

## **Response To Reviewers Post MODAF Review Board 7<sup>th</sup> July 2005**

# **MODAF ECC Deskbook**

## **ALL Issues**

There were 101 issues raised against the MODAF ECC Deskbook. The more serious issues were raised for review board consideration – there were 21 of these.

The issues fall into 4 broad categories:

- URD
- Capability Management/ Equipment Planning
- Document Layout
- Individual issues

The review board sequentially reviewed each of the 21 issues and either actioned them for resolution, or provided an appropriate response to the Reviewer.

A record of all 101 issues raised against the ECC Deskbook, including the 21 raised to the Review Board, is contained within this document.

**Page:**

**Section:**

**Issue:** Editorial

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Description:** Inconsistent phraseology across MODAF books

**Evidence:** The text in the above pages is 'almost 'identical to that in the Tech Handbook but appears to not be the latest version - subtle changes to improve sense are in the TECH HANDBOOK. also the layout is less clear in the Deskbook

**User's Proposed Solution:** Use the latest version of text and layout which I assume is the MODAF Tech Handbook .

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: As Introduction section is being revised across MODAF products (by Jon Lee) following the integration meeting, the consistency of text will be reflected in the subsequent versions of Handbook/ Deskbook.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:**

**Section:**

**Issue:** Insufficient emphasis on integration in deskbooks

**Category:** Major Technical

**Description:** The deskbooks do not place sufficient emphasis on the need to ensure architecture integration by reuse of existing objects in the architecture repository. Architecture entities (e.g. nodes or processes) should only be manually entered once when creating an architecture

**Evidence:** The deskbooks contain many references to updating and creating views, rather than the underlying objects which make up the views.

**User's Proposed Solution:** Add a paragraph to the introductory section each deskbook making the need for this more explicitly clear

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee Additional words about MODAR, along with the 6-step architecting process are being added to the introduction of the Deskbooks. No Action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:**

**Section:**

**Issue:** Spelling of Complement

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** The word "complement" (as in "A complements B" is consistently mis-spelt as "compliments", which of course means something quite different!

**Evidence:** What is the evidence for the issue. !e.g. middle of page 18 just below th edigram.

**User's Proposed Solution:** Word search and replace.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as proposed

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:**

**Section:**

**Issue:** Maturity

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Description:** What are their maturity goals?. There is a great deal of difference between outline illustrative OV's and definitive and endorsed views. I suspect that the former is more appropriate for IG submissions and the later for MG.

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Add to proposed annex

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: This is a question rather than a comment for action. However, clarification is required as to what maturity goals are being referred to such that an appropriate answer can be given. Assuming it is the URD development sequence, the Board Response below would provide the answer.

**Status** Open

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:** Review Board actioned the need to identify a URD process owner to confirm MODAF view use in URD development. This issue will hopefully be covered by this action in due course.

**Page:**

**Section:**

**Issue:** Link to URs

**Category:** Major Technical

**Description:** It is not clear how the views should link to the URs. Many actual URs will be scenario sensitive, especially their measures and therefore there should be a mapping (or priority scoring) between the URs and the scenarios.

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** probably needs some more thought and some good examples. Unless there is a good linkage there is a danger that the views are seen as a burden rather than a tool.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: For the board to identify a URD authority to which we can go to confirm the proposed use of MODAF views within a URD, and thus confirm the linkage and approach to MODAF articulated scenarios supporting a requirement set.

**Status** Open

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board** Action: Kathy Lamb to identify the URD process owner, for engagement and confirmation of URD MODAF views

**Response:** Action: Jon Lee to place caveat on proposed URD MODAF views and development sequence for MODAF release version 1.0

**Page:**

**Section:**

**Issue:** Ownership of Products

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Description:** I suspect some of the early views should be owned cross-DECs - for example, the capability taxonomy. Some might be owned by a DEC, The later ones will be project specific and therefore have to be produced by the desk officer.

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Include a recommendation in fig 3.1

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: For the board to decide whether Deskbooks should identify the specific ownership of each view within the COI. Recommendation is that the requested level of ownership should not be attempted at this time, because it is something that the COI parties would best determine for themselves during MODAF implementation, having reflecting on the experiences of using MODAF views.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board** Action: Core-DEC will take responsibility for cross-DEC issues.

**Response:** MODAF documentation can be revised in due course with more specific ownership of MODAF views within the community. When MODAF is implemented in earnest, a greater clarity of view use and ownership will be achieved - this is a 'to-be' situation that cannot be documented at this time.

**Page:**

**Section:**

**Issue:** Mandation

**Category:** Other

**Description:** Whilst it excellently describes the process, I think that the DEC's would appreciate an annex giving more guidance/specification of the necessary products to achieve IG and MG.

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Annex specifying exactly what the ECC desk officer is expected to produce at IG and MG

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: More information is required as to what additional guidance on URD views is being referring to. The DEC community have reviewed, and are happy with the current version of Deskbook.

**Status** Open

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:** Review Board actioned the need to identify a URD process owner to confirm MODAF view use in URD development. This issue may be clarified in further review of the documentation by this authority.



**Page:**

**Section:**

**Issue:** General

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Description:** References to the MODAF Handbook are inconsistent in title.

**Evidence:** page 10 references volume 2 Handbook and this is inconsistent with project TWG agreement to retitle the product MODAF Technical Handbook.

