



PSMC Conference, Orlando, FL, April 19-22, 2004

General Session Meeting Minutes

PSMC Apr 2004 Orlando, FL

Tuesday, April 20th

The Government Chair opened the meeting with introductions and administrative remarks. He welcomed and thanked to those who attended the Fall meeting in San Diego despite the fires. The next Fall meeting will be somewhere between Torrance, CA and San Diego, CA. Request was made to shift PSMC meeting fall date due to a conflicting industry meeting in Washington, DC. The Executive Steering Committee Report was given.

- The tentative dates and locations for the next meetings are:
 - Executive Steering Committee – August 10-11, Deerfield Beach, FL
 - General Session Meeting - week of Oct. 18th 2004 in San Diego, CA.

The Government Chair gave an overview of the PSMC. Subcommittee meetings and agenda were announced.

Action to assign subcommittee vice-chairs to act as backup in event chair is unavailable was accomplished.

Action regarding the Government Furnished Baseline, (GFB). Still collecting data about future needs, ultimate decision pending results of DoD Re-engineering efforts. Some discussion ensued regarding GFB and whether it is not used because it's not up to date or because of other reasons. The GFB is intended to be a list of parts all services have agreed to as "preferred".

The driving requirements for use/maintenance of GFB went away and it became stagnant. It was mentioned that something like the GFB could be a useful tool.

The Government Chair commented that "You are better off sending us a list of your parts and asking for them to be scrubbed, than using the current GFB".

Honeywell addressed the issue of parts having to be identified to specific programs even though the same part is being used on multiple programs. This was an action item carried from the last general session.

JSF is smart-numbering system (F-22 is not, and did not want to change for cataloging purposes). A paper is being developed on this subject by DLIS.

DSPO provided answers to action items from the previous meeting:

1. Who will have access to the Program Manager's Toll (PMT)?
Program Managers and other selected DoD personnel will have access. Industry will have access if they have a request submitted through a PM they are supporting. The reason we are limiting access is partially because the PMT will have access to International Standardization Agreements and other non-Distribution A documents.

2. Who will have access to Shopping Wizard accounts?
Currently just about anyone can request a Shopping Wizard account. If you have a “.mil” e-mail address, you get the account ID and password pretty much the same way you get your Assist0Online account ID and password. If you are a DoD contractor, you have to provide some verification and additional information for access to Distribution A documents.

3. Should HDBK-512 or SD-19 be included in the Joint Material Standards Roadmap (JSMR)?
It is not envisioned that guidance documents be included in the PMT. The PMT is not a slicing and dicing of the ASSIST. The PMT is the tool established in the JMSR. The purpose of the JMSR is to establish a filtering process to ensure that we develop and maintain standards needed to support the goals of the QDR and FLE. The operative word in the JSMR is “roadmap” because it provides a coherent migration of DoD’s standardization program consistent with the new National Defense Strategy. Those standards that make it through the filtering process will be included in a centralized database called the Program Manager Tool (PMT). The PMT will provide program offices, and the many organizations that support them, with a technical route for the selection of other than information technology standards to reach destinations involving interoperability, logistics readiness, safety and other operational needs. It will categorize standards by importance and by product category using the Work Breakdown Structure.

The Industry Chair mentioned that interest has been expressed for an advanced copy of the Chair’s DMS briefing and to discuss increased collaboration between PSMC and DoD DMSMS Teaming group

The results of the previous October meeting Survey Forms were presented by the Marketing Chair. There were 33 attendees. 22 completed surveys. Overall the comments were that the meeting was beneficial and relevant. Good format, networking, open forum discussions, and presentations.

PSMC Charter Chair mentioned that the charter has not been updated since 2000. He wants to review the charter and determine if it needs updating.

Marketing Chair will be working on PSMC budgeting.

DSPO provided the status on the DoD Parts Management Reengineering Working Group (PMRWG). Focus is not just on new design but also on sustainment. Expects to be about a 1-year effort meeting monthly. They are starting with only military/DoD, later plan to open to industry/academia. Looking for industry incentives that would increase participation in standardization.

