Question	Answer
The technical layer has not been addressed: wasn't it part of the project objectives? What is the level of detail you go to on technical level?	The MBSE exercise was done in parallel to system engineering activities using standard methods and started in phase B2. For that reason, it was not a major objective to have the detailed technical layer as the architecture work was already existing, but document-based. This is the reason why we did not push further. Moreover, what has been done in Logical Layer is at the end close to what we would have in Technical Layer as the architecure was already existing.
How d you use functions later on in the process, e.g. for procurements and verification?	The functions have been aligned with the specified ones (namely to the functional requirements) for the subonctracted items (specification being document-based) => that is the connection with procurement. The direct connection with verification is not yet done as the method and tools to perform it efficiently are still under defintion. Neverhteless, the model offers a functional reference. The main focus of the usage of the functional architecture was put on RAMS/FDIR to use it as input.
How are requirements captured/linked ?	As we started in phase B2 and not later, the requirements are pre-existing (even if they evolved). Thus the activity is more focused on connecting the requirements to the models. This is the purpose of an activity that is on-going as stated at the end of the presentation.
Can you please elaborate on the differences with the ARCADIA methodology ?	I am not a specialist of Arcadia so it is difficult to answer straight forward. Nevertheless the commonalitites and discrepancies are appearing in the OSMoSE activity targetting towards a shared Space ontology as Arcadia and MOFLT are two the inputs that are used. Those differencies have also been assessed in the frame of the OSIP activity conducted by CGI and presented in a later slot.
How about (multi-disciplinary) interfaces ?	Wrt. interfaces from a system architecture point of view they can be modelled at all levels: from operational to technical through functional. It is more at technical level where you chose the technologies you will apply and thus make apper the multi-disciplinary interfaces. But they can be modelled and managed in a consistent way at this conceptual level. Wrt. connection of the MOFLT system model towards the difference disciplines, this type of integration does not exist yet but it is in our target.
Is the MOFLT method tailored for each project at Airbus? If yes, is this tailoring analysis done at the beginning of the project?	The framework is generic but it is recommended to perform a tailoring with regards to the purpose of the modelling in the context of a given project. Nevertheless, we intend to have some reference tailoring based on generic considerations to support this exercise and keep as much as possible consistency between the different modelling approaches amongst our programs.
Why are you using states / state machines to model mission phases and not activities and activity diagrams?	In fact we use state machines to show the sequence of phases and the condition of transition between those phases. Then we use activity diagrams to describe the behaviour inside each phase. So the complete description is a mix of both approaches.
What is the purpose of keeping DOORS (where duplication of functions or un-realised functions may still be) as the master requirement base when the requirements can be expressed as model functions?	In fact not all requirements may be modelled (or at least we have not yet pushed modelling framework to cover all of them). So to ensure a consistent requirement engineering and management, we keep DOORS (to manage specifications as a set of requirements for instance). Then the use of (part of) models as content of a requirement is being pushed even not yet formalized.