MODAF Deskbook for the Customer 2 Community

Status Report on Issues Addressed with the Review Board regarding v0.3 at their 22 Jul 05 Meeting

28 Jul 05

Contents

Introduction

103 Issues were raised 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
	TOTAL	43	60	103

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[TXK1]>.

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, the Issues raised with the Review Board during their 22 Jul 05 meeting.

Content

This report is structured by Issue Type. The Issue Type is first explained and a page then follows on each Issue allocated to this Issue Type. 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 43 Issues raised to the Review Board.

Use of MODAF Views during Ops Planning / Ops

It is unrealistic to expect the military to use MODAF views in dynamic situations such as for operational short-term planning. It will not be possible to keep the underlying models coherent and up-to-date and thereby able to provide a 'trusted' answer.

The current descriptions of use of MODAF during Planning for Military Operations do not make sufficient allowance for military heirarchy.

Page: **Section:**

Issue: Op Plans

Category: Major Technical

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:

**User's
Proposed
Solution:**

References:

Review Board Decision, if   Agreed. Implement recommendation

Action: Implement recommendation

Person Actioned: SB

Status   Open

Page:	30	**Section:**	3.5

Issue: General

Category: Other

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:

**User's
Proposed
Solution:**

References:

Review Board Decision, if   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

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

Person Actioned: 2C team

Status   Open

Page:	N/A	**Section:**	Section 3.5/

Issue: General

Category: Major Technical

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:

User's Proposed Solution: Need to incoporate organisational levels. To atleast be clear on where views are applicable. E.g. long term planning rather than in the heat of battle

References:

Review Board Decision, if 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

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

Person Actioned: 2C team

Status Open

Level of Specificity of Deskbook

All reviewers have said that the use of MODAF is not articulated explicitly enough for people to start using the deskbook in a real situation.
It is felt that:

1) there are too many Views designated as Essential;

2) that the core Views that the community should focus on to carry out an activity are not clear;

3) that it is not sufficiently clearly stated as to exactly how to use a modaf view in a particular activity and what to produce from it.

Page: **Section:**   General

Issue: General

Category: Major Technical

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 prcesses' - more people's impressions of what the processes are. Only when we start to use MODAF for real will we be able to articulatesthe Customer 2 processes at the right level of detail and generality and write the 'Real Deskbook' .

Evidence: Aware of many different versions of processes

User's Proposed Solution: Begin to use MODAF for projects and document processes in a consistent way

References:

Review Board Decision, if   Agreed. Set expectation in Foreword

Action: Set expectation in Foreword

Person Actioned: KL

Status   Open

Page: **Section:**

Issue:

Category: Other

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

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

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

Action: Gain participation of relevant Customer 2 people

Person Actioned: KL

Status Open

Page: **Section:**

Issue: General

Category: Major Technical

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

Evidence:

**User's
Proposed
Solution:**

References:

Review Board Decision, if   Agreed. Set expectation in Foreword

Action: Set expectation in Foreword

Person Actioned: ~~KL~~DM

Status   Open

Page: 18-19 **Section:** 3.3.2

Issue: Unclear how StVs are used by 2C

Category: Major Editorial

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:

User'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.

References:

Review Board Decision, if 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

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

Person Actioned: 2C team

Status Open

Page: 26 **Section:** 3.3.4

Issue: Need example Views to illustrate the process

Category: Major Editorial

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:

User's Proposed Solution: Add in example Views throughout the process text to illustrate their usefulness.

References:

Review Board Decision, if 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

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

Person Actioned: 2C team

Status Open

Page: 26   **Section:** Last

Issue: Annotated examples required to support descriptions

Category: Major Technical

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

User's Proposed Solution: Add examples and expand text to describe how views are used

References:

Review Board Decision, if 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

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

Person Actioned: 2C team

Status Open

Page: 29   **Section:** 3.4

Issue: Use of View illustrations

Category: Major Editorial

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:

**User's
Proposed
Solution:**   Add relevant View examples to illustrate how they are useful in the process.

References:

Review Board Decision, if   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

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

Person Actioned: 2C team

Status   Open

Page: 29   **Section:** Section 3.4.3

Issue: Depth of explanation

Category: Major Technical

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

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Need to tell the community what each view does for them.

