Background

• Integral Systems has often been the contrarian at GSAW
• We have preached a commercial approach to building ground system for over five years
• Many commercial operators don’t require an architectural definition or description
• Integral Systems and Aerospace have agreed to disagree in the past, so … my position is:
Panelist Position

- Question 1: How do you think using an Architectural Approach should help a project?
  
- Position: I agree with whatever Mary Rich says during the panel discussion.
Panelist Position

• Question 2: How could it (an architectural approach) make things more difficult?

• Position: It can generate a long discussion on how to define and document the architecture and take the focus away from “what are the requirements?” and “how are we meeting them?”
Panelist Position

• Question 3: What aspects, features, or characteristics of an architecture do you think are most important to determine in advance and which may be left to emerge?

• Position: I disagree with whatever Raytheon says on this subject.
Panelist Position

• Question 4: Would you expect a “payoff” in the first delivery, or would the benefits come later on?

• Position: Both, since both are often required in competitive procurements these days.
Panelist Position

• Question 5: If you have experience with a project that used an architectural approach, what could they have done differently to improve the outcome?

• Position: On CCS-C, I agree with the lessons learned that were discussed Tuesday - Extend the competitive fly-off phase timeline and increase the support of legacy satellite contractors.