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• Intermittent / No fault found (NFF / A799) circuit problem with all Navy WRAs chassis
  – No way to reliably detect intermittent faults- currently technology it would take hundreds of hours to fully test a unit for intermittent faults using conventional technology – making current test sets unsuitable for intermittent testing
  – Difficult to conduct Engineering Investigations (EIs) when Intermittent chassis faults can not be eliminated from the equation
  – Bad actors due to Intermittent Fault continue to grow in the Navy Inventory

• AAT team from FRCSW visited Ogden Air Force Depot and was introduced to IFDIS technology as used on the F16 radar repair line
• Generator Convertor Unit (GCU) consistently appears on the top degrader list
  – GCU chassis currently verified with conventional continuity testers provided limited results – intermittent connections continued to be an issue although we could not prove that they were because we could not reliably detect them
  – Intermittent circuit detection extremely limited using conventional tester

• IFDIS technology was investigated by AAT 2010 and the idea was born to test the GCU at TQS facility in Ogden
• NAVSUP funded GCU/IFDIS test demonstration to determine if intermittent contact was an issue for the GCU
Test Demonstration - GCU Chassis
Test Demonstration - GCU Chassis Tied to IFDIS
IFDIS precisely detected and isolated one or more intermittent circuits in 80% of the GCUs tested.
Test Demonstration - Results

- Selected (5) Ready For Use (RFU) GCUs chassis for IFDIS testing
- IFDIS detected and isolated intermittent circuits in 80% of the RFU GCU Chassis
FRCSW uses DIT-MCO, Eclypse, digital and analog multi-meters testers to isolate opens, shorts, and miswires.

- This technology is not useful in detecting intermittent faults
- FRC was unknowingly building back up chassis with intermittent faults and returning them to the Fleet
Current Solution

• FRCSW, through coordination with COMFRC, has purchased an IFDIS system and three separate GCU IDs (G1, G2, and G3) via the Depots Capitol Improvement Program (CIP).
  • IFDIS to be installed October – December 2015
  • Training to be conducted January - February 2016.
  • Local Engineering Specification to be released by engineering to direct GCU chassis onto IFDIS test bench
  • Follow-on WRAs in work for future testing, suggested WRAs are APG-65/73 RADAR and various cockpit displays
  • RIF topic white paper submitted to Navy by Universal Synaptics for (1) IFDIS test set and three (yet to be determined) ID’s to be built for COMFRC
Current Solution – cont.

• Pros
  – Will eliminate GCU bad actors that are due to intermittent chassis within the Fleet
  – Testing is short duration; approximately 1 hour, relatively inexpensive for the gain in reliability
  – Will improve reliability of GCU- increased Time on Wing (TOW) due to reduced A799.
  – Programming of chassis is simplistic – self learning
  – IFDIS Identifies the exact circuit path that is faulty making repair relatively straight forward
  – Improves FRCSW GCU quality.
Current Solution – cont.

• Cons
  – Unit is costly $$$ - no efficiency of purchase for the Government for the multiple units we have purchased, (2) @ at Ogden, (1) at FRC SW
  – Originally thought that building IDs could be done organically but – it has taken 9 months to design and build the 3 GCU ID’s at significant cost
    • Possible solution is to stand up organic ID build capability at IDATS lab in Lakehurst
  – No high voltage testing
  – Capturing of intermittent waveforms is not automatic, waveforms must be captured manually
Main Issues/Concerns w/Current Technology

• Cost
  – As mentioned in the previous slide, the system is expensive:
    • Suggest buying multiple units to reduce cost per contract.
    • ID’s are expensive – Suggest developing Organic capability

• What it does well:
  – Quickly identifies intermittent faults
  – Identifies opens, shorts, and miswires in seconds
  – Identifies approximately 95% of intermittent faults in a one axis test
    • To obtain 99% detection, the other two axis tests must be completed – tripling testing time (3 hours) - Still extremely fast (magnitudes of order better) compared to the other testers out on the market
Questions?
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Intermittent Examples

Pin not soldered
Intermittent Examples

Cracked Solder Joint
Conventional Automatic Test Equipment (ATE)
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*Note – Conventional ATE scanning measurement window must perfectly synchronize with fault at the precise moment the fault occurs or the fault is missed completely, the result is No Fault Found.

IFDIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP1</th>
<th>TP2</th>
<th>TP3</th>
<th>TP4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1340ms of testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100ms missed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93% Test Coverage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note – All lines All the time test coverage equals no missed defects!