

Security Assistance Training: A Plan for System Sales

By

**Captain Michael J. Maloney, USAF
and
Mr. John O. Lincoln**

INTRODUCTION

Difficulties which may occur during the management of a major system sale may be overridden by the preparation of a comprehensive and well organized training plan by the Security Assistance Organization (SAO) training officer. A training plan that is realistic considers the manpower base of the host country, the skills that must be developed, and the background and experience of the host countries military. It will allow all parties to manage and evaluate training in the planning stages, during the implementation phase, and upon completion. The training plan should include both CONUS training and all in-country activities. A well defined and documented training plan can be administered by any SAO training officer regardless of tour length or when the officer takes over during the life of the system sale. In addition to the newly purchased system, the SAO training officer must also be prepared to devise a training plan to ensure continued support for the host country's existing systems--the systems which now may be overshadowed by the new system but are still functional and must be maintained.

MAJOR SYSTEM SALE TRAINING

In order to avoid spending much of the time in a state of crisis management over a pending system sale, the training officer must work within a set of guidelines. Those guidelines are called a System Sale Training Plan (SSTP). While no two systems are treated or worked exactly the same (i.e., tanks, ships, or aircraft) nor are the countries the same, all have similar basic requirements, making the training plan virtually generic. While a basic training plan can be determined for any system, the well defined program can only be put together based on the unique requirements and known capabilities of the particular host country. This plan will allow the SAO training officer to use a team of "experts" to help build the basic training requirements. On a typical F-16 aircraft sale for example, the following organizations make up the "training team": the Foreign Military Training Affairs Group (FMTAG), which is responsible for the overall management of the USAF Security Assistance Training Program; Headquarters Air Training Command (HQ ATC) as technical training experts; Tactical Air Command Security Assistance Office (TACSAO) as flying training experts (for fighter aircraft); Headquarters Tactical Air Command (HQ TAC) as On-The-Job training/flightline maintenance experts (for fighter aircraft); the Defense Language Institute, English Language Center (DLIELC), for English language training; and if a contractor is involved, a contractor training representative, who is an expert in his company's specific system.

TRAINING PLAN PREPARATION

When a host country first expresses an interest in a particular system, it will process a letter of request for Planning and Review (P&R) or Price and Availability (P&A) data for that system and its related support package. The initial training outline, which serves as a base for the training plan, will come as a result of a coordinated effort of the "training team" to provide P&R/P&A data for training and training-related items. Each team member provides information from their areas of expertise to "build" the P&R/P&A data. Regardless of the type of system being purchased, there

are specific ground rules that apply to developing P&R/P&A. For example, when developing P&R/P&A for an aircraft purchase one must consider the following: how many aircraft are being purchased, what is the specific aircraft configuration, how will the planes be based (i.e., how many squadrons will be established and how many main operating bases (MOBs) will be utilized, as well as the proposed aircraft utilization rate (flying hours per month). By the time that the initial P&A data is forwarded to a host country and the letter of Offer/Acceptance (LOA) is written, all the members of the "team" have provided information from their area of expertise. Once the LOA is signed, all of these organizations should be brought together in the host country for an initial (training) site survey. (Note: the initial site survey in a FMS program normally takes place within six months after the signature of the LOA). Each member of the "team" should provide input from their particular area of expertise, with the SAO training officer acting as a liaison with the host country counterparts, providing the team valuable country-unique information. It is during the training site survey that the team tries to develop a better understanding of the host country's particular training situation. A typical survey would include visits to existing maintenance facilities/shops and training facilities as well as discussions with host country representatives on their military's organization, AFSC/MOS structures, and maintenance and operations procedures. The site survey becomes the basis for the training plan. The SAO training officer must look beyond immediate needs and consider continuing and future needs as well.

Upon completion of the initial site survey, the following information will be known and used as the foundation of the training plan: identification of the approach to training that the host country will take; the total skill requirement to support the new system; determination as to the best source of training; where the newly formed skills can best be developed; what special training facilities are necessary; and what training equipment is necessary to teach these required skills.

