MODAF Handbook Issue Log
Pre-Baseline Version 1.0 –14th July 2005

Introduction

There were 406 issues raised against the MODAF Handbook during the review process for Review Pack 1. The vast majority of these were typographical errors, or issues that had already been fixed. The MODAF Review Board met on the 7th July to consider the remaining 92 more serious issues and another 9 issues raised at the meeting . These issues and their resolution have been captured in a database that has been used to auto-generate most of this document. It should be noted that a number of issues that require further clarification from their authors (most of which were raised by the IA) have yet to be reviewed or included in the plan for updating the Handbook. Similarly a number of issues that were received late have not been reviewed or included in the plan.

The more serious issues that were reviewed were sorted into the following broad categories:

- Real World Examples
- M3 System Connectivity
- Remove SV-2d
- IEEE1471 Definitions
- NATO Definitions
- DLODs
- Nodes
- Caveat on Cover

- StV-3 & 5 are too equipment-focused
- Epoch
- Life, the Universe & Everything – material & energy over needlines
- OV-1b ConOps / ConEmp
- MODAF Meta-Model Issues
- Use Cases for OV-5
- Individual Issues (Miscellaneous)

For many categories, the Review Board took an overall decision that resolved all of the issues in the category. Therefore when reading this document it is important that the resolution noted at beginning of each issue category is read prior to reading the decision on an individual issue. Each of the Individual Issues were reviewed separately.

The release of Baseline Version 1.0 in August will require:
- 70 of the issues resolved (covering many categories) to be used to update the Handbook
- the remaining typographical errors not discussed at the Review Board to be fixed
- particular assistance from
  - Ian Bailey in resolving MODAF Meta Model issues
  - Philip James in providing correct caveat text for the Cover
  - Dave Mawby, Fariba Hozhabrafkan and Ian Bailey in resolving issues on needlines
  - Simon Bray in resolving issues on SV-2d
  - Kathy Lamb in getting an approved Foreword

After the release of Baseline Version 1.0 there are 20 issues that will need to be examined and used to update the Handbook. Some issues of note are:
- Investigation and possible use of definitions from IEEE1471 and NATO
- Creation of new SVs
- Creation of further examples for many views
- Creation of a version of the Handbook that can be browsed on the internet

The remaining sections of this document list the issue resolutions from the Review Board

Real World Examples

Description

There is a mixture of real-world (i.e. defence) and generic examples in the view descriptions. The real-world examples are mostly in the new views. Some reviewers have commented that some of the generic examples are of little use. However, these originated mostly from the DoDAF vol II document, which is deliberately generic - the belief being that the deskbook should contain the real-world examples.

It may be too late in the day to consider re-drawing all these diagrams, and there is certainly no way this could be done in time for a 21st July interim release. However, the COI deskbook projects have produced a number of real-world examples which could be re-used.

The review board needs to decide if the handbook should be kept independent of defence (DoDAF's approach), or if real-world examples should be used. Should the review board choose to use real-world examples, some may already exist in the deskbooks, and these could be re-used in the handbook. However, they should not replace the generic examples unless those examples are wrong or misleading.

Proposed Solution

My feeling is that generic is probably best for the handbook - we don't want to imply process or specific usage of MODAF in the technical specification. Some of the generic examples taken from DoDAF aren't perfect and maybe the weaker ones could be identified and improved. Going this route would also mean that generic examples would have to be produced for the StVs and AcVs - so this is not the "easy option" it might appear. (Ian Bailey)

Review Board Decision for these types of Issue:

After considerable discussion it was agreed that the approach to examples needed to be more specific to MODAF and the UK Defence environment and less US based whilst still being "generic" in the sense that they are independent of a particular UK project, capability of system. However the meeting agreed that the pragmatic need to create the Handbook baseline version 1.0 suggests that it doesn't make sense to re-create examples for nearly every view.

So it was agreed that
* The US DODAF examples used in MODAF will be removed and replaced with UK based examples
* Existing UK based examples can remain irrespective of whether they are generic or based on a particular UK project, capability of system
* It is acceptable to have a mix of generic and specific views for Handbook baseline version 1.0
* The plan for updating the Handbook after the release of baseline version 1.0 should allow for the effort to update examples

Changes to some particular examples were agreed
* SV-5 examples should be more defence specific
* The examples used for OV-6 views and SV 10b and SV10c are too similar and should be changed
* Give better examples for all the cases discussed in SV11
* TV-2 examples should be more defence specific

Real World Examples

ID	230	**Page:**	45	**Section:**	Figure 5-15
Issue:	StV-5 Example				
Category:	Minor Editorial				
Description:	Could we show any more specific or realistic examples here - anything coming out of deskbook work?				

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: For consideration

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Another one…

Review Board   StV-5 examples should be more defence specific

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

Real World Examples

ID	245	**Page:**	66	**Section:**	Figure 6-8

Issue: OV-2a Diagram

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Could we have a UK example?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: For consideration

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey:

Review Board UK examples to be included

Action by When After Version 1

Status Closed

Real World Examples

ID	252	**Page:**	73	**Section:**	Figure 6-14
Issue:	OV-3 diagrams
Category:	Minor Editorial
Description:	Could we have a UK example?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: For consideration

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey:

Review Board UK example to be included

Action by When After Version 1

Status Closed

Real World Examples

ID	256	**Page:**	75	**Section:**	OV-4

Issue: OV-4 Product Description

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Para 4 could be complemented by an example?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: For consideration

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey:

Review Board UK example to be included

Action by When After Version 1

Status Closed

Real World Examples

ID	259	**Page:**	82	**Section:**	Figure 6-23
Issue:	OV-5 diagrams				
Category:	Minor Editorial				
Description:	All diagrams were generic - any way of including a defence specific example?				

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: For consideration

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey:

Review Board UK example to be included

Action by When After Version 1

Status Closed

Real World Examples

ID	265	**Page:**	89	**Section:**	Figure 6-28

Issue: Anatomy of an Executable OA

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Need a more relevant UK diagram I agree but also this doesn't really seem to link to the previous elements of the section as a diagram structure - is further explanation required?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Edit

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey:

Review Board The text in this section is to be removed

Action by When No change

Status Closed

Real World Examples

ID	268	**Page:**	92		**Section:**	Figure 6-31

Issue: OV-6c

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Can we find a defence example?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: For consideration

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey:

Review Board The examples used for OV-6 views and SV 10b and SV10c are too similar and should be changed and should be more defence specific

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Real World Examples

ID	270	**Page:**	95	**Section:**	Figure 6-34
Issue:	OV-7				
Category:	Minor Editorial				
Description:	Can we find a defence example?				

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: For consideration

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey:

Review Board   A UK defence example should be included

Action by When   After Version 1

Status   Closed

Real World Examples

ID　　　　273　　　　　　　**Page:**　　100　　　　　　　**Section:**　　Figure 7-2

Issue:　　Sv-1

Category:　　Minor Editorial

Description:　　Can we find a UK defence example?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:　　For consideration

References:

Recommended Action:　　Ian Bailey: See other issues

Review Board　　A UK defence example should be included

Action by When　　After Version 1

Status　　Closed

Real World Examples

ID	286	**Page:**	116		**Section:**	All figures

Issue: SV-4 diagrams

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Can we find a defence example?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Edit

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: At the moment, the Handbook has some examples that are military (mostly the new MODAF views) and some which are generic. The DoDAF Vol II is deliberately generic, relying on the deskbooks to show the real stuff. Is the review board happy with this mixture of approaches (bearing in mind the amount of work required to fix it would prevent release on 21st July).

Review Board A UK defence example should be included

Action by When After Version 1

Status Closed

Real World Examples

ID	288	**Page:**	122	**Section:**	Figure 7-25

Issue: Sv-5 Product Description

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Surely we can give a better, more self-explanatory example than this? Can we not describe the op activities and sys functions rather than numbering them (for the purposes of the example), plus there is no defence feel to it.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Edit

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: This is the existing DoDAF example - see issues 285, 286, 287

Review Board SV-5 examples should be more defence specific

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Real World Examples

ID	289	**Page:**	122	**Section:**	Product

Issue: Sv-5 Product Description

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: SV-5 is described as being able to be used to map different levels between capabilities and systems, this along with the para on product purpose would benefit from further (diagrammatic?) explanation

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: For consideration

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: This is the existing DoDAF example - see issues 285, 286, 287, 288

Review Board SV-5 examples should be more defence specific

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Real World Examples

ID	292	**Page:**	127	**Section:**	Figure 7-28

Issue: SV-6 Product Description

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: We have two table headings here for 1 continuous table - this should be explained, plus are all parts mandatory? Could we add in an actual defence example?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Edit

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Not all parts are mandatory - indeed, they are user defined (RH to add clarification text). As for defence examples, that's for the review board to decide.

Review Board UK defence example to be included.

Action by When After Version 1

Status Closed

Real World Examples

ID	301	**Page:**	140	**Section:**	Figure 7-38

Issue: SV-10a

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Could we have a defence example please? (or an equivalent but more relevant one)

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Edit

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Review Board to judge on use of examples

Review Board UK defence example to be included.

Action by When After Version 1

Status Closed

Real World Examples

ID	303	**Page:**	142	**Section:**	Figure 7-40

Issue: SV-10b

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Could we have a defence example please? (to aid showing the differences between this and the OV-6 set)

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Edit

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Review Board to decide on use of real-world examples

Review Board UK defence example to be included. Also examples used for OV-6 views and SV 10b and SV10c are too similar and should be changed

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Real World Examples

ID	306	**Page:**	144	**Section:**	Figure 7-42

Issue: SV-10c

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Could we have a defence example please?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Edit

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: review board to decide on use of real-world examples

Review Board UK defence example to be included. Also examples used for OV-6 views and SV 10b and SV10c are too similar and should be changed

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Real World Examples

ID	309	**Page:**	146		**Section:**	Figure 7-44
Issue:	SV-11					
Category:	Minor Editorial					
Description:	Could we have a defence example please?					

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Edit

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey:

Review Board Provide better examples for all the cases discussed in SV11

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Real World Examples

ID	313		**Page:**	151	**Section:**	Product
Issue:	TV-2					
Category:	Minor Editorial					
Description:	Please give a true defence example anyway					

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Edit

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Review Board to decide on use of real-world examples

Review Board TV-2 examples should be more defence specific

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

M3 System Connectivity

Description

M3 is being re-worked in this area which should address these concerns. The issues have been presented to the review board simply because they have a "Major Technical" categorisation.

The ISSE team and Telelogic are keen that the M3 model follows the UML composite structures approach. This presents some issues as UML is not designed with the physical world in mind, but I'm confident an appropriate solution can be found - Ian Bailey.

Proposed Solution

Ian Bailey:

No action needed from Review Board. Work is in progress.

The M3 is still being worked on, and must go through another technical review cycle before being incorporated into the Handbook. The revised M3 will go out for a quick review towards the end of July. It will then be added to the handbook.

The approach would seem to be:
- Systems are stereotypes of classes (no change there)
- Systems are presented in SV-1 and SV-2 as composition diagrams
- Sub-systems will be implemented as properties of the parent system, typed by the
- system classes
- Associations will be defined between classes
- Connectors will implement those associations between sub-systems
- Ports are shown in SV-2, but not SV-1 which presents a problem of re-using the
- connectors. ISSE team advises that simply "hiding" ports in SV-1 is not an option. This
- means that two sets of connectors will be needed (potentially causing re-use problems).
- A work-around is being sought that enables re-use but keeps the ISSE folks happy.

Review Board Decision for these types of Issue:

Agree with the recommendation and note that the issues will be resolved in time for the release of the Handbook baseline version 1.0 in August

M3 System Connectivity

ID	432	**Page:**	52		**Section:**	Figure 5-17:

Issue: StV-5 System Relationship stereotype

Category: Major Technical

Description: System relationships should be based on UML connectors

Evidence: This is a satisfactory technique for representing system relationships in DoDAF-related work; in addition, the use of associations cannot be contextualized in hierarchies (which is why connectors were added to UML in the first place).

User's Proposed Solution: System Relationship stereotype û should extend Connector metaclass instead of Association metaclass. Alternatively, it could extend both.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: This is to be tackled in the fixed M3 due in the Aug final release of M3

Review Board   Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

M3 System Connectivity

ID	439	**Page:**	102	**Section:**	Figure 7-4

Issue: SV-1 System Relations-hip stereotype

Category: Major Technical

Description: System Relationship stereotype extends the Association metaclass

Evidence: This meta-model structure does not allow for efficient implementation.

User's Proposed Solution: Change to extend the Connector metaclass.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: See issue 446

Review Board   Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

M3 System Connectivity

ID	440	**Page:**	102	**Section:**	Figure 7-4

Issue: SV-1association classes

Category: Major Technical

Description: Association classes incompatible with proposed System Relationship representation (see "SV-1 System Relationship stereotype" issue)

Evidence: Cannot use association classes with connectors

User's Proposed Solution: Replace by either a) folding comms link definition into existing System definitions, or b) make an explicit subclass of System to represent Comms Link Type.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: See issue 446

Review Board   Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

M3 System Connectivity

ID	410	**Page:**	118	**Section:**	7.4.3

Issue: SV4 dataflows

Category: Major Technical

Description: Use of UML Class Diagram is suggested here for the SV-4 data flow diagram - this would appear to be not appropriate.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Use UML Class Diagram for the functional decomposition and UML Activity Diagram for the data flow diagram.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: System connectivity in meta-model is being re-worked - also functional models will be re-worked in M3

Review Board   Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

Remove SV-2d

Description

SV-2d does not seem to add any more functionality than SV-3 and SV-6

Proposed Solution

Ian Bailey:

Recommend removing SV-2d - it was a "straw-man" view proposed in the original MODAF white-papers but has been received neutrally. Same effect could be achieved in the MODAF meta-model, but would rely on tools to make the link between information elements and the data model.

Review Board Decision for these types of Issue:

Agree with the recommendation to remove SV-2d subject to consultation with Simon Bray, MoD

Remove SV-2d

ID   25   **Page:**   103   **Section:**   7.2 & 7.2.

Issue: What happened to the SV-2d?

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Section 7.2 refers to the SV-2a,b,c,d but section 7.2.2 refers to only SV-2a,b,c.

Evidence: SV-2d missing

**User's
Proposed
Solution:**   Add "d"

References:

**Recommended
Action:**   Ian Bailey: Remove reference to SV-2d - also recommend removing SV-2d view as it seems to not
                     add any more than SV-3 and SV-6

Review Board   Remove view

**Action by
When**   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

Remove SV-2d

ID	281	**Page:**	112	**Section:**	Figure 7-15

Issue: SV-2d Product Description

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Diagram should be on one page. Plus see my White Paper comments

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: For consideration

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Recommend SV-2d is removed - SV-3 and SV-6 take care of this anyway. Review Board to decide.

Review Board   Remove view

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

IEEE1471 Definitions

Description

Several comments recommend using these. However, they are heavily systems-oriented and may not be that applicable to an enterprise architecture.

In addition, there is a drive to follow an agreed set of NATO definitions.

Proposed Solution

Ian Bailey:

Review Board to decide between existing MODAF, NATO and IEEE definitions.

Review Board Decision for these types of Issue:

The definitions in MODAF need to reflect that it is an enterprise architecture and not a technical architecture. The MODAF definitions are in the spirit of IEEE1471 and have been incorporated into the MODAF definitions where possible. However IEEE1471 definitions do not have precedence. It was agreed to add a statement in the Handbook to this effect emphasising that MODAF is an Enterprise Architecture with different aims to IEEE1471.

IEEE1471 Definitions

ID	422	Page:		Section:

Issue: View & Viewpoint

Category: Major Editorial

Description: If possible, in order to reduce misunderstanding in the wider community, it is desirable to use existing definitions of the terms view and viewpoint. The definitions given in IEEE 1471 (which are compatible with RM-ODP usage) appear to be applicable, but do not match MODAF usage: view: A representation of a whole system from the perspective of a related set of concerns. viewpoint: A specification of the conventions for constructing and using a view. A pattern or template from which to develop individual views by establishing the purposes and audience for a view and the techniques for its creation and analysis.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References: Ian Bailey: The standards you mention are technical architecture standards. However, the definitions seem to be broadly in line with MODAF - esp. if you taken the term "system" to include

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: My belief is that the definitions are in the spirit of IEEE1471. However, that is a technical architecture standard, not an enterprise architecture standard, hence our definitions need to be broader. Review board to decide whether to copy IEEE1471.

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When After Version 1

Status Closed

IEEE1471 Definitions

ID	384	**Page:**	14	**Section:**	Sec 2.1.2.1,

Issue: Inconsistency with DODAF

Category: Major Technical

Description: MODAF appears to be using "viewpoint" and "view" (albeit inconsistently) whereas DODAF uses "view" and product". There is no rationale presented for the divergence. Given that MODAF is based on DODAF this has potential to confuse for no apparent value

Evidence: see text

User's Proposed Solution: Consider whether this inconsistency is necessary. Recommend that it is not, and that MODAF re-aligns to DODAF terminology

References: DODAF Volume 1

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Strictly speaking, "product" is meant to be an instantiation of a view - i.e. real data - according Truman, Fatma, and all the folks who worked on the DoDAF spec. However, the DoDAF documents use product and view randomly, it seems. A decision was taken to use view and viewpoint based on IEEE1471, but with modifications to take into account that MODAF is *enterprise* architecture.

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When After Version 1

Status Closed

IEEE1471 Definitions

ID	170	**Page:**	18	**Section:**	Section 3

Issue: View Definition

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Need to take into account the IEEE View and Viewpoint standard definitions as agreed at the

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: My belief is that the definitions are in the spirit of IEEE1471. However, that is a technical architecture standard, not an enterprise architecture standard, hence our definitions need to be broader. Review board to decide whether to copy IEEE1471.

