



2008 Technical Maturity Conference

Technology Transition on the C-17 Aircraft

Authors:

Richard Reams – USAF

Andrew Harber – The Boeing Company

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE SEP 2008		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2008 to 00-00-2008	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Technology Transition on the C-17 Aircraft				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) ASC/ENFS,2530 Loop Rd West Bldg 560,Wright Patterson AFB,OH,45433				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES See also ADM002183. Presented at the Technology Maturity Conference held in Virginia Beach, Virginia on 9-12 September 2008.					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 29	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			



Technology Development



- Technology development done at various places:
 - Government labs (e.g. – Air Force Research Laboratory)
 - Aircraft manufacturer labs (e.g. – Boeing Phantom Works)
 - Independent labs
 - Universities
- Special interests drive technology development:
 - Better performance (higher, faster, lighter, etc.)
 - Lower cost (manufacturing and operating)
 - Higher reliability
 - Longer life
 - Etc.



Technology Transition Challenges



- Technology must “buy” its way onto the system
 - New materials, manufacturing methods, etc. need to be competitive with current products
 - Technology should offer a benefit to the customer (higher performance, less weight, reduced maintenance, higher reliability, etc.)
- Aircraft manufacturers want multiple, reliable, and low cost sources for production and sustainment
 - Risks must be taken by the manufacturers and operators to adopt unique materials, new technology, etc.
 - Technology must be manufacturable, producible, repairable, available, etc.



U.S. AIR FORCE

Technology Application

- Finding an appropriate *application* of new technology is just as important as developing and certifying the technology
 - Good technologies applied poorly will not be successful
 - Material and product form selection for structures is critical
- New structural / material technologies have historically been applied initially to tertiary or secondary structures
 - Gathering in-service performance is highly desirable
 - Primary structure applications may follow if field experience is favorable
- New applications should have minimal impact to the customer



U.S. AIR FORCE

What to Transition



- Plenty of screening and readiness assessment tools are available
- All tools try to answer the following questions:
 - How much will this save?
 - When will it be ready for production?
 - What are the risks?
 - Is this the best option?
 - How to prioritize?

What “sieve” do we pass potential technologies through to answer these questions?



U.S. AIR FORCE

Transition Tools



- Technology Transition Tools:
 - Technology/Manufacturing Readiness Levels (TRLs/MRLs)
 - Technology/Manufacturing Readiness Assessments (TRAs/MRAs)
- TRLs provide a common standard for:
 - Assessing the **performance maturity** of a technology and plans for its future maturation
 - Understanding the level of **performance risk** in trying to transition the technology into a weapon system application
- MRLs are a common language and standard for:
 - Assessing the **manufacturing maturity** of a technology or product and plans for its future maturation
 - Understanding the level of **manufacturing risk** in trying to produce a weapon system or transition the technology into a weapon system application



Systems Engineering Approach



1. Who is your customer(s)? How are you involving them in the program?
2. What are customers specific/comprehensive requirements? What must you achieve to make the program viable? (Exit Criteria)
3. How will you demonstrate you have met the requirements?
4. What are the technology options to respond to the requirements and what is the best approach? Why?
5. What are the risks to developing the selected technology?
6. How will you structure your program to meet requirements (Exit Criteria) and account for risk? Have you coordinated all key aspects with your customer?
7. What is the business case for transitioning this technology. Are you collecting the needed info. What is your transition strategy? Do your business/transition plans have customer approval?



Andy's 6 "Magic" Questions



- How much does this technology improve performance?
- Is there a Strategic Need for this?
- Is it applicable to other areas?
- When will it REALLY be ready for use?
- When can I REALLY get it "on the jet?"
- What is the TOTAL cost/benefit?



Notional Cost Benefit Matrix



Factory			Field	
	COST	SAVINGS	COST	SAVINGS
Contractor Lab	X			
Government Lab	X			
Program Office / Customer			X	X
Supplier	X			
Manufacturer (OEM)	X	X		
Total	X	X	X	X



U.S. AIR FORCE

“The Question”




- A laboratory has developed a new technology...
 - Readiness tools have been used to the maximum extent:
 - Technology is mature – TRL=7
 - Manufacturers are ready – MRL=7/8
- Designers have found a great application...
- The technology is cheaper to build in the factory...
- The customer wants the technology...
- So...

Why can't we just build it and put it on the airplane???



U.S. AIR FORCE


"The Standoff"



A "standoff" exists between the laboratories and the program offices in order to move from TRL=7 to TRL=8



Implementation and Certification





Technology Implementation



- Implementation of technology requires a non-recurring investment to “get it on the airplane”
- Non-recurring effort can be large:
 - Drawing changes (paper and electronic)
 - Model updates (finite element, thermal, etc.)
 - Material, processing, and fabrication specifications
 - Updates to technical and maintenance manuals
 - Manufacturing tooling
 - Shop floor training

Understanding non-recurring cost investment is critical



Airworthiness Certification



- Airworthiness Certification
 - A repeatable process implemented to verify that a specific air vehicle system can be, or has been, safely maintained and operated within its described flight envelope.
- USAF and USN use MIL-HDBK-516 “Airworthiness Certification Criteria”
 - Describes the certification process and provides criteria to assess the degree of airworthiness
 - Covers all airframe, aircraft systems, avionics, etc.
 - Tailored by weapon system
- FAA use the Federal Aviation Regulations (FARs)
 - Parts 21 through 49 for aircraft



U.S. AIR FORCE

Certification Impacts



- Cost and schedule impacts for certification need to be understood
 - Communications with certification agency are mandatory to determine requirements
 - Need to understand specific requirements: documentation, build records, material certifications, etc.
 - Additional analysis, testing, qualifications, etc. may be required by the certification agency to prove airworthiness

Understanding the certification requirements is key to successful technology transitions



C-17 Technology Transition and Projects



- Address technology transition process
- Provide examples of successful and not so successful airframe technology projects on the Boeing C-17 Globemaster III aircraft
- Show customer needs and the impacts of the non-recurring and certification effort





C-17 Technology Planning Process



Capability Focus Areas

Precise Delivery

Survivability


Efficient Operations

Reduce Life Cycle Cost

Capability Roadmaps

STRATEGIC CAPABILITY NEED	PRODUCTS / SERVICES									
PRECISE DELIVERY	Precision Airdrop					Autonomous Landing Operations				
SURVIVABILITY	Improved Crew Armor	Advanced Situational Awareness	Defensive Systems			Counter Measures	ASACM Integration	Oxygen Sensors		
EFFICIENT OPERATIONS	Airborne Networking	Lab Modernization				Database Management System	Airborne Aircraft Carrier	LRU Obsolescence	Civil Aviation Rqmts.	
REDUCE LIFE CYCLE COST	Material Improvements					CBM-I/ISHM	FCC Diagnostics	Smart Sensors	Smart Actuators	
EFFICIENT SUSTAINMENT (under construction)						UID / RFID	ITEMs	JTAV	AIT	PMA's
								FDA	Others	
	2006-2008					2009 & BEYOND				
	TICR Board Approved					Pending Board Approval				

Technology Roadmaps



2008 Technical Maturity Conference


DISTRIBUTION A - Approved for Public Release; distribution unlimited.



Closing the Gap Between Dev. & Prod.




Technology Progression (Insertion Process-A)



Development

Production

SYSTEM ENGINEERING PHASES Employed in The C -17 Change Process (Insertion Process-B)



2008 Technical Maturity Conference


DISTRIBUTION A - Approved for Public Release; distribution unlimited.



Success: SRI MLG Doors



- Stitched/Resin Infused (S/RI) Composite Main Landing Gear (MLG) Doors
 - Resolved production issues with door loft and preload
 - Customer benefit – higher resistance to runway debris
 - Weight neutral
 - Non-recurring costs significant - covered by multiple parties
 - Secondary structure
 - Certification by analysis and similarity






Success: Monolithic Frames



- Monolithic Machined Aluminum Fuselage Bulkheads and Frames
 - Reduced manufacturing cost, part inventory, and assembly labor
 - Reduced weight
 - No impacts to customer
 - Primary structure – certification effort significant
 - All non-recurring costs including certification covered by recurring production savings







Success: FSW Ramp Toe Nails




- Friction Stir Welded (FSW) Titanium Ramp Toe Nails
 - Reduced production and spares costs
 - Saved weight
 - Non-recurring costs covered by recurring production savings
 - Certification costs minimized by application to tertiary structure





Success: Cast Pylon Nose Cap



- Cast Titanium Pylon Nosecap
 - Thin walled titanium casting replaced complex built-up structure
 - Original design costly to manufacture
 - No impact to customer
 - Non-recurring costs covered by recurring savings
 - Certification costs small - secondary structure



Success: Nacelle Strakes



- Foam Core Nacelle Strake
 - Construction changed from honeycomb to foam core
 - Saved material and machining costs
 - No impacts to customer
 - Tertiary structure - non-recurring and certification costs small





Limited Success: ARALL Cargo Door



- Aramid Reinforced Aluminum Laminate (ARALL) Door Skin
 - Original design - used on cargo door skins for first 40 aircraft
 - Raw material and manufacturing costs were high - complex joining required due to limited panel widths
 - Replaced with sheet aluminum for cost savings
 - No customer impacts
 - Secondary structure
 - Non-recurring and certification costs covered by recurring production savings



Limited Success: Al Li Fuselage Parts



- Aluminum Lithium Cargo Floor and Fuselage Stringers
 - Difficulties with manufacturability (warping and machining) and toxicity issues (chips and dust)
 - Changed to aluminum alloy for cost savings
 - Manufacturing challenges outweighed weight savings
 - Primary structure
 - Non-recurring and certification costs covered by recurring production savings





Limited Success: LAM Pylon Skins



- Laser Additive Manufacturing (LAM) Engine Pylon Sidewalls
 - Saved material and machining costs
 - Vendor decided to drop production for business reasons - built only 5 shipsets
 - Primary structure – large certification effort
 - Non-recurring and certification costs were to be amortized over production run




Unsuccessful: Machined Spars




■ Machined Front and Rear Wing Spars

- Spar caps integral to web in lieu of mechanically fastened caps – machine from thick aluminum plate
- Non-recurring costs likely paid by production savings
- Certification costs prohibitive – materials testing plus full scale static and durability tests of wing would have likely been required



Unsuccessful: Slat Track Cans



- Slat Track Can
 - Design change to save material and assembly costs
 - Impact to user – required separate spares and technical data
 - Minimal non-recurring cost
 - Secondary structure - certification by analysis and similarity



Conclusions and Recommendations



- Foster communication between technology developers and technology implementers
- Search for appropriate applications of technology
- Understand customer requirements and constraints
- Don't rely 100% on technology readiness tools
- Understand requirements of the certification agency
- Develop realistic cost estimates for non-recurring and certification efforts
- Technology has a higher probability of transitioning early in a program so that non-recurring costs can be amortized over the production run