

# MODAF Deskbook for the Customer 2 Community

## Status Report on Issues Lodged on MODAF.com

28 Jul 05

### Introduction

103 Issues were raised on MODAF.com against v0.3 of the MODAF Deskbook for the Customer 2 Community of Interest (COI).

Based on these Issues, "Issue Types" were created and each Issue was allocated to an Issue Type. Many of the Issues raised had, in fact, already been accepted by the team prior to the 22 Jul meeting of the Review Board and – indeed – had been implemented in a v0.4 of the Deskbook.

A report was presented to, and discussed with, the Review Board during their 22 Jul 05 meeting. This contained an Executive Summary by Issue Type together with details on representative Issues regarding each Issue Type. To avoid duplication, equivalent Issues were not included.

The Issue Types and the resulting situation were as follows:

Issue Type		Number of Issues		
Serial	Name	Reported to the Board	Not reported to the Board	Total
1	Use of MODAF Views during Ops Planning / Ops	2	2	4
2	Level of specificity of Deskbook	14	5	19
3	Ownership of Views unclear	2	0	2
4	Quick Start Guides	2	1	3
5	Style of diagrams	5	2	7
6	BMS	1	0	1
7	Acronyms 2C / PM / CL	4	0	4
8	Premature use of Systems Views	2	1	3
9	StV-5 View	2	1	3
10	Consistency across Deskbooks and common sections	9	14	23
11	Typos / minor errors / minor changes	0	34	34
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>103</b>

The Review Board came to decisions regarding each Issue Type. These were documented, with resulting actions, in < Draft notes on 2C Deskbook from 21 Jul 05 meeting of the MODAF Review Board v0.2[TKK1]>.

### Purpose

The purpose of this report is to inform the Review Board, reviewers and other stakeholders as to the status of, and plans for dealing with, each of the Issues raised on MODAF.com against v0.3 of the MODAF Deskbook for the Customer 2 COI.

### Content

This report has a page for each Issue raised. In addition to the information on that Issue included in the report to the Review Board for their 22 Jul 05 meeting, each Issue page below also includes:

- The Review Board's decision in that regard
- Resulting action
- Person actioned
- Current status of this action – closed or still open, i.e. still to be done.

A page is included here for each of the 103 Issues raised.

**Re page no.:**

**Section:**

**Issue:**

**Category:** Other

**Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** Involvement of real users must occur in the near future rather than development of the deskbook by consultants in isolation.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's  
proposed  
solution:**

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Agreed. Gain participation of relevant Customer 2

**Action:** Gain participation of relevant Customer 2 people

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** KL

**Re page no.:**

**Section:**

**Issue:** Op Plans

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Use of MODAF Views during Ops Planning /  
Ops

**Description:** I just don't think the Ops staff can afford to spend time doing this when the op plans need writing and planning. I really only believe that MODAF supports the OA and Lessons Identified processes. I suspect that the ops planning work would need turning into MODAF views to support this and capture the essence of an operation for analysis purposes - not to articulate the plans and troops to task. That can be quite ably handled using the current methodology for delivering orders."

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's  
proposed  
solution:**

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Agreed. Implement recommendation

**Action:** Implement recommendation

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:**

**Section:**

**Issue:** General

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** the current deskbook presents a slightly optimistic picture, since not all the views will be available to users in the early stages

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's  
proposed  
solution:**

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Agreed. Set expectation in Foreword

**Action:** Set expectation in Foreword

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** DM

**Re page no.:**

**Section:** General

**Issue:** General

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** Really good start point - has achieved the 80-20 necessary in order to get started with MODAF. However we should be aware that the processes described aren't 'real processes' - more people's impressions of what the processes are. Only when we start to use MODAF for real will we be able to articulate the Customer 2 processes at the right level of detail and generality and write the 'Real Deskbook' .

**Evidence:** Aware of many different versions of processes

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Begin to use MODAF for projects and document processes in a consistent way

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Agreed. Set expectation in Foreword

**Action:** Set expectation in Foreword

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** KL



**Re page no.:** 10

**Section:** 3.1.1

**Issue:** Product ID

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** Quick Start Guides

**Description:** drawing needs explanation of some objects in content

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

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** On separate pull out include reference to new objects

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Produce a Quick Reference Guide on the architecture development process as part of the v1.0 set.

**Action:** Produce a Quick Reference Guide on the architecture development process as part of the v1.0 set.

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** DM



**Re page no.:** 10

**Section:** Figure 3-1

**Issue:** Font size

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** The legibility of this table is borderline because the font size is too small.

**Evidence:** A printed version is legible with difficulty, the digital version at 100% resolution is less clear.

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Enlarge the font. Consider a dedicated 'landscape format' page for this table if necessary.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Subsection removed. No specific action

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 11

**Section:** 1st

**Issue:** Tone of grammer

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** The word 'should' implies that documents have to be created retrospectively or that other stakeholders have been negligant in not creating them.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Replace 'should' with 'would'.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Issue not implemented because 'should' is used in many places throughout the Deskbook. This will be adjusted in the general release version for live use

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 11

**Section:** 3.1.4

**Issue:** Repeated information?

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** This comment also applies to section 3.1.5:

I thought we had agreed in the integration meeting that the different Views (Essential and Highly Desirable) and the Viewpoints would be described in a separate document to avoid repeating this information in all the Deskbooks, for it to be read once and then just take up space.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Remove sections 3.1.4 and 3.1.5.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Develop and agree standards for all MODAF documentation and apply them across that documentation suite

**Action:** Sections removed

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 12

**Section:** 3.1.4

**Issue:** terminology

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** needs to explain the what is meant by any view (other MODAF view - hybrid or other views? And consequence of introducing them if not MODAF.

**Evidence:** Any view may be used in addition to Ess and HD Views

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** specify if this means other MODAF views or 'other' views and that they need to be supported by MODAF meta model to be captured in MODAR.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Resolve in all v1.0s

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** DM

**Re page no.:** 12

**Section:** Section 3.1.5

**Issue:** Overview of views

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** Currently only the Customer 2 Deskbook provides such a detailed overview of the views.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** For consideration: Either remove from Customer 2 Deskbook entirely or update all Deskbooks with a view relevance section. If the later is the case, I would consider using shortened bullets following the viewpoint overview diagram (Figure 2-1) on page 6

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Agree standards for all Deskbooks & implement them in v1.0s

**Action:** Sections removed

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 12, 13

**Section:** 3.1.5

**Issue:** consistency

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** this section describing viewpoints is missing from other deskbooks

**Evidence:** not in acquisition though both were produced after the integration meeting

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** consistency where possible across deskbooks

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Resolve in all v1.0s

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** DM

**Re page no.:** 13

**Section:** 3.1.6

**Issue:** Unnecessary explanation of the key to the process diagram

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** This section says in words and with a large table what could be shown on the process diagram with just a key in the corner, with an elliptical box titled 'Highly Desirable View' and a rectangular box titled 'Essential View'. The colours are the same throughout all the documentation and, as the View names are written in the boxes anyway, a whole table to explain the colours is a bit of overkill. I think it is pretty obvious that the other boxes are the process steps, but again, if necessary, this could be included in a key in the corner of the diagram.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Remove section 3.1.6 and put a key in the corner of the process diagram

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Develop and agree standards for all MODAF documentation and apply them across that documentation suite

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** DM

**Re page no.:** 13, 14

**Section:** 3.1.6

**Issue:** consistency

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** inconsistent use of essential - mandated etc in process mapping

**Evidence:** fig 3-2 uses old terminology of mandated and recommended

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** use agreed terminology throughout ie Essential, Highly desirable.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Agreed. Implement in v0.9 of all Deskbooks

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK



**Re page no.:** 14

**Section:** 3.2

**Issue:** Draft 0.3

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** DLOD descriptions have undergone a minor change and now Doctrine and Concepts and are referred to as Concepts and Doctrine.

**Evidence:** DMB Paper

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Change to Concepts and Doctrine

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 14

**Section:** Figure 3-2

**Issue:** Terminology

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** The use of terms like 'mandated' and 'recommended' is confusing when the previous terms used were 'essential', 'highly desirable' and 'optional'. What is the mapping between these, if any?

**Evidence:** See page 12.

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Explain what mandated and recommended mean in this context.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Correct in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 14

**Section:** Figure 3-2

**Issue:** Use of colour

**Category:** Other

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** The colours may not mean much to the colour blind.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** No change suggested but record as a comment to guide product authors.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** When requested, produce special versions of the documentation for individuals with accessibility difficulties. Say this in Overview

**Action:** Say this in Overview that, when requested, special versions of the documentation for individuals with accessibility difficulties will be produced. Explain poc.

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** DM

**Re page no.:** 14

**Section:** Figure 3-2

**Issue:** Diagram key

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** Diagram key and supporting text has been re-worded in Customer 1 Deskbook. Colour scheme is highlighted through reference to Figure 2-1

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Update diagram key as per Customer Deskbook v2.1

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 14

**Section:** Section 3.2

**Issue:** Section start on new page

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** The section start of each process segment is best forced on to a new page for clarity

**Evidence:** Customer 1 Deskbook version 2.1 now has new page starts for each process segment

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Add page breaks for each process segment

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Not implemented. Felt not appropriate.

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 15

**Section:**

**Issue:** Acronyms

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Acronyms 2C / PM / CL

**Description:** Second paragraph the text jumps from talking of Core Leader to CL without having shown the usual procedure to identify the acronym.

**Evidence:** What is the evidence for the issue.

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** On the first line of the paragraph amend '...both Core Leaders and...' to '...both Core Leaders (CL) and...'. Then all future occurrences of Core Leader can be amended to CL. Alternatively keep to 'Core Leader' throughout the paragraph.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement Board's decision re acronyms in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 15

**Section:**

**Issue:** Bracket

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** Missing end bracket 3rd paragraph line 4.

**Evidence:** What is the evidence for the issue.

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Insert end bracket after 'System'.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 15 **Section:** 2nd

**Issue:** Core Leader vs Pivotal Manager

**Category:** Minor Editorial **Issue Type:** Acronyms 2C / PM / CL

**Description:** Making the definition of Core Leader vs Pivotal Manager clearer. Can Core Leader and Pivotal manager be described here as roles/ functions? à then one can say that a single person may be carrying out both roles at any one time.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** I think a clear bulleted definition of Core Leader/ Pivotal Manager is required upfront, maybe Section 3.1.3, page 11

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Agreed. Implement in v0.9

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK



**Re page no.:** 15

**Section:** 3.2

**Issue:** CIWG

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** The CIWG or equivalent is lead by a variety of people depending upon the programme and its maturity.  
The CIWG is the custodian of the CIP.

**Evidence:** J2CHB

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Recommend amend as follows: 'Recommended changes to a CIP will come from across the Customer 2 community and other stakeholders and these will be considered by the CIWG (or equivalent) who will update and disseminate the revised CIP.'