It was mentioned that LM Aero has a checklist for PM contracts.

Presentations: All presentations are available for viewing at www.dscc.dla.mil/PSMC

“Parts Management Documentation & Education Committee” (Honeywell Airframe Systems)

Trying to create 3 levels of PM documentation

Reviewed top level parts management presentation

Definition

Myths

Why you should do PM?

Cost Avoidance

Return on Investment ROI

Discussion about ROI draft chart

DSCC can provide standardization ROI numbers for specific service programs upon request.

Chart should be changed to FAA from NASA

Final chart take (specific restrictive elements) out of parentheses

IHS representative asked, can we quantify “what is the investment?”

PEMS / COTS Subcommittee Minutes

(DSCC, Chairman; Lansdale Vice-Subcommittee Chairman)

Chair provided information on the following:

The Crane study on PEM/COTs will be placed on the PSMC website shortly.

Vendor Item Drawings: There are currently 121 VIDS available from DSCC covering 246 unique parts, all from TI. National Semiconductor has a number of VIDS in process at DSCC and should be available soon.

Aerospace Qualified Electronic Components: Using the AQEC in conjunction with the DSCC VID program will be discussed at the May JEDEC/G-12 meeting in Portland, Maine. This is a preliminary discussion on this idea so it is unclear where this will lead. There are concerns about what level of quality will be available through AQEC and if the aerospace community will use the DSCC VIDS/part numbers.

DMSMS Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

(Radian, Joe Hartline, Chairman; GIDEP, Vice-Subcommittee Chairman)

- The DMS Subcommittee will be working to completely revise the compendium of tools available.
- The DMS Subcommittee Chair will be presenting to the DoD Working Group at their meeting in Philadelphia in May.

Presentations: All presentations are available for viewing at www.dscc.dla.mil/PSMC

▪ **“Program Manager’s Handbook, Common Practices to Mitigate the Risk of Obsolescence” (DMEA)**

- ARMS – Advanced Reconfigurable Manufacturing for Semiconductors
No commercial conflicts
Complementary service to Sarnoff GEM program
- DMEA has only 136 total Professional Engineers as core staff
- LM Fire Control Texas – 2 boards redesigned by DMEA but never made it to production
- Program Manager’s Handbook derived from and incorporating the best of:
Navy: Case Resolution Procedures Guide
AFMC: DMSMS Program Case Resolution Guide
Army: DMS Case Resolution Guide

The handbook identifies “Triggers” (what is driving user) to implement or enhance an obsolescence program. It defines Level 1, 2, and 3 program practices with suggested actions and practices.

It includes a methodology to establish an Opportunity Index – business case analysis for problems and resolutions

Cost resolution metrics

Cost avoidance costs table does not include qualification and documentation costs

Reclamation is not recommended for microelectronics

Question: Raytheon: Does reclamation include die reclamation? DMEA: lets not get into that, you would have to be really desperate.

Lockheed Martin, AEGIS program, instead of calling a CCA a throw-away, recommend labeling it as replace on failure.

▪ **“DMSMS Tools” (GIDEP)**

- GIDEP has existed for 40 years.
- Since inception, GIDEP has reported over \$1 Billion in cost savings
- GIDEP has 3 sites available from their website:
 - Public, member, and parts databases
- GIDEP databases
 - Batch match for full BOMs
 - Urgent Data Request (can request parts or data)
- Training Quarterly, Clinic (hands on training), Workshop (symposium), GROW
 - GIDEP representative outreach program, come to train on our site
 - Registration fees involved
- Participant directory
- Networking for solutions
- DMSMS Center of Excellence
 - Materials aspect becoming increasingly important
 - 2005 transition date to GIDEP

- Goal is to develop a non-redundant solution platform

Questions:

- Does this go back into service data-bases
- Where does COE R&M and maintenance data come from??
- Network of vendors to procure/deliver products
- Data Warehousing – linking available DMSMS databases via Portals

gidep@gidep.org

<http://members.gidep.org>

- **“DMSMS Solutions-Problems and Issues from the Contractor’s Perspective” (Radian MILPARTS)**
 - DMS is exasperated by system inertia
 - Administrative lead-time (ALT)
 - Dependencies
 - Requirements
 - Communications
 - Commitment
 - SAR (source and repair) Approval process
 - Contracting
 - When is a requirement real
 - P/N, qty, need date
 - A MARC – The Davis-Mothan AFB aircraft storage and recovery facility “boneyard” can be used to fill demand for one or two items selected from the best in the inventory
 - Quantities of lot buy needs are hard to establish
 - Age related wear-out is increasing
 - Cannibalization is a short term solution which masks the overall problem
 - JEDMICS- even L3 dwg packages can be inadequate- assy drawings not always suited for manufacturing
 - Supplier process changes can impact availability
 - 339 form should be an obvious data stream
 - What is a backorder (definition)? Every entity has its own unique definition
 - Samples of initiatives currently underway for DMSMS:
 - AF SLUPI – Strategic Low Use Parts Initiative
 - WR-ALC C-5 pilot project
 - Part characterization vs. FSC system
 - Forgings were done in past, today newer technology to heat treat
 - NAVAIR Aging A/C IPT – develop solutions but send back to program office for implementation
 - DSCP Market baskets
 - Pre-positioned supplier by FSC
 - Not really viable
 - Lockheed – parts with no supplier, symposium to find buyers??
 - AF Aging A/C – technology/mechanics of aging only
 - DMS Solutions
 - Taking No action doesn’t produce repercussions

- Taking action can produce repercussions if wrong decision is made
- 25% rule and quantities of one
- Return on Investment – the criteria for evaluation needs to change from simply parts vs. dollars spent. The new equation based on a qualitative cost benefit analysis should consider the difference between not having the part and the difficulty in having a viable vendor. The Qualitative elements on both sides of the equation are:
 - Reverse engineering cost
 - FAT
 - Limited production quantities
 Compared to:
 - Reduced ALT
 - Reduced PLT
 - Increased customer satisfaction

Wednesday, April 21st

Government Chair reconvened the meeting and proceeded with the agenda.

- DMS/FAR Discussion – DoD 4140.7-R
- GIDEP - Addition to DFAR
 - paragraph 207.105 “contents of written acquisition plans”
 - section (b)(13)
 - Where do we go from here?
 - Action to see if FAR needs update?
 - FAR Committee

<http://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/dfars/changes.htm>

- DMS White Paper Discussion (Radian MILPARTS)
- White paper to make DMS solution trail easier to navigate
- Looking for ideas/comments to be placed into white paper, would footnote contributions
- Expect to have draft for review complete by fall meeting
- The basic issue is to reduce the empirical cost metric of preparing 10 bids to address DMS issues and receive only one award.
- RFQs issued with short fuses and often no follow-up
- AMCOM attempting to write best practice. Send input to AMCOM.

Parts Management Transformation (PMT) Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

(Boeing, Chairman; DSCC, Vice-Subcommittee Chairman)

General discussion took place concerning Parts Management Transformation. Boeing presented the following discussion topics.

“PSMC Parts Management Transformation Subcommittee” (Boeing Integrated Defense Systems)

This subcommittee will interact with the PMRWG at the next meeting (Oct 04).

Presentations:

“Parts Management Transformation for the Supplier” (Honeywell Airframe Systems)

Legacy

NSPAR

Customer supplied PPSL

Legacy process had wait-time for feedback

Currently more commercial than military (60%-40%)

Would need to be more personnel to support legacy process

Increased cost

Created company PPSL, PM policy

Helping suppliers below them write their plans

Company and site policies

Suggest changes to preferred parts on PLs

Substitution list (equal to or better than parts)

Personnel went from 6 to 2

FAA and commercial requirements in many cases are stricter than DoD

1 PPL for corporation and 1 PPL for the Torrance site

“Lockheed Martin Part Management Plan Guideline” (Lockheed Martin MS2, Moorestown, NJ)