The SAO training officer will most likely be the lone training representative in-country, and it will be his/her responsibility to ensure that all of the country-unique items that might affect the training plan are known to other members of the training team. This will require the training officer to be knowledgeable of the following: the host country's military organizational structure; the existing military school systems (how personnel are brought into the service and trained in a specific skill); the existing training programs for a particular service; host military schools; and the present maintenance and operations concept/policy of the host country, to include its experience with the new or similar systems. If no DLI representative is available from in-country resources, the training officer must also be aware of the host countries in-country English language training capability and capacity and their overall English speaking capability.

Granted, there is a distinct advantage to the training officer who is stationed in a country which has a military system patterned after the United States. What may prove to be difficult to the training officer is dealing with a different system but one which is "close" to that of the United States, especially in the area of skill field identification. The SAO training officer must be able to match up the duties and responsibilities of the Air Force Specialty Codes (AFSCs) or the Military Occupational Specialties (MOSs) of the US and that of the host country. For example, some foreign air forces are not specialized and therefore do not employ the same number of technicians per aircraft that the USAF does. These foreign air force technicians have duties and responsibilities that overlap one, two, or three of their USAF counterparts duties, thereby making training difficult to arrange. Even more difficult are countries that have the same skill codes (i.e., AFSCs), but different job descriptions. For example, a host country air force non-commissioned officer (NCO) may hold a 326XC (Communications/Navigation Technician) the same as the US, but he works on the fire control system of an aircraft while the USAF technician who has the exact same number may not. It will take close coordination with both host country personnel and the training team to ensure that the correct students receive the correct training to do their job once they return home. To an SAO training officer, not being familiar with these types of information about the host country's military forces, even to the smallest detail, could prove to be detrimental to the entire

training program, if not immediately, at least during the implementation portion of the training program.

With the information obtained from coordination with the other "training team" members, plus a training survey, and information gathered on the unique aspects of the host country, the SAO training officer should be prepared to put together a comprehensive, well defined training program.

THE SYSTEM SALE TRAINING PLAN

The SSTP should cover at least four major areas: a Unit Manning Document (UMD), English language, training requirements, and a master schedule.

UNIT MANNING DOCUMENT

The key to the successful maintenance and operation of a newly acquired weapon system is a stable, experienced work force. The creation of a Unit Manning Document (UMD) is one of the most important steps to ensuring such a work force. To assure that the required manpower is available within the host country to meet the mission requirements, a UMD must be created in the very early stages of the program. These manpower requirements must be identified with sufficient leadtime for recruiting (if it is determined that additional manpower is required), training, and assignment of personnel. At least one or two years lead time may be required to ensure an adequate number of personnel are available to support the newly acquired system. It is for this reason that the best time to have the document created is during or immediately following the initial training site survey. Very simply, the host country should review the AFSC/MOSs involved in training for the new system and outline (with the training team offering advice) the mix of students (AFSCs) needed for each work center. Depending on the maintenance policy/philosophy of the host country, they would determine exactly how many personnel they require to operate and maintain the new system. Even though this sounds simple, it is many times over shadowed or overlooked by complete acceptance of a cadre approach CONUS training package. In this situation, the training plan might become the UMD leaving a false impression of the total training requirements for the system. The cadre approach takes into consideration only a limited portion of the total Trained Personnel Requirements (TPR) required to support the full complement of the system. For example, for a newly formed F-16 squadron (assuming 12 aircraft and the host country's UMD indicates 9 technicians per aircraft), the cadre approach can be used to train up to 65 direct maintenance personnel and 18 instructors to be able to maintain the initial aircraft delivery as well as begin teaching in an in-country school. The direct maintenance requirements to maintain the *entire complement* of aircraft, (which may arrive in-country within six months) will drive the need to train at least 43 more direct maintenance technicians. Once again, the ability to be able to assist the host country in the creation of a UMD requires knowledge of the host countries military, their limitations and strengths on manpower, their school system capabilities and capacities, as well as other cultural uniquenesses.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING (ELT) CONSIDERATIONS