**User's Proposed Solution:** Apply a consistent naming convention across all Deskbooks and the Handbook to retitle ' MODAF - Volume 2 - Technical Handbook'

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as proposed

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** **Section:**

**Issue:** Language style and mandation nature

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Description:** The first paragraph of section 2.1 contains language that I would expect to turn off most if not all military people. It would freak most engineers and almost all managers that I know. I would have assumed that the average ECC desk officer is an "intelligent layman" in systems engineering terms, and the language of the entire document should reflect this target audience. Further, the early part of the document and specifically page 14 refers to mandated views. I would suggest that it is inappropriate for the deskbook to mandate views: this is a policy issue that should be managed independently of the deskbook - Otherwise you will have to re-issue the deskbook every time the policy is changed. Also individual IPTs and communities of interest may wish to vary the level of mandation - this again will be difficult if local practice is at variance with an apparently authoritative document.

**Evidence:** What is the evidence for the issue: p5, 12, 14.

**User's Proposed Solution:** 1. Remove references to mandating throughout document. 2. Mandation should be managed centrally so that multiple documents do not need to be amended if the mandation policy changes. 3. Have a careful discussion with the target audience to see whether the language style on page 5 is a turn-off.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Review board to recommend that there is need to make language in section 2 more 'simple', and to suggest an appropriate response to the comment that Deskbook should not be mandating views. (may also be worth considering Kathy comment on mandation here - issue )

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board** Action: MODAF Partners are rationalising the introduction section to the Deskbook, to significantly simplify the content. The detail will be incorporated into the Executive Summary.

**Response:** Action: The terminology 'Mandated' will be changed to 'Essential', Recommended becomes 'Highly Desirable', Supportive becomes 'Desirable'. This enables mandation to be recommended by recommending that the Essential views are mandated.

**Page:**

**Section:**

**Issue:** Spelling

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Description:** Page 8 of MODAF Viewpoint Overview:Ov-1c 'Quantification'

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

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Amend 'Quantification'

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as proposed

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:**

**Section:**

**Issue:** BMS

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Description:** To determine what BMS process mapping approach should be -

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** BMS Process linkage could form an individual section in each Deskbook or could be a combined section held together in one place, e.g. Exec Summary/ Appendix

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: As discussed in the integration meeting - 5 Jul - we need some guidance from the review board as to how to incorporate the BMS linkage.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board** Deskbooks will not contain linkage to BMS process for version 1.0

**Response:** Action: Acknowledge BMS in the Technical Handbook and Executive Summary

**Page:**

**Section:**

**Issue:** General

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Description:** Text layout is completely different from the MODAF Technical Handbook. We should be adopting the same standard across all docs

**Evidence:** THE MODAF Tech handbook is better laid out in use of para headings, numbering and less indentation of paragraphs. - also uses less paper for the same information.

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:**

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: The integration meeting - 5 Jul -agreed that the Deskbooks would be revised inline with the format of the Handbook. The integration meeting would like to ask the review board whether they would also like to see the paragraphs numbered through all the Deskbook sections.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:** Action: MODAF Partners to define and use common paragraph numbering scheme

**Page:** 3

**Section:**

**Issue:** additional annex

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Description:** There should be an additional Annex for the one page implementation guide ( ex User group presentation)

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Include as Annex G the color chart and a reference in the main body to its use, cross reference to the EXEC summary

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Architecture development process now forms part of the Deskbook introduction

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 5 **Section:** 2

**Issue:** Network Enabled Capability Definition

**Category:** Other

**Description:** NEC is defined as a system - as is increasingly happening elsewhere. NEC is not a system, but a concept. It is the way that network are used to deliver capability, but it is not the networks themselves. To limit its description so suggests that NEC can only be delivered by the equipment LOD, whereas all LOD must be addressed in order to maximise NEC.

**Evidence:** The description of NEC paraphrases SoS talkingon the SDR in Jul 02 where sensors, network and strike assets are "at the heart of" NEC, but they do not COMPRISE NEC

**User's Proposed Solution:** The description of NEC should be revised to reflect its status as an enabler of capability.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: This introduction now forms part of the Executive summary. To be picked up by Dave Mawby in production of this document

**Status** Open

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 5 **Section:** 2.1  
**Issue:** Architecture Framework Descriptions

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Description:** There is much repetition within the first four sub-headings.

**Evidence:** "What is an Architectural Framework?" goes on to describe views (3rd to 6th sentences), which is repeated under "Architectural Framework Viewpoints". The second paragraph talks about the consistency of views, which is repeated under "Architectural Framework Meta-models".

**User's Proposed Solution:** Restructure the paragraphs above to better present the topics under discussion.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: These sections are being moved to the Executive Summary as determined by the integration meeting - 5 Jul - This issue is to be picked up by Dave Mawby in production of this document.

**Status** Open

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**



**Page:** 5 **Section:** All  
**Issue:** Foreword

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Ensure that ECC Rep is chasing this so that it is produced on time

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Review at MODAF Mgt Mtg

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Review board need to confirm that ECC representative is chasing the Foreword:

**Status:** Open

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:** Action: Kathy Lamb to write Foreword and forward for approval

**Page:** 6

**Section:**

**Issue:** General

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Footnote fonts size not consistent and footnote 5 refers to the next page

**Evidence:** as above

**User's Proposed Solution:** revisit all footnotes and standardize fonts

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as proposed

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 6

**Section:** What is an

**Issue:** Clarity

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Need to reword first sentence, defines more than jst the key business and technical information, defines relationships, defines usage. I think that we need to bettern utilise the words from the Conuse

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Reference was made to Deskbook v1.0. This section is omitted from version v2.0. No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 6

**Section:** What is an

**Issue:** Careful selling

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** add 'potentially' before interoperable with other Architectures. We do not want to oversell what will occur.