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When After Version 1

Status Closed

NATO Definitions

Description

MOD has been working with NATO to pin-down some common terminology and definitions. Several issues centre around the Handbook using the NATO definitions.

There have also been issues raised about using IEEE1471 definitions.

Proposed Solution

Ian Bailey:

Review Board to decide between existing MODAF, NATO and IEEE definitions.

Review Board Decision for these types of Issue:

MODAF definitions will harmonised with NATO definitions but both are changing at present making consistent update of the Handbook difficult in the short term. Harmonisation to be done after the release of Handbook baseline version 1.0 in August

NATO Definitions

ID	144	**Page:**	13	**Section:**	What is an

Issue: Potential misuse of words against agreed NATO definitions

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: NATO with UK involvement, within the NAF Revision activity, have agreed specific definitions for terms such as 'abstraction' and 'aspect'. It would be good if these terms could be used consistently across all organisations documentation

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Ensure words are used as intended

References: Agreed definitions of NAF Revision Meeting from Stockholm, Sweden (see Andy, Fariba).

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: review Board to approve - Rob H to discuss NATO terminology with Andy North then make changes if review board has approved

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When After Version 1

Status Closed

NATO Definitions

ID   156   **Page:**   16   **Section:**   Why use

Issue: Definitions

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Aspect

Evidence: Aspect has a specific connotation in the NATO community

**User's
Proposed
Solution:**

References: Agreed definitions of NAF Revision Meeting from Stockholm, Sweden (see Andy, Fariba).

**Recommended
Action:**   Ian Bailey: Andy North & Review Board to decide on adoption of NATO definitions

Review Board   Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

**Action by
When**   After Version 1

Status   Closed

DLODs

Description

MOD is moving to 8 Lines of development - examples in the StV and AcV views mention (and in AcV-2 model) six lines of development

Proposed Solution

Ian Bailey:

Reluctant as I am to introduce extra technical work at this late stage, I think the solution to this is to make the Handbook description as generic as possible - i.e. it shouldn't mention LoDs. Then, for AcV-2 the handbook simply introduces the concept of a generic traffic-light system. It is then down to the deskbooks to show how this could be used for LoDs

Dave Mawby:

Replacing the hexagons with a segmented circle (looks like a pie chart) would enable any number of traffic lights to be located at project milestones.

Review Board Decision for these types of Issue:

The term Defence Lines of Development, DLoD, shall be used. It was agreed that views representing DLoDs could use pie charts, regular polyhedron or whatever graphic that is preferred providing that
- the graphic is explained
- it covers the currently agreed MoD DLoDs.
- the red, amber greed traffic light system is still used with additional colouring to indicate that white means an absence and that black means not applicable

The text and graphics in AcV-2 in particular will be updated to reflect this decision and other views are to be reviewed and changed similarly in time for the release Handbook baseline version 1.0 in August.

DLODs

ID	382	**Page:**		**Section:**

Issue: LoD needs to be changed to DLoD throughout the document.

Category: Major Editorial

Description: LoD needs to be changed to DLoD throughout the document.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Review Board to rule on this. This would probably be too big a job to do in time for 21st July, but maybe could be done for final August release.

Review Board DLoD will be used.

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

DLODs

ID	516	**Page:**	159	**Section:**	9.2.1.3

Issue: Number of lines of development

Category: Major Editorial

Description: The MOD has restructured its LoDs from six to eight. This means that the 'Hex Traffic Light' icon will probably have to be an octagon now, rather than a hexagon. Figure 9-5 and Figure 9-6 will also need to be updated to show eight LoDs rather than six.

Evidence: LA IPT, FRES IPT and SAT IPT have all expressed concern that the MODAF documentation is not in line with the new LoDs

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Review Board to discuss

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

DLODs

ID	412	**Page:**	159	**Section:**	Sec 9.2.1.3

Issue: Alignment with DLOD

Category: Minor Technical

Description: pgs 159-160 There are now eight Defence Lines of Development, therefore the hexagon is not consistent.

Evidence: see text

User's Proposed Solution: Recommend that the hexagon becomes either octagon (possibly too complex) or a grid/matrix.

References: Defence Lines of Development, 10 Feb 05, JDCC

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey:

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

DLODs

ID   381   **Page:**   159   **Section:**

Issue: The need for a hexagon is now an octagon with the 2 added DLoDs.

Category: Major Technical

Description: The need for a hexagon is now an octagon with the 2 added DLoDs.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: This needs to be discussed by the review board.

Review Board   Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

DLODs

ID   317   **Page:**   160   **Section:**   Figure 9-5

Issue: AcV-2

Category: Minor Technical

Description: We need to use the latest thinking on Lines of Development when we baseline

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Edit

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey:

Review Board   Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

Nodes

Description

The MODAF Meta-Model has followed DoDAF's CADM and does not distinguish between the different nodes types (operational and system). However, the taxonomy does, so the user can still label each one appropriately.

The issue is being raised generally because MODAF took a lead from the US Navy and allows both types of node to be shown on OV-2 and SV-1 which is strictly speaking not allowed in DoDAF. The review board needs to decide if they want a hard distinction between the types of nodes (i.e. two different M3 classes) or whether they want the looser approach. This could greatly impact the way architects work, so care must be taken in making this decision.

Proposed Solution

Ian Bailey:

The reality of most models is that node can be both a systems node and an operational node - especially in the naval context. Recommend keeping the M3 generic in this respect.

As for the handbook description, the best approach may be to say that any node shown in an OV-2 is operational in that context (i.e. we don't talk about systems nodes in OV-2). However, the same nodes may also be re-used in an SV-1 - however in that context, they are systems nodes - i.e. you can deploy systems to them. In other words, the same node can be viewed in two different contexts. Should a node be only operational, it would only appear in the OV-2. Should it be only a systems node it would be shown only in the SV-1. So, nodes get re-use (a good thing), but the architect still has the ability to show nodes in OV-2 that are not needed in SV-1 and vice versa. Dave should be able to explain this in the Review Board meeting (I've got a long-standing social appointment on the Review Board day).

Review Board Decision for these types of Issue:
Agree with the recommendation that the same node can be viewed in two different contexts. Additional text similar to that recommended is to be put in the Handbook in time for the release of baseline version 1.0 in August.

Nodes

ID	413	**Page:**		**Section:**	

Issue: Nodes

Category: Major Technical

Description: We have the impression that there has been a decision to treat operational and system nodes as one type. This would be a significant weakness, as their relationships to other elements are different and to themselves.

Evidence: On real complex projects e.g. CVF the information we hold and the relationships between other elements are very different.. There is not a one to one mapping, in fact some operation nodes are not supported by systems but are needed to be modelled

User's Proposed Solution:

References: CVF and Tornado support models.

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: This is common with CADM in DoDAF. In reality, the systems nodes and operational nodes may be one and the same thing. The taxonomy is used distinguish between node types, so if the architect wants to take a rigid approach then this is possible. However, we don't enforce this.

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Nodes

ID	423		**Page:**		**Section:**

Issue: Node, operational node, system node, system and organisation

Category: Major Editorial

Description: These seem to be very closely related terms, but their use and interrelationships are not clear.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: We have not encountered this problem before - it doesn't seem to have caused any confusion with the users. As a definitive reference, the MODAF Meta-Model declares the allowable relationships between those architectural elements.

Ian Bailey: recommend no action, review board to approve

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Nodes

ID	435	**Page:**	65	**Section:**	Figure 6-7:

Issue: OV-2a representation of operational and system nodes

Category: Major Technical

Description: Is it meaningful to represent Operational nodes and System nodes on the same diagram when they have many-to many relationships? (Similar issue to AcV-1 systems, project and organisation relationships.)

Evidence: Many-to-many relationships allow system/organisation relationships which cannot be represented on a 2 dimensional diagram

User's Proposed Solution: Do not attempt to depict system nodes on the OV-2a diagram

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Not sure 3d is needed for this ;) There is no difference between a system node and an operational node (as with CADM for DoDAF). I agree relationships are complex, but that's life. All we're showing is how things are deployed, and that is done by overlay (may have to make these composite diagrams in next M3 release). To remove the systems nodes from OV-2a would require a Review Board decision.

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Nodes

ID	407	**Page:**	102	**Section:**	Figure 7.4

Issue: System Node Relationship

Category: Minor Technical

Description: It is not clear when the relationship between 'System' and 'Node' is.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Show on Meta-model that a (System) 'Node' contains 'Systems'.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: A decision was taken to make sure we were in line with DoDAF when it came to nodes. CADM does not distinguish between system nodes and operational nodes. A node is an arbitrary element of topology and can often play the role of hosting systems and operational activities. Recommend no action - Review Board to decide.

Review Board   Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

Caveat on Cover

Description

The security caveat on the cover of the document needs attention

Proposed Solution

Ian Bailey:

Fiona Burn and Dave Mawby seem to know what is needed here - suggest they liaise with Andy and Kathy to come up with an appropriate document cover notice.