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 15 **Section:** 3.2

**Issue:** BMS

**Category:** Minor Technical **Issue Type:** BMS

**Description:** Reference to the BMS will confuse the issue being made here.

**Evidence:** n/a

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Remove reference to BMS (Business Management System)

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Agreed. Implement in v0.9

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 15

**Section:** Figure 3-3

**Issue:** Unclear diagram

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** The diagram does not print clearly in either black and white or colour. The offset between the CADMID arrows is not clear either (see also figure 2-3).

**Evidence:** Print it and see.

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Use bold colour for lines and weak colour for background. Avoid small font size.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** This diagram is of a standard format. Therefore changes need to be agreed with the authors of the other Deskbooks. Therefore to be done in v1.0 rather than in v0.9

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 15 **Section:** Paragraph

**Issue:** Ambiguous repeated statement

**Category:** Minor Editorial **Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** This papagraph re-states that Customer 2 activity is more complex than shown - as per paragraph before figure

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Delete paragraph Is there anything we can do to make the COI diagram better articulate Customer 2 scope and make this section read ceasier?

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 16 **Section:** 3.3.1  
**Issue:** sub-bullets  
**Category:** Minor Technical **Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** Propose re-wording of sub-bullets

**Evidence:** n/a

**References:** place curse on cell to read

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Suggest revise as follows:  
Policy and Capability development through the 7-Step process including the production of CONOPS/CONEMP/CONUSE  
Responding to specific Requests For Information (RFI) as an SME.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed **Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 17

**Section:** Figure 3-4

**Issue:** Who creates OV-2 and OV-5

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Ownership of Views unclear

**Description:** OV-2 and OV-5 are shown in this diagram as being created by 2C. However, in the Customer 1 Deskbook, they are created by Customer 1 as part of the URD. I am therefore confused as to why 2C would not just re-use these OVs created by Customer 1, rather than creating their own.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's  
proposed  
solution:**

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Address ownership of Views and information in the Overview (and then copy to Deskbooks?). Meanwhile, leave diagrams as are relative to this topic.

**Action:** Address ownership of Views and information in the Overview (and then copy to Deskbooks?). Leave diagrams as are relative to this topic.

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** DM

**Re page no.:** 17

**Section:** Figure 3-4

**Issue:** Input and output

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** Style of Diagrams

**Description:** The method of representing inputs and outputs from processes is ambiguous. For example, is OV-5 and input to developing the CIP, updated at this point or both?

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Clarify diagram.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Where input only is being provided to a View owner, do not show the View as an output. Where the architecture is being developed into greater detail for local use, show the View as an output.

**Action:** Sort in v0.9

**Status:** Close

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 17

**Section:** Figure 3-4

**Issue:** Use of SVs pre-concept

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Premature use of Systems Views

**Description:** This diagram shows the use of SV-1, SV-4 and SV-5 during 'Analyse and Research Implications for FLC' and 'Develop CIP'. These activities are pre-Concept, in terms of the Acquisition cycle, and pre-empt an IPT being given instruction to procure the capability. It therefore does not seem appropriate to be using SVs this early in the process, especially as they will not be created until the SRD is developed (during the Demonstration phase of the Acquisition lifecycle).

Even if SVs were available, the capability formulation should be system independent, not prescribing a solution.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Remove the use of SVs as inputs into capability planning.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Agreed. Implement in v0.9

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** SB



**Re page no.:** 17

**Section:** Figure 3-4

**Issue:** Would 2C really update / create AcV-2

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** Ownership of Views unclear

**Description:** Would the Customer 2 community really be updating or creating AcV-2, given that it is the Customer 1 community who owns the Equipment Programme?

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's  
proposed  
solution:**

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Where input only is being provided to a View owner, do not show the View as an output. Where the architecture is being developed into greater detail for local use, show the View as an output.

**Action:** Ensure that: where input only is being provided to a View owner, do not show the View as an output; and where the architecture is being developed into greater detail for local use, show the View as an output.

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** All D'b authors

**Re page no.:** 17

**Section:** Figure 3-4

**Issue:** Who produces StV-5?

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** StV-5 View

**Description:** StV-5 is shown as an input, but none of the Deskbooks so far have identified StV-5 as a View to be produced, therefore at the moment no-one is producing StV-5s to be able to use.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's  
proposed  
solution:**

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Address ownership of Views and information in the Overview (and then copy to Deskbooks?). Meanwhile, leave diagrams as are relative to this topic.

**Action:** Address ownership of Views and information in the Overview (and then copy to Deskbooks?). Leave diagrams as are relative to this topic.

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** DM

**Re page no.:** 17 **Section:** Figure 3-4  
**Issue:** Inputs / Outputs unclear on process diagram  
**Category:** Major Editorial **Issue Type:** Style of Diagrams

**Description:** The process diagram is not very clear as to what are inputs and what are outputs. There are a lot of Views depicted, and it is not easy to see which is which.

Maybe the inputs could be above the process boxes and the outputs below?

If the Highly Desirable Views were removed and only the Essential Views shown this might make things clearer as well, as there are an awful lot of Views for them to use here, especially given the feedback we received from the other COIs that they wanted a few useful Views rather than absolutely everything, at least to begin with.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Lessen the number of Views, and make it clearer on the diagram which are outputs and which are inputs rather than showing them all grouped together.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open **Person Actioned:** 2C team

**Re page no.:** 18

**Section:** Figure 3-5

**Issue:** Use of colour

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Style of Diagrams

**Description:** Diagram doesn't print clearly. Background colours too dark.

**Evidence:** Print it and see.

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Use weak background colours.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Sort in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 18-19

**Section:** 3.3.2

**Issue:** Unclear how StVs are used by 2C

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** This section just gives a description of the Views, exactly the same as that in the Customer 1 Deskbook, and does not explain at all how they are useful for the Customer 2 function.