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Reference was made to Deskbook v1.0. This section is omitted from version v2.0. No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 6

**Section:** What is an

**Issue:** Clarity

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** The last sentence is a bit woolly, needs to be more specific or the addition of further understanding / explanation

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Reference was made to Deskbook v1.0. This section is omitted from version v2.0. No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 7

**Section:** Why use

**Issue:** Acronym

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** BISAs is a new acronym at this point - please explain at first usage

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Reference was made to Deskbook v1.0. This section is omitted from version v2.0. No action.

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 8

**Section:**

**Issue:** Un-needed quotes

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Quotes seem a bit out of place. I think the supporting text pushes the case for MODAF better than Geoff Hoon could.

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

**User's Proposed Solution:** Remove the quotes.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: These sections are being moved to the Executive Summary as determined by the integration meeting - 5 Jul - This issue is to be picked up by Dave Mawby in production of this document.

**Status** Open

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 8

**Section:** 2.1

**Issue:** Mandation

**Category:** Procedural

**Description:** -bottom of page - Reference to mandated views is not factually correct

**Evidence:** Reference to elements of MODAF are mandated locally within COIs etc. To date there is only an intention to mandate once a proposal has been put forward so at the time of publishing this will not be true.

**User's Proposed Solution:** reflect the intention to mandate by altering wording. The statement on DMB NEC workshop should also be amended to say it was a proposal.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Issue no-longer valid as MODAF mandation policy has changed. The Deskbooks will not refer to mandated views, they will reference 'Essential' and 'Highly Desirable' views.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**



**Page:** 8

**Section:** MODAF

**Issue:** MODAF Benefits

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** When we had the benefits workshop; I thought we split out some specific ECC benefits - we could use these here.

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: This section is being moved to the Executive Summary as determined by the integration meeting - 5 Jul - This issue is to be picked up by Dave Mawby in production of this document.

**Status** Open

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 9 **Section:** bottom of  
**Issue:** Differentiate between Equipment Capability and Military Capability

**Category:** Major Technical

**Description:** "Development of new and improved military capability" One example is cited (in one document) where a distinction is needed between MODAF Equipment Capability (EC) and Smart Acquisition Military Capability (MC). Also affects StV-3 guidance (see discussion thread).

**Evidence:** Smart Acquisition Handbook (Ed.5 Jan. 2004) p.13 shows MC to be the contribution of all the LODs, and NOT JUST EQUIPMENT alone.

**User's Proposed Solution:** Explain early on that MODAF is dealing with EC (thereafter referred to as "capability") and that MC is delivered by all the LODs which MODAF does always cover (e.g. Sustainability).

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: For board to decide whether it is o.k. for MODAF StV-3 to ignore other LODs, focussing on equipment capability only, and thus be different to StV-2 which would detail military capability. This may impact the meta-model - do we now need two capability data elements, equipment vs military?

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board** Capability in the MODAF Strategic views StV-2,3,5 is Military Capability. StV-3 maps Military Capability to a single LOD - the system, system of systems.

**Response:** Action: Jon Lee/ Ian Bailey to add paragraph to Technical Handbook and Deskbooks that clarifies what is meant by 'capability'

**Page:** 9 **Section:** first  
**Issue:** Structure of MODAF docs

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** We have 5 deskbooks currently - but this may change in the future - we do need to refer to MODAF lifecycle at some point. A section on MODAF Further development, inputs for new ideas and modifications, or at least a note on these issues seems to make sense.

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** For consideration.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: For review board to decide how the ongoing MODAF development be handled, and whether it should be noted in the Deskbooks (if at all). If a section is added to the introduction, the MODAF project really needs to have the governance processes in place to be able to handle ongoing user suggestions for modification.

**Status** Open **Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:** Action: MODAF Partners to add a section that directs users to where they can send comments and suggestions  
Action: Kathy Lamb to determine contact mechanism to which users can send these comments and suggestions

**Page:** 9

**Section:** Long Term

**Issue:** MODAF Benefits

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** A bit picky but maybe we should caveat ourselves somehow in that MODAF allows contract errors to be more easily avoided and makes cost overruns less likely etc. through it consistent application and repository

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: I don't think this sentence suggests that MODAF alone will solve contract errors and cost overruns. Suggest that no action is taken.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 9

**Section:** Long Term

**Issue:** MODAF Benefits

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** We miss an opportunity to use some buzz words from the Acquisition Handbook such as continuous improvement and incremental acquisition. MODAF offers a real opportunity to plan for and perform these approaches for once!

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: These sections are being moved to the Executive Summary as determined by the integration meeting - 5 Jul - This issue is to be picked up by Dave Mawby in production of this document.

**Status** Open

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 9 **Section:** top of pag  
**Issue:** MODAF and Requirements Engineering

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Description:** "Consistent, comprehensive and less ambiguous requirements documents (amongst other documents)". It is only true for the higher level (ECC) requirement documents such as CRD and/or URD.

**Evidence:** p.8 "The System Views are closely linked with the generation of System Requirements Documents (SRD) and System Design, both of which are not functions of the ECC and so the Views are not mandated or recommended for ECC stakeholders."

