



Successful First AESA Deployment through Application of Systems Engineering

Terry Duggan Scott Nichols Christopher Moore 29 October 2009



Outline

- Background
- Approach
- Systems Engineering Activities
- Results of Analyses
- Readiness Assessment
- What Happened
- Lessons Learned

Background

- Raytheon developed a new AESA radar for the F/A-18E/F aircraft under contract to Boeing for the US Navy
- After completion of OPEVAL and training, US Navy planned to deploy two full squadrons of 12 jets each with new AESA radars for a six month deployment in support of OIF/OEF.
 - One squadron on the USS Reagan deployed from San Diego, CA and one on the USS Roosevelt deployed from Norfolk, VA.
- US Navy/Boeing/Raytheon Team dedicated to deployment success!

Used a Systems Engineering Approach to Address All Aspects of First Deployments



- Created a joint team of Navy, Boeing and Raytheon representing the various disciplines required for a successful deployment
 - Squadron Commanders, pilots, maintainers, engineers, software engineers, field support technicians, repair management, etc
- Determined Success Criteria
 - Stability of hardware
 - Tactical performance
 - Inputs from Commanders
 - Inputs from Navy Maintainers
 - Inputs from USN PMO/DAPML
- Visited each of the 2 squadrons on each coast to conduct pre-deployment readiness review/coordination sessions
- Assess all Logistics Elements
- Developed Action Plan
 - Developed a readiness checklist
 - Spares, repairs, retrofits, IETMs, etc
- Worked Plan
- Supported Deployment
- Prepared Lesson Learned



- Hardware Readiness
 - Evaluate maturity of hardware to be deployed
 - Determined the minimal configuration of each radar LRU (WRA).
 - Identified hardware that needed to incorporate retrofits for radars to be deployed
- Evaluate Performance of Tactical Software
 - Analyzed OPEVAL and training data of various mission profiles
 - Analyzed data on various tactical software releases
 - Analyzed current problems/anomalies reported from fleet and pilots
 - Developed procedure to work-around critical anomalies
- Evaluate performance of BIT software
 - Ability to accurately Fault Detect
 - Ability to accurately Fault Isolate
 - False Alarm rate

Systems Engineering Assessment of All Logistics Elements

- Maintenance Concept
- Supply Support
- Repairs
- Depot Status
- Tech Reps
- IETMS
- PHST
- Maintenance Training
- Reliability
- Support Equipment
- Tools

Raytheon



Results of Analyses

| | | | | Priorities | | |
|----|--------------------------------|---|--------------|--------------|-----|--|
| | H/W List of Items | Comment | High | Med | Low | |
| 1 | Antenna Filter | Special tools and training will be needed. Difficult to do on airplane | | | | |
| 2 | Reload Spares with H4 OFP | GPP, ARI, PPM, SNBC, and MFA/BSC need to be loaded with H4, 8P | \checkmark | | | |
| 3 | Check busbar torques | Should check for torque value | | | | |
| 4 | Spare IRR Attach bolts | Top and bottom bolts (different bolts) have been know to strip and bind | | | | |
| | | - check torque value - spare bolts | | | | |
| 5 | MFA Attach bolts | - spare green loctite | | | | |
| 6 | FC Cables | extra set of FC cables for IQ and AL between CISP and REX | | | | |
| 7 | Spare RF Green Y Cable | RF cable between Antenna and REX | | | | |
| 8 | MFA Busbar Screws | see parts list | | | | |
| 9 | PCU Repair kit | upper bolt repair Vit | | | | |
| 10 | Spare IRR's | When the MSS to the fail, thire we ways to fix. 1 swap IRR 2- complete teardown of the IRR (risk of break if maint in the property) | \checkmark | | | |
| 11 | Cover Hinge Loctite | CISP, REX, RPS | | | | |
| 12 | WRA Shipping containers | | | | | |
| 13 | BIT Tool | Laptop which contains the BIT Tool to help roubleshoot | | | | |
| 14 | Check CAL information | Run the BIT CST and TR Element tests on the airplanes to trend performance | | | | |
| 15 | Subrack Spare Parts | Special tools and parts will be needed1/4 Turn Cover Fasteners, Attach bolts, EMI gasket, QD's (module and subrack) | | | | |
| 16 | Review A/C "Grey" failures | Some A/C were having issues at power up (FCAL not connecting) and Arrays failing and healing itself. It hasn't officially failed. | | \checkmark | | |
| 17 | Cable assembly for support pan | in case it breaks | | | | |

Mitigation:

- Recommend a spare radar
- Provide consumable parts for deployment



AESA Maintenance Concept



Developed Plan to Address Items in the Readiness Assessment



- Hardware upgrades
 - Plan for retrofitting Hardware
- Software Upgrades
 - Identified required version of tactical software (OFP)
 - Identified issues with software performance
 - Published new instructions for Pilots to mitigate or eliminate problems
- Generated a minimal Spares List
 - WRAs
 - Consumables
 - Special tools
- Ensured adequate repair contract in place
 - Arranged for surge capacity
- Identified Additional Maintainer Training
- Established a 24 hour help desk
- Established contract for tech reps to go to sea
- Provided list of required Support Equipment
- Communicated plan and status to all stakeholders weekly/daily

24 Hour Help Desk/Repair Communication Flow Process Implemented



Results of VFA-22 Squadron Deployment

- Deployed on cruise with 12 F/A-18F aircraft
- 6 month deployment (May to November)
 - 1,713 sorties flown
 - 3,773 hours flown
 - 19 Radar Parts (WRAs) ordered
 - 137 Maintenance Discrepancies written against the radar

Radar Reliability Exceeded Predictions and Maintainers Complained of Nothing to DO



Results of VFA-213 Squadron Deployment

- Deployed on cruise with 12 F/A-18F aircraft
- Over 7.5 month deployment (September to April)
 - 2,120 Sorties flown
 - 6,536 Hours flown
 - 24 Radar Parts (WRAs) ordered
 - 245 Maintenance actions written against the radar

Kaytheon



Lessons Learned - The Good

- Communications throughout the planning & deployment crucial
- Getting all the stakeholders involved early led to better planning and execution
- The work-around procedures eliminated the previously experienced pilot problems
- Had the right set of Support Equipment to perform majority of required maintenance actions
- Had sufficient spares on board
- Broken Non-Classified Hardware was quickly removed and sent back to Raytheon for repair
- Additional tools and consumables were useful
- Great support from 24 hour help desk
- Prior to deployment, the verification of spares, consumables and support equipment paid huge dividends while deployed!
 - Inventory discrepancies
 - Incorrect NIIN's
 - Wrong location
 - Missing quantities

Did it but could have been easier

Lessons Learned – The Not so Good

- Was very difficult and time consuming to perform pre-deployment verification of spares, consumables and support equipment
- Lacked ability to remove Integrated Radar Rack without improvising a stand and using extra bodies
- Process to get broken classified hardware off the ship and back to depot was inconsistent and slow.
- Didn't identify all the consumables that were needed.
 - Missing one cable



VFA-22 & VFA-213 and AESA

- First AESA squadrons to:
 - Complete the workup cycle
 - Fly Combat Missions
 - Drop ordnance in Combat
 - Fire the gun in Combat
 - Complete a successful CVN deployment
 - Numerous AESA articles written
 - Defense daily
 - Stars and Stripes
 - Sea Power Magazine

A Successful Deployment – Setting the Standard

Question and Answer



