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**AAI PT Organization**

**Tasking:**
- Identify and eliminate safety issues & cost drivers associated with operating aging aircraft
- Provide PMA’s with timely recommendations for engineering, logistics solutions, cost analysis, and coordination with other Services (DoD, FAA, NASA)
- Facilitate implementation of new technology solution

**Fleet Focus Teams**

- **WIRING & POWER**
  - On Board Diagnostics
  - Off Board Diagnostics
  - Circuit Protection
  - Batteries
  - Process Improvement
  - Fire Extinguisher
  - Structure Analysis

- **AIR VEHICLE**
  - Corrosion
  - Hydraulics
  - Transparencies
  - Aeromechanics

- **AVIONICS**
  - S & T
  - Legacy
  - Process
  - "Hot Line"
  - PMA Support

- **OBsolescence**
  - Policy
  - Process / Tools
  - Process
  - "Hot Line"
  - Products
  - PMA Support

- **FASTRack Sustainment (S.E.T.)**
  - Policy
  - Process
  - Products

- **LOGISTICS**
- **COST**
- **FINANCES**
- **CONTRACTS**
- **JCAA**
Background

• LRL concept evolved from the DOD 5000.2 mandated Technology Readiness Levels (TRL) assessment process
  - TRLs provide:
    • Evaluation of critical technology maturity
    • Maturation plan (as needed)
    • Best practices/guidelines for each Milestone
      - MS B target is TRL = 6
      - MS C target is TRL = 7
      - MS C preferred is TRL = 8
    - Understanding of the technical maturity without consideration of the sustainment of those technologies
      • TRLs were never intended to consider logistics

LRL is a new concept intended to consider sustainment issues
Background

- Logistics benchmark system was desirable
  - ~10 logistics elements that are often interdependent and parallel are required to successfully acquire, field, and support new technology
  - Aid in understanding what sustainment is required at different time phases

Engineers and Logisticians need clear definition of what is required for sustainment at each phase of a project
LRL Definition

• LRL intent:
  – Provide a methodology for assessing Logistic Element Readiness for technology
  – Establish benchmarks for programs at different phases in time
  – Provide a management tool to forecast logistics workload, manpower requirements, identify gaps, etc.

• NAVAIR Aging Aircraft convened a working group of engineers, logisticians, and program managers to draft an LRL concept
  – LRL concept is work in progress
  – Initial phase focus was on technology insertion for in-service (post MS C) aircraft platforms
LRL Definition

- LRL’s evaluated for 6 project phases:
  - Lab Test/R&D
  - Project Definition (Fleet Need/metrics/BCA/Decision to proceed)
  - Project Development /Implementation (Finalized analysis, change recommended, ECP development, Class II change development, RAMEC, LECP, other)
  - Engineering Validation
  - Fleet Verification
  - Fleet Use

- First step is to discern what phase your tech insertion project is in
LRL Definition

- Evaluation Criteria gathered from numerous sources including but not limited to:
  - Defense Acquisition Guidebook
  - DON Independent Logistics Assessment Handbook
  - Defense Acquisition University logistics curriculum
  - NAVAIR Acquisition Logistics Support Plan Guide
  - NAVAIR Deputy Assistant Program Manager for Logistics (DAPML) Handbook
  - ASN RD&A Acquisition Logistics for the Rest of Us
LRL Definition

- Evaluation criteria established for each phase in a Microsoft Excel worksheet format
  - Determined what is the benchmark of required tasks appropriate for each logistics element at that time phase
  - Not all elements require same level or effort in the same time phase
- Answers question of “What tasks must be complete at each project phase for each logistics element?”
# LRL Evaluation Criteria - Excerpt for Design Interface