**User's Proposed Solution:** Section 3.7 and 3.8 could be improved by putting MODAF into the requirement set context, perhaps written from a requirements engineering POV. MODAF deals well with functionality, but it does not does not justify performance requirements (MOPs) at system level, additional modelling is needed for this. For example a SRD requirement "... shall detect a 1m3 object at 120km"; these numbers would not emerge

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: As per issue 3 - For the board to identify a URD authority to which we can go to confirm the proposed use of MODAF views within a URD. Although MODAF could not clarify all aspects of the SRD/ URD, its articulation of some of the textual requirements by MODAF views should improve their clarity I would have thought.

**Status** Open **Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board** Action: Kathy Lamb to identify the URD process owner, for engagement and confirmation of URD MODAF views

**Response:** Action: Jon Lee to place caveat on proposed URD MODAF views and development sequence for MODAF relaease version 1.0

**Page:** 10

**Section:** References

**Issue:** Further info

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** There could be more references here, for example the website would not be a bad one! In time we will need a deskbook POC also (User Group to identify?). One individual in the IA will not be able to configuration manage all the MODAF suite of docs. Although the editorial board should probably continue to stand throughout new baselines

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** For consideration.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: MODAF website added to contact list

Refer also to issue 26

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 11

**Section:** 2.3

**Issue:** General

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Description:** Naming of contacts is inappropriate as people move on.

**Evidence:** Andy North is leaving imminently so this will be out of date before release

**User's Proposed Solution:** Use job title only

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as proposed

Refer also to issue 26

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**



**Page:** 11  
**Issue:** Development of Architecture

**Section:** About this

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** MODAF does not support or endorse any specific process is true , however we still wish to emphasise the importance of various aspects. A disclaimer is better at the end than at the beginning if possible. Also, we definitely have Metamodel compliancy if they are developing an architecture for serious use.

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Reference was made to Deskbook v1.0. This section is omitted from version v2.0. No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 11 **Section:** Overview

**Issue:** Architecture Development Process

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** A better description is required of the Views (too many architectures in one sentence) - could be an option for a diagram? or link into Figure 3-1 somehow?

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Reference was made to Deskbook v1.0. This section is omitted from version v2.0. No action.

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 12

**Section:** 3.1

**Issue:** Text flow

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Description:** Guide to... para: '...there are a set of Reference Guides are available for...'

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

**User's Proposed Solution:** 2 options: '...a set of Reference Guides are available for...' , or '...there are a set of Reference Guides available for...'

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as proposed

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 12  
**Issue:** Sentence Structure

**Section:** 3.1

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Under "Guide to using this section, 3rd sentence requires re-wording.

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

**User's Proposed Solution:** Re-word - "In addition, there is a set of Reference Guides available for day-to-day use."

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as issue 33.

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 12  
**Issue:** Document Structure

**Section:** 3.1

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Definition and expansion of terms "Mandated" and "Recommended" split. There is a definition of each, separately followed by further explanation.

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

**User's Proposed Solution:** Merge the explanatory paragraphs with the definitions.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: The mandated/ recommended bullets are short and sharp for effectiveness of communication. The supporting text does not repeat the bulleted information, but further expands on them. No action taken.

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 12 **Section:** Figure 3-1

**Issue:** Architecture Development Process

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** The Lines of Development do not feature and All Views are omitted. May need an update in the light of outputs from recent workshop

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Reference was made to Deskbook v1.0. This section is omitted from version v2.0. No action.

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 12 **Section:** Step 1  
**Issue:** Architecture Development Process

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Yes - it explains why the arch is being developed but we should make the statement that in developing an arch we must have a question to necessitate the action in the first place -what is the driver? This currently just assumes there is a need,

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Reference was made to Deskbook v1.0. This section is omitted from version v2.0. No action.

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 12 **Section:** Step 2  
**Issue:** Architecture Development Process

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** When does looking at previous / existing data take place? We mention making data available for re-use but what if some already can be made available? What about the Lines of Development? We need to explain the word Epoch in more detail and how they can fit together (see Handbook comments) - all may be affected after recent workshop.

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Reference was made to Deskbook v1.0. This section is omitted from version v2.0. No action.

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**



**Page:** 12

**Section:** Steps1 & 2

**Issue:** Reference to AV1

**Category:** Other

**Description:** It might be worth mentioning that steps one and two are part of defining the AV1

**Evidence:** AV1 description

**User's Proposed Solution:** If you have a suggestion for solving the problem please put it here.

**References:** MoDAF Handbook

**Action:** Jon Lee: Reference was made to Deskbook v1.0. This section is omitted from version v2.0. No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 13

**Section:**

**Issue:** spelling

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** misuse of word 'eclipse' - and pg 28

**Evidence:** References the ovals in diagrams which (according to my dictionary are 'ellipse' shaped.

**User's Proposed Solution:** amend to read 'ellipse' throughout all docs

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as proposed

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 13 **Section:** Step 2 -  
**Issue:** Architecture Development Process

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Are we just talking architecture at this stage or should we mention views? We will just get them to manipulate the data in the long run - but for now?

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** For consideration.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Reference was made to Deskbook v1.0. This section is omitted from version v2.0. No action.

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 13 **Section:** Step 3

**Issue:** Architecture Development Process

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Standard Data Dictionaries - refer to our taxonomy? Should we have Line of Development coverage here (People)?

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Reference was made to Deskbook v1.0. This section is omitted from version v2.0. No action.