Review Board Decision for these types of Issue:

Document cover to be changed in time for the release of the Handbook baseline version 1.0 in August. Action on Philip James DEC CCII to provide correct caveat text (with reference to JSP 101 and JSP 440)

Caveat on Cover

ID	141	**Page:**	1	**Section:**	Caveat

Issue: Caveat on cover

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Need alternative words to use as document caveat for UNCLASSIFIED and re-printable documents, where the need to know in the course of business is still evident

Evidence: Queries have been made on the subject

User's Proposed Solution: MOD Rep on MODAF Mgt Team to provide appropriate words

References: JSP440 or Security Advice

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Recommend Review Board tasks appropriate "MOD Representative" - Rob Howard to add appropriate text, and make sure Deskbooks are also in line.

Review Board New Caveat to be used

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

StV-3 & 5 are too equipment-focused

Description

StV-3 shows capability being met only by systems. StV-5 adds some organisational aspects, but still does not cover the LODs. COIs have not complained about this too much, so maybe it is acceptable.

Proposed Solution

Ian Bailey:

Dave Mawby has suggested that text is added to StV-3 to state that only when systems meet FOC should they be shown in the diagram. Not sure this can be done for StV-5 though.

Review Board Decision for these types of Issue:

These views are intended to allow the description of DLoDs, military capability, systems and if appropriate to a particular architecture the equipment as well. The text in these views shall be amended so that this point is clear and in a way that show capability being met by systems plus other aspects and the changes will be done in time for the release of the Handbook baseline version 1.0 in August.

StV-3 & 5 are too equipment-focused

ID	459		**Page:**	22	**Section:**	3.2 & 5.5

Issue: Capability to System Deployment Mapping

Category: Major Technical

Description: pgs22 & 49 [Possibly minor] Surely Capability is only provided by Systems when they are mapped through an Operational 'structure'? Just to say that I have equipments A B C does not imply that I have Capability X unless I know how I am going to use those systems (perhaps OV-5). Alternatively, StV-6 may provide this link

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: The issue boils down to StV-3 an StV-5 mapping capability to kit - a habit that the MOD is supposed to be kicking. I think the fact that StV-5 also shows organizational deployment, and StV-6 maps the capabilities onto processes gives us more complete coverage. However, it is fair to say that the StVs don't really take into account how the LODs combine to provide fielded capability. This issue does not seem to have been picked up in COI workshops. Review Board to decide a way forward.

Review Board aspects The text in these views shall be amended to show capability being met by systems plus other

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

StV-3 & 5 are too equipment-focused

ID	397	**Page:**	44	**Section:**	Fig 5-9

Issue: Complexity possible in StV-3 (1)

Category: Major Technical

Description: The example shown implies a capability function is typically provided by a single system - often not the case. Also omits representation of scenario/vignette aspects.

Evidence: Our experience, from work with DEC ISTAR is that a capability function is typically provided by a complex combination of systems that differs depending on scenario - e.g. surveillance of land targets capability function.

User's Proposed Solution: Suggest describe this potential complexity, and provide guidance that StV-3 can be used as high level guide, or detailed mapping; but the latter depends on significant extra detailed OV/SV work for its data.

References: BAE Systems/Detica consultancy to DEC ISTAR, 2004

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: I have this concern with StV-3 also. In addition, it reinforces MOD's unfortunate tendency towards "capability = kit".

Review Board aspects The text in these views shall be amended to show capability being met by systems plus other

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Epoch

Description

There has been some concern about the use of the term Epoch. In particular, certain parts of the MOD have specific dates attached to given epochs - whereas in MODAF, it is just meant to be a period denoted by start and end dates. Need to decide whether the use of "Epoch" is appropriate and if not, what should replace it.

Proposed Solution

Ian Bailey:

Dave and I reckon this should be re-named "PeriodOfTime" - then the deskbooks can show how this more generic concept can be used to represent an MOD Epoch.

Review Board Decision for these types of Issue:

Agree with the recommendation and changes to Handbook to be made in time for the release of the Handbook baseline version 1.0 in August. It was noted that this decision is for the Handbook, and Deskbooks may introduce new terminology to represent this concept if appropriate to the user community of that Deskbook.

Epoch

ID	391	**Page:**	35	**Section:**	Sec 5.1.1.2

Issue: Use of 'Epoch'"

Category: Minor Technical

Description: Reviewer notes previous opinion that an "Epoch" was historical and that an alternative term was preferred

Evidence: see text

User's Proposed Solution: Consider whether DODAF "time frame" or an alternative term is preferable.

References: DODAF Volume 1

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: I think the footnote clarifies the meaning. There have been other concerns expressed that Epoch is something of a loaded term. Review Board to decide whether Epoch should be replaced with an alternative term. Rob H to do global replace should the decision be made to change it.

Review Board Agree with the recommendation and changes to Handbook to be made

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Life, the Universe & Everything

Description

OV-2 Needlines in DoDAF just showed information flow. In MODAF, we've extended the concept to cover matter, energy and information. Unfortunately, this breaks OV-3, OV-5 and OV-6b/c.

Proposed Solution

Ian Bailey:

As a first simple fix, it seems sensible to ditch "energy" in favour of "people" and lose "matter" in favour of "materiel" as these are more appropriate.

Then, it may be sensible to only use needlines for information (to retain compatibility with US/CAN/AUS) and add a separate (optional) overlay relationships for materiel and people. This would keep us compatible with DoDAF at least for the overlap between OV-2 and OV-3.

Dave should be able to clarify any questions on this at the Review Board.

Review Board Decision for these types of Issue:

Agree with the recommendation and to keep Needlines as lines representing information flows. A new concept will be introduced in to the Handbook for people and materiel "lines" and for them to be shown graphically by overlaying them on OV-2 diagrams. The consequences for the OV-2 diagram and MODAF Meta Model are to be investigated and resolved by sub group involving Dave Mawby, Fariba Hozhabrafkan and Ian Bailey with the resulting changes incorporated in the Handbook in time for the release of baseline version 1.0 in August

Life, the Universe & Everything

ID	5	**Page:**	63	**Section:**	6.2

Issue: Needlines and materiel / people

Category: Major Technical

Description: MODAF alters DoDAF to allow needlines to cover more than just information flows - energy and matter are added. This then breaks some of the relationships to OV3 and OV5.

Evidence: MODAF Meta-Model, DoDAF CADM

User's Proposed Solution: Alter the description so that needlines JUST handle information, then we have complete compatibility with DoDAF. Then add a new type of relationship (not called a needline) to deal with materiel and people (not energy).

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: review board to decide

Review Board   Agree with the recommendation and to keep Needlines as lines representing information flows

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

Life, the Universe & Everything

ID	250	**Page:**	72	**Section:**	MJD

Issue: MJD Comment 6

Category: Minor Technical

Description: Agree with comment - OV-2 Needline definitions have been extended in MODAF to include energy and matter. Need to bring OV-3 into line with this thinking. That is needlines cover all inputs/outputs required to support an activity. Review in Apr – Jul period in discussion with Andy North. - we may need to discuss

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: For consideration

References:

Recommended Action:

Review Board Agree with the recommendation and to keep Needlines as lines representing information flows

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

OV-1b ConOps / ConEmp

Description

Although no issues have been raised directly on this, there have been rumblings for some time that OV-1b is not necessary. Many think that it should just be possible to refer to the appropriate documents from TV-1.

Proposed Solution

Ian Bailey:

I also think it should go in the TV-1 view - it's just a supporting document really. Review Board to decide - not my call

Review Board Decision for these types of Issue:

OV-1b should remain but should only contain text and should always accompany OV-1a. The title of OV-1b shall be changed to "high level operational concept description" and the Handbook Section 6.1 should read "high level operational concept". The information intended for ConOps/ConEmp that cannot be put into OV-1b should be put into TV-1.

OV-1b ConOps / ConEmp

ID   239   **Page:**   59   **Section:**   Figure 6-3

Issue: OV-1b Example

Category: Minor Technical

Description: this diagram seems to show and StV-1 breakdown in the top half and then an OV-1b, also you could call some parts of the elements shown capabilities - hence I become uncomfortable with how well we have nailed down the use of an OV-1b?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Need to discuss

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Personally, I think OV-1b is pointless and should be moved to a reference in TV-1. Need to discuss this with Andy North and Dave Mawby

Review Board   OV-1b should remain but should only contain text and should always accompany OV-1a.

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

MODAF Meta-Model Issues

Description

These issues are already being worked on in the most part. However, some were Major Technical, so have to be referred to the Review Board to approve the course of action currently being taken

Proposed Solution

Ian Bailey:

The MODAF Meta-Model is working to a different review schedule to the Handbook - only snippets of the M3 appear in the handbook, the model is published in full in a separate document (see www.modaf.com).

The work is scheduled to finish early August, with a short review period for vendors, then it will be rolled into the Handbook.