The section is regarding 'understand capabilities, concepts and plans', yet there is no description of what this process entails, and therefore how the Views support this process.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Re-work the section to describe the process, and use the Views to illustrate how they help this process, rather than repeating the customer 1 process, which is not relevant here.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** 2C team

**Re page no.:** 19

**Section:** Figures 3-6

**Issue:** Epochs

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** The term 'epoch' may have a specific business meaning but can also refer to an unspecified period of time. This needs to be clarified.

**Evidence:** Specific and predetermined periods of time are often associated with epochs.

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

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Clarify terminology.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Sort in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 20

**Section:** 3.3.3

**Issue:** Tangential and irrelevant information

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** Section 3.3.3 is entitled "Analyse and Research Implications for FLC", yet this section does not describe the process, or how MODAF Views relate to the process, of analysing and researching implications.

It firstly describes use of OVs, in no context with FLC.

Pages 20 and 21 describe OV-1 and its components with no reference to how these fit into the analyse & research implications for FLC' process.

The second para on page 22 then gets even more confused, talking about mission or scenario preparation, moving on to discuss URDs - again these are all far removed from analysing & researching implications for FLC.

By the time we get to the section on OV-2, OV-5 and OV-7, the process description is focussing on URDs, still without having described the process and Views for 'Analyse and Research Implications for FLC'.

The rest of this section proceeds to discuss Views seemingly at random which are tagged as 'other Views that might be useful', with no description as to why they might be useful for analysing and

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** The entire section needs to be re-written, with more thought put into the Views that help the process as described in the section title 'Analyse and Research Implications for FLC'. This process (and no other) should be described in this section and the Views just used to assist the process, rather than describing all the Views possible.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v1.0

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 20

**Section:** Figure 3-8

**Issue:** Line of Development

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

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

**Evidence:**

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

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Revise representation of LOD. Use darker colours for lines and larger font sizes.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Sort in v1.0

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** SB



**Re page no.:** 20,23, 24, 25,                      **Section:** figures on  
**Issue:** drawings generally  
**Category:** Minor Editorial                      **Issue Type:** Style of Diagrams

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

**Evidence:** on all pages as detailed

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** increase font size or enlarge scale

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Agreed. Implement in v0.9

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed                      **Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 21

**Section:** Figure 3-9

**Issue:** OV-1

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Style of Diagrams

**Description:** Is this figure intended to be readable? At present it is not.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Enlarge and place on a whole page. Other diagrams that are intended to be readable may require similar treatment.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Where appropriate (dependent on its purpose rather than its content), diagrams are to be enlarged, making them landscape format if necessary. The use of an Annex of landscape diagrams is to be considered.

**Action:** Sort in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 22

**Section:** 3.3.3

**Issue:** terminology

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** para 2 refers to another section but for URD s but it is not clear which

**Evidence:** ..more info about the URD in the next section 0.?

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** amend

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 22

**Section:** Second

**Issue:** Section reference

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** next section 0! Is this a typographic error?

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Correct or explain reference.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Correct in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 24 and 25

**Section:** Figures 3-13,

**Issue:** Illegible diagrams

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Style of Diagrams

**Description:** These figures are not legible. Readers may form an adverse impression of the utility of this document if diagrams are frequently illegible.

**Evidence:** If the document were not available in digital form, I would have classed this as a major editorial issue as I think the diagrams need to be readable.

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Enlarge and place on a whole page.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Sort in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 25

**Section:** 3.3.4

**Issue:** CIWG

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** The CIWG or equivalent is lead by a variety of people depending upon the programme and its maturity.  
The CIWG is the custodian of the CIP.

**Evidence:** J2CHB

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Recommend amend as follows: 'Recommended changes to a CIP will come from across the Customer 2 community and other stakeholders and these will be considered by the CIWG (or equivalent) who will update and disseminate the revised CIP.'

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 26

**Section:** 3.3.4

**Issue:** URD development diagram

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** Not sure what relevance the URD development sequence has with developing the CIP - would the CIP not be developed prior to the URDs to deliver it?

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's  
proposed  
solution:**

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** 2C team

**Re page no.:** 26

**Section:** 3.3.4

**Issue:** Need example Views to illustrate the process

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** Section 3.3.4 contains a lot of View references and text describing them, which is quite overwhelming for someone who has been working with MODAF for a while, let alone someone who is picking this up for the first time.

Each step of the process needs a relevant View example to illustrate it. This will make the process 'story' easier to follow and to understand how the Views fit in and assist the process.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Add in example Views throughout the process text to illustrate their usefulness.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** 2C team



**Re page no.:** 26

**Section:** 3.3.4

**Issue:** terminology

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** this reference is to an Army specific product is it relevant to all. What are the other Cust 2 handbooks

**Evidence:** para 2 and 3 ref that more info can be found in the DCBM(A) guide and relevant cust 2 handbook

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** shouldn't the production of URDs reference the AMS for guidance?. Consider DCBM(A) refs as a footnote.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Resolve in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 26

**Section:** Last

**Issue:** Annotated examples required to support descriptions

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** This brief paragraph is key Deskbook content. It does not expand sufficiently to show a user what the views are used for, partially because not annotated view examples are used

**Evidence:** No diagrams to support brief text

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Add examples and expand text to describe how views are used

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** 2C team

**Re page no.:** 26 **Section:** towards the

**Issue:** layout

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** this section is overlong and rambles on to 'the rest of this section describes..'

