



A Study of Critical Technology Events in the Development of Selected Army Weapons Systems

Army Science Conference

30 November 2006

Richard Chait and John Lyons

Center for Technology and National Security Policy

National Defense University

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 01 NOV 2006		2. REPORT TYPE N/A		3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE A Study of Critical Technology Events in the Development of Selected Army Weapons Systems				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) Center for Technology and National Security Policy National Defense University				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 ADM002075., The original document contains color images.					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 22	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			



Acknowledgments



- Tom Killion
- Hans Binnendijk
- Duncan Long
- Al Sciarretta
- Interviewees




Selected Army Systems





Objectives

- Study history of successfully fielded Army systems
- Gain insight into important factors underpinning system technology development by assessing
 - In-house, industry, and academic involvement
 - PM role
 - Funding source
 - Leveraging efforts
- Provide findings and recommendations to Army leadership to meet today's and tomorrow's S&T program management challenges




Approach

- Locate and interview key managers, S&Es and technicians (total ~140)
- Request key information in form of Critical Technology Events (CTEs). CTEs:
 - Are central technology events in the development of a weapons system that has led to a key capability
 - Include analyses, concepts, models, patents and processes
 - Can also include capability decisions made by management
 - Can originate in industry, in-house government labs, academia, or with international partners




Innovation Timeline






Evolution of the KE Projectile – Importance of Basic & Applied Research



Basic research still vital



CTE Count by Subsystem



Abrams (55)	Apache (44)	Stinger/Javelin (35)
Armaments (18)	Avionics & Weapons (20)	Warheads & Propulsion (9)
Armor (13)	Crew Protection (11)	Target Acquisition (18)
Power Train (9)	Power Train (10)	Guidance (5)
Vetronics and Fire Control (15)	Enabling Technologies (3)	Enabling Technologies (3)

Total CTEs: 134



Example CTEs (Abrams)



Category	CTEs
Armaments	120mm gun, penetrators and sabots
Armor	Welded hull, Special Armor
Power Train	Gas turbine engine, transmission
Vetronics and Fire Control	Digital architecture, FLIR common modules



Example CTEs (Apache)



Category	CTEs
Avionics & Weapons	TADS/PNVIS, IHADSS , and MMW radar
Crew Protection	Crashworthiness , composite materials
Power Train	T700 engine, transmission
Enabling Technologies	Modeling (“T” tail vibration problem)



Example CTEs (Stinger/Javelin)



Category	CTEs
Target acquisition	IR/UV detector, Imaging IR
Guidance	Laser ring gyros, tracker
Warhead and Propulsion	Propellant chemistry, tandem warhead
Enabling Technologies	M&S (HWIL)



Some CTE Sources

Government Labs

- Aberdeen PG
- Forts Belvoir, Eustis, Monmouth
- Arsenals Edgewood, Frankford, Picatinny, Redstone, Watertown, Watervliet
- NASA (Ames, Glenn, Langley)
- Navy (NRL, Indian Head)

Industry

- Chrysler
- GE
- GD
- GM
- Honeywell
- Hughes
- Martin Marietta
- Raytheon
- Rockwell
- TI

Other

- Academia (Delaware, Penn State)
- DARPA
- DOE (LL, Oak Ridge)
- International partners (Germany, UK)



CTE Source Summary

System	Gov't	Industry	Joint	Other*	CTE Total
Abrams	55%	18%	13%	14%	55
Apache	43%	20%	30%	7%	44
Missiles	17%	25%	50%	8%	35

* Those CTEs that were gov't management decisions or that were contributed by allies and academia



Teamwork and Collaboration



- Army in-house experts
- Industry technologists
- Academics
- Other U.S. Government labs
- Overseas allies




Role of Army Laboratories



- Contributed many CTEs
- Collaborated with others on CTEs
- Evaluated performance of prototypes, including fixes for technical problems
- Acted as consultants to contractors and to the Program Manager
- Acted as advisors to the Army to ensure a “smart buyer” capability



Key Factors in Army Labs' Success



- Experts with many years experience in Army specialties
- Ability to sustain efforts over many years
- Relatively low staff turnover
- Effective management
- Long term investments in special facilities – ranges, special laboratories, high performance computing
- Co-location of Army staff at NASA laboratories



Program Manager Role




Responsible for the programs after 6.1-6.3 complete

- Experienced staff – many staff from labs
- Long-standing relations with contractor personnel
- Oversight – systems integration
- Defended the programs when required



Involvement of the User Community



- Definition of needs and requirements
- Continuing discussions during development
- Champions for the programs



Cross-cutting Technologies




- C4ISR – IR technology, GPS, communications networks, microprocessors on the battlefield
- Modeling and simulation
- Materials – armor and armaments, structures, composites, ballistics



The Way Ahead

- Maintain strong in-house Army laboratories – staff, facilities, budget
 - Keep staff at the technical frontiers – use IPA authority, advanced education, details, exchanges, visiting S&Es
 - Alternate personnel systems – expand Lab Demo personnel systems to all DoD labs, add additional delegations of authority – LQUIP proposals
- More collaborations where industry leads technologies
- Continue to strengthen the ties among the in-house laboratories, the PM FCS, and the LSI team



Summary

- CTEs came primarily from the Army laboratories and industry
- CTEs came out of problem-driven research – the “Mining” phase
- Teamwork/collaboration among the participants was essential
- Army laboratory and industry experience was critical
- The Army should:
 - Maintain its laboratories
 - Keep top-flight scientists and engineers on staff
 - Continue to invest in facilities and research equipment
 - Seek permanent delegations of personnel authorities for its laboratories
- The Program Managers played very important roles especially in integration of technologies



Questions?

To Contact Us:

Chaitr@ndu.edu

Lyonsj@ndu.edu