It is worth flagging a risk with M3 - many issues will not become apparent until the vendors have tried to implement it - which could be a year from now. As the M3 is published in the handbook, it may be necessary to re-issue the handbook (or a corrigendum to it) if any show-stoppers emerge.

Review Board Decision for these types of Issue:

These issues will be investigated and resolved as part of editing the MODAF Meta Model and changes incorporated in time for the release of baseline version 1.0 in August. With respect to the particular issues on OV-2b that was raised as a Meta Model issues, it was agreed that "OV-2b purpose" should be removed resulting in OV-2a being renamed to OV-2 subject to consultation with the Deskbook teams. Again this OV-2b change is to be actioned in time for the release of baseline version 1.0 in August

MODAF Meta-Model Issues

ID	447	**Page:**			**Section:**	n/a

Issue: SysML compliance

Category: Major Technical

Description: Our understanding is that the M3 (MoD metamodel) is supposed to extend SysML, and not only UML 2.0. (also see row 31)

Evidence: The metamodel fragments shown do not seem to take SysML into account at all. For example, many of relationship in M3 can be classified as either Satisfy or Allocation relationships.

User's Proposed Solution: Align meta-model entities with SysML entities where appropriate.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: This has also been discussed with Mr Bjorklander on the modaf.com discussion forum. SysML is not going to be a standard in the near time-frame. Hence we have followed the same approach as SysML (same metaclasses for same purpose, though stereotype names may differ). In the case of satisfy and allocation, we use the same base UML 2.0 metaclass (UML::Usage). This has been referred to the Review Board because of the "Major Technical" flag.

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

MODAF Meta-Model Issues

ID	448	**Page:**		**Section:**	n/a

Issue: M3 constraints on representation

Category: Major Technical

Description: Since the M3 provides limitations on how it makes sense to implement the views, it is important that they are not too restrictive. In many cases, there is more than one useful way to model a concept.

Evidence: e.g. A capability could be represented either as a UML class or a use case.

User's Proposed Solution: Where there are different valid ways of expressing a concept, the M3 should allow for the different representations in order to not lock down implementations

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Not much choice in this matter as we've adopted a UML profile. This was always going to be a problem if a vendor chooses to implement the M3 internally in their UML tool. M3 is not designed with this in mind - it's main purpose is to constrain and add semantics to the content of XMI files. In the specific case mentioned here (capabilities), I think he's wrong - capabilities are certainly not use cases, they are functional requirements, and we had a mandate to follow the SysML approach and use classes to represent requirements.

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

MODAF Meta-Model Issues

ID	449	**Page:**		**Section:**	n/a

Issue: M3 stereotypes

Category: Major Technical

Description: The M3 includes stereotypes that are superfluous.

Evidence: If, for example, a connector is marked with a stereotype, its ends need likely not be explicitly marked as well.

User's Proposed Solution: Delete unnecessary stereotypes from the M3 (unless they are really likely to have taxonomy refs)

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Again, there is only one specific example here. I will look into what can be done. This has been referred to the Review Board as it is flagged "Major Technical".

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

MODAF Meta-Model Issues

ID	450	**Page:**		**Section:**	n/a

Issue: M3 UML legality

Category: Major Technical

Description: The metamodel fragments shown are not legal according the UML 2.0 specification.

Evidence: In particular, it is not permissible to have associations between stereotypes.

User's Proposed Solution: Delete illegal relationships from the M3 or make clear that the shown notation is a shorthand for expressing the equivalent constraints.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: This has been extensively debated with Mr Bjorklander on the modaf.com website. The relationships are not new, they are simply a short-hand for constraining existing relationships. This will be explained clearly in the final release of the M3 and handbook. This has been referred to the Review Board because of the "Major Technical" flag.

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

MODAF Meta-Model Issues

ID	431	**Page:**	42	**Section:**	Figure 5-8:

Issue: StV-2 Capability stereotype

Category: Major Technical

Description: The Capability stereotype should ideally extend the Use Case metaclass instead of the Class metaclass. Alternatively, Capability should extend both Use Case and Class.

Evidence: In DoDAF related work, the use of use cases for this kind of modelling is prevalent.

User's Proposed Solution: The Capability stereotype should ideally extend the Use Case metaclass instead of the Class metaclass. Alternatively, Capability should extend both Use Case and Class.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Not sure about how a capability is a use-case. Will look into this.

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

MODAF Meta-Model Issues

ID	434	**Page:**	68	**Section:**	Figure 6-11:

Issue: OV-2a needline stereotype

Category: Major Technical

Description: Needline stereotype extends the Association metaclass û it should extend the Connector metaclass.

Evidence: Needlines are closely associated with OIEs. This information cannot be semantically linked to needlines in a UML-based model unless connectors are used; also see previous comment about associations and connectors

User's Proposed Solution: Needline stereotype should extend the Connector metaclass

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: This is being looked into - there may be problems when dealing with first-levels of a composite class diagram though.

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

MODAF Meta-Model Issues

ID	436	**Page:**	68	**Section:**	6.2.6 OV-2b

Issue: OV-2b purpose

Category: Major Technical

Description: We find the combination of the existing OV-3 and OV-7 is sufficient to represent the concepts of OV-2b. Is there some other information that this view is intended to convey?

Evidence: All information discussed in the product description is already present in OV-3 / OV-7

User's Proposed Solution: Delete product

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: I think he's right, even though I was responsible for OV-2b in the first place when we wrote the white papers. The intention was to tie the information elements to the data model - I now think it's sufficient to do this in M3 and let OV-3 and OV-7 do the rest. Review Board decision as to whether to remove this view. Ian Bailey to make sure M3 handles the links between information element and data model.

Review Board It was agreed that "OV-2b purpose" should be removed resulting in OV-2a being renamed to OV-2 subject to consultation with the Deskbook teams.

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

MODAF Meta-Model Issues

ID   438   **Page:**   70   **Section:**   Figure 6-13:

Issue: OV-2b Information Exchange Requirement stereotype

Category: Major Technical

Description: Information Exchange Requirement stereotype only extends the Class metaclass.

Evidence: This meta-model structure does not allow for efficient implementation.

User's Proposed Solution: Change to extend the Classifier metaclass.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: This will extend information Flow in next M3 release. Have to refer this to Review Board as it is major technical.

Review Board   Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

MODAF Meta-Model Issues

ID	437		**Page:**	71	**Section:**	6.2.10 OV-2

Issue: OV-2b Organizational Relationships stereotype

Category: Major Technical

Description: The definition of the Organizational Relationships stereotype is not clear. (No definition present in 6.2.10 either.)

Evidence: Organizational Relationships stereotype does not have a definition in the text following the meta-model fragment.

User's Proposed Solution: Add definition - based on a Connector metaclass, not an Association metaclass.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Ian Bailey to fix in next M3 release. Referred to Review Board simply because it is labelled "Major technical" - it isn't.

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

MODAF Meta-Model Issues

ID	404	**Page:**	83	**Section:**	6.5.4

Issue: Handbook Volume 2Draft 0.56 April 2005

Category: Major Technical

Description: It appears that there is no direct relationship between Operational Activity Flows and IERs. Our view is OV5 is the best method of identifying IERs .

Evidence: Based on BAE Systems Insyte use of DODAF OV5

User's Proposed Solution: Need to include a relationship directly between Operational Activity Flow and IER .The documentation implies that IERs will be derived elsewhere and the relationship will be through needlines.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: This is currently being worked in M3 - Information Exchanges will map onto the information flows in OV-5. These are then gathered as information exchange requirements, which in turn are collected together as needlines - this is the way DODAF/CADM does it, and it seems appropriate to be compatible in this area. Referred to review board because of "major technical" classification.

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

MODAF Meta-Model Issues

ID	433		**Page:**	156	**Section:**	figure 9-3:

Issue: AcV-1systems, project and organisation relationships

Category: Major Technical

Description: this representation only works if systems are entirely contained within a single project or organization and projects are always contained in single organizations. (otherwise it might not be possible to draw a 2-dimensional diagram).

Evidence: See description

User's Proposed Solution: Confirm that the required restriction will always exist for the system-project-organisation relationship

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: In this case, I believe that we will only over show a given system within one project, as those are the projects that procure the systems. Hence, I think this is valid - review board to decide, as this is a "major technical" issue.

Review Board Will be resolved in manner consistent with all issues of this type

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Use Cases for OV-5

Description

It is not clear that use cases are appropriate for OV-5. Gut feeling is to disallow, though there may be some users who wish to do this.

Proposed Solution

Ian Bailey:

Can't say I see how these are appropriate for an activity model. The M3 is designed to handle activity models, not use cases also.

Review Board Decision for these types of Issue:

It was agreed to remove the text in OV-5 that referenced use cases. Furthermore it was agreed to action Ian Bailey to ensure that the MODAF Meta Model was able to allow for the exchange of all types of activity diagram independent of diagramming technique, including Use Cases.