**Evidence:** sentences appears a paragraphs, very bitty

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** may merit a split into 2 new sub-para 3.3.4.1 and 3.3.4.2

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 27

**Section:** Last but one

**Issue:** Reference to DEC

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** The StV-3 view mentioned here is that used by Customer 1 COI to determine capability shortfalls, excesses, and inform the Capability Shortfall Catalogue & CAPS

**Evidence:** No reference to Customer 1 is made

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Add reference to C1 Deskbook- Highlight that DEC Capability Shortfall Catalogue, and CAPs are called on- Focus on StV-3 used to perform capability analysis, rather than StV-2- Add example StV-3 view and text from C1 Deskbook to clarify linkage

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 27 **Section:** last sentence

**Issue:** layout

**Category:** Minor Editorial **Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** floating sentence doesn't appear to tie in with anything

**Evidence:** views required to support that community'?

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** explain the link with other text

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Issue not recognised and not implemented

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 28

**Section:** Figure 3-18

**Issue:** Question marks

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** What does 'Manage risk ???' mean? Why the question marks?

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Clarify or remove question marks.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Sort in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 28

**Section:** Figure3-18

**Issue:** Figure 3-18 is confusing

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Issue Type:** Style of Diagrams

**Description:** This Figure is again confusing as to which Views are inputs or outputs. Are all the Views in the square box both inputs and outputs?

And are we really expecting Customer 2 to go down to the level of system Views in assessing Capability, and in deciding how to close the gap I do not think they should be creating SVs - again these do not get created until SRD development, in which 2C should not need to be involved, if they have specified their capability requirements adequately it should not matter to them exactly how these are implemented within the technical details of the system.

Then there are other Views listed in the red text within the circle - are these also inputs and outputs, and where exactly do they come in the process?

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Figure needs to be re-drawn with explicit Views showing whether they are inputs or outputs.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** 2C team

**Re page no.:** 29

**Section:** 3.4

**Issue:** Use of View illustrations

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** There are no illustrative Views anywhere in this section. Use of Views to show how they are useful in this process would make the section far easier to understand, and far more useful to the people who need to create these Views.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Add relevant View examples to illustrate how they are useful in the process.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** 2C team



**Re page no.:** 29

**Section:** 3.4.3

**Issue:** Use of SVs in capability review

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Premature use of Systems Views

**Description:** SVs seem too detailed for 2C to be using to assess current capability. SV-5 is identified for use, but I am not sure what value that brings over and above that available in StV-5.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Remove use of SVs.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** 2C team

**Re page no.:** 29

**Section:** 3.4.4

**Issue:** Rephrasing

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** Phrasing of the final paragraph does not match the correct process.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Propose first sentence reads: Once a means of closing the gap has been determined and agreed a BOI decision can be undertaken and the EP/STP adjusted if necessary

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 29

**Section:** 3.4.4

**Issue:** Determining solution too early in the process

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Premature use of Systems Views

**Description:** All through development of the Customer 1 and Acquisition Deskbooks, we have received comments that people hope the use of MODAF will discourage the practice of determining the solution too early on in the process.

This section goes against that (and therefore against best practice in Smart Acquisition) by suggesting that 2C should be developing solutions through use of SVs and OVs.

Surely the purpose of this exercise is to determine a capability gap, and assist Customer 1 with the requirements for closing that gap. The exact solution to provide the required capability should not be defined until further down the process, once the SRD is also developed and all options can be considered.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** This process needs reviewing in conjunction with Customer 2 to ensure it reflects their capability, not system needs. The use of SVs should be reviewed, as they are too detailed this far up the process.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** 2C team

**Re page no.:** 29

**Section:** Section 3.4.3

**Issue:** Capabiliity gap definition

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** I think this should be an activity that 'Defines the capability gap' because the DEC have already determined and approved that a surplus or shortfall exists

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Amend to define capability gap

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 29

**Section:** Section 3.4.3

**Issue:** Depth of explanation

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** It states "Operational views (OV-1c, OV-2, OV-5) should be examined in order to gain an improved understanding of the particular issue and its implications" my question is how? This should be the meat of the paragraph

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Need to tell the community what each view does for them.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** 2C team

**Re page no.:** 29 **Section:** Section 3.4.4

**Issue:** Maintain capability versus acquiring capability

**Category:** Major Technical **Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** This sounds more like the need to change something significant, e.g. acquisition, rather than maintenance

**Evidence:**

**References:** "applying patches/ fixes to worn communications equip" etc"

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Change terminology- "closing the gap" to "assessing against and returning to baseline?"- "modifying communications/ information flows" to something in the vein of "re-configuring to baseline"

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 30

**Section:** 3.5

**Issue:** General

**Category:** Other

**Issue Type:** Use of MODAF Views during Ops Planning /  
Ops

**Description:** I think that this view can stand at the moment, however, I am not sure that MODAF will be dynamic enough to meet the fast changing nature of operations. Further Classification may be an issue.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's  
proposed  
solution:**

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** 2C team

**Re page no.:** 30/32 **Section:** Sections

**Issue:** Receive Order versus understand situation

**Category:** Major Technical **Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** I would think that MODAF views at this point in the process are 'an articulation of the battle situation' and therefore appropriate to 3.5.2 and 3.5.3 combined rather than just the former. The MODAF views would provide a means of briefing those involved.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Cobine sections, or move views to later section with explanation

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open **Person Actioned:** SB



**Re page no.:** 30-42

**Section:** 3.5-3.7

**Issue:** Use of View illustrations

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** None of these sections have any illustrative Views. This is explained as already having been given, at the start of 3.5, in section 3.3. However it makes the Deskbook very difficult to read and understand, especially for people unfamiliar with the MODAF Views.

Some illustrative Views throughout the Deskbook, and where a View is repeated several times at least a reference back to its illustration (though sometimes the View would be used in different ways, and so different annotations would be appropriate), would make the Deskbook far more readable and understandable to the audience.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Add illustrative Views all the way through the Deskbook, using annotations to show how the View is being used for the particular process being described.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** 2C team

**Re page no.:** 31/34

**Section:** Figures 3-19

**Issue:** Completeness of planning process

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** The process diagrams do not cover all the proposed activities and view mappings. It is not clear what the difference is between the two planning phases. Preparatory versus Deployment planning?

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Update diagrams, or include additional diagrams Update supporting text to clarify the difference/ commonality between planning processes

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v1.0

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 33 **Section:** 3.5.6

**Issue:** Who produces StV-5?

**Category:** Major Technical **Issue Type:** StV-5 View

**Description:** This section states that "it is essential that an StV-5...is available".

As no-one has StV-5 as an essential View to create, there will be situations where this is not available. It would not be practical for the Commander on the ground to start putting together an StV-5 in the middle of a battle, and therefore this can not be an essential View here.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Change this to be that an StV-5 would be very useful if it is available (or words to that effect).

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Agreed. Implement in v0.9 - but other decisions (see notes)

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Open **Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 33 and elsewhere                      **Section:** 3.5.6; 3.5.7  
**Issue:** terminology  
**Category:** Minor Editorial                      **Issue Type:** Acronyms 2C / PM / CL

**Description:** confusion on use of PM is this a Project manager or a Pivotal Manager

**Evidence:** 3.5.6 - the assigned PM, 3.5.7 'the Pivotal manager to understand ' etc

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** normal use of PM meand Projecvt manager so avoid and use Pivotal manager in full.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Agreed. Implement in v0.9

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed                      **Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 34 **Section:** Figure3-20

**Issue:** What is the point of Figure 3-20?

**Category:** Major Editorial **Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** Figure 3-20 is exactly the same as figure 3-19, except for the fact it is labelled 'planning' rather than 'preparation'. It is therefore redundant, and just Figure 3-19 could be used for both planning and preparation.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Remove Figure 3-20 and have just one figure for both preparation and planning, if they are the exact same process, as they are shown to be.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Replace duplicate figure with correct one

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 34

**Section:** Section 3.5.4

**Issue:** Lesson Learned

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** View table needs to say that these views represent lessons learned and how, and that there will be multiple sets of them - this should be the core set for lessons learned as per later section

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Be clear on lessons learned suite here. Also, expand section 3.7.5 to clearly identify views for lessons learned and how they would articulate the lessons - a meaty bit of the process as it can be carried out through offline documentation.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** 2C team

**Re page no.:** 35

**Section:** 3.5.8 etc

**Issue:** layout

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** para 2 - single line implies the following are sub-paras of the previous para.

**Evidence:** there now follows a textual description' these appear to be 2 separate phases and have 2 separate figures 3.19 & 3.20

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** make 3.5.8 etc read as 3.5.7.1 etc instead if that is what they are?

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 35

**Section:** Section 3.5.10

**Issue:** Views from Acquisition

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** SV-7, along with a number of other system views would likely be produced in the acquisition process. This output of Acquisition should be highlighted more specifically

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Confirm acquisition link in text in this section, and other sections where Acquisition views are being used

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** SB



**Re page no.:** 35

**Section:** Section 3.5.9

**Issue:** Unlikely use of StV-5

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** StV-5 View

**Description:** StV-5 takes a lot of effort to create. Suggest it would unlikely be used here, especially in the heat of battle

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Remove reference to StV-5

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 36

**Section:** 3.5.12

**Issue:** Section 3.5 contains too many Views

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** Throughout the whole of section 3.5, but in 3.5.12 in particular, there seem to be a host of Views to be created, which seems too much to expect someone in a war situation to be expected to produce.

More thought needs to be given (in conjunction with the Pivotal Manager community) as to which of these Views are absolutely essential, and then only include them in this section. I would imagine that probably only 2-3 Views is the maximum number someone in the battlespace could be expected to produce.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Discuss this with 2C community and reduce the number of Views being created in the battlespace environment.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** 2C team

**Re page no.:** 36

**Section:** 3.5.14

**Issue:** Repeated sentence

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** The first sentence of this paragraph is repeated twice.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's  
proposed  
solution:**

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 36

**Section:** 3.5.14

**Issue:** Editorial

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** First sentence repeated

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Remove one sentence

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 37

**Section:** 3.5.14

**Issue:** Vagueness

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** This paragraph states that where dormant contracts interact with other organisations, this should be recorded "in the appropriate place". This is very vague, and for someone new to MODAF they would not have a clue where "the appropriate place" was, and so ignore this paragraph entirely.

Either these contracts should be recorded in a specific place (and so we can say it is highly desirable that they be recorded in an OV-4, for example, if that is where you envisage them being recorded), or leave this paragraph out altogether.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's  
proposed  
solution:**

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** 2C team

**Re page no.:** 37

**Section:** 3.6

**Issue:** Typing error

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** Full stop before the section heading should be removed

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's  
proposed  
solution:**

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 37

**Section:** 3.6.1

**Issue:** Use of 'Mandated' and 'Recommended' terminology

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** Use of 'Mandated' and 'Recommended' should be changed to 'Essential' and 'Highly Desirable' in the last sentence of this paragraph.