Lockheed Martin corporate, Camden, NJ 1989 heritage from GE

Engineering Process Improvement Center (EPIC)

Monthly newsletter, email forums, focus on business wide issues

2000 focus on commercial technology insertion (CTI-PG)

EIA 4899 compliant for PM

LM obsolescence management plan guidelines

Created lexicon for definitions spanning LM sites, also addresses who is responsible for issues

Individuals selecting parts have to get part approvals

Myparts – part generating program at LM – ids if part has been used before

C-17, LSAR, MTBF

An open forum session following the previous presentation led to discussion on the following issues:

Performance Based Logistics contracts awarded to OEMs and the fact that there are few if any requirements in such contracts that encourage standardization across programs and platforms.

Thursday, April 22nd

Government Chair reconvened the meeting and proceeded with the agenda.

Parts Management Education/Documentation Subcommittee Minutes

(Honeywell, Chairman; Military Chair, Vice-Subcommittee Chairman)

PM Education slides reviewed in the meeting

Honeywell looking for technology insertion – Government Chair will provide
ID source of dollar figures in notes

ROI chart needs to address not only return but what is the investment

Presentations:

“Expanding the Usefulness of Your parts management Solutions through Reference Content” (IHS Engineering)

Information Handling Systems

Expanding the value of Parts Management solutions through reference content

Boeing, GM, BAe, United Technologies

Adding the value of reference content

Global spec has made Thomas Register better, internet searchable

Beta launch of fastener catalog/database to find standard fasteners

IHS work at NAVAIR Aging A/C, WR, etc on e-portal

USAF Aging A/C program now called “Enterprise?”

Organizations must begin treating mission critical data as a business asset

Practical real world applications

AF MRO parts database

Flat file, less than 50% accurate

Linked to digitized tech data

DMS e-portal

Can be tailored for each individual user

Defense Sustainment Consortium

Portal platform built on Plumtree

Search Haystack, JEDMICs, Specs & Stds, TOs, etc all from one screen

70% reduction in effort

General Session Wrap-Up

Subcommittee action items:

Charter: Any comments to charter, provide to AMCOM

Education: Looking for comments on presentation

PEMS/COTS:

Latest status on VIDs, AQEC teaming on VIDs

Ideas for discussion at next meeting

DMSMS a couple white papers

Chair's presentation will be shortened

FAR write-up: approach OSD

Also attending DMSMS working group and will get minutes to PSMC

The FAR will be moved forward

Repair data for CLS contracts, needs to be a deliverable

What would incentivize parts management

Grade contractor PM plans

PM should be presented as part of systems engineering "game"

Must have a PM plan referenced in contract

No upper level references to DoD 4120.4

Support systems envelope – draft from DLIS

Contained a statement about commonality

Need to require PM in govt contract requirements

Systems Engineering Center of Excellence – WPAFB

Should there be a CDRL? Govt doesn't want the paper

Contractors' proposals graded on PM content possibly but in some cases the OEM may not be aware of it

Conference participants included representatives from: Anteon Corporation; Air Force Aeronautical Systems Center (Wright Patterson AFB); Air Force Logistics Information Support Office (Battlecreek); Army Aviation & Missile Command (Redstone Arsenal); Boeing (St

Louis); Defense Logistics Agency (Ft. Belvoir, Columbus, & Richmond); Defense Logistics Information Services (Battlecreek); Defense Microelectronics Activity (DMEA); Defense Standardization Program Office; Government0Industry Data Exchange Program (GIDEP); Honeywell (Torrance); Information Handling Services (HIS); Intuitive Research & Technology; Inventory Locator Service (ILS); Lansdale Semiconductor; Lockheed Martin (Dallas & Moorestown); MTI; Naval Air Systems Command (Lakehurst); Naval Inventory Control Point (Philadelphia); Naval Surface Warfare Center (Crane); Parker Hannifin; Radian MILPARTS; Raytheon (Indianapolis); and SRA International.