Use Cases for OV-5

ID	403	**Page:**	80	**Section:**	6.5.3

Issue: Use cases

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Use Cases are recommended but no examples are given.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Add an example to clarify, especially since this a significant addition to DoDAF.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: see issue 402 - I vote we disallow use cases in this context.

Review Board It was agreed to remove the text in OV-5 that referenced use cases.

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Use Cases for OV-5

ID	402	**Page:**	80	**Section:**	6.5.3

Issue: Activity diagram

Category: Minor Technical

Description: UML Use Case Diagram and UML Activity Diagram are recommended here (for the 'OV-5b/c') but nothing for the activity hierarchy.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Add UML Class Diagram for the activity hierarchy ('OV-5a').

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: I don't believe use cases are appropriate for activity diagrams - best to let the review board decide though, as there seems to be some demand for this. Currently, M3 does not allow this.

Review Board It was agreed to remove the text in OV-5 that referenced use cases.

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Use Cases for OV-5

ID	258	**Page:**	80		**Section:**	UML Rep

Issue: OV-5 UML Rep

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Complicated wordy para - can this be shown?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: For consideration

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: see issue 402 - If Use Cases are permitted to stay, then Rob will edit appropriately

Review Board It was agreed to remove the text in OV-5 that referenced use cases.

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues - Document Layout

Description

Issues relating to the way the document is structured or published - each of these issues should be considered individually

Proposed Solution

Ian Bailey:

Tackle them issue by issue - only the major layout issues have been flagged for Review Board attention.

Review Board Decision for these types of Issue:
Each issue was judged individually and no overall review board decision applies

Individual Issues - Document Layout

ID	31	**Page:**		**Section:**	

Issue: Format

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Probably too big for a paper reference.

Evidence: What is the evidence for the issue.

User's Proposed Solution: Would be more useful in HTML form with hyperlinks and 1 view to a page.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: investigate web publishing for final release. Likely to involve a lot of work, hence review board to approve this action. Recommend Phil Smith does the work to link it all up.

Review Board An HTML version available on the internet would be of use but such an endeavour needs to be factored in to the overall plan and resources and so will be considered after the release of Baseline version 1.0.

Action by When After Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues - Document Layout

ID	55	**Page:**		**Section:**	

Issue: Table of figures could be removed

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: The table of figures has been removed from the ECC Deskbook, and is not planned to be included in the Acquisition Deskbook. Therefore it might be worth removing from the Handbook so that they are all consistent.

Evidence: ECC Deskbook

User's Proposed Solution: Remove table of figures

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Handbook is much larger document than deskbook, and so any navigation aids are welcome - recommend table stays - Review Board to decide

Review Board Keep the table of figures

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues - Document Layout

ID	335	**Page:**	25	**Section:**	3.7

Issue: explanation

Category: Minor Technical

Description: reference a peer process do we need to explain where this is from ie a MODAF term or a smart Acq term

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: This refers to the MODAF stakeholders deciding if the diagrams should stay in the document. Originally, this was a comment, but seems to have magically become part of the document text. I guess that the peer review is from the Review Board. If they like this diagrammatic approach, I'll produce the rest of the diagrams, and alter the wording.

Review Board Delete offending phrase in Handbook

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues - Document Layout

ID	192	**Page:**	25	**Section:**	Figure 3-2

Issue: Relationships between architecture data elements

Category: Major Technical

Description: It would be useful to discuss this within a workshop environment at some point. Need to gain more understanding of full version of this diagram. I have discussed some of these issues with the team already but a full analysis would be helpful.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Set up session

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: See Issue 335 - I think I know what needs to be done, I just need the go-ahead to do it. Given my vacation plans, and the fact that it is dependent on M3, this will probably have to be done for the final release in August though.

Review Board   This area of the document to be reviewed after baseline 1.0 has been released and consequences for handbook to be considered at that stage

Action by When   After Version 1

Status   Closed

Individual Issues - Document Layout

ID	241	**Page:**	62	**Section:**	MJD

Issue: MJD Comment 5

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: I agree with the comment - Final version of Handbook (and Deskbooks) should emphasise that numbering of views does not imply hierarchy or sequence of development.- this is a good idea. Perhaps we could refer to the utility of the deskbooks?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: For consideration

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: RH to add some appropriate wording at start of document - review board to delegate senior MODAF rep to produce those words

Review Board   Agree with recommendation that DM, FH and RH agree appropriate wording for baseline version 1.0 that emphasises that numbering of views does not imply hierarchy or sequence of development.

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

Individual Issues - Document Layout

ID	401	**Page:**	78	**Section:**	6.5

Issue: OV5s

Category: Procedural

Description: OV-5 has two or three distinct views - activity hierarchy and activity model / Use Case which all use the same designator 'OV-5'. All these are valid but different and therefore suggest OV 5a, 5b,5c would be clearer

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Name these as 'OV-5a' and 'OV-5b' to distinguish between them. Consider 'OV-5c' for the Use Case Diagram.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Not sure this is necessary - IDEF0 can A & B all in one diagram, and use cases are pretty useless as activity diagrams. Decision is for Review Board.

Review Board   Appears to be distinct issues of
- even if the meta-model allows for the distinction what is the impact on tool exchange
- does that require creation of extra views for MODAF

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

Individual Issues

Description

Not grouped with any other issues - each of these issues should be considered individually

Proposed Solution

Ian Bailey:

Again, each of these is an issue which cannot be grouped with other issues, so will need attention to each. In general, they're not big issues, but one or two might spark some debate.

Review Board Decision for these types of Issue:
Each issue was judged individually and no overall review board decision applies

Individual Issues

ID   523   **Page:**   **Section:**

Issue: Feedback form

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Add a section that tells users where to send comments and suggestions for changing MODAF

Evidence:

**User's
Proposed
Solution:**

References:

**Recommended   Add feedback form
Action:**

Review Board Add feedback form and ensure it is consistent with that used for the Deskbook.

**Action by   Before Version 1
When**

Status   Closed

Individual Issues

ID	524	**Page:**		**Section:**	

Issue:	Paragraph Numbering
Category:	Major Editorial
Description:	The absence of paragraph numbering makes review and reference of the large document difficult

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: MODAF Partners to define and use common paragraph numbering scheme - can be either sequential all the way through or numbered with association to a section. The possible issue with the later approach is the potential for long numbers (e.g. 2.1.2.3.46) that significantly indent each paragraph.

Review Board Add paragraph numbering in a manner to be agreed by Deskbook and Handbook teams

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	525	**Page:**		**Section:**	

Issue: Inform users of the review process

Category: Major Editorial

Description: The users and reviewers of the Handbook need to be informed in the document of what configuration control and issue control process is being used to manage its development.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Add appropriate text

Review Board Add text to introductory sections or in an Appendix that defines the configuration control approach being used and ensure it is consistent with that used for the Deskbook.

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID   527   **Page:**   **Section:**

Issue: The relationship between BMS and the Handbook

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Reviewers and users may be confused by the lack of reference to BMS

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action:

Review Board   Acknowledge BMS in the Technical Handbook and Executive Summary by including appropriate text on what it is and how it impacts the Deskbooks rather than the Handbook

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

Individual Issues

ID	429	**Page:**		**Section:**	

Issue: User Guide

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: As part of the MODAF there needs to be a recipe book which specifies the steps to be taken in applying the defined concepts to achieve the required goal. Worked examples are a step towards such a guide but are not a replacement for it.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: I believe the deskbooks serve this purpose, though maybe at a higher level than he requires. Review Board to decide if more low-level recipe book is required.

Review Board After due consideration no change to the Handbook was thought appropriate at this stage

Action by When No change

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	528	**Page:**		**Section:**	

Issue: Consistent use of "capability" and its effect on StV-3

Category: Major Editorial

Description: The term "capability" needs to be consistently used and interpreted across all the Deskbooks and the Handbook

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Capability', as used in MODAF, refers to 'Military Capability' not 'Equipment Capability' (Military Capability includes all LODs, whereas Equipment Capability, only the Equipment LOD). This means that StV-3 shows capability functions that cover all LODs (as StV-2) but mapped to only the equipment LOD (systems only). The Handbook should be updated to reflect this

Review Board Consistent use of the term Capability as note in the recommended action

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	529	**Page:**	**Section:**

Issue: Presentation of Views in Document

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Each view should start on a new page to assist readability of the Handbook

Evidence:

**User's
Proposed
Solution:**

References:

**Recommended
Action:**

Review Board   Start each view on a new page

**Action by
When**   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

Individual Issues

ID	526	**Page:**		**Section:**	

Issue: The use of Hybrid Views

Category: Major Editorial

Description: The Handbook should clarify that hybrid views are permitted when documenting an architecture, and additional text should be included explaining the concept

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action:

Review Board Allow Hybrid views and add text in Handbook to state that

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID   430   **Page:**   **Section:**

Issue: PRINCE

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Other important standard approaches may impinge on the trade space MODAF seeks to manage; the relationship to them e.g. to PRINCE should be included, even if null.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: AcV-1 & 2 are based on smart acquisition principles, which are in turn derived from PRINCE 2 principles. Recommend no action. Review Board to approve.