**Evidence:** What is the evidence for the issue.

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** If you have a suggestion for solving the problem please put it here.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 37

**Section:** 3.6.2

**Issue:** Use of 'Mandated' and 'Recommended' terminology

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** Remove use of 'Mandated' and 'Recommended' and replace with 'Essential' and 'Highly Desirable' in the fifth paragraph of this section.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's  
proposed  
solution:**

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK



**Re page no.:** 37

**Section:** 3.6.2

**Issue:** terminology

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** references mandated and recommended views - old terminology

**Evidence:** last para ' All mandated and recommended views

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** express as essential and highly desirable - check throughout doc.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Agreed. Implement in v0.9 of all Deskbooks

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 37

**Section:** Section 3.6.2

**Issue:** TTPs

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** I would think that TTPs for specific operations would unlikely be articulated in MODAF views. Common TTPs and SOPs would however, but this is in the remitt of the C&D Deskbook

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Remove linkage to creation of TTPs, add reference to C&D Deskbook

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 39

**Section:** 3.6

**Issue:** Figure 3-21 does not match textual description

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** Figure 3-21 shows lessons learnt as an output of the 'Monitor and control situation and progress', however in the text lessons learnt is described as an input to this process.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's  
proposed  
solution:**

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 39

**Section:** Figure3-21

**Issue:** Is it realistic to expect a command unit to be updating Views whilst monitoring battle progress?

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Use of MODAF Views during Ops Planning / Ops

**Description:** Is the Customer 2 community happy with being asked to update SV-1, SV-5, OV-1a, OV-1b, OV-1c, OV-2, OV-3, OV-4, OV-5, OV-6a, OV-6b, OV-6c and OV-7

that's 13 Views in all

whilst monitoring progress of a battle situation?

It would seem to be secondary to ensuring the troops safety and ensuring the required effects are delivered.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Consult with Customer 2 community to ensure they have understood and buy-in to the Views to be updated during this process, and reduce the number of Views if that is what they wish.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 39 **Section:** Figure3-21

**Issue:** Put process diagram before process description

**Category:** Major Editorial **Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** For each preceding section the process diagram has been before the textual description of the process. In this section, the diagram comes at the end of the section.

This is confusing to the reader, who expects it to relate to the next section as has previously been the case. It would also help with understanding of section 3.6 to have the diagram first.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Move Figure 3-21 to the start of section 3.6

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 40

**Section:** 3.7.4

**Issue:** terminology

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** first use of USR and USURs need to be explained in full

**Evidence:** appear in title and text

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** procure in full at first use (if not elsewhere earlier in doc)

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 40

**Section:** 3.7.4

**Issue:** Use of Views for USRs and USURs

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** It would seem that USRs and USURs are key documents produced by the 2C community, and therefore it is surprising that there are no MODAF Views that would be helpful in putting together these documents.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Review production of these documents with 2C community, and see which Views would be helpful for inclusion in these documents.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 41

**Section:** Last bullet

**Issue:** Bullet point

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** No text against bulet point.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Add text or remove bullet.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK



**Re page no.:** 42

**Section:** Figure3-22

**Issue:** Use of URD Views to inform operational plans?

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Use of MODAF Views during Ops Planning / Ops

**Description:** I am not sure why the URD Views (StV-6 and the URD Operational View Suite) feed into Operational Plans. URDs are more concerned with individual procurements rather than operations. It seems more likely that several items with their own individual URDs would have been put together to create the capability now being used in an operation.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Check back with Customer 2 community to determine exactly which Views they would find useful in determining their operational plans.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** SB



**Re page no.:** 44

**Section:**

**Issue:** Contact details

**Category:** Procedural

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** Given the stage the project is at, how long will this reference be valid?

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** A help desk or generic point of contact may be less volatile as a point of contact.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** 44

**Section:** para 5

**Issue:** refernces

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** names a person as a reference

**Evidence:** document maintenance

**References:**

**Reviewer'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.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Agreed. Implement in v0.9 of all Deskbooks

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK & authors of other

**Re page no.:** 6

**Section:** 2.1 Last

**Issue:** NEC delivery

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** Strictly speaking we will strive to achieve NEC and get forever closer but never fully attain it as technical innovation and other developments will always limit what we can do.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Adopt a form ow wording that recognises that MODAF enables NEC but both are through life initiatives and not one off activities.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Finalise wording of common parts of Deskooks and have them implemented

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** DM

**Re page no.:** 6

**Section:** 2.1

**Issue:** Views and Viewpoints

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** The terms view and viewpoint are used but there is inconsistency between various documents in circulation over how they are defined. This needs to be clarified.

**Evidence:** Check other documents and listen to verbal descriptions.

**References:** All documents but viewpoint overview in particular.

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** It may be difficult to enforce consistency of use as the terms have been used interchangeably for some time. Some awareness information focusing on this may be needed although it is an irritation rather than a major issue.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Include explanation of key terms that users will not understand (Viewpoint, View, architecture) up-front in wording of beginning, common-across-Deskbooks, section and have them implemented

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** DM

**Re page no.:** 7

**Section:** Figure 2-2

**Issue:** Terminology

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Acronyms 2C / PM / CL

**Description:** The reference to '2c deskbook' is not understood. A label like customer 2 or C2 would be clearer.

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Clarify wording. Avoiding a mixture of red and green will be appreciated by those with defective colour vision.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Leave 2C acronym in diagrams. When requested, produce special versions of the documentation for individuals with accessibility difficulties. Say this in Overview

**Action:** Remove acronym in v0.9. Provide special copies as requested. Say this in Overview

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK, DM

**Re page no.:** 8

**Section:** Figure 2-3

**Issue:** CADMID Diagram

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** The CADMID cycle is shown twice. One occurrence is for funded options but the significance of the other is not apparent. Nearby text does not clarify the diagram. The offset between the CADMID arrows is not explained either.

