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Common Link Integration Processing (CLIP) – Background

Cooperative Air Force/Navy program

• Integrate Tactical Data Links (TDLs) across platforms with a TDL requirement

• Provide message processing, gateway functionality, and a common interface

• Enable transition of new and legacy platforms to Network Centric Warfare (NCW) environment
CLIP System Concept

CLIP Platform

- EPLRS
- S-TADIL J
- JREAP
- VMF
- WNW/TTNT
- IBS
- IP

Platforms:
- Link 22
- Link 16
- Link 11
- Link 4a
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CLIP Software Concept

Host System

- Sensors
- Mission Computer Applications
- Displays

Common Host Interface

CLIP

- Host I/O
- Link Processing
- Terminal I/O

Configurable

JTRS, Link 22, Link 16, Link, Link 4a, VMF, WNW, SADL, TTNT, IBS, SATCOM
Challenges

• Incremental acquisition supporting different platform integration need dates
• Developing software assets which will be portable to the different platforms using diverse hardware and software
• Ability to forward data “intelligently” from multiple TDLs
• Integration of CLIP with other DoD systems under development
• Development of a common host interface
Key DoD 5000 Acquisition Documents

- Acquisition Strategy and Acquisition Plan
- System Engineering Plan
- Test and Evaluation Master Plan
- Request for Proposal
  - Statement of Work
  - System Requirements Document
  - Sections B, H, L, and M
  - CDRLs (Deliverables)
- Timeline to support acquisition milestones

Architecture Driven
Current Acquisition Status

CLIP Contract:
• $275 Meg*
• In final phase of source selection
• Projected contract award: May 2005

Software architecture related contractual events:
• QAW to be conducted in July 2005
• Software architecture document to be delivered in support of Preliminary Design Review (PDR)
• First ATAM engagement in Nov 2005

Use of QAW and ATAM to Reduce Software Acquisition Risk

QAW — Quality Attribute Workshop
• Provide a common forum for discussing quality attribute requirements and architectural implications
• Gain stakeholder buy-in

ATAM — Architecture Tradeoff and Analysis Method
• Increase communication among stakeholders
• Clarify quality attribute requirements
• Identify software risks early in the development cycle
• Provide documented basis for architectural decisions
Such a “big picture” view of a contractor’s architecture-centric development approach would be described in its Software Development Plan (SDP).
Software Architecture Evaluation in an Acquisition Environment

Software architecture evaluation is especially critical when acquiring large, complex systems ...

but, conducting a software architecture evaluation in the DoD acquisition environment is more involved ...

- acquisition focus is on acquiring “systems”
- limited points of contact and leverage
  - exercised from a distance
  - occur at discrete points in the life cycle
  - governed by a stringent set of regulations
- lack of awareness that certain practices are permitted
Approaches for Conducting ATAM-Based Evaluations

Reactive

Software architecture evaluations are conducted *opportunistically* and performed in situ under an existing contract at the request of the program manager.¹

Proactive

Software architecture evaluations are *preplanned* and integrated up front in a request for proposal (RFP) for a system (or software) acquisition.

¹ Or at the request of a contractor under a separate agreement
Request for Proposal (RFP)

Incorporating architecture evaluations in an RFP requires developing appropriate language for the following sections:

- **Section C**: Description, **Statement of Work (SOW)**, Performance Specification
- **Section H**: Special Contract Requirements *(in certain cases)*
- **Section J**: Contract Deliverables Requirements List
- **Section L**: Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors
- **Section M**: Evaluation Factors for Award
"An evaluation team shall conduct a series of software architecture evaluations in accordance with the special requirements of Section H."

Includes detailed requirements (comparable to a plan) specifying how the software architecture evaluations are to be conducted using the ATAM. These constitute the software architecture evaluation requirements.

Identifies Associated Contract Deliverables
- Software Architecture Documentation
- Software Architecture Evaluation Report
What Needs to be Specified?

The software architecture evaluation requirements must address:

- What evaluation method is to be used and what are the steps?
- Who are the participants in the architecture evaluation?
- What are their roles and responsibilities?
- How many evaluations need to be conducted and when?
- If multiple evaluations are involved, how are they to be staged?
- What are the prerequisites for conducting the evaluations?
- What is involved in terms of time, effort, and cost?
- How are evaluation team responsibilities to be transitioned?
- How will the objectivity of the participants be ensured?
- How are the evaluation results to be captured and used?
- What contract deliverables need to be included?
- How can the evaluations be carried out collaboratively to ensure both government and contractor stakeholders play an active role?
- What training will be provided for the evaluation team members?
- And the list goes on …
## Participants in the Initial Architecture Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATAM Participants</th>
<th>1st Architecture Evaluation (Increment/Spiral 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATAM Evaluation Team</td>
<td>SEI conducts full ATAM evaluation. A contractor and program office representative may also attend as observers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Decision Makers</td>
<td>Includes chief architect and other agents of contractor and program office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Architecture Stakeholders (Only participate in Phase 2 of the ATAM)</td>
<td>Includes program office agents, contractor personnel, and representatives from organizations to be supported by Increment/Spiral 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* External evaluators can be an agent of the government program office or an agent of the contractor organization; contractor agents, though, must be external to the project whose architecture is being evaluated.
# Example Staging & Transitioning of Responsibilities

## Contractor’s Software Development Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATAM Participants</th>
<th>1st Architecture Evaluation (Increment/Spiral 1)</th>
<th>2nd Architecture Evaluation (Increment/Spiral 1)</th>
<th>3rd Architecture Evaluation (Increment/Spiral 2)</th>
<th>Follow-On Evaluations (Increment/Spiral 3 to N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATAM Evaluation Team</td>
<td>SEI conducts full ATAM evaluation. A contractor and program office representative may also attend as observers.</td>
<td>SEI provides ATAM facilitation. Team consists of SEI lead evaluator, an SEI evaluator, and two or more external* ATAM evaluators.</td>
<td>SEI provides ATAM coaching only. Lead evaluator and other team members are all external* ATAM evaluators.</td>
<td>SEI is not involved. An all project team conducts evaluations. Lead evaluator and other team members are all external* ATAM evaluators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Decision Makers</td>
<td>Includes chief architect and other agents of contractor and program office</td>
<td>Includes chief architect and other agents of contractor and program office</td>
<td>Includes chief architect and other agents of contractor and program office</td>
<td>Includes chief architect and other agents of contractor and program office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Architecture Stakeholders (Only participate in Phase 2 of the ATAM)</td>
<td>Includes program office agents, contractor personnel, and representatives from organizations to be supported by Increment/Spiral 1</td>
<td>Includes program office agents, contractor personnel, and representatives from organizations to be supported by Increment/Spiral 1</td>
<td>Includes program office agents, contractor personnel, and representatives from organizations to be supported by Increment/Spiral 1</td>
<td>Includes program office agents, contractor personnel, and representatives from organizations to be supported by Increment/Spiral 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* External evaluators can be an agent of the government program office or an agent of the contractor organization; contractor agents, though, must be external to the project whose architecture is being evaluated.

---

Alternatively, the architecture evaluations can be conducted by SEI ATAM-certified evaluators.
Coordinated Use of QAW and ATAM

When detailed design is complete, it occurs before the architecture design is frozen.

Contract Award occurs after the software architecture is documented and before coding begins.

Increment/Spiral 2

ATAM #3

SAD

ATAM based evaluation should cover the ability of the architecture to support future increments.

Increment/Spiral 3

ATAM #4

SAD

The ATAM-based evaluation should cover the ability of the architecture to support future increments.

Increment/Spiral 4

ATAM #5

SAD

When detailed design is complete.
Impact

A QAW and ATAM-based evaluation have been successfully integrated into an RFP/contract for a major DoD acquisition.

The approach and RFP/contract language were approved by an independent assessment team and the CLIP contracting officer.

Based on the CLIP experience, we have developed “Guidance for Reducing Software Acquisition Risk through Architecture Evaluation”.

This guidance is available to DoD programs that want to promote architecture-centric development and proactively perform software architecture evaluation in their system acquisition.

The architecture evaluation approach and corresponding contract language and software deliverables will be described in a set of SEI Technical Notes.