

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 435

Page: 5

Section: 1

Issue: Overview: layout

Category: Major Editorial

Description: the foreword is marked as part of the content

Evidence: marked as para 1

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: remove para no.

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Agreed. Will address this.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 517

Page: 6

Section: 2 (2)

Issue: Grammar

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: across MOD

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: across the MOD

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Agreed - will change

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 518

Page: 6 **Section:** 2.1 (3)

Issue: Purpose of MODAF

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: What is the purpose of the 3rd para?

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Could remove this. I understand what is being said, but this is in reference to use of EAF's and therefore not necessarily appropriate

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: None. This para acknowledges the likely non-MOD usage of MODAF and the fact that such usage is not the primary purpose and will not be explicitly supported.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 436

Page: 6 **Section:** para 2.1

Issue: Overview: description

Category: Minor Technical

Description: describes MODAF compliant but not what it is

Evidence: MODAF compliant architectures

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: add what that means

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Agreed. Will amend text to be clearer.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 519

Page: 7

Section: 2.2

Issue: Document structure

Category: Major Editorial

Description: First glance suggests Section 5 should be earlier. It seems wise to explain the benefits and then tell them how to achieve these rather than vice versa?

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Document re-structure?

Solution:

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Review board preference / guidance on section order is sought.

Approach:

Review Board Decision: Leave as is.

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 520

Page: 8 **Section:** 3.1 (2)

Issue: International Architecture exchange

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: As before ensure seems a little strong

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Adjust to 'allows'.

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Agreed - will use "facilitates"

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 521

Page: 8

Section: Figure 3.1

Issue: Strategic Viewpoint definition

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: As before

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Delete 'long term'

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Agreed

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 522

Page: 9 **Section:** 3.2 (2)

Issue: Superfluous and misleading words

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: There will be some people that need to understand and deal with all MODAF views at some point

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Delete 'if any'

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Agreed.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 523

Page: 9 **Section:** 3.2.1

Issue: Strategic Viewpoint definition

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Understand reasoning for use of long term, but StV can be used differently than just long term issues; needs slight tweaking

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution:

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Agreed. Will delete "long term" or amend to include all strategic issues - whether long term or otherwise.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 524

Page: 11 **Section:** 3.2.4 and thro

Issue: Acronym usage

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: TTPs first usage should be explained

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: As pre Defence Writing, all acronyms should be explained at first use, even with the existence of a glossary

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Agreed.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 440

Page: 13

Section: fig 3.6

Issue: Overview: valid views

Category: Major Technical

Description: AcV2 out of date

Evidence: shows the old 6 LODs

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: needs to reflect 8 LODs as per other deskbooks

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Agreed - will be fixed in V1.0

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 525

Page: 13

Section: Figure 3-6

Issue: AcV-2

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Generic AcV-2 is and old style view

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Update

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Agreed - will change.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 526

Page: 13

Section: Figure 3-6

Issue: AcV-2

Category: Major Technical

Description: I thought we agreed that these were not AcV-2's! They do not show the same thing

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Alter words or redefine AcV-2 and change metamodel as all Lines of Development information now unnecessary therefore excess to maintain???? I'd go for alter words <grin>

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Will alter the words to refer to "ACV-2 like" diagram but emphasise that it is not MODAF compliant wrt DLOD.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 437

Page: 14

Section: fig 3.8

Issue: Overview: layout

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: illegible diagram

Evidence: pull down for OV1 obscures text

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: move pull down

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Agreed.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 527

Page: 14

Section: Figure 3-8

Issue: Diagram clarity

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Tidy diagram as described previously in other doc comments

Evidence:

Reviewer's

Preferred

Solution:

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board



Suggested Agreed - see issue wrt Exec Summary

Approach:

Review

Board

Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 350

Page: 15

Section: 3.4

Issue: Look and feel

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: There is reference to 'common look and feel' as if this was the aim of MODAF view definition. In practice, this is only likely to be achievable within a community if either a community adopts a single tool or the community adopts a formal modelling language such as UML.

Evidence: This issue is significant for tool certification. It suggests that a tool may be ineligible for certification if it cannot reproduce the look and feel of the example views in the handbook. I don't believe this was ever the intention (nor has there been any test that this is achievable).

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Either this paragraph needs to be softened (to avoid giving the impression that a common look and feel is achievable by following the MODAF handbook) or the handbook needs to be significantly strengthened to define precisely what graphical representation(s) is/are acceptable for each element.

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: None. I suggest that COIs should still strive for a common look and feel - whether by narrowing tool selection, use of templates, etc - so as to improve coherence and readability.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 438

Page: 15 **Section:** footnote

Issue: Overview: description

Category: Minor Technical

Description: footnote 4 is incorrect

Evidence: refers to product overview which is properly titles viewpoint overview and is ref MODAF M07 017

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: validate product title and ref.

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Agreed - reference will be amended - although number is actually MODAF-MO7-016.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 439

Page: 16 **Section:** fig 3.10

Issue: Overview: presentation

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: diagram illegible

Evidence: too small to read all text

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: enhance scale or font

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Will review - although elements are intended to be icons only and not to be read.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 351

Page: 18

Section: 4

Issue: Quick Start Guides

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: The proliferation of quick start guides is worrying as it significantly increases the maintenance burden and increases the risk of inconsistencies arising between the various documents. Are these guides really (as implied by Figure 4-1) part of the MODAF baseline? If so, why?

Evidence: Surely the deskbooks should contain this information (perhaps pull out appendices could be used)

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: See above

Solution:

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: None. This was at the request of the Customer 1 COI and endorsed in the Acquisition COI. Anything that makes MODAF more accessible ought to be encouraged.

Review Board Decision: The existing Quick Start Guides will be delivered but will not be part of Baseline 1.0 as they are likely to evolve at a different rate through their respective COIs. Also, some Deskbooks will not have any Quick Start Guides at the time of Baseline 1.0. The figure and text on page 18 will be amended accordingly.

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 441

Page: 18 **Section:** fig 4.1

Issue: Overview: product title

Category: Minor Technical

Description: incorrect title of product

Evidence: refers to view overview - but product is viewpoint overview

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: amend to correct title

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Agreed - will change figure and text below.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 442

Page: 19 **Section:** fig 4.2

Issue: Overview: scope

Category: Minor Technical

Description: sustainment scope incorrect

Evidence: reflects limited CADMID cycle and has recently been expanded

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: match up with Sustainment deskook

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: As per issue ID 444 and issues wrt Executive Summary.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 471

Page: 22

Section: 5.2

Issue: Misrepresenting AFNEC conclusions in MODAF Overview

Category: Major Editorial

Description: The Overview states that the potential for savings has been scoped by AfNEC at ú0.75-3.0Bn. This is not quite true. The figures quoted are the risk estimated in the EP if nothing is done. How much can be saved depends on what action is taken and when. There is greater prospect for saving where action is taken early - there are little or no savings if action is delayed until development is complete and the system is in service.

Evidence: The AfNEC team in DDSA (now D Def Acq) are not listed in the acknowledgments section hence are presumed not to have been consulted.

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Consult the AfNEC team to improve the document.

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Agreed. Will seek to achieve wording that is acceptable to AfNEC team wrt risk money not savings.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 443

Page: 23

Section: fig 5.

Issue: Overview: presentation

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: clarity of meaning obscure

Evidence: no scale or indication of meaning given

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: describe what they are percentages of.

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Agreed. Will add clearer labels and text.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 528

Page: 24

Section: 5.3 bullet 5

Issue: Spelling

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: en'abler

Evidence:

**Reviewer's
Preferred
Solution:**

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

**Suggested
Approach:** Agreed

**Review
Board
Decision:**

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 529

Page: 25

Section: Section 6

Issue: Section 6

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Comments as before against other docs

Evidence:

Reviewer's

Preferred

Solution:

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Don't understand what this refers to.

Approach:

Review

Board

Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 530

Page: 31 **Section:** Figures 6-3/4

Issue: Feedback loop consistency

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Are the feedback loops depicted here (not explained in text) and there associated reasoning still the same as Figure 6-2? They could be interpreted differently

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Add clarification

Solution:

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Agreed. Will add a note about similar iterations are possible to those shown in Figure 6-2.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 531

Page: 32

Section: 6.3

Issue: General - User Group

Category: Major Editorial

Description: where does the user group and various comms activity get a mention in all the documentation?

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: for discussion

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Will add other user group and TWG members to acknowledgements.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 472

Page: 35 **Section:** 6.3.3

Issue: Incorrect definition of Acquisition in the MODAF Overview

Category: Major Editorial

Description: Acquisition has been previously and authoritatively defined to include part of Capability Management, Concept and Doctrine (as just one of the DLOD - the others are also part of Acquisition) and sustainment. The MODAF definition will confuse and must change.

Evidence: DDSA (now D Def Acq) are not listed in the Acknowledgements section and hence are presumed not to have been consulted. D Def Acq are the "owners" of the SMART Acquisition brand.

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: Consult with D Def Acq.

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: (a) Will include DDSA (now D Def Acq) in acknowledgements as they have been part of the User Group / Programme Team.
(b) Consider changing title from "Acquisition" to something with a more limited scope regarding equipment procurement.

Review Board Decision: The organisation name will be amended.

For Baseline 1.0 the title "Acquisition" will be kept because this was agreed through various MODAF User Groups and Project Board meetings and would have impacts throughout the entire MODAF document suite. Any future change of title will be addressed through a change control process.

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 444

Page: 36 **Section:** fig 6.9

Issue: Overview: scope

Category: Minor Technical

Description: sustainment scope incorrect

Evidence: reflects limited CADMID cycle and has recently been expanded

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: match up with Sustainment deskook

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: We have a problem if the CADMID scope of Sustainment COI is changing because of the impact / overlap with the Acquisition COI deskbook. I suggest that actually the Sustainment COI in only inflencing the CADM elements (eg through sustainability / ILS constraints in requirements docs), not conducting them themselves. Indeed, Sustainment COI Deskbook clearly states that it isn't involved in the capability system itself, which is what CADM is delivering at IOC.

Review Board Decision: The Sustainment COI scope will primarily be focussed on the "In-Service" stage and provides inputs to the remainder of the CADMIC cycle (eg sustainability constraints feeding into the requirements process). The scope diagrams throughout the MODAF product suite will be amended to show this scope and inputs into other CADMID stages.

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 446

Page: 38

Section:

Issue: Overview: acknowledgements

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: limited acknowledgement of support

Evidence: limited to Project Board reps only

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: add wider Project TWG UG rep organisations

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: Refer to similar issue wrt Executive Summary.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 532

Page: 38

Section: 7

Issue: POC

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: E-mail would be useful?

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: For consideration

Solution:

References:

Status: Open

Referred to Review Board

Suggested Approach: See issues wrt Executive Summary. We need an agreed POC with full contact details including e-mail and telephone number.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 445

Page: 38 **Section:** para 7

Issue: Overview: reference

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: poc is incorect

Evidence: MODAF PM role ceases at end of development

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: ref MODAF poc EC CCII Cap Strat MOD MB London

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Refer to similar issue wrt Executive Summary.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 447

Page: 39 **Section:** appendix a

Issue: Overview: content

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: appendix a is not ref in the main body

Evidence: should appear somewhere in intro

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: insert appropriate ref to BMS

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: None. There is a reference in section 6.3. We didn't want to overplay the role of BMS by placing it in the Intro.

Review Board Decision:

MODAF Review Board

Document: MODAF Overview

Issue ID: 533

Page: 39 **Section:** Appendix A

Issue: Appendix A

Category: Minor Editorial

Description: Para 2 of the appendix could be useful in the main doc?

Evidence:

Reviewer's Preferred Solution: For consideration

Solution:

References:

Status: Open **Referred to Review Board**

Suggested Approach: Agreed - wil expand text in section 6.3 para 3 accordingly.

Review Board Decision:

Review Board Decision: