

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 427

Page:

Section:

Issue: content

Category: Major Technical

Description: No explanation of the technical constraints / enablers that support MODAF

Evidence: No indication that M3 and repository ect are requird to make this work

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: include summary of technical aspects

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Could include a short para in section 2 that summarises section 3.4 from the MODAF Overview.

Review Board Decision: Agreed to include a brief paragraph and cross-reference regarding M3, MODAR, etc.

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 424

Page:

Section:

Issue: General layout

Category: Major Editorial

Description: The content of the CONUSE is not covered - what replaces it?

Evidence: much shorter document

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: make sure that the info in the CONUSE is contained in one of the revised products

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Original CONUSE has now been superceded by the COI deskbook work and is no longer valid. We have no summary version of the COI deskbooks with views overlaid - the figures in MODAF Overview section 6.3 are the closest now. The development of a new CONUSE is a significant task and outside scope of baseline 1.0 production.

Review Board Decision: It is suggested that a revised CONUSE is developed in a subsequent phase of the project.

MODAF Review Board Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 421

Page: **Section:** all sections or

Issue: General layout

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Within sections few/no sub paragraph numbers and mix of sub-paras and bulletpoints

Evidence: page 5, page 7/8 versus page 10

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: use para numbers

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Will make para structure more consistent.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 422

Page: 3

Section: 1

Issue: General layout

Category: Major Editorial

Description: The foreword should not be part 1 it is not an element of the deskbook

Evidence: given a section / para no.

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: exclude from content

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: There may be a significant impact with updating figure / table numbers if the section structure changes throughout the deskbooks. Advice sought.

Review Board Decision: Restructure with a un-numbered Foreward, 1. Introduction and 2. MODAF Framework. A similar structure is to be introduced in each of the Deskbooks too - which will address the issues about lack of scope definition / purpose.

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 425

Page: 3 **Section:** Introduction

Issue: content

Category: Major Editorial

Description: no explanation of what is MODAF why use it.

Evidence: section in last version now missing

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: ensure this is included in brief in introduction

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Will include in an Introduction - see issue ID 423

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 423

Page: 3 **Section:** Introduction

Issue: General layout

Category: Major Editorial

Description: There is no introduction to the doc

Evidence: gives no explanation of what the product is for

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: include an intro with purpose of the document

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Originally excluded to reduce page count but can be added back in.

Review Board Decision: Will be included - see Issue #422.

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 428

Page: 5

Section: 2

Issue: content

Category: Minor Technical

Description: relationship with Overview not clear

Evidence: similar chunks and more detail is in the overview but due to lack of introduction there is no explanation

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: amend the doc to provide the summary as described in para 3

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Will include in an introduction - but the relationship of the entire MODAF suite is covered in section 3.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 483

Page: 5 **Section:** Figure 2-1

Issue: Strategic Viewpoint definition

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: I have noticed this late (apologies). The Strategic Viewpoint states that it articulates the long term strateigc picture. Well - it's not just long term is it - itÆs the whole strategic picture at any time.

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Delete 'long-term'. Applicable to all docs using this figure.

Solution:

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Agreed - will delete "long term"

Approach:

Review Board

Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 482

Page: 5 **Section:** MODAF Fram

Issue: Ease of exchange with US

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: I understand what is being said here (MODAF is not much different from DODAF and thus we can exchange information). However, lets not forgetthat there are different underlying models. Perhaps 'ensure' is too strong?

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Change to 'allow the ability to exchange' rather than 'ensure'.

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Agreed. Will change to "facilitates"

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 429

Page: 6

Section: fig2.2

Issue: content

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: illegible diagram

Evidence: OV1 flap obliterates text

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: redraw to to move pull down flap

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Agreed. Will update Figure 2-2

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 484

Page: 6

Section: Figure 2-2

Issue: Figure 2-2 clarity

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Text Obscuration issues

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Why not move the text 'Operational' to the top of the front face of the cube. Also the TV-1 view flap needs labelling.

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Agreed. Will update Figure 2-2

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 430

Page: 7

Section: fig 3.1

Issue: content

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: product title incorrect

Evidence: view over should read viewpoint overview as per product

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: amend to match product title

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Agreed. Will change Figure 3-1 and text below.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 485

Page: 7 **Section:** Figure 3-1 an

Issue: MODAF Doc Suite completeness

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Should we include the ERM documentation for completeness; it will be under the same change control rigours. The Metamodel doc also includes example exchange files (unless these are being moved to a certification doc)

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Update figure and text

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Will refer to these in the text below Figure 3-1 rather than clutter the figure any more.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 486

Page: 8 **Section:** Section 3 COI

Issue: COI Scope and DLOD relationship

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: It may be worth emphasising the DLOD coverage within the Scope definitions; as they are used in AcV-2; which therefore will need contributions by many communities to produce a valid view

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: For consideration

Solution:

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Will examine the feasibility of including more DLOD emphasis in the scope definitions

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 470

Page: 9 **Section:** 4

Issue: Quoting AfNEC risk figures without adequate understanding.

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Although quoting from AfNEC, there appears to be little understanding of the AfNEC findings. AfNEC correctly identified significant risk in the EP. The amount of that risk that can be addressed depends on the maturity of the systems being considered. Clearly there is greater leverage to mitigate the risk in the early stages of a project. There is little leverage once the systems is fully developed and in service. For legacy systems the full "at risk" price is likely to be paid.

Evidence: The statement on EP risk in the Exec Summary is misleading and does not reflect AfNEC accurately. As lead consultant and acting workstream lead on AfNEC I stand by to discuss with the authors.

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Suggest authors discuss with the AfNEC team.

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Will discuss improved wording with AfNEC team re ability to leverage risk at different stages in the lifecycle. This argument does reinforce the importance of getting the system scope and interfaces right (ie the architectures) ASAP in the CADMID cycle.

Review Board Decision: Agreed - will agree improved wording regarding AfNEC figures with D Def Acq.

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 489

Page: 9 **Section:** All

Issue: Section 4 additions

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Would it make sense to refer to some of the examples from deskbooks that 'prove' some of the benefits. I.e. rather than all vague improved, better, more effective statements?

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: For consideration

Solution:

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: I am not sure which examples "prove" the benefits but am open to suggestions.

Review Board Decision: Will add a generic benefits statement and example (eg JOPIT and consider international interoperability example) and move the benefits by COI into an Annex.

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 431

Page: 9

Section: fig 4.1

Issue: presentation

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: the diagrams are not clear in what they present against an axis - what are the lumps percentages of?

Evidence: each of the two figs shows mounds but doesn't explain what they are.

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: include an axis description or similar

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Agreed - will label axes.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 488

Page: 9

Section: Figure 4-1

Issue: Label missing

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Hanging labelless arrow on left graph

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Rectify

Solution:

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Agreed - this seems to be a PDF problem but will find a solution.

Approach:

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 432

Page: 9 **Section:** footnote 5

Issue: content

Category: Minor Technical

Description: needs a reference for the AfNEC study

Evidence: include version date

Reviewer's

Preferred

Solution:

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Agreed. Will seek a full report reference.

Approach:

Review

Board

Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 487

Page: 9 **Section:** Section 4 par

Issue: Section 4 opening

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Would the sentence read better 'One of the key benefits of implementing MODAF isà'?

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: For consideration

Solution:

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Agreed - will change.

Review Board Decision:

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 426

Page: 10 **Section:** 4

Issue: content

Category: Major Technical

Description: The benefits are only aligned to individual deskbooks rather than general across defence. It would mean amending the EXEC summary for any new deskbook and appears to limit benefits to these areas

Evidence: page 10 lists the 5 Defence COIs engaged with therefore missing wider benefit

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: decouple benefits from the COIs in this and generalise or include the wider benefits that were expressed in earlier docs such as Business case

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Will add wider benefits to the introductory para in addition to the COI specific ones. All suggestions welcome.

Review Board Decision: Covered by the actions on Issue #489.

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 434

Page: 11 **Section:** 5

Issue: content

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: limited acknowledgements

Evidence: excludes the TWG and UG

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: include them or the depts they represent as contributors

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Happy to include a full list of the organisations consulted if this can be provided.

Review Board Decision: Will include all organisations that were participants in the User Group and Technical Working Group. Will also add the industry participants who contributed directly to COIs, pilots, worked examples, etc.

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 433

Page: 11 **Section:** 5

Issue: content

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: the poc identified will lapse with the end of this project

Evidence: indicates MODAF Project Manager

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: amend poc to MODAF point of contact DEC CCII Cap Strat MOD MB

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Please advise of contact details including e-mail and telephone number.

Review Board Decision: Agreed.

MODAF Review Board

Document: Executive Summary

Issue ID: 490

Page: 11 **Section:** Section 5

Issue: POC

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: E-mail addresses for internal and external readers would be useful

Evidence:

Reviewer's

Preferred

Solution:

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: See issue ID 433. It was decided not to use MOD staff names in POC section. Ideally we should have a mail box such as MODAF@mod.uk

Review Board Decision: Agreed.