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 14

**Section:** 3.4

**Issue:** Minor typo

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Last line of para below Fig 3-8 - "in the in"

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

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Delete second "in"

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as proposed

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 14

**Section:** Fig 3-1

**Issue:** Fig 3-1 Omission

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Description:** There should be a path into StV-2 in "Conduct Capability Audit.

**Evidence:** Page 19, Para 3.4 - "Conduct Capability Audit - Analyse Data & Identify Capability Issues", 4th para states that StV-2 should be updated to reflect required capability

**User's Proposed Solution:** Update Fig 3-1 to reflect text.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as proposed

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 14 **Section:** Step 5

**Issue:** Architecture Development Process

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** This is PESTLE style analysis so we could credit / mention this?

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Reference was made to Deskbook v1.0. This section is omitted from version v2.0. No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 14 **Section:** Step 5

**Issue:** Architecture Development Process

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Are things typically performed or can they be performed? May be able to find better wording.

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Reference was made to Deskbook v1.0. This section is omitted from version v2.0. No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**



**Page:** 14 **Section:** Step 6

**Issue:** Architecture Development Process

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Need to take care in the use of the term models / views in accordance with the Metamodel. Do we build views or models? Models I think.

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Reference was made to Deskbook v1.0. This section is omitted from version v2.0. No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 15 **Section:** Overview

**Issue:** Approach to mapping MODAF Views to ECC Processes

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Should we mention the option of hybrid views here?

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** For consideration.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Review board to decide where hybrid views should be mentioned in the MODAF documentation - where we cater for more experienced users. The proposed user audience of the Deskbooks would find hybrid views a 'concept to far' to grasp, but experienced users would find it useful. The current Deskbook cut-off point is at a less experienced user level. Should the Technical Handbook support more experienced users in this context?.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:** Action: MODAF Partners to include a short statement on hybrid views in Deskbook introduction

**Page:** 16 **Section:** Figure 4.1  
**Issue:** Inclusion of a mandated or optional OV4 for URD development

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Description:** The inclusion of an OV4 to encourage stakeholder analysis in terms of key roles and organisations would be beneficial as a starting point for both the URD and the OV5s. In other words we are asking who is the User and once that has been established we can ask what does he do within the capability functions.

**Evidence:** See AMS website [http://www.ams.mod.uk/ams/content/docs/reqweb/pages/05\\_user/frame.htm](http://www.ams.mod.uk/ams/content/docs/reqweb/pages/05_user/frame.htm)  
quote first activity:"1. Identify the individual stakeholders or stakeholder classes who have a legitimate interest in the system throughout its life cycle. This includes, but is not limited to, users, supporters, developers, producers, trainers, maintainers, disposers, acquirer and supplier organizations, regulatory

**User's Proposed Solution:** Include OV4 as a mandated or atleast optional view

**References:** AMS Requirements Web - User Requirements

**Action:** Jon Lee: As per issue 3 - For the review board to identify a URD authority to which we can go to confirm the proposed use of MODAF views within a URD. Use of OV-4 to enforce a stakeholder analysis seems a little overkill.

**Status** Open

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board** Action: Kathy Lamb to identify the URD process owner, for engagement and confirmation of URD MODAF views

**Response:** Action: Jon Lee to place caveat on proposed URD MODAF views and development sequence for MODAF release version 1.0

**Page:** 16

**Section:** Figure 4-1

**Issue:** ECC Process

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Description:** Are there any side branch activities that can be supported? e.g. COEIA?

**Evidence:** Look at Col workshop

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: As per issue 48 - Review board to decide where we cater for more experienced users. The ECC community wish to keep the Deskbook at a high level, so branching out into specific activities is currently not catered for.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:** No action. Has been registered and will be picked up in future stages

**Page:** 16

**Section:** Figure 4-1

**Issue:** Clean Diagram

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Can this be cleaned up? I.e. have the blue crosses removed?

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Andy was referring to Deskboook v1.0. This diagram is cleaned up in version v2.0. No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 16 **Section:** Guide to  
**Issue:** Approach to mapping MODAF Views to ECC Processes

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Appendix C not D? and B not C?

**Evidence:**

**User's** Edit  
**Proposed**  
**Solution:**

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Reference was made to Deskbook v1.0. This section is omitted from version v2.0. No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review**  
**Board**  
**Response:**

**Page:** 17

**Section:** 3.4

**Issue:** Minor Editorial - Spelling

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** "compliment" should be "complement"

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

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as proposed

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 17

**Section:** fi3-5

**Issue:** clarity

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Description:** Gives a constraint on use without explaining consequence...A view cannot be referred to ..... if it makes use of data elements above and beyond that specified by MODAF.

**Evidence:** Insert the explanation of why - impact

**User's Proposed Solution:** link to data model and repository?

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Hybrid views to be explained in introduction. Text here removed

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**



**Page:** 17

**Section:** Gather info

**Issue:** Capability Audit

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** We are back to the definition of epoch again, here we use it slightly different form the previous mention by relating it to NEC maturity states - we need to be precise

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Dave Mawby to clarify the meaning of Epoch - I understand that it means different things to different people.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:** Review Board decided to modify meta-model to refer to Epoch as 'period of time'. Issue resolved, no action needed.

**Page:** 17  
**Issue:** Capability Vision Development

**Section:** Update CRD

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** We could refer to the Concepts and Doctrine deskbook here?

