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| **Table Number: PDR Facilitator Name: Taylor La Monica** | |
| **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**   * **What are the current overall challenges to preparing, documenting, executing, and reviewing SETRs?** * Getting people in the same room.   + Classification level issues   + Travel Budget issues   + The right people and educated reviewers need to be involved * An evolving design leading up to the event itself   + Never fully complete before event   + Data due too far in advance (in example, 60 days) causes barriers to the review processes. * Program reviews are a distraction to engineers * Engineering the system versus preparing product for SETR   + A struggle between preparation versus progress.   + SETRs should be demonstrating capability   + Should already have a definition of done with clear entrance and exit criteria. This doesn’t always happen.   + SETR audience should be guided by a need to know basis. Usually have too many people in the room.   + Getting data that is possible to review, and create a relevant and cohesive story.   + Data being submitted to check a box.   + Often do not have the foundational knowledge to process the data given to the government (need SMEs)   + military culture. not changing or adapting   + ﻿﻿becomes more about the review than the technology.   + Classification issues * **What approaches (digital or otherwise) have you found successful in accelerating the SETR process while increasing (or maintaining) the efficacy of the review?**   + ﻿﻿define what should be reviewed ahead of time.   + ﻿﻿model based gate review. decide ahead of time what we want to see.   + ﻿﻿not developing entrance criteria exit criteria before   + ﻿﻿briefing from an engineer→ someone proficient in modeling tools.   + ﻿﻿model "fly-through"   + ﻿﻿cameo web interface. not intimidating for PM   + PM needs a willingness to learn   + ﻿﻿System engineer should lead SETR.   + ﻿﻿Change gov culture- dialog on criteria (communicate not dictate.)   + ﻿﻿confluence, jira + bitbucket helps communicate   + ﻿﻿PM and engineers should be getting into the dashboards + model * **What digital tools, platforms, or methods have you used in your SETR processes? Have these been sufficient? Expand on successes, failures or gaps.** * **What are the lessons learned from the approaches you've tried or participated in?** * **(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?** | |
| **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,   * **Do the listed digital engineering criteria make sense for your selected SETR event?**   + Every review should have all data available. digital ecosystem strategy should be submitted parallel to Acquisition Strategy   + digital thread should be developed SFR/SRR   + program data   + #2 to be specific if accessible (financial data? what kind)   + #4. What does validated mean? Against what?     - Specific requirements to bring to situation     - Modeling and sim plan needed     - Needs to be accredited     - Style standards necessary     - What level of requirements do we have?       * Locked in too early?   + ﻿﻿2 use cases for modeling.     - ﻿﻿not verifiable or creditable     - ﻿plan for backside       * ﻿Requirements validated? Validated designs? Is the requirement validated?     - Software and tools not showing up at right time       * ﻿put in schedule   + VI - tool review at POR. sunset some. * **Are there any criteria you would add, change, or remove? (Annotate the Gate Criteria doc if helpful)**    + Risk Ledger needs to be added   + Government needs to evaluate skill gaps   + Product support package should be introduced at PDR     - Logistics acquisition lifecycle should be taken into account     - How do we move to ops     - Plan for test at PDR     - Production should be involved     - Design to build     - Bring lifecycle considerations in early * **Do the listed criteria represent a reasonable digital maturity for the SETR event?**    + Didn’t get to this | |
|  | |

|  |
| --- |
| **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?   * **How would you change / eliminate / redesign the technical reviews in this new world?**   + AI-gives report on system + risk analysis   + IPTs     - collocated teams in single environment.     - SME gives reviews in same place     - •authoritative source of truth includes PM data as well - cameo jira. digital thread. single tool.   + ﻿﻿All tools tied together and using agile lifecycle.   + ﻿﻿Break down barriers between customer + contractor.   + ﻿﻿No waterfall milestones.   + ﻿﻿Agile continuous integration.   + ﻿﻿If speed is the goal... design with speed in mind to begin with.   + ﻿﻿Democratize down to pm. PM needs to report to higher ups. engineering decisions not made just because of statute.   + ﻿﻿No trying to get on SES schedule   + Congressional change of decision authority   + Agile systems engineering struggle resolved   + Baseline evolved in sprints   + Every 90 days, develop requirements   + Every 90 days, develop requirements   + Tool allow you to write a set of rules... software does quality of design check.   + ﻿﻿Art of not doing it all at once   + ﻿﻿operational capability!     - make it. test it, operate and sustain     - ﻿﻿integrate as well   + ﻿﻿how do we evaluate progress?   + ﻿﻿continuous review   + ﻿﻿approve data as data object. measure progress at smaller increments.   + ﻿﻿burn - up chart. % based reviews.   + ﻿﻿Milestone vs CI/CD.     - ﻿expected level of maturity in system model   + ﻿﻿contractors can produce model + gov can pursue it.   + ﻿model based acq. every 30 day reviews?   + ﻿﻿dashboads can be made.   + ﻿﻿cultural transformation   + ﻿﻿dashboards with live data. diff programs in same dashboard.   + Adapt the Agile Software Methodology for Weapon Systems & Platforms and Shift to Sprint & Epics Instead of Gate Reviews   + PMs can read all dashboads.   + ﻿﻿tools available between gov and ctr   + • collaborate   + AI automation.   + ﻿﻿focus on data elements instead of CDRLs.   + ﻿﻿cross domain solutions.   + Ad hoc reviews/ agile continuous renews   + ﻿﻿manages go to digital thread. find everything they need to find. no reviews. relevant people data   + ﻿﻿stepping into design and seeing what falls behind   + ﻿﻿event based system- go in and see what you need to see- review when things are not on track   + ﻿﻿tools pull together data and tell you where you are vs. planned to be.   + ﻿replan when metrics off by x amount.   + ﻿﻿train workforce to be active collaborator- not nit picking     - ﻿﻿no throwing it over the wall   + ﻿﻿training for decision makers—both sides equally informed * **Map out the new technical reviews process to make it a reality** |
| **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. |