MBDA Craig Randall S-Series Comments (1)

- A small number of programmes, mainly from European Countries, prescribe the ASD S Series, but in an inconsistent way.
- For example, requested S1000D with a mix of issues 2.3 and 4.1, S2000M mandated 7.0 but requested the DEDs from 5.0, and S3000L they requested 1.1 whilst 2.0 is available.
- We have received excel templates that automate population of the ASD S series tool they use but there are instances where they want data that isn't available (for example scrap rate - we do not have sufficient statistically significant repairs to calculate it), but then ask that we put values in anyway, **guidance on this would be useful**.
- Other programmes we have worked closely with the Customer to understand their data needs, and some of them are switched on; using S Series terminology consistently.

MBDA Craig Randall S-Series Comments (2)

- One of the key issues is with already in service Military Off The Self equipment, with complete technical publications, yet we receive requests for S3000L Task, Sub-Task structures, including definition of the Start-up, Core and Close-up aspects.
- The Support Analysis and Task Analysis has already been conducted for some of the In-Service Equipment and informed the technical publications process, but does not have the S3000L Task Analysis structures, e.g. it pre-dated the adoption of a S3000L compliant system.
- Effectively we are being asked to re do Task Analysis in the S3000L format for a MOTS product, which drives cost not efficiency, and whilst we are migrating our products over to S3000L tools, it appears as though there is no real tailoring conducted for consideration of MOTS equipment, and the Specification does not provide clear guidance on this.
- For example, it is the purpose of the Task Analysis for a development project to determine the resources and procedural steps to perform a maintenance activity, the net outcome is the Technical Publication that the end user sees, **S3000L could be clearer in providing the guidance around inclusion of Task Analysis data for MOTS / COTS products that entered service prior to formal adoption of S3000 Task Analysis structures and data requirements**, e.g the S1000D Data Modules / publications of MOTS products takes precedent over Task Structures.
- Revisiting Task Analysis to adapt it into a S Series format drive costs up unnecessarily, shouldn't one of the primary aims of standardisation seek to reduce additional / duplicative work, especially when considering the whole purpose of Task Analysis.

MBDA Craig Randall S-Series Comments (3)

- The next point is about Task Personnel Resource Competence, and role as per S3000L.
- We have had specific values provided by a customer (Leading Hand etc) to populate in the TPRC column, S3000L gives the flexibility to do this, and allows Roles to be defined e.g. Person 1, Person 2, but it does not align with the allowable values of S1000D (which tends to use Person A, Person B).
- Therefore, there is a need **to map all of the S Series where data is supposed to flow between the standards - or provide improved guidance on allowable values for roles in S3000L that will subsequently map to S1000D.**
- If there is flexibility to assign values for project defined roles, then the S1000D fields should be flexible to receive the variations of roles that may be defined by different customers or S Series Specifications.

MBDA Craig Randall S-Series Comments (4)

- Another example is that of S2000M to S1000D hardwarePartProvisioningCategory (ITY) to PartsUsageCode.
- They should be the same list, but they are not. When using automated tools that pull information from S3000 & S2000 tool and runs through a parser, it returns errors due to the differences. Whilst this can be resolved locally, it takes time and can differ from project to project, not a standardised approach.
- Another issue is the hardwarePartProvisioningCategory (ITY) which has grown slightly to include StandardTool (ST) but has not included Special Tools which doesn't follow logic, both are support equipment (AG) so what is the purpose of specifying Standard Tools as an ITY and omit Special Tools? Perhaps use HT for Standard Hand Tool and ST for Special Tool.
- Whilst the above may appear minor, these are all points that have instigated some level of Customer discussion and delay for interpretation of specifications.