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| **Table Number: TRR Facilitator Name: Jinkins** | |
| **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? 6. Everything is done in piece meal approach.   Work pauses while the reviews are being prepared  If the contractor is delivering digital documents the government may not have tools to receive the information. There are huge time burdens to prepare for TRR   1. Collaborative environment where building the TRR together has been useful. There is software available to help with this Implementing continuous reviews have helped eliminate surprises Having a clear connection – created digital thread from the requirements to what is being tested   For software implementing CI/CD pipelines have been useful. Having dedicated time to make the tests   1. Confluence and jira have been helpful for tracking requirements from ideation to test using built in gitlab runners for software test has been helpful to automate testing Current digital engineering tooling is not adequate to work collaboratively together with contractors. So there is a lot of passing data and models back and forth. This limits how fast people can go 2. Best reviews are continuous in nature so at the formal event there are no surprises.  having clear linkages from the test events to the requirement being validated helps the process go faster Going through required support equipment and coordinating with stakeholders early helped prevent surprises  There is a lack of test experience in the workforce and so it can often be hard to make sure there is  There is a lack of digital engineering experience at all levels of the workforce 3. Need to implement a culture change of continuous review and continuous test is the norm Using powerpoint as a mode of communication is a static discussion. Need to ensure that there is training in place so people know how to read outputs from digital tools directly | |
| **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? 4. Yes, seem to capture everything needed. 5. Needs to be set up so that it can be a continuous review cycle. Right now gates still feel incredibly linear. Focus on parallelizing as much as possible 6. Still risk of all the information being translated to excel and powerpoint which goes against the intent. Need to make sure tools are in place for the enterprise to work together on reviews. Contractors and government need to be working from the same source of truth. | |

|  |
| --- |
| **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  • Burn DoD 5000 to the ground.  • Continually gather requirements with good systems engineering in a digital environment.  • Well-defined, authoritative source of truth.  • Information is shared seamlessly.  • Models are able to be used with other teams.  • No major support surprises in reviews.  • Resilient Reusable system architecture.  • Increase performance Interoperable frameworks from a data level.  • Fully integrated digital environment.  • Open relationships between contractors and government.  • Maintained data infrastructure.  • Industry partners are able to play in the same sandbox as the government.  • DoD able to share with sister services.  • Able to assess opportunity and risk.  • 99% model-based test, trust in the models, and are validated.  • Increased awareness of existing digital artifacts, early discoverable information. |
| **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.  • More digital test sets that reflect reality.  • Trust in the technology, trust the reports experts.  • Continuous /evolutionary review culture, smaller bites more often.  • Everything fully integrated.  • Must be collaborative.  • Tests incorporated into design of requirements.  • Encourage smart risks — find & fix problems iteratively.  • Reward if programs killed  • Record progress being made.  • Incentivize doing the right thing. |