References:

Review Board Decision, if 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

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

Person Actioned: 2C team

Status Open

| **Page:** | 30-42 | **Section:** | 3.5-3.7 |

Issue: Use of View illustrations

Category: Major Editorial

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:

User'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.

References:

Review Board Decision, if   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

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

Person Actioned: 2C team

Status   Open

Page: 34   **Section:** Section 3.5.4

Issue: Lesson Learned

Category: Major Technical

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:

User'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.

References:

Review Board Decision, if 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

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

Person Actioned: 2C team

Status Open

Page: 36   **Section:** 3.5.12

Issue: Section 3.5 contains too many Views

Category: Major Technical

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:

User's Proposed Solution: Discuss this with 2C community and reduce the number of Views being created in the battlespace environment.

References:

Review Board Decision, if 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

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

Person Actioned: 2C team

Status Open

Page: N/A   **Section:**   Section 3.3

Issue: General

Category: Major Technical

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

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

References:

Review Board Decision, if   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

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

Person Actioned: 2C team

Status   Open

Page:	N/A	**Section:**	Section 3.3

Issue: General

Category: Major Technical

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.

User'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.

References:

Review Board Decision, if 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

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

Person Actioned: 2C team

Status Open

Page:	N/A	**Section:**	Section 3.3

Issue: General depth of explanation

Category: Major Technical

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:

User's Proposed Solution: Need to ensure each use is backed up by benefit to community

References:

Review Board Decision, if 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

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

Person Actioned: SB

Status Open

Page: None **Section:** None

Issue: Document creation

Category: Other

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:

User'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.

References:

Review Board Decision, if To be covered in QSGs

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

Person Actioned: 2C team

Status Open

Ownership of Views Unclear

The ownership of data within Views, particularly the Operational suite of Views, is unclear. Future Operational Views are owned by Customer 1, (though Customer 2 provide some input into them). Customer 2 will develop some of these Vews in more detail for practical operational use, as implementation gets nearer and they fill out some of the details in the CIP. Also, Customer 2 should probably have ownership of the 'As-Is' Views in some cases, but which ones?

Further, items of data within a view 'owned' by one COI may be provided by another COI. (e.g traffic light data in AcV-2 for some of the DLoDs will come from Customer 2).

Page: 17   **Section:** Figure 3-4

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

Category: Minor Technical

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:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision, if   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.

Person Actioned: All D'b authors

Status   Closed

Page: 17   **Section:** Figure 3-4

Issue: Who creates OV-2 and OV-5

Category: Major Technical

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:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision, if   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.

Person Actioned: DM

Status   Open

Quick Start Guides

Quick Start Guides (QSGs) required for 2C.

In addition, a generic Quick Reference Guide was requested for the 6-Step process.

Page: 10   **Section:** 3.1.1

Issue: product ID

Category: Minor Technical

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

Evidence: It appears here as an insert drawing fig 3.1

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

References:

Review Board Decision, if 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

Person Actioned: DM

Status Open

Page: 9 **Section:** 2.2.3

Issue: Document IDs

Category: Major Technical

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

Evidence: Quick start guides

User's Proposed Solution: include thiese as part of the doc or state when and where they are available

References:

Review Board Decision, if Agreed. Implement in v1.0

Action: Implement in v1.0

Person Actioned: 2C team

Status Open

Style of Diagrams

There are numerous comments about diagrams, covering readability, clarity, accessibilty, etc.
Some of these are general across deskbooks.

One specific issue is that of portraying the development of a View, as distinct from its creation. We understand that only the owner of a View will update it, others contributing only input to views .

On the other hand, as mentioned in the Ownership Issue, some users will develop a View to a greater level of detail and then own those.

Page: 17 **Section:** Figure 3-4

Issue: Inputs / Outputs unclear on process diagram

Category: Major Editorial

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:

User'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.

References:

Review Board Decision, if 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

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

Person Actioned: 2C team

Status Open

Page: 17   **Section:** Figure 3-4

Issue: Input and output

Category: Minor Technical

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

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Clarify diagram.

References:

Review Board Decision, if 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

Person Actioned: SB

Status Close

Page: 20,23, 24, 25,   **Section:** figures on

Issue: drawings generally

Category: Minor Editorial

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

Evidence: on all pages as detailed

User's Proposed Solution: increase font size or enlarge scale

References:

Review Board Decision, if Agreed. Implement in v0.9

Action: Implement in v0.9

Person Actioned: SB

Status Closed

Page: 21   **Section:** Figure 3-9

Issue: OV-1

Category: Minor Editorial

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

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Enlarge and place on a whole page. Other diagrams that are intended to be readable may require similar treatment.

References:

Review Board Decision, if 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

Person Actioned: SB

Status Closed

Page: 28   **Section:** Figure3-18

Issue: Figure 3-18 is confusing

Category: Major Editorial

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 ouptuts?

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 detials 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:

User's Proposed Solution: Figure needs to be re-drawn with explicit Views showing whether they are inputs or outputs.

References:

Review Board Decision, if 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

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

Person Actioned: 2C team

Status Open

BMS

Should BMS be mentioned , and if so, what should be stated about it?

Page: 15   **Section:** 3.2

Issue: BMS

Category: Minor Technical

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

Evidence: n/a

User's Proposed Solution: Remove reference to BMS (Business Management System)

References:

Review Board Decision, if Agreed. Implement in v0.9

Action: Implement in v0.9

Person Actioned: TK

Status Closed

Acronyms 2C / PM / CL

Different reviewers have expressed conflicting views on the use of these acronyms.

E.g.
Should it be Customer 2 or 2C?
Should Core Leader and Pivotal Manager be abbreviated to CL and PM?

Page: 15 **Section:** 2nd

Issue: Core Leader vs Pivatol Manager

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Making the definition of Core Leader vs Pivotal Manager clearer. Can Core Leader and Pivotal manager by 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:

User's Proposed Solution: I think a clear bulleted definition of Core Leader/ Pivotal Manager is required upfront, maybe Section 3.1.3, page 11

References:

Review Board Decision, if Agreed. Implement in v0.9

Action: Implement in v0.9

Person Actioned: TK

Status Closed

Page:	15	**Section:**	

Issue: Acronyms

Category: Minor Editorial

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.

User's Proposed Solution: On the first line of the paragrah 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.

References:

Review Board Decision, if

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

Person Actioned: TK

Status Closed

Page: 33 and elsewhere   **Section:** 3.5.6; 3.5.7

Issue: terminology

Category: Minor Editorial

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

User's Proposed Solution: normal use of PM meand Projecvt manager so avoid and use Pivotal manager in full.

References:

Review Board Decision, if   Agreed. Implement in v0.9

Action: Implement in v0.9

Person Actioned: TK

Status   Closed

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

Issue: Terminology

Category: Minor Editorial

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

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Clarify wording. Avoiding a mixture of red and green will be appreciated by those with defective colour vision.

References:

Review Board Decision, if 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 ~~Sort~~ in v0.9. Provide special copies as requested. Say this in Overview

Person Actioned: TK, DM

Status Closed

Premature Use of Systems Views

Systems Views are not ususally of interest to Customer 2 but have been mentioned in the 2C deskboook as useful in some circumstances. This has given rise to concern that Customer 2 are being described in the Deskbook as considering system needs, not capability needs.

Their inclusion was intended to help users understand the genuine constraints that are imposed by existing systems in some circumstances e.g. a new capability may have to interface with existing communications platforms. This is not the same thing as 'solutioneering'.

Page: 17   **Section:** Figure 3-4

Issue: Use of SVs pre-concept

Category: Major Technical

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:

User's Proposed Solution: Remove the use of SVs as inputs into capability planning.

References:

Review Board Decision, if   Agreed. Implement in v0.9

Action: Implement in v0.9

Person Actioned: SB

Status   Closed

Page: 29   **Section:** 3.4.4

Issue: Determining solution too early in the process

Category: Major Technical

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:

User'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.

References:

Review Board Decision, if   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

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

Person Actioned: 2C team

Status   Open

StV-5 View

The StV-5 view is recommended for use, but it is not clear whether anyone is actually going to produce it.

Page: 17   **Section:** Figure 3-4

Issue: Who produces StV-5?

Category: Minor Technical

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:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Review Board Decision, if   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.

Person Actioned: DM

Status   Closed

Page: 33   **Section:** 3.5.6

Issue: Who produces StV-5?

Category: Major Technical

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:

User's Proposed Solution: Change this to be that an StV-5 would be very useful if it is available (or words to that effect).

References:

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

Action: Implement in v0.9

Person Actioned: SB

Status   Open

Consistency across Deskbooks & Common Sections

This issue type covers issues which are common across the different deskbooks, including the introductory material and the reference to the document owner.
In some cases, version 0.3 of the 2C deskbook omitted to consistently reflect some changes that had already been agreed; in others, agreement has been proposed since publication of version 0.3
This specifically Includes:
The 6-step architecture process diagram
Use of Essential and Highly Desirable, rather than Mandated and Recommended Views
Contact details.
Accessibility issues

Page: 11   **Section:** 3.1.4

Issue: Repeated information?

Category: Major Editorial

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:

User's Proposed Solution: Remove sections 3.1.4 and 3.1.5.

References:

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

Action: Sections removed

Person Actioned: TK

Status Closed

Page: 12   **Section:** Section 3.1.5

Issue: Overview of views

Category: Major Editorial

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

Evidence:

User'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 folllowing the viewpoint overview diagram (Figure 2-1) on page 6

References:

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

Action: Sections removd

Person Actioned: TK

Status   Closed

Page: 13, 14   **Section:** 3.1.6

Issue: consistency

Category: Major Editorial

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

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

User's Proposed Solution: use agreed terminology throughout ie Essential, Highly desirable.

References:

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

Action: Implement in v0.9

Person Actioned: TK

Status Closed

Page: 14   **Section:** Figure 3-2

Issue: Terminology

Category: Minor Technical

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.

User's Proposed Solution: Explain what mandated and recommended mean in this context.

References:

Review Board Decision, if

Action: Correct in v0.9

Person Actioned: TK

Status Closed

Page: 37   **Section:** 3.6.2

Issue: terminology

Category: Major Editorial

Description: references mandated and recommended views - old terminology

Evidence: last para ' All mandated and recommended views

User's Proposed Solution: express as essential and highly desirable - check throughout doc.

References:

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

Action: Implement in v0.9

Person Actioned: TK

Status Closed

Page: 44   **Section:** para 5

Issue: refernces

Category: Major Technical

Description: names a person as a reference

Evidence: document maintenance

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

References:

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

Action: Implement in v0.9

Person Actioned: TK & authors of other Deskbooks

Status Closed

Page: 44 **Section:**

Issue: Contact details

Category: Procedural

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

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: A help desk or generic point of contact may be less volatile as a point of contact.

References:

Review Board Decision, if

Action: Implement in v0.9

Person Actioned: TK

Status Closed

Page: all   **Section:** All

Issue: Paragraph numbering

Category: Minor Editorial

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

Evidence: Try reviewing a document like this.

User's Proposed Solution: Adopt an appropriate paragraph numbering convention.

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

Review Board Decision, if 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

Person Actioned: DM

Status Open

Page: all   **Section:**

Issue: General presentation

Category: Major Editorial

Description: I dislike reading documents of this size on screen. On printing off this document, and others, I am concerned at the number of pages involved, especially when the margins are so large. Being in the format presented I have not been able to reduce the margins myself, which would have significantly reduced the number of pages.

Evidence: What is the evidence for the issue.

User's Proposed Solution: Decrease all margins to at least 2cm, even 1.5cm top bottom and right side would be better.

References:

Review Board Decision, if   Agree standards and have them implemented

Action: Agree standards and have them implemented

Person Actioned: DM

Status   Open

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