

11. KEYNOTE 2 : Rebuilding the Tower of Babel – Better Communication with Standards

Matthew Hause
Co-chair of the UPDM group, OMG

Abstract

The book of Genesis tells the story of how the peoples of the earth came together to build an enormous tower. To confound them in their task, God changed the languages of the different groups of people so that they were unable to communicate. Since they could not coordinate their efforts, the project was abandoned and the different groups dispersed throughout the world.

The same problem exists today in the world of Architecture Frameworks. Although they express similar concepts, interchange between the different frameworks is awkward at best, time consuming, and leads to misunderstanding and miscommunication. This lack of communication was highlighted in a recent report on the conflict in Afghanistan, where the lack of interchange of architectures was cited as a limiting factor in coalition efforts and may have contributed to loss of life.

This presentation will assess the current situation, examine international efforts to solve it, and identify future challenges. This will include:

- The role of standards for collaboration and communication
- Standards and standards organisations
- The Object Management Group (OMG)
- A brief history of Military Architectural Frameworks
- The interoperability problems of frameworks
- The Unified Architecture Framework (UAF) effort
- Using reference architectures to define a common conceptual “dictionary”
- Systems engineering, acquisition, and process
- Vertical and horizontally complementary emerging standards
- Future problems and potential solutions

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE FEB 2013	2. REPORT TYPE N/A	3. DATES COVERED -			
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE KEYNOTE 2 : Rebuilding the Tower of Babel â Better Communication with Standards		5a. CONTRACT NUMBER			
		5b. GRANT NUMBER			
		5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER			
6. AUTHOR(S)		5d. PROJECT NUMBER			
		5e. TASK NUMBER			
		5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) UPDM group, OMG		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER			
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)			
		11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)			
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES See also ADA585222. Proceedings of the 2012 Model-Based Systems Engineering Symposium, 27 - 28 November 2012, DSTO Edinburgh, South Australia., The original document contains color images.					
14. ABSTRACT The book of Genesis tells the story of how the peoples of the earth came together to build an enormous tower. To confound them in their task, God changed the languages of the different groups of people so that they were unable to communicate. Since they could not coordinate their efforts, the project was abandoned and the different groups dispersed throughout the world. The same problem exists today in the world of Architecture Frameworks. Although they express similar concepts, interchange between the different frameworks is awkward at best, time consuming, and leads to misunderstanding and miscommunication. This lack of communication was highlighted in a recent report on the conflict in Afghanistan, where the lack of interchange of architectures was cited as a limiting factor in coalition efforts and may have contributed to loss of life.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified	SAR	20	

Presenter Biography

Matthew Hause is Atego's Chief Consulting Engineer, the co-chair of the UPDM group (Unified Profile for DoDAF/MODAF) and a member of the Object Management Group (OMG) SysML specification team. He has been developing multi-national complex systems for almost 35 years. He started out working in the power systems industry and has been involved in military command and control systems, process control, communications, Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition (SCADA), distributed control, and many other areas of technical and real-time systems. His roles have varied from project manager to developer. His role at Atego includes mentoring, sales presentations, standards development and training courses. He has written a series of white papers on architectural modeling, project management, systems engineering, model-based engineering, human factors, safety critical systems development, virtual team management, systems development, and software development with UML, SysML and Architectural Frameworks such as DoDAF and MODAF. He has been a regular presenter at INCOSE, the IEEE, BCS, the IET, the OMG, DoD Enterprise Architecture and many other conferences. Matthew studied Electrical Engineering at the University of New Mexico and Computer Science at the University of Houston, Texas. In his spare time he is a church organist, choir director and composer.

Presentation



UPDM Group

Rebuilding the Tower of Babel Better Communication Through Standards

Matthew Hause
Chief Consulting Engineer - Atego



Disclaimer: The views and opinions expressed in this presentation are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Object Management Group (OMG).