Review Board   After due consideration no change to the Handbook was thought appropriate at this stage

Action by When   No change

Status   Closed

Individual Issues

ID 427   **Page:**   **Section:**

Issue: Business Viewpoint

Category: Minor Technical

Description: None of the viewpoints appears to address the structure of the business logic This is key to separating business from technology such separation is essential not to integration but to avoiding inextricable entanglement of business and technology.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: The OV viewpoint defines the operation activities, constraints, sequences, data structures, topology and organizational structure. What aspect of business logic is it that you need above and beyond that ? Review Board to approve closing this issue with no action required.

Review Board After due consideration no change to the Handbook was thought appropriate at this stage

Action by When No change

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	425	**Page:**		**Section:**	

Issue: Multiplicity of Views

Category: Major Editorial

Description: The multiplicity of views make their interrelationships difficult to understand and this may make them difficult to manage. For example, the large number of views in each of the two key viewpoints (O and S) creates clear potential for overlap, giving rise to different representation of the same real world concepts in a number of different views (as well as two viewpoints). This will create considerable potential for problems with maintaining consistency. Whilst this is probably inevitable given the number of views, the consideration given in the document to this issue is limited. Also, it will impact the buy-in from the community of practitioners. Also, the multiplicity of views makes it difficult to grasp the underlying model. In some cases there seem to be groupings that might be better treated as a single view e.g. all 3 views comprising SV10 appear to be aspects of system behaviour. The existence of the All views viewpoint (sic) indicates that the concerns addressed by each viewpoint have not been fully considered. There is, arguably, a need for an additional viewpoint that addresses correspondences between the other viewpoints, but this is not it. We suggest that the set of concerns of each viewpoint be reviewed, taking the RM-ODP viewpoints as a starting point. It should be noted that this standard has no such requirement for an overarching all views viewpoint.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: The *whole* point of MODAF (and DoDAF) is that the same architectural elements can appear in different views - this is called "re-use" and is generally a good thing. The reason for the meta-model is to provide a semantic underpinning the framework so that these elements can be re-used. The number of views is large, but not all are mandated (see COI Deskbooks).

Ian Bailey: Recommend no action. Review board to approve.

Review Board After due consideration no change to the Handbook was thought appropriate at this stage

Action by When No change

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	424	**Page:**		**Section:**	

Issue: Distinction between model and that which is being modelled

Category: Major Editorial

Description: In places there seems to be a confusion between the model and that which is being modelled e.g. Entity (Business): (Data Model Entity) A representation of a business object, with characteristics (or attributes) and relationships, that exists in one or more business architectures. It is a blueprint for creating objects for a particular business architecture. An entity could, for example, be a building, a ship, an aircraft, a person or message amongst other things

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: OV-7 and SV-11 define data models - i.e. they are views which enable to user to define the data structures used by the architecture. This is pretty normal architectural framework stuff (see Zachman, TOGAF, etc.)

Ian Bailey: No action necessary - Review Board to approve

Review Board After due consideration no change to the Handbook was thought appropriate at this stage

Action by When No change

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	421	**Page:**		**Section:**

Issue: Architecture Scope

Category: Major Editorial

Description: It is not clear to what the architecture applies and of what the views are views. Section 2.1 talks of an enterprise architecture where, by implication, the enterprise is an instance, or configuration of people, processes, systems and organisations, connected by their inter-relationship , but the document does not say what this is in the case of MODAF.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: The views are views of a given enterprise, the scope of which is defined by the architect, not by the framework. Recommend no action, Review Board to approve.

Review Board After due consideration no change to the Handbook was thought appropriate at this stage

Action by When No change

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	420	**Page:**	**Section:**

Issue: Architecture Definition

Category: Major Editorial

Description: There seems to be a confusion about use of the term architecture. Three typical uses are: A design for a specific system (as in the definition of architecture in DODAF). An architectural style or conceptual mode (a model used to create UML profiles as used for different systems of the same architectural style. A reference model - which is a good way to think about things, and should (but so often doesn't) present the concepts that will be used to provide solutions to the stated problems e.g. integration. The first two of these are in this text. However, MODAF is about integration, but there is nothing apparent here about how this is to be accomplished. Integration is a multi-layer problem, and addressing a very few layers in an architecture that is to tackle this key problem leaves some aspects weakly addressed. For example, management, security and QoS are not well addressed. Also organisational interoperability is not addressed, so this systems focus will miss critical processes

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: MODAF may be used in all these ways. As for security and QoS, aspects of this are covered in SV-6 , along with other Information Assurance aspects such as non-repudiation. There is no explicit security view though, nor has there been a requirement stated for this from the MOD. As for the business needs, I suggest you look at the OV, AcV and StV viewpoints which cover MOD's operational, strategic and acquisition needs.

Review Board After due consideration no change to the Handbook was thought appropriate at this stage

Action by When No change

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID 531 **Page:** **Section:**

Issue: Use of boiler plate text for describing taxonomy and meta-model

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Each view section has M3 and Taxonomy sections. The introductory paragraphs are repeated in each section - this is probably unnecessary.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Best moved to the M3 and Taxonomy sections at the start of the document (with appropriate, educated editing - i.e. don't just cut and paste it in, check how it reads)

Review Board Agree with the recommendation

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

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

Issue: Technical Viewpoint

Category: Minor Technical

Description: The two TV views appear to be list of applicable standards. As such they are useful indications of technological maturity in the epochs indicated. However, such lists have not previously been shown to be effective in ensuring interoperability. It is suggested that there needs to be a corresponding view (in the MODAF sense of the term) that expresses where in the other view specifications each standard applies.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: I agree, we need to look at how this could be represented in the views. It will certainly go into the meta-model, but probably not needed to be specified in the views. Suggest that this is a tool issue. Review board to approve.

Review Board It was agreed that this issue needs to be more thoroughly investigated after the release of Baseline Version 1.0.

Action by When After Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	142	**Page:**	12	**Section:**	All

Issue: Foreword Production

Category: Other

Description: To be produced over Apr-Jul timeframe

Evidence: Known MODAF Mgt Issue

User's Proposed Solution: Push further for early production within the MODAF Mgt Team

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Review Board to request Foreword (General Fulton ?)

Review Board Foreword to be written, action on Kathy Lamb to ensure text is available for Baseline Version 1.0

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	161	**Page:**	16		**Section:**	Why use

Issue: Mandation Phrasing

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: The MODAF approach should be mandated not MODAF (implying the whole architecture Framework in all cases?)

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Provide clarity

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: review board to decide wording

Review Board Text on mandating MODAF to be removed from the Handbook. The principal is that the mandating of MODAF will be done using the governance framework for MoD projects and budgets and not by statements in MODAF products

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	163	**Page:**	16	**Section:**	Why use

Issue: Example clarity

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: MODAF strategic views are used in the ECC community but they can be relevant elsewhere - it is appropriate to link to the deskbooks here to add to the explanation

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey - there was some reluctance in the MODAF team to reference the deskbooks - Review board to make decision

Review Board Add text into introductory sections of the Handbook that says the use of views is described in each Deskbook, but make reference to a specific Deskbook in the case of this example

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	385	**Page:**	16	**Section:**	Sec 2.1.3

Issue: MODAF Mandation

Category: Major Editorial

Description: States that "MODAF should be mandated from April 2006". Key to be clear on whom this is mandated (IPTs, IA, Industry, C2 etc.) and what is the form/extent of the mandation. Is the MODAF Handbook suitable for auditing for compliance with this Mandate?

Evidence: see text

User's Proposed Solution: Either insert such a clear definition, or instigate MoD/Industry dialogue to establish the most effective blend between mandation and discretion that adds benefit and is enforceable.

References: NA.

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Review Board to decide on appropriate governance wording. Suggest add sentence - "MODAF is likely to be mandated on a view-by-view basis for different communities of interest, with the COI Deskbooks providing guidance to those communities".

Review Board Text on mandating MODAF to be removed from the Handbook. The principal is that the mandating of MODAF will be done using the governance framework for MoD projects and budgets and not by statements in MODAF products

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID   457   **Page:**   16   **Section:**   2.1.4

Issue: Justify Benefits

Category: Major Editorial

Description: It is not self-evident that the benefits listed will accrue.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Provide justification - e.g. examples of how MODAF will provide these benefits (possibly link to the descriptions of the views)

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Does the Review Board believe these benefits are self-evident ? If not, some traceability will be required.

Review Board   The section on benefits in the Handbook will be removed and after appropriate editing will be put into the MODAF Executive Summary. Each Deskbook will be encouraged to include a section on benefits that takes the relevant portion of the generic benefits and uses metrics and values

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

Individual Issues

ID	164	**Page:**	17	**Section:**	MODAF	

Issue: Phrasing

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Can we use an alternative word to platform?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Review Board to decide appropriate word - Rob Howard to edit.

