# Yves’s Review Comments

1. General:
   1. Navigabilities are questionable
      1. Example - System Interconnection – association should be two way navigability not one way.
      2. Will fix as convenient as-is and address completely in to-be
2. 6.5.1.1: System Hierarchy
   1. A <<problem>> states there is an issue with deeply nested components but as modeled today there is no possibility of more than one level of nesting => “component” should be the role of the composite end in a reflexive association on System
      1. It is not clear if the as-is requirements actually states there should be multiple levels of decomposition. We all agree it should. John added this relationship in a later diagram (System roles) s it was added to this diagram.
      2. This relationship will be carefully examined in the “to-be” model.
   2. By the way there is no fundamental difference between “system”, “component” and “subsystem”. This is a matter of viewpoint (=> role).
      1. Agreed will be fixed in To-Be model. Recorded as Issue 31
   3. The definition of the “physical” nature is unclear and the subclasses of “physical component” are questionable. One could consider they are actually systems with both physical and logical aspects. My proposal: physical items are those which are subject to the laws of Physics. For instance, for a written procedure the physical component could be a paper document on which the procedure is written (but it could be a PDF electronic file as well) while then logical component is the procedure itself.
      1. Added as Issue 32, and in the to-be it needs to be clearly define logical and physical or replace them that is more concrete in definition
      2. Logical could be to be various levels of an abstraction of some physical component
3. 6.5.1.2: Environment
4. By definition, the (system) environment can only be defined in relation to a system. This relation is missing.
5. Resolved – relation is provided on System Interconnection Diagram through “Connection”
6. Formally the environment of a System is “everything but” this system. In practical SE, the perimeter of this environment is chosen arbitrary.
7. Added issue 35
8. “External System” cannot be a subclass since its definition is relative. It is a role of an association but not sure it is convenient modeling it this way.
9. Does issue 34 cover this or do we need to add another issue? Will be fixed in the to-be model
10. 6.5.1.3: System interconnection
11. The requirements define a System boundary as a set, not as a component. It should be linked to the system somehow.
12. Add “p” name for both and added a constraint on the composition from System Boundary to Ports, “System Boundary.p ["] = System.p [\*]”
13. Will improve model on the to-be model
14. “Connecting component” is a role rather than a subclass
    1. Add issue 39 and this will be improved in to-be model
    2. The relationship between port and Input/Output is missing
    3. Cover on 6.5.2.1.1c – The import/output is bound to port. This relation already existed on another diagram and was added to this diagram
15. 6.5.1.4: Deployment to Component to Node
16. What does “source” means” for a deployment? This cannot be traced to a requirement
17. Source and target were changed to “from role” and “to role” respectively to agree with the terminology ion the requirement.
18. The role “resource” on the association between Deployment and Resource was changed to “utilized resource”
19. The concept of “Node” is defined as a (potential?) target of a deployment => role?
20. Will improve on the “to-be” model.

# John’s Review Comments

1. Review Structure Requirements Diagrams
   1. System Hierarchy
      1. Minor alignment and overlap fixes, completed before meeting - **Fixed**
      2. Add reflexive composition to component showing components decomposing to lower layers of components - **Added**
      3. Definition of component – “constituent part of an element or system that”, the definition element does not agree with this usage.
         1. Added Issue 33
      4. Discuss “Model Issue” of multiple identical relationships that are not used
         1. Fixed
      5. Composition between System and Component – What is the composition name “a” mean and why is it displayed? Removed “a” - **Fixed**
      6. In new RFP diagram, See issue 31
         1. Component composes behavior, port, proper and connection.
         2. System is a specialization of component inheriting all the above.
         3. Add reflexive composition to component showing component decomposing
         4. System of interest, external system are specializations of system
   2. Environment
      1. Distinguish difference between system of Interest and System. Most references in requirements say system and are actually referring to system of interest. Our diagrams do that also. Added issue 34
   3. System Interconnection
      1. To define the same set of ports in System and System Boundary, should the composition between System Boundary and port be labeled with the same name as the composition to system? - **Fixed**
      2. Is the connection between an internal component and an external system covered, see 6.5.1.3 **Added note 38**