 MBSE Conference
November 2012 – Matthew Hause 1



UPDM Group


Agenda

- Barriers to communication and collaboration
- The interoperability problems of frameworks
- Standards and standards organisations
- A brief history of Military Architectural Frameworks
- Working Towards a Common Framework
- Exchange of Architecture Data
- Using Reference Architectures for a common conceptual “dictionary”
- Systems engineering, acquisition, and process
- Vertical and horizontal complementary standards
- Future Problems and solutions


MBSE Conference
November 2012 – Matthew Hause 2



UPDM Group


The Tower of Babel – A Communications Fable for our Time

Ancient	Modern
<div style="text-align: center;"> <p>TOWER OF BABEL BY BRUEGHEL</p>  </div>	<div style="text-align: center;"> <p>EU PARLIAMENT STRASBOURG</p>  </div>
<p>Does this solve the problem?</p>	


MBSE Conference
November 2012 – Matthew Hause 3


UPDM Group

European Union Parliament Translation Services

- The EU has 20 recognised languages, 380 language permutations and an annual interpreting and translation bill of €1bn.
- EU institutions currently require around 2,000 written-text translators. They also need 80 interpreters per language per day, half of which operate at the European Parliament.
- From 2007 Irish MEPs have been able to speak in the chamber of the European Parliament in the Irish language with interpretation, though no more than five Euro-MPs have the fluency to do so.
- Catalans and Basques have won more limited language rights. Welsh speakers are stepping up demands.
- Languages include Maltese despite the fact that Malta is largely Anglophone and has just 397,000 citizens.


MBSE Conference
November 2012 – Matthew Hause 4

UPDM Group


USA/UK: Two Countries Separated by a Common Language

- Even speaking the same language doesn't always help. Picture this:
 - A man wearing a vest, pants, and a pair of suspenders.

The American Image



The British Image



Vest

UK: Waistcoat

Suspenders

UK: Braces


Pants

UK: Trousers

So, if communication is hard with spoken language, are models the answer?


MBSE Conference
November 2012 – Matthew Hause 5

Unclassified




The Afghanistan Mission Network (AMN)

Reference Document 3195
 NATO Consultation, Command and Control Agency
 Agence de Consultation, de Commandement et de Conduite des Opérations de l'OTAN




DEVELOPMENT OF THE AMN ARCHITECTURE IN 2010 – LESSONS LEARNED


Torsten Graeber, NATO C3 Agency
 June 2011
 The Hague



Unclassified




UPDM Group



What is the AMN?


- The Afghanistan Mission Network (AMN) is the primary Coalition Command, Control Communication and Computers Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C5ISR) network in Afghanistan for all ISAF forces and operations. It is a federation of networks with the AMN Core provided by NATO and national network extensions.
- Planning for the AMN is supported by a multi-national, collaborative effort to develop and maintain the enterprise architecture for the AMN.
- This document is a working paper that may not be cited as representing formally approved NC3A opinions, conclusions or recommendations.

UPDM GROUP | MBSE Conference | November 2012 – Matthew Hause 7 | OMG





AMN Issues (1)

- In 2010, there was no proper governance structure for the AMN as a whole.
- Likewise there was no governance for the development of the AMN architecture.
- The development of the architecture was primarily coordinated through the AWG consisting of the architects of the nations participating in the AMN.
- This AWG usually received ad hoc tasking from different stakeholders involved in the development of the AMN without clear leadership defining the goals and deliverables upfront.
- As a direct result of this missing governance several issues arose that had a negative impact on the architecture development work.




MBSE Conference

November 2012 – Matthew Hause 8


AMN Issues (2)


- These issues included:
 - Different expectations on content and usage of the architecture leading to ever changing requirements and deliverables
 - No enforcement of the architecture during implementation
 - Usage of different architecture frameworks
 - Usage of different architecture tools.
 - No interchange between the tools
- In late 2010, a governance structure for the AMN was endorsed by Chief Of Staff SHAPE and the AWG was included in this governance structure. As a direct consequence, the situation regarding clearer expectations, deliverables and enforcement of architecture has been improved in 2011.
- **However, as the architects are sponsored by their respective nations they have to implement national policies and requirements, so that improvements regarding the usage of a single framework and tool are not to be expected.**



MBSE Conference



November 2012 – Matthew Hause 9





AMN Recommendations

- **Recommendation 1**
 - Before starting, establish the governance structure.
- **Recommendation 2**
 - Ensure availability of a common infrastructure allowing remote access to a single repository
- **Recommendation 6**
 - Harmonize national and NATO policies related to architecture development and reference architectures.
- **Recommendation 16**
 - Develop common reference models
- **Recommendation 18**
 - Standardize on one tool and a single repository. Synchronization is expensive as is training.
- **Recommendation 19**
 - Develop a formal exchange mechanism for data


MBSE ConferenceNovember 2012 – Matthew Hause - 10

Standards Are Important

- **Great Baltimore Fire of 1904**
- **Response from Philadelphia, Washington, New York, Virginia, Atlantic City... hundreds of firefighters**
- **Burned for two days, 140 acres**
- **Why?**




©2012 Object Management Group - Page: 11



Introducing OMG

- **One of the most successful forums for creating open integration standards in the computer industry**
 - **Modelling platforms (UML, BPMN, SysML & related work)**
 - **Middleware platforms (DDS, CORBA & related specs)**
 - **Vertical domain specifications (Software Radio, C4I)**
 - **Commerically-available implementations**
- **Member-controlled industrial consortium**
 - **Both vendors and users**
 - **Not-for-profit**
- **Interfaces freely available to all**
 - **Visit <http://www.omg.org>**



OBJECT MANAGEMENT GROUP

Copyright © 2012, Object Management Group. All rights reserved.

UPDM & OMG

12

Who Are OMG?



Atego	FICO	Microsoft	ODNI
ASC	Firestar Software	MITRE	Oracle
Boeing	Fujitsu	British MOD	PTC
CA Technologies	Hewlett Packard	National Archives	Raytheon
Canadian DnD	Hitachi	NEC	SAP
Citigroup	HL7	NEHTA	Scientific Research
Cognizant	IBM	NIST	TCS
CSC	JARA	No Magic	THALES
US DoD/DISA	Lockheed Martin	Northrop Grumman	Unisys
EADS	Mayo Clinic	NSWC & NUWC	US Army
		OASIS	






© 2012 Object Management Group - Page: 13

One Standard?


...no. Our job is to *minimize the cost of adaptation...*





..and enable innovation!




©2012 Object Management Group - Page: 14





Unclassified




**Unified Architecture Framework
NATO Architecture CaT
Introduction**

Mr. Walt Okon
Senior Architect Engineer
DoD Chief Information Officer Office
Architecture and Interoperability Directorate
walt.okon@osd.mil

10-11 September 2012
Office of the Chief Information Officer

Unclassified

Unclassified



4.1 ARCHITECTURE FRAMEWORKS

- **4.1.2 Observations [Need for a Unified Architecture Framework]**
- **Differences in DoDAF, MODAF, and NAF make it difficult to match the meta-model one to one.**
 - some of the concepts in the frameworks have the same name but different definitions, i.e. different semantics.
- **Difficult to cross-walk the concepts between the different frameworks leads to miscommunication between architects using different frameworks.**

Unclassified 19

Unclassified

Unified Architecture Framework

Unified Architecture Framework Strategic Direction

- Move towards a Single Architecture Framework to achieve Interoperability
- Development of the AMN architecture in 2010
- Development of Unified Profile for DoDAF and MODAF (UPDM) Versions 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0
- Meeting at Object Management Group (OMG) March 2012
- Ideas Meeting in June 2012
- Plan for NATO CAT workshop 10/11 Sept 2012

Launchpad for Unified Architecture Framework (UAF)

Unclassified 20

Unclassified

Architecture Framework Convergence Vision


Framework Objective:

- Achieve a single integrated Architecture Framework for interoperability.
- Achieve a US, Canada, and United Kingdom single Framework with a common Data Meta Model
- Achieve alignment with the US Government Common Approach to Enterprise Architecture

19 June 2012


Unclassified

21





The Unified Profile for DoDAF and MODAF

- UPDM is a standardized way of expressing DoDAF and MODAF artefacts using UML and SysML
 - UPDM is NOT a new Architectural Framework
 - UPDM is not a methodology or a process
 - UPDM implements DoDAF 2.0, MODAF & NAF
- UPDM was developed by members of the OMG with help from industry and government domain experts.
- UPDM is a DoD mandated standard and has been implemented by multiple tool vendors.
- UPDM is a proof of concept of the UAF
- Future versions of UPDM will implement the UAF




MBSE Conference

November 2012 – Matthew Hause 22


Data Exchange Case Study: CAD (1)


- Computer Aided Design (CAD) data exchange involves a number of software technologies and methods to translate data from one Computer-aided design system to another CAD file format. This PLM technology is required to facilitate collaborative work (CPD) between OEMs and their suppliers.
- The main topic is with the translation of geometry (wireframe, surface and solid) but also of importance is other data such as attributes; metadata, assembly structure and feature data.
- There are basically three methods of transferring data from one CAD system to another.
 - Direct CAD system export/import
 - Direct 3rd party translators.
 - Intermediate data exchange formats



MBSE Conference


November 2012 – Matthew Hause 23







Data Exchange Case Study: CAD (2)

- **Intermediary Format.**
 - Some by standards organisations
 - Others are private and regarded as quasi industry standards.
- **Examples**
 - STEP – ISO 10303, a replacement for IGES and VDA-FS with the CAD specific parts: STEP AP203 and AP214: Mechanical CAD systems
 - STEP AP210: CAD systems for printed circuit board
 - STEP AP212: CAD systems for electrical installation and cable harness
 - STEP-NC AP238: CAD, CAM, and CNC machining process information
 - STEP AP242, Managed Model-Based 3D Engineering – the merging of the two leading STEP application protocols, AP 203 and AP 214
 - Others: IGES, VDA-FS, DXF, Parasolid XT, JT Open, DRG, etc.
- **In short: multiple incompatible standards offering partial solutions.**




MBSE Conference

November 2012 – Matthew Hause 24


DoDAF Physical Exchange Specification (PES) – A Solution?


- PES is a direct translation of a DoDAF model into XML based on the data in the DoDAF 2 Data Dictionary and Viewpoint Mappings
- Proprietary standard, developed, owned and maintained by the DoD.
- New versions of DoDAF means new versions of PES automatically generated from the DM2.
 - No tools to support backwards compatibility of a means of converting between different versions of the PES.
 - No formal verification and validation of the DM2.
- **Currently no significant level of support within tools.**
- Tests of complete/interoperable implementation of PES across tools have not been performed nor have interchange standards been defined.




MBSE Conference

November 2012 – Matthew Hause 25








UPDM Group



DoDAF Physical Exchange Specification (PES) – A Solution?

- Parsing a PES file will be problematic
- In the DM2 there is only one definition of activity. Is this:
 - a project activity?
 - a system activity?
 - a service activity?
 - an operational activity?
 - All of them?
- How does one know to which model the activity belongs?
- The PES will need significant work before it can be used to successfully interchange models.
- Most important, it will not solve the interchange problem between DoDAF and MODAF models.
- The DoD is considering RDF as an alternative.


MBSE Conference
November 2012 – Matthew Hause 26





Modelling Tool Interoperability

- **OMG publishes standard for MOF model interchange**
 - **XML Metadata Interchange (XMI)**
 - **UML, SysML, UPDM all based on MOF models**
- **Sadly, publishing standard doesn't guarantee separate good-faith implementations can interchange models**
 - **Tiny ambiguities & programming errors kill interoperability**
- **Multi-vendor testing drives out bugs, assures interoperability**
 - **OMG Model Interchange Working Group compiles tests**
 - **Vendors run tests, fix their tools or file spec. bug reports**
 - **UPDM OV-2 interchange demonstration at April 2012 DoD Enterprise Architecture Conference**
 - **Result: assures tool interoperability & model longevity**

Copyright © 2012, Object Management Group. All rights reserved.



UPDM & OMG


27



Reference Architectures – A common dictionary

- Provides a template solution for an architecture for a particular domain.
- Provides a common vocabulary to discuss implementations
 - Stresses commonality.
- Defines functions and interfaces and interactions
- Can be defined at different levels of abstraction.
- Set of patterns of successful implementations.
 - Shows how to compose these parts together into a solution.
 - Will be instantiated for a particular domain or for specific projects.
- Accelerates delivery through the re-use of an effective solution and provides a basis for governance to ensure the consistency and applicability of technology use.
- Dependent on a common data/interchange format, storage and distribution capability, configuration management, etc.




 | MBSE Conference
 November 2012 – Matthew Hause 28





Architecture Reference Models

- The intent of this Australian Government Architecture (AGA) framework is to assist in the delivery of more consistent and cohesive services to citizens and support cost-effective delivery of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) services by government, providing a framework that:
 - provides a common language: provides a common language for agencies involved in the delivery of cross-agency services
 - enhances collaboration: supports the identification of duplicate, re-usable and sharable services
 - assists in describing and analysing ICT investments: provides a basis for the objective review of ICT investments by government
 - assists in transforming Government (citizen-centric, results-oriented, market-based): enables more cost-effective and timely delivery of ICT services through a repository of standards, principles and templates that assist in the design and delivery of ICT capability and, in turn, business services to citizens.

Australian Government Architecture Reference Models, August 2011 Version 3.0


 | MBSE Conference
 November 2012 – Matthew Hause 29




UPDM Group

Systems Engineering, Acquisition, and Process

- National acquisition processes have evolved over time
 - Unique to each country and established by law
 - Fiendishly complex
 - Not necessarily fit for purpose
 - Resistant to change
- Adoption of a common process across countries is neither likely nor practical
 - Need to concentrate on MBSE best practice
 - Architecture standards
 - Certified Architect Standards
 - System Lifecycle Standards (15288)
 - Competency Frameworks
 - Etc.
- Most important, a process should NOT tie itself directly to a specific tool or tool vendor.

UPDM GROUP | MBSE Conference | November 2012 – Matthew Hause 31 | OMBG

Vertical and Horizontal Complementary Emerging Standards

- **CA-FEA: The Common Approach to Federal Enterprise Architectures**
- **UML: The Unified Modelling Language.**
- **SysML: The Systems Modelling Language**
- **SoaML: The Service Oriented Architecture language**
- **NIEM: UML Profile for NIEM - provides a common method for defining XML schema conforming to the NIEM Specifications**
- **IEPV: Information Exchange Policy Vocabulary – provides a method for defining the business rule for the aggregation, transformation, tagging and filtering data and information to a specified message format.**
- **SOPES IEDM: Codified set of business rules for the JC3IEDM (STANAG 5525) conforming to compliance point 1 of the IEPV**
- **Etc.**



©2012 Object Management Group - Page: 32



Unclassified

Common Approach

National IT Architecture Movement in the United States across all Government Departments, Agencies, and Organizations


Federal, State, and Local

Industry

Academia (Colleges and Universities)

Unclassified

33




Unclassified

Common Approach

Increasing Shared Approaches To Information Technology Services

- Implements Governance Process
- Provides Authority to the Common Approach to a Unified Architecture Framework
- Provides Standards Methods and Tools
- Design and Implement Shared Services
- Design architectures that facilitates interoperability and information-sharing



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

May 2, 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR FEDERAL AGENCY CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS

FROM: Steven VanRooyen
Federal Chief Information Officer

SUBJECT: Increasing Shared Approaches to Information Technology Services

This memorandum provides Federal Agencies with policy guidance and management tools to use in increasing shared approaches to information technology (IT) service delivery across mission, support, and commodity areas. Taking a shared approach will:


- Improve return on investment across the Agency's entire IT portfolio through the coordinated use of TechStat program reviews; PortfolioStat investment reviews; and the consolidation of commodity IT systems, services, and related contracts as described in the *Information Technology Shared Services Strategy* that accompanies this memo.
- Close productivity gaps by implementing integrated governance processes and innovative IT service solutions at the program, bureau and agency levels. Agency implementation is to be consistent with guidance contained in the *Federal Cloud Computing Strategy*¹ and *Digital Government Strategy*², as well as the *Common Approach to Federal Enterprise Architecture* (Common Approach) that accompanies this memo. The Common Approach provides agile, standardized methods and tools for designing the next generation of IT resources and shared services that Federal Agencies will need to successfully accomplish their missions in the face of tight resources and rising customer needs.
- Increase communications with stakeholders as shared service managing partners, customers, and providers work together to ensure transparency, accountability, and ongoing collaboration in the full lifecycle of intra- and inter-agency IT shared service activities. Collaboration resources that are available to support this are CIO.gov, ITDashboard.gov, Performance.gov, and BusinessSA.gov.

To ensure that IT shared services are implemented in a coordinated and expedient manner, Federal Agency Chief Information Officers (CIOs) will submit an "Enterprise Roadmap" to OMB by August 31, 2012 that covers Fiscal Years (FY) 2012-2015 and includes:


- (1) *Business and Technology Architecture*: a high-level, integrated description of the agency's business objectives and enabling IT capabilities across all operating units and program areas - using enterprise architecture concepts and methods from the Common Approach to describe the agency-wide current architecture, future architecture, and transition plans. The transition plan will include a description of the two IT areas that Federal Agencies will migrate to a shared service model by December 31, 2012 in accordance with OMB guidance.
- (2) *IT Asset Inventory* (Appendix 1): a list of IT assets agency-wide to include all IT systems³ and services that support mission, administrative, and commodity IT programs, using the Federal

Unclassified

34




UPDM Group




Future Problems

- Systems of systems will grow in complexity and scale
 - Architectures will be necessary for understanding and governance
 - Essential for proper management and control
 - Tools will need to evolve to support this
- Individual national support of proprietary architecture frameworks will become unsupportable
 - Unaffordable
 - Not interoperable
 - A barrier to communications
- The ROI case for MBSE has not yet been made
 - Some evidence exists, but it is not yet overwhelming
 - PowerPoint Engineering is still the status quo



MBSE Conference

November 2012 – Matthew Hause 35



UPDM Group

A Call to Arms

- **Development of the UAF will solve many problems (but not all)**
 - Requires immediate support and funding from national governments
 - A change from “individual cars” to shared transport
 - Local variants will be necessary
- **An interchange standard will be essential**
 - Problems with PES or its replacement must be overcome
 - Work on interchange using RDF is looking promising
- **Reference Architectures need to be created and shared**
 - At both the capability and component level
- **A fundamental change in process needs to happen**
 - MBSE needs to change from “extra work” to “how things are done”
 - Tools need to evolve to better enable this change in process
- **The case for MBSE *Must* be made**
 - Industry partners *Must* publish more success stories
 - Governments *Must* require MBSE starting with the concept phase, the bid process and throughout the acquisition lifecycle

MBSE Conference
November 2012 – Matthew Hause 36

Contact Details

Matthew.Hause@Atego.com