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** For consideration.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edit as proposed - the integration meeting - 5 Jul - identified with further clarity the interfaces between COIs, and these will be further integrated into next versions of Deskbook.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 17  
**Issue:** Capability Vision Development

**Section:** Update CRD

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Description:** We should suggest they review the existing taxonomy (i.e. what already exists) before creating StV-2 for planning purposes? How can this be achieved?

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** For consideration.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Re-worded to identify that a capability taxonomy may already exist and that it is taken into account when decomposing the Capability Vision

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 17  
**Issue:** Capability Vision Development

**Section:** Update CRD

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** When we say a view can do something such as quantitative attributes and metrics we should really show this in the example

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Quantative metric StV-2 to be added into example.

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 18

**Section:** 3.4

**Issue:** Mis-use of "compliment"

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Paragraph below Fig 3-6 - use of "compliment" instead of "complement".

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

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as proposed

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 19

**Section:** 3.4

**Issue:** StV Updating

**Category:** Other

**Description:** During the analysis and Identification of Capability Issues there is a process of updating viewpoints (StV-3 is mentioned in this section). Use of this view is optional throughout the ECC process. How will required changes be tracked to ensure that they are not lost?

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

**User's Proposed Solution:** If you have a suggestion for solving the problem please put it here.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: This issue is a COI process and governance issue, that needs to be determined by the ECC community during the implementation of MODAF. At this stage we are simply identifying the views that would support the ECC 'as-is' process, without looking to see how their process could be modified. As a suggestion however, AV-1 can be used as a tool for change control, identifying when views within the architecture were last amended. No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:** Review Board discussed the use of AV-1/2 - introductory text will now be incorporated into the documentation, identifying that AV-1/2 can be used for configuration management and change control. The precise details of how they will achieve this will need to be clarified during MODAF implementation.

**Page:** 19

**Section:** Figure 4-5

**Issue:** Capability Audit

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Needs cleaning up

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as proposed (It is Figure 3-7 in Version 2.0)

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 20  
**Issue:** Miscellaneous Editorial

**Section:** 3.4,3.5

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** pgs20-23: P20, Para headed Operational Analysis, line 1 - "a" should be "an"P20, final para, line 1 - should read "MODAF Operational View"P21, final para, line 2 - should read "Capability Area Plan" P22, final para, line 1 - should read "View used to"P23, first para, line 2 - should read "It then"

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

**User's Proposed Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as proposed

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**



**Page:** 20

**Section:** 3.5 (last para

**Issue:** Missing word

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** "modaf operational is available",,"add Views after Operational.

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** 30/06/2005

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as proposed

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 20

**Section:** Conduct

**Issue:** Capability Audit

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Is the further analysis more detailed or just more?

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Further analysis, as a term, is intended to cover both 'more' and 'more detailed' analysis. No action

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 20

**Section:** EP View

**Issue:** Capability Audit

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Description:** so will the MS Excel EP View need adapting for MODAF - question for Col / User Group

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Review board to determine message that should be communicated to COIs when BESPOKE tools that contain MODAF compliant views are not supported by a MODAF meta-model /XMI interoperability capability at this time. Should they be adapted?

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board** Answer: Yes, the tools need adapting to incorporate the data elements and relationships of the MODAF meta-model to make the tools MODAF compliant

**Response:** Action: Jon Lee to ensure that the ECC Deskbook clarifies that the EP View isn't supported by the MODAF meta-model.

**Page:** 23

**Section:**

**Issue:** Text flow

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Description:** 2nd sentence: 'In then provides..'

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

**User's Proposed Solution:** Amend 'It then provides..' ?

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as proposed

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 23

**Section:** Conduct

**Issue:** Capability Audit

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Description:** Does the Capability Shortfall catalogue actually exist? (if it does will further assist a NATO / UK process mapping under consideration.

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Discussion?

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: A Capability Shortfall Catalogue does exist. Action for Dave Mawby to discuss seperately with Andy North the need for this to assisi NATO/ UK mapping.

**Status** Open

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 24

**Section:** Conduct

**Issue:** Capability Audit

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** And the benefit of doing this is?

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Please add

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Updated wording to clarify the benefit of doing further analysis - that is that it provides greater assurance that the capability issue exists.

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 24

**Section:** Conduct

**Issue:** Capability Audit

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** We need to be careful when we are saying we can use any view without some of the elements - yes, this is true but this means it is no longer what it was originally, it becomes a hybrid or a lesser view.

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Re-word to identify that any change in view data elements makes the view a hybrid, or modified view.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 25  
**Issue:** Use of Recommended Views

**Section:** 3.6

**Category:** Major Technical

**Description:** pgs25-26 - The use of StV-5 and OV-1a is strongly recommended, but is not shown on Fig 3-1.

**Evidence:** If Fig 3-1 is adopted as an aide-memoire, the omission of these recommended views could lead to a less than complete analysis than would otherwise be performed.

**User's Proposed Solution:** Expand Fig 3-1 to include all recommended views, as appropriate.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Review board to decide whether StV-5 and OV-1a can be added to the ECC process diagram with a caveat identifying that in normal circumstances, there is not time to develop the capability options in this manner - possibly as a 'desirable' change in' COI process.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board** Action: Jon Lee to discuss with Carl Longley offline and confirm addition to ECC process diagram  
Follow-up action: Jon Lee to incorporate StV-5 and OV-1a/b as a highly desirable view for capability option articulation - but to form part of DEC processes at a later date, rather than initial implementation.

**Response:**



**Page:** 25

**Section:** All

**Issue:** Capability Audit

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Description:** Shifting the definitions of capabilities (i.e. saying we did not quite get the capability breakdown right first time) was not discussed as a different way of removing a capability gap!

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** For consideration.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Re-worded to include this method of identifying a capability gap (Is page 21 in Version 2.0)

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 26

**Section:** 3.6

**Issue:** Mis-use of "bi-annual"

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Para 3 refers to the "bi-annual EP cycle". "bi-annual" is six monthly, or twice a year.

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

**User's Proposed Solution:** reword as "the two year EP cycle", rather than the option of "biennial"

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edit as proposed.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 26  
**Issue:** DEC and C2 Capability Review

**Section:** Review

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** We could mention Finance and external influences against these bullets?

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** For consideration.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Add finance and external influences to cross-DEC review bullets (Is page 22 in Version 2.0)

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 26  
**Issue:** DEC and C2 Capability Review

**Section:** Review

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** We could make a mention of Enterprise and Programme management at this point?

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** For consideration.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: I'm not sure that a mention of these items would add value to this section. No action. (Is page 22 in Version 2.0)

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 27  
**Issue:** DEC and C2 Capability Review

**Section:** Figure 4-12

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Clean up required

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Figure 4-12 no-longer used in Deskbook Version 2.0. No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 27

**Section:** Review

**Issue:** DEC and C2 Capability Review

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Description:** What level of information is looked at here - it requires knowing something or knowing where to get data based on the dependency? Can we assist the reader any further here? What information is reviewed? Draft URDs? Business Casesà

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** For consideration.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Information required to support the cross-DEC review is not currently known. For the review board ECC representative to identify whether they would like a greater depth of COI process explained here, and whether other documentation containing MODAF views is likely to be used. E.g. URD/ business case

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:** Action: Jon Lee to add text to describe where information in AcV-2 comes from, i.e.dependencies between capabilities etc (PTs may not exist) E.g. using StV-3 and 5 as examples.

**Page:** 28  
**Issue:** DEC and C2 Capability Review

**Section:** Figure 4-13

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Where is this figure referred to in the text?

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Figure 4-13 no-longer used in Deskbook Version 2.0. No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 29

**Section:** Review

**Issue:** DEC and C2 Capability Review

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** WE could link to the Config Mgt here?

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** For consideration.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Add wording concerning use of AV-1/2 to help configuration management across the piece (Is page 22 onwards in version 2.0)

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**



**Page:** 30

**Section:** 3.8

**Issue:** CADMID Process

**Category:** Major Technical

**Description:** The inference is that the URD is baselined at MG and at this point the IPT begins to develop the solution etc. As I recall, by MG solutions should have been developed to be taken forward into Manufacture, although this may involve further down-selection. A URD, albeit not mature, will have been presented at IG to support the Business Case and industry will have been involved during the Assessment Phase.

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Clarify the linkage between the URD development process using AF and the established CADMID cycle.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: As per discussions in integration meeting - 5 Jul - and issue 3 - For the board to identify a URD authority to which we can go to confirm the proposed use of MODAF views within a URD. Whether all views should be mandated for IG. Specifically considering mandation of OV-5 at IG.

**Status** Open

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board** Action: Kathy Lamb to identify the URD process owner, for engagement and confirmation of URD MODAF views

**Response:** Action: Jon Lee to place caveat on proposed URD MODAF views and development sequence for MODAF release version 1.0

**Page:** 30

**Section:** 3.8

**Issue:** Minor editorial

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Second para, line 2 - should read "involved with DPA"

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

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as proposed

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 31  
**Issue:** Capability Option Development

**Section:** Develop Cap

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Is the (no views are mandated) actually necessary?

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Statement not applicable to Deskbook Version 2.0. No action.

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 34  
**Issue:** Requirements Development

**Section:** Develop URD

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Some confusion could be sown here? We refer to 5 OV's (there are 7). We then talk StV-6. We could also discuss the usage of use cases across different systems with config management and a diagram or two?

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Edit and For Consideration

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: The URD section is re-worded in Deskbook Version 2.0 and is hopefully clearer. Also, the worked example in version 2.0 is much more extensive than verison 1.0 and hopefully covers the later requirement to articulate use-cases across systems. No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 36 **Section:** Beyond URD

**Issue:** Requirements Maintenance and Assurance

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Description:** This could need further development - we could have some URD examples (User Group action?), we could also refer onwards to the verification and validation cycle when the ECC will be involved to ensure the requirements are met?

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** For consideration.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Review board to advise whether the "beyond URD baseline" section requires further development in the ECC deskbook, noting that the acquisition Deskbook identifies URD development throughout CADMID.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:** Action: Jon Lee to add a sentence or two on change control to this section and linkage to AMS URD process

**Page:** 37

**Section:** About this

**Issue:** Worked example

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Can we re-word - it is not intended to represent UK ISTAR assets - it doesn't, so that's ok then?

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Re-worded more appropriately

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 37

**Section:** About this

**Issue:** Worked example

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** It intends to add? or IT adds?

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited tense from 'It intends to add' to 'It adds'

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 37

**Section:** About this

**Issue:** Worked example

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Why not just say integrate across the Lines of Development?

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Reference was made to Deskbook v1.0. This section is omitted from version v2.0. No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**



**Page:** 37 **Section:** Overview  
**Issue:** ISTAR Worked Example Intro

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Description:** Surely we should introduce the AV1 and AV2 here?

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Review board to consider how AVs are used to detail the architecture - is the scope of an ECC architecture inline with the view set that forms a document e.g. URD? Or does it cover, say, one year of ECC process?

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:** Action: Jon Lee to ensure ECC Deskbook introduces AV-1/2. Minimum use is that if you create an AV-1/2 when you generate an architecture , or to inherit the AV-1/2 from the previous architecture for update and modification.

**Page:** 38  
**Issue:** ISTAR Worked Example Intro

**Section:** Overview

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Make terminology in diagram and words consistent - e.g. Special Forces Patrols vs. Fighting Patrols

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edited as proposed (Is page 31 in version 2.0)

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 38  
**Issue:** ISTAR Worked Example Intro

**Section:** Overview

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** OSD or run-out date - what is the best terminology? (repeated throughout)

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Dave Mawby to suggest best used terminology in MOD community and Jon Lee to amend.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 39  
**Issue:** Capability Vision Development

**Section:** Figure 5-4

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** No metrics used here - consistency in approach!

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Deskbook version 2.0 uses metrics in ISTAR example StV-2 . These will remain, and section 3 will be updated with metrics as per issue 58 . No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 40

**Section:** Figure 5-5

**Issue:** Capability Audit

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** We state the dates for the systems earlier so why not use them on the timeline?

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Figure updated with dates (Figure 4-5 in version 2.0)

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 42

**Section:** All

**Issue:** Capability Audit

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Should StV-4 not get a review mention at least?

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Add

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Version 2.0 includes StV-4. No action.

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 42  
**Issue:** Capability Option Development

**Section:** Develop Cap

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** This is subtle I know but OV-5 isn't mandated but if they are going to use something for the activity mentioned here then it should be OV-5 - add this clarity?

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: OV-5 no longer forms part of the worked example in version 2.0. No action.

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**

**Page:** 46  
**Issue:** Requirements Development

**Section:** Develop URD

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Should we mention that Options 1 and 2 could be reviewed in more detail by MODAF to establish the benefits?

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** For consideration.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Text added to identify that further MODAF views can be used to perform benefits analysis

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:**



**Page:** 46  
**Issue:** Requirements Development

**Section:** Develop URD

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** The scenarios may be provided and controlled to a certain extent to ensure cross DEC consistency - should the Col be looking at this?

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Discussion?

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Version 2.0 identifies that the scenarios are based on the standard SAG scenarios. Consistency is therefore maintained. No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 47  
**Issue:** Requirements Development

**Section:** Figure 5-16

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Why did we not touch on our OV-1b and OV-1c or add the words that are supposed to go with the OV-1a? Completeness of examples!

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: For Review Board to decide whether ISTAR worked example should include OV-1b abd 1c for Capability Options.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board** Action: Jon Lee to update documentation to reflect OV-1b modification - OV-1b is now "Operational Graphic Description" and is mandatory with every OV-1a produced

**Response:** Action: Jon Lee to discuss applicability of OV-1c to capability option development with Carl Longley offline

Follow-up action: Jon Lee to incorporate OV-1c as a highly desirable view for capability option articulation - but to form part of DEC processes at a later date, rather than initial implementation.

**Page:** 48  
**Issue:** Requirements Development

**Section:** Figure 5-18

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Would we like to mention the additional columns allowed in OV-3 here?

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** For consideration.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: To add wording that identifies additional columns allowable in OV-3

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 49  
**Issue:** Requirements Development

**Section:** Figure 5-20

**Category:** Major Editorial

**Description:** Check with COI but I would have thought there may be room for using the OV-4, or SV-9 / TV-2 combo at some point during the ECC Deskbook

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** For consideration.

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: ECC review board representative to comment on use of OV-4, SV-9 and TV-2 in ECC processes.

Possible OV-4 uses? (1) stakeholder analysis in URD as per issue 49 (2) Operational Analysis (although covered by C&D Deskbook)

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board** Action: Andy North to provide overview of these proposed views to Jon Lee; their use in the ECC community

**Response:** Action: Jon Lee to discuss use of these views with Carl Longley offline, and incorporate as appropriate.

Follow-up action:

OV-4: the organisational angle is being provided by StV-5 in capability option articulation - Jon Lee to incorporate StV-5 as a highly desirable view for capability option articulation - but to form part of DEC

**Page:** 73

**Section:** AcV-2

**Issue:** AcV-2

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Clean up required

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Edit as proposed - AcV to be cleaned up in MODAF View Overview Appendix A

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**

**Page:** 74

**Section:** Matrix

**Issue:** Appendix B

**Category:** Minor Technical

**Description:** Need a full one of these in the end for a view across all processes to be used by the management team

**Evidence:**

**User's Proposed Solution:** Discussion?

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: View-Process matrix no-longer forms part of Deskbook Version 2.0 following DEC request to simplify the document. Review board to advise on whether this matrix is still a requirement

**Status:** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review Board Response:** No action required. MODAF Partners have produced COI scope diagrams to integrate across the MODAf piece

**Page:** 84

**Section:** Recommende

**Issue:** grammar

**Category:** Minor Editorial

**Description:** Used 'as' a checklistà

**Evidence:**

**User's  
Proposed  
Solution:** Edit

**References:**

**Action:** Jon Lee: Appendix B View-use tables no-longer form part of ECC Deskbook. No action.

**Status** Closed

**Refer to Review Board**

**Review  
Board  
Response:**