**Evidence:** What do others new to the documentation think?

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Add a note to say what the upper CADMID arrow represents. Is it unfunded capability or capability that is aspired to?

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Sort in v0.9

**Status:** Close

**Person Actioned:** SB



**Re page no.:** 8

**Section:** Figure 2-3 &

**Issue:** Customer 1 definition

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

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

**Evidence:** COI diagram and subsequent bullets refers to the COI as Capability Management rather than Customer 1

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Update COI diagram as per Customer Deskbook v2.1

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Implement in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** SB

**Re page no.:** 9 **Section:** 2.2.3  
**Issue:** Document IDs  
**Category:** Major Technical **Issue Type:** Quick Start Guides

**Description:** reference to other products that don't appear to exist

**Evidence:** Quick start guides

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** include these as part of the doc or state when and where they are available

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Agreed. Implement in v1.0

**Action:** Implement in v1.0

**Status:** Open **Person Actioned:** 2C team



**Re page no.:** All **Section:** All  
**Issue:** Paragraph numbering  
**Category:** Minor Editorial **Issue Type:** Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

**Description:** Identification of individual paragraphs is difficult as they are not numbered.

**Evidence:** Try reviewing a document like this.

**References:** This comment has been raised in respect of other documents which need similar attention.

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Adopt an appropriate paragraph numbering convention.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Prepare standards for all MODAF documentation and implement them in v1.0 of each Deskbook and in other MODAF documentation

**Action:** Prepare standards for all MODAF documentation DM  
• Prepare standards for all MODAF documentation and implement them in v1.0 of each Deskbook and in other MODAF documentation

**Status:** Open **Person Actioned:** DM

**Re page no.:** All **Section:** All

**Issue:** Document Format

**Category:** Minor Editorial **Issue Type:** Typos/Minor Errors/Minor Changes

**Description:** The document has been saved with the default print layout set to 'landscape' but the actual page layout being 'portrait'. This invariably leads to the first printout being incorrect and wasted.

**Evidence:** Print it and see.

**References:** Other products sent for review also have an inappropriate default print format.

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Change print default to portrait.

**Review Board Decision, if any:**

**Action:** Sort in v0.9

**Status:** Closed

**Person Actioned:** TK

**Re page no.:** N/A **Section:** Section 3.3  
**Issue:** General  
**Category:** Major Technical **Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** There are too many views mandated. The core views that the community should focus on are not clear. In similarity with previous issue, I think this is symptomatic of not having had sufficient time with the right people in the community

**Evidence:** Diagrams use lots of views, without due clarity over use

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** As per previous issue, Firstly, to review use of views in community offline, and to 'boldy' propose the core views.for them.To present these back to the community for consideration.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open **Person Actioned:** 2C team

**Re page no.:** N/A

**Section:** Section 3.3

**Issue:** General

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** Use of views is not specific enough to enable person to start using MODAF in implementation. I think this is symptomatic of not having had sufficient time with the right people in the community, those who run the processes

**Evidence:** Views are described as inputs or outputs, but it is not clear what they are used for, nor why.

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Firstly, to review use of views in community offline, and to 'boldy' propose specific uses for them. To present these back to the community for consideration.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** 2C team

**Re page no.:** N/A                                   **Section:** Section 3.3  
**Issue:** General depth of explanation  
**Category:** Major Technical                   **Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** Text often says "these views can be created to inform you of information x". It doesn't then state the benefit - that this information is then used to do y. E.g. for board to make informed decision, or correct option to be chosen etc

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:**     Need to ensure each use is backed up by benefit to community

**Review Board Decision, if any:**     Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Action:**     Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:**     Open                                   **Person Actioned:**     SB



**Re page no.:** N/A

**Section:** Section 3.5/

**Issue:** General

**Category:** Major Technical

**Issue Type:** Use of MODAF Views during Ops Planning /  
Ops

**Description:** These sections do not cater for the hierarchy of military organisation. Dfferenct levels of organisation will have different MODAF applicability. Individual commands would not be creating MDAF views

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** Need to incorporate organisational levels. To atleast be clear on where views are applicable. E.g. long term planning rather than in the heat of battle

**Review Board Decision, if any:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce as much as possible re 2C for v1.0 to as good a quality as possible

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** 2C team

**Re page no.:** None

**Section:** None

**Issue:** Document creation

**Category:** Other

**Issue Type:** Level of specificity of Deskbook

**Description:** I have a concern that it is not readily apparent which views need to be used to recreate a document such as a URD. Should documents be regarded as composed of views in this way?

**Evidence:**

**References:**

**Reviewer's proposed solution:** A table showing how views map to requirements may help although I am content for this observation to be recorded as a comment for future reference.

**Review Board Decision, if any:** To be covered in QSGs

**Action:** Work with relevant members of the 2C community, if available, and produce a QSG for each key document

**Status:** Open

**Person Actioned:** 2C team

[TXK1]Title of report to be changed to correct document please, Kathy.