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| --- | --- |
| **Table Number: Facilitator Name:** | |
| **Session 1 Part 1: Implementing Digital SETRs** | |
| For SETR processes in general, please use the space below to answer the following questions. If continuing your answers on a different page, please use the question number, e.g. 1.c, to indicate what you are responding to. | |
| **Overall SETR Process**   1. What are the current overall challenges to preparing, documenting, executing, and reviewing SETRs? 2. What approaches (digital or otherwise) have you found successful in accelerating the SETR process while increasing (or maintaining) the efficacy of the review? 3. What digital tools, platforms, or methods have you used in your SETR processes? Have these been sufficient? Expand on successes, failures or gaps. 4. What are the lessons learned from the approaches you've tried or participated in? 5. (optional) What specific cultural attributes need to change to successfully implement the approaches identified above? Are their risks or impediments, and how would you mitigate or overcome them?   Question A: Response- Verification, lack of information, quality control, updating and auditing at the same time. Constraint on time to consume large amount of data. Having the right SMEs  Question B: Response- Incremental reviews, digital twins, having material before reviews and available data  Question C: Response- Doors to teamcenter and cameo, but there are multiple versions and none talk to each other. Excel and powerpoint, MS project, relied on contractor excel and MS project. Still paper based, everyone wants excel.  Question D: Response; Communication between OEM and customer. Trust must exist. Making reviews smaller to consume. Keep focus on requirements. Identify parts that work | |
| **Session 1 Part 2: Implementing Digital SETRs** | |
| For your designated SETR event, please use the space below to answer the following questions. If continuing your answers on a different page, please use the question number, e.g. 1.c, to indicate what you are responding to. | |
| **Circle your table’s designated SETR Event** | |
| 1. Systems Requirements Review (SRR)  2. Systems Functional Review (SFR)  3. Preliminary Design Review (PDR)  4. Critical Design Review (CDR) | 5. Test Readiness Review (TRR)  6. System Verification Review/Functional Configuration Audit  7. Production Readiness Review (PRR)  **8. Physical Configuration Audit (PCA)** |
| **Specific Digital SETR Gate Criteria (as specified by your table marker)**  For the Digital Engineering criteria proposed for your selected SETR event in the provided “Digital SETR Gate Criteria” document,   1. Do the listed digital engineering criteria make sense for your selected SETR event? 2. Are there any criteria you would add, change, or remove? (Annotate the Gate Criteria doc if helpful) 3. Do the listed criteria represent a reasonable digital maturity for the SETR event?   Question A: Response- Digital twin is critical. Quality assurance, software document  Question B: Response- What was left out   * + quality assurance   + Software documentation   + Packing details   Question C: Response- Yes, PCA event goal is to baseline the physical foundation of the weapon system. The configuration management is critical to the execution of the audit. The group agreed having the digital twin is critical going forward. | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table Number: Facilitator Name:** |
| **Session 2: Future State of Technical Reviews** |
| Under the premise that we are now in 2045 where DMM has been actualized, what would the process of technical reviews be?  1. How would you change / eliminate / redesign the technical reviews in this new world?  2. Map out the new technical reviews process to make it a reality  Based on the final question, SE with no barriers:     1. To accelerate, execute, and implement future design and vision of future capabilities    1. Using AI to provide technical solution options for desired capabilities    2. Eliminating bureaucracy and regulations that hamper the ability to get capability to the field    3. Requirements should be scoped and centralized.    4. Using AI identify all requirements to provide potential impact to proposed designs, cost, and schedule.    5. Accountability from senior leaders through the entire process |
| **Additional Comments/Feedback** |
| Please provide any additional comments or suggestions on SETRs, Digital Transformation, or other areas you would like to express to the Air Force Material Command.  Please also include on feedback on the workshop, or recommendations for workshops or events you would like to participate in the future. |