AM Workshop After Action Report Call Minutes

29 June 2020

On 29 June 2020, the Additive Manufacturing (AM) Workshop Working Group (WG) Co-Leaders conducted a call to discuss lessons learned during the 23-25 June 2020 Virtual AM Workshop. The following were the main discussion points:

**Virtual Specific:**

* Need to identify someone dedicated to virtual support (Jenn Khoury was excellent)
* Would like to align sooner by having WGs and sub-WGs meet prior to the workshop. Late registrants will be an issue.
* Would like to have venues to work across the WGs to share thoughts and integrate topics
* The live event probably can’t be completely replaced, but some virtual prep and/or use of virtual tools during the workshop to enhance data gathering and input could be very effective.

 **Agenda/Format Specific:**

* Workshop vs Presentations. It was mentioned that some WGs agendas were heavy on presentations vs working in groups (break-outs), causing concern for some that the large number of attendees were not actively engaged. Some individuals preferred one method over another. It was agreed that when choosing a format, the virtual aspect must be considered, as conducting working groups (break-outs) requires a great deal of preparation, facilitation, virtual tools, and participation, but does allow more input from participants. Several groups utilized the “White Board” and “Chat” functions in Adobe Connect to increase dialogue.
* As an example, the TDP session of the DLA workshop did have many briefings. Nevertheless, even with the number of questions received after each brief, there was enough time to go through them. These were targeted briefings provided by TDP SMEs from government, industry and academia which are helping address JAMWG task #1.1: Common Technical Data Package standard developed, accepted by all Military Services and published. The workshop event was a great start and we intend to keep this core team engaged with the Joint AM Acceptability (JAMA) project as we move forward to achieve the JAMWG goal.
* The use of https://www.polleverywhere.com/app was a game changer in the Parts Selection / TDP Workgroup. Not only does it provide the ability to conduct brainstorming sessions, it also provides you better control of Q&A activities. It provides a real time visualization of how your response fits in the collective thinking of the topic. PollEv is among many other alternatives in this market sector that produces tools to keep the audience engaged without stepping over each other. Another advantage is that it keeps your input anonymous so that introverts and extroverts have the same chance to provide input. This type of tool is certainly a keeper for virtual or live AMMO Workshops.
* Workshop Size and Frequency. Look at some smaller workshops throughout the year. Smaller focused workshops like 25-30 people max on a specific topic that is something like 4-6 hours over 2 days may be a good approach to get there.
* A 2nd day subgroup regroup was not necessary when we are virtually. That is more time folks could use in their groups or more of a break. In person that makes a lot more sense.
* WG Topics. The group agreed that the WG Topics selected were appropriate and also suggested two additional topics to add:
	+ Blockchain. While often included as a cybersecurity topic, blockchain is more encompassing and should be its’ own topic.
	+ Digital Thread. Connectivity at the enterprise level is extremely important and should be considered for an additional WG. This particularly could lend itself to some kind of scenario based experience if others are interested in helping plan this let’s discuss. There is a separate group out of the OSD Digital Engineering world working this and I think we could propose an integrated workshop. If you are interested let Kelly Visconti, kelly.visconti@pm2strategies.com, know!
* Duration. It was widely agreed that three consecutive full days doing a virtual workshop was exhausting for the co-leaders / facilitators / organizers. We also experienced many participants needing to break away from the WGs to attend other calls or work other tasks. Several people suggested a virtual framework with smaller segments over a longer time period.

**Admin Support**

* Admin support from NCMS was outstanding. Availability was never an issue.
	+ Registration
		- The registration process and website were very user friendly.
		- It was noted that the registration due date on the registration website, was not updated for a time period after the due date was extended.
		- Late registrants caused a great deal of late shuffling within the WGs and the late joiners did not have the information previously sent to the WG participants. Several late registrants “jumped” WGs to find better fits. It was suggested to have a hard registration due date.

**Briefings**

* Briefings utilized a set template and outline and were presented by the WG Co-leads themselves. Roughly ten minutes were allocated for each brief plus additional time for questions. All of the three plenary briefing sessions ended on time or ahead of time.
	+ The virtual environment resulted in fewer questions during the out briefs.
	+ The SES’s were not as engaged during the out briefs this year as last year. Could be due to the virtual format but need to consider new ways to prep the SES’s for the session.
	+ All the out briefs will be posted on the AM for Maintenance Operations (AMMO) WG website. Any additional information that the WG co-leads want posted will also be posted.
* It was recommended to add to the out brief a review of the products actually developed. No in-depth product discussion, but to show those and make sure those products are shared out. For example, in the Guidebook there will be a word document outline and next level of detail basically a strawman for the Guide – In the out brief, the “table of contents” was presented, but not the full doc, which will be shared out. That will be great to get from each group in a central repository.

**Next Steps / Follow-on**

* It was recommended that the WG Co-Leads send their WG outputs to their WGs to review , engage, and keep their WG members engaged.
* Also recommended that each of the subgroup leads look at the outcomes/action and develop a plan for the next steps and identify what you can do within your group, where is it someone else’s responsibility and do you need more resources to support (what and how much?).
	+ Would be great to get those action plans from each group as a follow up from the workshop by say mid-July. This becomes the input to the JAMWG planning and prioritization of topics and focus for the next year.
* Mini-Workshops were suggested as possible venues to continue work in the WGs.
* The AMMO WG monthly calls are also an available venue if WG Co-Leads would like to provide updates in the future.
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