

Q & A from ATE/ATS Technology Forum 28 Oct 2014

Q1. Is there a DoD initiative to develop a common test interface (CTI) that will allow preservation of TPS investment but establish portability between families?

A1: There was a CTI. Due to the old TPS needing to migrate – but not a lot has been done. Some TPS are being done. For the Navy, they are based on Virginia Panel 80 (Common Panel). The goal is to always have some sort of interface that allows a TPS to transport over.

Added by a non-panelist: The SSC20 effort under IEEE-P1693 is being developed to create a transparent architecture to mount the interface of choice that delinks the necessity to fix the ATS to the interface.

Note: The CTI is the only open standard test interface under IEEE-1505.1.

Q2. How does the Navy intend to meet calibration requirements? It's often hard to "calibrate" computer software or the hardware interface module for the software.

A2. Typically, NIST is the standard. All the CASS family uses calibration standards. Peculiar equipment presents more difficulties.

Q2.1. Is there a synthetic instrumentation footprint in these systems (VDATS, ECASS, etc.)?

A2.1 Yes, it's just a matter of how broad. The capability exists, but implementation may be different. The long term sustainment of synthetic instrumentation is a concern. There is still work to do.

Q3. What is the total USAF TPS migrated since 2007? Has that total all been migrated to VDATS?

A3. 5 total. Yes, all have gone to VDATS

Q4. I've heard nothing discussed WRT LM-STAR and I believe Naval Aviation has plans to interface w/it - especially as it relates to JSF. Can any Service address this please?

A4. JSF is using LM-STAR. There is a potential for I-level that would require modifying LM-STAR. It will likely be hosted on eCASS in the Navy.

Q5. Does the DOD ATS Framework IPT nominate ATS standards for incorporation into the Defense Information Standards Registry (DISR)?

A5. No. In the past, the ATS Framework standards were being placed in DISR. However, it was decided to move away from DISR since the AMB preferred to recommend standards versus requiring standards in ATS. This gave the individual Services flexibility in determining when and if certain standards would be incorporated in their ATS.

Q6. For the Army, Navy, and Marines...how does the DoD Working Capital Fund capital Investment Program (CIP) used to replace obsolete technology and equipment in the depots interface with the programs being worked? Do you have requirements identified through the WCF requirements process and what controls do you have to capture the requirements?

A6. Army procurement quantities, at least for the TMDE portfolio, are driven by the basis of issue plan which focuses on field units (Active Army and National Guard units) and the schoolhouse (which is developed by the Army's Training and Doctrine Command) and other requirements which are captured through the Army's 4610-R process that documents requirements for depots and other non-field unit organizations. If CIP requirements are identified in conjunction with a planned or existing procurement then fill of those requirements could be addressed by that procurement. By themselves, WCF/CIP

requirements will not prompt a procurement by the Army's PD TMDE office. Also, although some of the items procured by PD TMDE for the Army have a narrow focus, PD TMDE procures general purpose test equipment. The procurement of items that are not general purpose (have a purpose unique to a platform), are the responsibility of the platform program manager.

These USMC General Purpose Automatic Test System Programs do not use the CIP to replace obsolete technology and equipment. We do use the WCF at the designated depots to repair and maintain our systems. The work schedule is determined each year based on previous years usage and projected additional requirements. This requirement is then levied against other projects and prioritized for the work schedule for that year.

Q7. Panel, Please say a few words on ATE and the F-35?

A7. One of the challenges with ATE on the F-35 is that they have numerous configurations of the tester. A key fact of CASS is that they are all kept in a central data depository (to avoid obsolescence). The Air Force to date has nothing in the program to support F-35.

Q8. Besides EO and possibly RF subsystems, are there any plans to develop any common ATE systems across services (Army, USMC, etc.)

A8. Common subsystems - yes. Common systems across the Military Services – No...within the Services, Yes. Other Services are always invited to participate.

Q9. How are we jointly addressing the information assurance process?

A9. There is an IPT which is identified on the bottom of the slide. It is called the Joint Services Integration Product Team. They leverage other dedicated teams that are working the issue. The challenge is that the rules keep changing. Information is being shared, and lessons learned captured.

Q10. Is there a body of knowledge where a PM can go to see all the DoD-wide things that have occurred in ATE/ATS? i.e. does a accessible central database exist?

A10. There is an OSD website, but it has not been updated in 2 years due to ongoing information assurance issues. We are getting close though. NAVAIR has a CASS website for naval aviation. Army PMs are required to go through the ATE/ATS section to ensure the capability does not already exist. The Navy and Air Force have similar requirements, though they are not always followed correctly. The Air Force has a SharePoint site where information is dispersed within the Air Force.

Q11. There is a move afoot in the Services to try and understand intermittence. Is there a move afoot in the ATE/ATS community to address intermittence?

A11. NAVAIR is testing boxes under environmental tests. The Army has no central effort. Within the Air Force the F-16 complex does have some capability with the test system they purchased. We (Air Force) are not seeing it as a major issue in other systems.