Review Board Delete "across platform" in the bulleted text reference by the issue

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	387	**Page:**	19	**Section:**	Secs 2.2.3

Issue: Target audience

Category: Major Technical

Description: The target audience does not include Industry. Surely the main body of hands-on users of MODAF will be in industry (e.g. within concept and assessment studies) so this decision appears strange

Evidence: see text

User's Proposed Solution: Consider whether Industry forms part of the target audience, and if so amend descriptions.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: This is a governance issue for the review board to deal with…

Review Board After due consideration no change to the Handbook was thought appropriate at this stage

Action by When No change

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	458	**Page:**	21	**Section:**	3.1.3
Issue:	Clarify 'Business Tasks'				
Category:	Other				
Description:	By 'business tasks'"				

Evidence: are you suggesting that the operational views support acquisition processes

User's Proposed Solution: for example. I think this is true in that they help to ensure you 'buy the right kit'"

References: but this is not unique to the OVs.

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Personally, I think this means all tasks/activities, so needs no further explanation. Review Board to decide if the document is clear enough in this section.

Review Board   After due consideration no change to the Handbook was thought appropriate at this stage

Action by When   No change

Status   Closed

Individual Issues

ID	530	**Page:**	23	**Section:**	Fig 3.1

Issue: Inconsistency in presentation of Tables

Category: Major Editorial

Description: The colours used for the different rows in the table in Figure 3-1 that lists all MODAF views should be consistent with the colours used for Figure 2-1

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action:

Review Board Update figures so that consistent colours are used

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	460	**Page:**	50	**Section:**	5.5.1.3

Issue: Guidance on system dependency/interaction

Category: Major Technical

Description: I think it is rather vague to say that 'links connect systems that are dependent and/or have interaction with other systems'. There are many forms of interaction that could be relevant including the OV interactions. This relationship should be made richer and possibly more formal - specify the types of interaction/dependency and say in which other views the relevant data would be found for each type

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: The detail is added in SV1/2 - this view is intended to be high-level and show the types of link that can be used. Recommend no change, or at most some wording to explain that this is a more high-level view and SV1-2 can be used to add detail.

Review Board No change to the Handbook was thought appropriate at this stage, though further discussion of this issues should occur between Jim Wood and Ian Bailey after the release of Baseline version 1.0. in order to clarify the points raised

Action by When After Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID   364   **Page:**   56   **Section:**   Paragraph 2,

Issue: In the 2nd para of 6.1.1.3, in the 4th line it says "in what order"

Category: Procedural

Description: In the 2nd para of 6.1.1.3, in the 4th line it says "in what order" relating to the operational concept. Where does sequencing fit into the OV-1a product?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: good question - difficult to remove this without the say-so of the Review Board - hence referring it.

Review Board   Amend text so that is more clear that further information on sequencing can be found from other Operational Views

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed

Individual Issues

ID	400	**Page:**	67	**Section:**	6.2.4

Issue: Use of UML for OV2a

Category: Major Technical

Description: Use of UML Class Diagram is suggested here for the OV-2a - this would appear to be not the most appropriate construct.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Use UML Composite Structure Diagram for the OV-2a.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Already looking into this for next M3 release. Referred to board, as its "Major Technical", though issue is currently in hand.

Review Board   No action at this stage pending updates to MODAF Meta Model

Action by When   No change

Status   Closed

Individual Issues

ID	24		**Page:**	82		**Section:**

Issue: A Priori Knowledge of Nodes

Category: Major Technical

Description: Regarding the OV-5 Activity Model, use of 'swim lanes' presupposes that you have already identified your operational nodes. From whence comes this a priori knowledge?

Evidence: It is my experience that an IDEF0 approach is necessary first. That is, having completed my hierarchical decomposition I am then able to investigate the leaves of my activity tree for logical clusters of activities that should be performed at the same operational node (logical node). Have annotated the leaf activities with their operational node identifier, then and only then can I discover

User's Proposed Solution: Work the entire hierarchical decomposition of activity tree before defining nodes and allocating activities to nodes. This applies to "to-be" architectures only.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Swimlanes are optional, so would only be used if the nodes were known. If you don't know your nodes, then you can't use the swimlanes - seems pretty obvious to me. Referred to review board because of "Major technical" classification.

Review Board After due consideration no change to the Handbook was thought appropriate at this stage

Action by When No change

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	266	**Page:**	90	**Section:**	Figure 6-29

Issue: Histogram usage

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Again - what are we saying here? More deskbook activity? How is this figure linked in? Is it described in the MMM (I Think not), so what is the intention?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Edit

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: I think these are meant to be generated from the state-chart information and act as summaries. Might be easier to just remove all references to this, as it doesn't look like core architectural data to me. Review Board to decide

Review Board Remove all text and diagrams in section 6.6.6.3 of OV-6b relating to Histograms

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	272	**Page:**	98	**Section:**	Product

Issue: SV-1 Usage

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Can the relationship described in paras 5 and 8 be shown in a diagram (single needline to multiple interfaces), so the reader can be sure what this looks like.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: For consideration

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: This is a missing concept in DoDAF and MODAF - no needline to system interface mapping. Might be a bit late to want include one now (Mike Duffy and I did flag this issue several months ago). Review Board to decide an action - recommend that this is queued for addition in a future MODAF release as a new view, or as SV-1b.

Review Board Investigate the possibility and consequences for creating a new view to resolve this issues after the release of Baseline Version 1.0

Action by When After Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	274	**Page:**	104	**Section:**	Last para

Issue: SV-2a Product Description

Category: Minor Technical

Description: Agree with statement that protocol referred to in SV2a should be in TV1, but is this a clear handbook statement or a process deskbook one?

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: For consideration

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: I believe this is universal, not COI-specific - review board to decide

Review Board Amend text in SV-"a so that is clear that such information should also be documented in TV-1 but that these views are based on the same MODAF Meta Model class that only need be populated once.

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	409	**Page:**	116	**Section:**	7.4

Issue: Sv4

Category: Procedural

Description: SV-4 has two or three distinct views - functional decomposition and data flow / Use Case which all use the same designator 'SV-4'.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution: Name these as 'SV-4a' and 'SV-4b' to distinguish between them. Consider 'SV-4c' for the Use Case Diagram.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: Review Board to decide - bear in mind, this will be a deviation from DoDAF. Also consider ditching Use Case approach.

Review Board Investigate the possibility and consequences for creating new views to resolve this issue after the release of Baseline Version 1.0

Action by When After Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	44		**Page:**	129	**Section:**	

Issue: Handbook volume 2

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: on SV& one of the performance metrics is "Availability". This is always a problematic area when determining requirements. There are numerous definitions used by different projects, each has different assumptions behind them, some incorporate logistic and administrative delay times, others are purely based upon the design. It is essential to provide definitions for the metric in order for all to have a shared view and to have a clear understanding of what is stated. My interpretation of view SV7 is that some multiplication of system component availabilities will occur to provide the "capability availability". It would be easy to mix metrics and arrive at an incorrect conclusion. It may be appropriate to utilise more than one availability metric. As the equipment progresses through the CADMID cycle our understanding of the availability will improve. This value can be progressively updated from "modelling" data to "in service" data. However some confidence limits would need to be applied to reflect our current knowledge.

Evidence: What is the evidence for the issue.

User's Proposed Solution: The issue would need to be discussed within RMG, however due to my late awareness of the review deadline this has not been possible. Therefore the comments above are my views only. RMG would like the opportunity to respond officially.

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: The Availability metric is just an example. It is entirely up to the architect what metrics to use. The reviewer has given this a major technical category, so has to go to Review Board - recommend no action, though if Review Board believes SV-1 is confusing then perhaps the text should be reviewed.

Review Board Amend the text so that it emphasises that "example metrics" are being used. Add a footnote indicating that the use of the term "availability" is not in the specialised sense familiar to R&M and ILS.

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID 346   **Page:** 149   **Section:** 8.1.1.2

Issue: product reference

Category: Minor Technical

Description: states that TV1 is the bridge between SV and TVs is this correct or do we mean SVs and OVs

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: This is from DoDAF Vol II - can't say that I agree with it, but it's not possible to forcefully disagree with it on account of it not really meaning anything. Suggest removing the sentence altogether, as it appears to be confusing and serves to add no information. Review Board to decide, RH to edit.

Review Board Delete offending phrase in Handbook

Action by When Before Version 1

Status Closed

Individual Issues

ID	380	**Page:**	156	**Section:**	Paragraph 1,

Issue: 1st para of 9.1.3 is not relevant.

Category: Major Editorial

Description: 1st para of 9.1.3 is not relevant.

Evidence:

User's Proposed Solution:

References:

Recommended Action: Ian Bailey: These appear all over the document - review board to decide if they should all be removed. RH to make edits based on board's decision.

Review Board   Delete offending phrase in Handbook. All such similar paragraphs to be removed from the document and replaced with a more general caveat in the introductory sections

Action by When   Before Version 1

Status   Closed