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Lab Test/R&amp;D phase</th>
<th>Project Definition</th>
<th>Project Development/Implementation</th>
<th>Engineering Validation</th>
<th>Fleet Verification</th>
<th>Fleet Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Interface</td>
<td>Review and identify significant <strong>design interface</strong> impacts of project to existing system or platform (eg. available power, weight constraints, etc.) Create POAM to resolve any design interface issues.</td>
<td>Existing <strong>Reliability and Maintainability</strong> (RAM) metrics reviewed. Initial improvement predictions determined. <strong>Design interface</strong> issue resolution in work.</td>
<td>For new designs, <strong>Reliability Centered Maintenance</strong> (RCM) and <strong>Failure Modes and Effects Analysis</strong> (FMEA) completed to identify failure modes, failure frequency, effect on performance, and criticality. For modifications to existing design, RCM and FMECA reviewed for impacts. <strong>Design interface</strong> issues resolved.</td>
<td>Results of RCM and FMEA used to develop or modify existing condition based and schedule based maintenance tasks. Results of RCM and FMECA also used to update the Critical Items list as applicable. <strong>Technical updates</strong> (such as Maintenance Requirement Card changes) verified.</td>
<td>Technical updates completed and available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LRL Evaluation Criteria - Excerpt for Training & Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Lab Test/ R&amp;D phase</th>
<th>Project Definition</th>
<th>Project Development/ Implementation</th>
<th>Engineering Validation</th>
<th>Fleet Verification</th>
<th>Fleet Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing training procedures/ curricula and training plan identified and reviewed.</td>
<td>Impacts to Training identified</td>
<td>Training curricula changes drafted. As required changes to Naval Training Systems Plan (NTSP) drafted.</td>
<td>Training curricula changes updated post validation/verification with changes as necessary. NTSP changes finalized. Changes submitted for approval.</td>
<td>Training curricula updated. NTSP updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Current Facilities reviewed and impacts identified. When applicable, facilities modifications or new requirements are documented and analysis completed for (in) adequacy of existing facilities, trade studies for optimal new facility, funding requested.</td>
<td>As needed with funding available, Facilities modifications or new facilities projects in work.</td>
<td>Facilities project completed and approved.</td>
<td></td>
<td>New or modified Facilities completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Excerpt for Training & Facilities**
- **Phase**: Training, Facilities
- **Project Definition**: Existing training procedures/curricula and training plan identified and reviewed.
- **Project Development/Implementation**: Impacts to Training identified
- **Engineering Validation**: Training curricula changes drafted. As required changes to Naval Training Systems Plan (NTSP) drafted.
- **Fleet Verification**: Training curricula changes updated post validation/verification with changes as necessary. NTSP changes finalized. Changes submitted for approval.
- **Fleet Use**: Training curricula updated. NTSP updated.
### LRL Evaluation Criteria - Excerpt for DMSMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Lab Test/R&amp;D phase</th>
<th>Project Definition</th>
<th>Project Development/Implementation</th>
<th>Engineering Validation</th>
<th>Fleet Verification</th>
<th>Fleet Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMSMS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing <strong>DMSMS program management plan</strong> reviewed. Determine the <strong>technical refresh strategy</strong> (2 yr, 4 yr, spiral, etc.)</td>
<td>New technology evaluated to determine criticality as it relates to DMSMS. Assess components against the tech refresh strategy. <strong>Impacts to DMSMS plan or metrics identified.</strong></td>
<td><strong>DMSMS forecasting</strong> completed for new technology. Updates to DMSMS management plan drafted. Technical data package requirements drafted.</td>
<td><strong>DMSMS management plan</strong> updated. Technical data package that supports DMSMS mitigation strategy available.</td>
<td>Metrics and usage monitored as required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LRL Quantified

- With benchmarks established, focused on quantifying effort required to achieve those benchmarks
  - Useful for project planning of available personnel and resources
- Evaluated percentage of total effort required at each phase
  - Considered each logistics element to have a 100% total effort by last phase
    - Simply stated each logistics element is fully supported by “Fleet Use”
- Percent effort is subjective number based on efforts outlined in the LRL for each element at each phase
- Graphed percentage effort as a function of phase of the project
- Example of one way to depict data
Percent Effort by Project Phase

- Lab Test/R&D Phase
- Project Definition
- Project Development
- Engineering Validation
- Fleet Verification
- Fleet Use

- Percent Effort
- Maintenance Planning
- Supply Support
- Technical Data
- Training
- Facilities
- Manpower
- PHS&T
- Support Equipment
- Computer Resources
- Design Interface
- DMSMS
LRL Tool

- LRL tool created in Microsoft Excel (compatible with Microsoft Office 2003) to evaluate a logistics readiness level
- Detailed evaluation requires familiarity with the project and tasks completed to date
- Buttons allow a point and click use of color
  - Grey indicates the project is not yet in that project phase therefore benchmarks are not applicable
  - Blue indicates the benchmark is not applicable due to the details of the project
  - Red indicates the benchmark task is not complete
  - Green indicates the benchmark task is complete
LRL Tool

• Numeric LRL score evaluated for each project phase
  - LRL = 0 **Unsupported** (zero% required tasks completed)
  - LRL = 1 **Poorly Supported** (1-50% of required tasks completed)
  - LRL = 2 **Moderately Supported** (50-70% or required tasks completed)
  - LRL = 3 **Nearly Supported** (70-90% of required tasks completed)
  - LRL = 4 **Fully Supported** (100% of required tasks completed)

• Numeric LRL scale provides a reference framework for project comparison

An LRL of 4 is the goal for all phases
LRL Prototypes

• Completed 4 prototypes on current Air Vehicle Projects
  – Identified gaps in logistics support (red areas)
  – Gaps reviewed with team leads and plan of action created
  – Plan to complete updated evaluation no later than six weeks
  – Monitor progress from initial evaluation and follow on evaluations

• Demonstration to follow in Microsoft Excel
LRL Benefits

Benefits of LRLs include:

- Template/benchmark to measure readiness by logistic element on a project level basis
  - Utilized to train/mentor new logisticians, engineering and program management personnel in sustainment requirements for tech insertion projects
- Aid in planning manpower/funding/schedule requirements for projects as they mature from project concept to implementation
- Dovetail with logistics risk assessments for another perspective
- Offers a logistics readiness perspective for technology insertion currently missing from TRL evaluations

Value of LRL is the establishing the time phase benchmarks
Next Steps

- Continue to collect input on Draft LRL concept
  - Update/change draft as needed
- Establish a Joint working group to expand the scope to encompass a more joint perspective
- Complete four prototypes with follow up evaluations
- Initiate LRL evaluation for all Air 4.1D Air Vehicle Projects in FY 07
Questions?
AAI PT Points of Contact

- AAI PT Lead, Bob Ernst, 301-342-2203, robert.ernst@navy.mil
- AAI PT Jacksonville Wiring, Andrew Yang, 904-594-5821, andrew.yang@navy.mil
- AAI PT Assistant Program Manager for Logistics, Harry Proffitt, 301-757-0868, melvin.proffitt@navy.mil
- AAI PT Air Vehicle IPT lead, Don Sheehan, 301-342-9738, donald.sheehan@navy.mil
- AAI PT Consultant, Elizabeth Broadus, 301-862-7049, broadus_elizabeth@bah.com