SECOND NAVAL TRAINING DEVICE CENTER/INDUSTRY CONFERENCE THEME

TECHNOLOGY IN TRAINING

DR. H. H. WOLFF
Technical Director
Naval Training Device Center

It is a pleasure to welcome you to the Second Naval Training Device Center/Industry Conference. As most of you know, this conference grew from an idea for a problem-solving meeting for a specific trainer area. It was NTDC's late Commanding Officer, CAPT. J. K. Sloatman, who supported and encouraged the idea of a conference that would deal with NTDC's and the Training Industry's problems on a broad basis.

Though we received many favorable comments last year from Industry and other Government Agency attendees, I feel that the real proof of usefulness is in the continued interest shown by other participating Government activities, and the Trainer Industry.

Soon after we had sent out the invitations we were assured of the desirability for this second conference. In fact, the response and the requests for attendance by companies that did not participate in last year's conference were such that we feel we did the right thing when we limited the attendance to two persons from each Company. Three times as many companies asked for admission and we were forced to turn down a number of requests due to limited space.

In addition, our bosses' bosses' boss from the Office of the Secretary of Defense requested that we invite a specific group of officers and civilians from other Government activities. I like to welcome these gentlemen here especially, since their interest and attendance provide further proof of the value of this conference.

We do not know yet what we will do in the future. The large session facilities on the Base are not very satisfactory for a conference of this type. On the other hand, we do not like to go to an outside hotel facility. We may--though reluctantly--have to apply further restrictions to admissions, but we will, under any circumstances, ensure that those who could not be admitted will receive the conference reports.

Our request for Industry participation in the presentations was not very successful last year. However, this time the number of papers that were submitted by Industry was so large that we were confronted with a selection problem, since we planned to have a balance between Industry and Government presentations. Like last year, we will publish most of the papers presented and, in addition, we will publish a number of papers that were submitted but could not be presented from the platform due to lack of time.

I might add that we have already received a number of requests to present papers for next year's conference, as well as a large number of requests for attendance.

Much of our effort during our last year's conference was to inform Industry about the organization of the Naval Training Device Center, and the Army Participation Group, and to give Industry an insight into our operation.

I think that several important items were discussed that may have assisted you in understanding our procedures. Among the key presentations was the one dealing with the Navy's program cycle, to which we at the Center, as well as you in Industry, have to respond. The TDP (Technical Development Plan) is now a fact of life here at the Center. It is a detailed descriptive plan of the effort necessary to accomplish a specific project. These project plans are then integrated into the total planning, programming and budgeting process of the Navy.

As an outgrowth of this process and of your request for our future plans, information on programs for Fiscal Year 1968 was published last May in the Commerce Business Daily.

This morning we will give you an opportunity to look further ahead, for you will hear from the Navy's Requirement Divisions as well as from the Army and the Marine Corps about their training systems needs in the not-too-distant future.

The field of training has made much progress over the last decade, but there are still many areas of present requirements where a better use of present day technology is needed.

Our operational weapons systems are entering into the second or third generation of development and production. However, training techniques have not made the corresponding progress that would lead to an optimum utilization of modern hardware. In too many cases the training equipment designers tend to concentrate on the simulation of operational hardware without giving enough attention to the problems of the military instructor and his students.

The military educator and our technical community, both in Industry and in Government, have to cooperate much more to achieve a product that will not only satisfy the general training mission of the training agency, but be both cost-effective and, last but not least, training-time effective.

I like to take this opportunity to re-emphasize the importance of the Zero-Defects Program and of the Value Engineering Program. Both must be kept alive and not be degraded to propaganda slogans.

While our aim is, of course, to have maintenance-free equipment, the various maintenance problems will still be with us for quite a number of years.

If we consider the tremendous complexity of our present-day training systems and the shortage of trained maintenance personnel, I feel that none of us has really done his utmost to use modern technology, taken in the broadest sense, to overcome the consequences of this condition.

We have not paid enough attention to our software and we have not made enough use of automatic failure indicators and analyzers. In this context I would like to call your attention to a relatively new CNM Instruction 3960.4 of 31 July 1967, (Automatic Test Equipment, Policy for Development and Acquisition of,) which you will soon find reflected in our specifications.

Efforts to combat the maintenance personnel problem on the broadest front will have an important bearing in the evaluation of future procurements.

This year's agenda concentrates on the technical problems confronting organizations having a prime interest in simulation for training. Both the equipment and the operational situation which we must simulate are becoming more complex. The techniques of simulation are also increasing in both numbers and complexity. A real challenge today is to develop the necessary technical solution and still remain cost effective. The technical viewpoints exchanged during this conference should be stimulating and lead to better technical and cost-effective solutions in the future.

I am sure that this conference will give all of us an opportunity to learn new techniques and hear about new ideas. It is important that we identify and define all of our problem areas in discussions during this conference and concentrate vigorously on the solution of these problems.

I am certain that this conference will be as productive as the last one.