in the figure I looked at.

Evidence:

Reviewer's Update

Preferred

Solution:

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested (integration) Update with a more suitable example and include it in the other deskbooks

Approach:

Review

Board

Decision:

Page: 18 **Section:** 3.3.2 (5)

Issue: S&T feeds

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Technical

Description: S&T feeds and resources could also be represented as programmes of activities with deliverables if required and useful?

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: For consideration

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Leave as is - this is not the view of the COI from a MODAF perspective

Review Board Decision:

Page: 18 **Section:** fig 3.6

Issue: consistent presentation

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Technical

Description: ref to LoD hexagon is not now relevant

Evidence: the key shows colour code in hexagon

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: remove hexagon references and pics

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Update with a pie chart wedge (integration)

Review Board Decision:

Page: 19 **Section:** 3.4 (2)

Issue: Acronym Usage

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Some acronyms are not spelt out at first use throughout the doc; e.g. PPSG. Whilst understood by the majority of readers and the existence of the Glossary; defence writing says spell out at first use.

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Spell out at first use.

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Already actioned

Review Board Decision:

Page: 20 **Section:** footnote 12 e

Issue: configuration

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: footnotes for doc refs not clearly identified

Evidence: draft JDCC Concept handbook no date or version no.

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: include dates & version no.s on all referenced docs where available

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: This particular version had no date or version number (Very draft). A newer version is out for review and will be incorporated and referenced in this deskbook if available.

Review Board Decision:

Page: 21 **Section:** 3.4.1

Issue: consistent presentation

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Technical

Description: use of acronym for Cust 2 is this an accepted version (CL2C)

Evidence: does not match terminology in cust 1 deskbook and other sources

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: ensure all deskbooks are referencing the correct ref for Customer 2

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: The JDCC uses this convention to avoid confusion with Command and Control systems (C2). The correct terminology needs to be clarified for integration purposes between Deskbooks (Integration)

Review Board Decision: The full version of Customer 2 is to be used. The abbreviated version is to be agreed as an integration issue

Page: 21 **Section:** 3.5.1 (3)

Issue: products reference

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: refernce for C1 deskbook appears wrongly

Evidence: should be MODAF MO7 021

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: amend M10 001 ?

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Already actioned

Review Board Decision:

Page: 23 **Section:** Fig 3-9

Issue: OV-1b completeness

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: So why are ENEMY, BDE HQ, MOB and PJHQ in the diagram and what are we trying to achieve? Not a full explanation of the associated OV-1a therefore setting a bad example

Evidence: What is the evidence for the issue.

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Complete

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Rename as OV-1b extract and edit accordingly

Review Board Decision:

Review Board Decision:

Review Board Decision:

Page: 24 **Section:** fig 3.11

Issue: consistent presentation

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: assumed colour significance to arrows for dependencies

Evidence: arrows used on diagram in different colours but no colour code key

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: include key if relevant

Solution:

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Already actioned in text

Review Board Decision:

Review Board Decision:

Page: 24

Section: Fig 3-11

Issue: StV-4 markings

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Technical

Description: New markings in use on this diagram. Is there a new scheme for arrow types, ellipses and meanings?

Evidence:

**Reviewer's
Preferred
Solution:**

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

**Suggested
Approach:** New markings introduced in text and ,no, they are not part of the View schema. They are included to highlight particular points being made in the descriptive text about the potential use of the View once produced.

**Review
Board
Decision:**

Page: 24 **Section:** StV-4

Issue: StV-4 explanation

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: We should explain how the boxes are derived and their relationship with other StV's. I feel the reader needs to understand this so they do not create any old boxes on the StV-4.

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: For consideration

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: The Concepts and Doctrine COI will not derive these from first principles, only use them if they exist, therefore more detail will not be included regarding derivation of boxes.

Amend text to reflect they should be used where avail but as C1 isn't mandating their usage this is may be a moot point.

Review Board Decision:

Page: 25 **Section:** 3.5 (1)

Issue: CADMID / CADMIT

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: CADMID and CADMIT validation and oversight. also DLOD

Evidence:

**Reviewer's
Preferred
Solution:**

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Leave as is - these are specific headings used in the 7 Step Concept to Capability process and are not meant to be applied in the purest sense of the words or structured in a grammatically correct way.

**Review
Board
Decision:**

Page: 26 **Section:** 3.5.1 (2)

Issue: Child Support <grin>

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Technical

Description: Could child StV-1's be supported by linking descriptive OV-1's?

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: For discussion

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Not necessarily, it is totally dependent on the nature of the CONOPS, and whether an OV-1 View set would be capable of capturing the CONOPS in a coherent manner. The current worked example provides more detail as to why this is unlikely to be useful when High Level CONOPS are being developed. The OV-1s only become possible when the CONOPS is broken down into CONEMP or CONUSE.

Review Board Decision:

Page: 27 **Section:** 3.5.1 (7)

Issue: Unreferred figures

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Number of () left over with figure references not filled in.

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Complete

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Completed

Review Board Decision:

Page: 27 **Section:** fig 3.13 and

Issue: presentation

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: diagrams too small and difficult to read

Evidence: words in boxes faint / small

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: increase by one point on font or to legible quality

Solution:

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Corrected in V 0.3

Review

Board

Decision:

Page: 29 **Section:** 3.6 2nd bulle

Issue: acronyms

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: no explanation of acronym BDD in footnote

Evidence: assumed refernce to bullet 2 British Defence Doctrine

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: insert acronym after Brit Def Doct

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Actioned in V 0.3

Review Board Decision:

Page: 29 **Section:** 3.6 section

Issue: products reference

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Technical

Description: References an OPLAN but not what it is

Evidence: does this need a ref to explain in footnote

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: insert explanation

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Minor editorial - insert explanation

Review Board Decision:

Page: 31 **Section:** OV6a

Issue: OV 6 usage

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Technical

Description: We discuss the use of OV6a; with no reference to complimentary views 6b and 6c; is there a particular reason for this?

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: For discussion

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: It is believed that this community is likely to explain the constraints in textual form rather than the other views and the OV-6a provides this without requiring a specific tool. This approach has been taken with the pragmatic view that the greater the alignment of MODAF with existing functionality and processes the more likely that it will be adopted in this critical community.

Review Board Decision: The section will refer to an OV-6, using an OV-6a as the example and referencing the Handbook for examples of OV-6b &c

Page: 34 **Section:** 5

Issue: consistent presentation

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Major Editorial

Description: drefers to MODAF project manager which is time related

Evidence: sugestions to MODAF project manager

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: replacew with MODAF point of contact in EC CCII Cap Strat MOD MB

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Need an enduring email address and contact telephone number for EC CCII (integration)

Review Board Decision: MODAF PM to provide an agreed form of words for this.

Page: 34 **Section:** acknowledge

Issue: refernces

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Major Editorial

Description: incorrect acknowledgements

Evidence: this is from Cust 2

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: amend to reflect correct sources (inc those engaged plus TWG and UG)

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Will be amended in final release

Review Board Decision:

Page: 35 **Section:** App 1

Issue: Process diagram content

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Technical

Description: It is disappointing that the deskbook does not reflect the importance of behavioural views in relation to Applied Concepts (in particular).

Evidence: For example, a CONEMP is about operational employment of a capability, including the ability of the capability to react to events. This would suit an OV6a, OV6b or OV6c description.

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: The Applied Concepts Development process stage should refer to OV6 products (as desirables).

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Yes, this seems sensible and a suitable form of words will be used to introduce this view at the applied concepts stage

Review Board Decision:

Page: 35 **Section:** App 1

Issue: Presentation of process diagrams

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: I see no reason to deviate from previous deskbooks by putting the process diagrams (with associated MODAF views) in an appendix. This is easily the most important diagram in each deskbook because it indicates the justification for use of certain MODAF products, the mandate level and the coherent nature of the products when used together.

Evidence: Acceptance of this diagram is critical to stakeholder acceptance of the utility of MODAF.

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Restore diagram in Appendix 1 to main text

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Will be addressed in next release in addition to current figures

Review Board Decision:

Page: 35 **Section:** App 1

Issue: MODAF view mandate

Reviewer: **Organization:**

Role: **e-mail:**

Category: Minor Technical

Description: I think the mandate levels in the process diagram need review. Also why does Step 6 and Step 7 not have any corresponding views? Is TV1 really appropriate for concepts and doctrine work? I would have expected this to apply to technical standards only (there is a place for military standards in MODAF but TV1 is probably not it)

Evidence: I would have thought StV1 only desirable for Applied Concepts (this is a policy output), StV4 essential for analytic concepts (otherwise they lack capability function content), OV6a essential for doctrine development (this is about the business rules, the core of in service doctrine).

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Review mandate levels

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Leave as is - The TV-1 is the best view for capturing current doctrinal standards being applied for the employment of capabilities/systems. Tv-2 is a useful medium for providing the various COIs with the knowledge of emergence or proposed changes to existing doctrine.

Review Board Decision: Leave the references to TV as is, and amend Section 3.5 to indicate that the outputs will be fed into other views maintained by different COIs.

Page: 35 **Section:** Appx 1

Issue: consistent presentation

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Major Editorial

Description: no pictorial explanation of what essential and highly desirable figures look like

Evidence: inconsistent with other deskbooks

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: amend to provide consistent docs

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Deskbook to be updated

Review Board Decision:

Page: 36 **Section:** doc end

Issue: consistent presentation

Reviewer:

Organization:

Role:

e-mail:

Category: Major Editorial

Description: would benefit (like other deskbooks) from a page of references to other products

Evidence: no ref page

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: include references as per sustainment

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Reference page to be included in new version of Deskbook

Review Board Decision: