

**From:** Steven Long *WRL*  
**To:** Patrick Milano *NRL*  
**Date:** 3/27/01 1:45PM  
**Subject:** Re: Help on Question 1

Pat, I'm don't know what to write in those sentences. I suspect that the probelm isn't that they "aren't clear". That's often a euphomism for "I don't want you to say that, even though it's correct." I guess we need to meet with Doug to see what he thinks is not clear enough. I'll call you when I'm out of my next meeting.

Steve

>>> Patrick Milano 03/27/01 01:27PM >>>

Based on your recommendation, could you send me a couple of sentences that capture the thoughts and can be inserted into the section?

>>> Steven Long 03/27/01 01:20PM >>>

Pat, I don't think the suggested change is clear enough to use. The ROP *does* attempt to quantify the joint effects of multiple performance deficiencies. Recent modifications accentuate that intent. So, what does the sentence mean to say that the ROP does not do?

I also don't see why a "clarification" is needed. All the sentence says is that there is a logical problem with trying to quantify the effects of multiple overlapping issues and at the same time quantify the total risk increase in a compatible way. That is a problem that we have encountered in several programs, before.

Doug seems to want to have some summation sentence that says the ROP has the "right" procedure, now, so there is no problem. The last I heard, Gareth didn't agree with him. since he has not put a detailed procedure in the ROP, I don't think he can make the claim.

Anyway, I prefer to go out with an acknowledgment of the need to try to capture the risk effects of overlapping issues and an acknowledgment that there needs to be some careful consideration of how to do it. I don't believe we can claim a consensus on how to do it, nor that that consensus is captured in MC 0609 in sufficient detail to be implemented unambiguously.

Steve

J/09