In those FMS cases where English language proficiency training is a factor in the development and execution of the System Sale Training Plan (SSTP), there are numerous ELT-related details which are pivotal to success, and which must be understood and agreed on by all parties involved, including the client country, in structuring the SSTP. Fundamental issues which have to be settled early-on might include: consideration of writing DLIELC-conducted Specialized English Training (SET) into the SSTP; agreement on English language proficiency prerequisites for in-country contractor training; constructing an in-country ELT and CONUS DOD/contractor training pipeline that articulates with the weapon system delivery; and assessment of the client's ELT capability to meet existing in-country English training requirements, such as those supporting an on-going IMET Program, plus those ELT needs soon to be superimposed by the new system

acquisition. For such reasons, DLIELC should be represented on the training team that develops a case's SSTP from day one.

Very early in the development of the SSTP, training planners have to decide on the issue of whether or not to write DLIELC-conducted Specialized English Training (SET) into the case. Typically, SET is a nine-week block of language training conducted at DLIELC, Lackland AFB, Texas. For the student who must already be ECL-qualified, SET provides a valuable transition from in-country training institutions to new and often differently paced U.S. military or industrial training environments. SET prepares the trainee for the academic and cultural adjustments necessary to obtain maximum benefit from highly specialized with follow-on training. Since CONUS training varies considerably with respect to the weapon system, with who conducts the training, and with the education and experience levels of the personnel who will man and maintain the system, there are no hard-and-fast rules on establishing SET prerequisites. For example, if part or all of the training for the new equipment is to be conducted in established U.S. service school courses, the MILDEP has probably already either recommended or required SET as a prerequisite, and the MASL can be consulted for guidance. If, on the other hand, training is to be conducted by the system's manufacturer, it is possible that little thought will have been given to stipulating SET as a prerequisite. Unusual circumstances sometimes occur which eliminate SET from consideration, such as the actual case in one country where all trainees in a particular specialty possessed undergraduate degrees in related scientific fields from U.S. universities. As a rule of thumb, however, if a U.S. service school conducts training similar to that which is to be performed by a contractor, and the service school recommends or requires SET as a prerequisite, then SET should be seriously considered for inclusion in the SSTP. The returns are significant for a relatively small investment of time and money.

English Comprehension Level (ECL) prerequisites for CONUS service schools are published in the appropriate MASL; occasionally, however, an FMS case will contain provisions for in-country contractor training. If this training is to be conducted in English, training planners, including the contractor and the client country, need to agree on realistic ECL prerequisites. There is sometimes an inclination to set ECL requirements for in-country contractor training significantly lower than for equivalent training conducted in CONUS, on the assumption that translators will be available. Such a decision must be weighed very carefully in light of the increased potential for degrading the quality of the training. Although it will mean increased ELT time for those technicians scheduled for in-country technical training, thought should be given by the training team to setting ECL prerequisites as if the training were to be conducted in the CONUS.

In-country ELT can best be viewed in the wider perspective of the complete training sequence. The so-called "training pipeline" is constructed backwards, with the last training day in the "pipeline" planned to coincide as closely as possible with the system delivery. A variety of important activities comprise the total pipeline, including technical courses in the CONUS, perhaps SET at DLIELC, student out-processing time in the home country and, in many cases, in-country ELT. The devising of the ELT portion of the training plan is crucial to its success, since any serious delays with language qualifying trainees in-country could disrupt an entire training sequence. Furthermore, if problems with the ELT portion of the SSTP are of sufficient magnitude, many training sequences could be adversely affected and the projected activation date of the new weapon system would be delayed.

The amount of time which in-country ELT will require will depend on various factors, such as target ECL scores, current English proficiency levels, the experience and quality of the indigenous English Language Training Program (ELTP), the intensity of the ELT, and the willingness of unit commanders to release their personnel from duty to attend English classes. Since it is not unusual for some individuals to need a year or more of intensive training in-country to achieve high ECL scores, it is important for the training team to learn as much as possible about the system's trainees early in the planning stage. A dedicated screening effort should be made

early, focusing on existing language ability (DLIELC's American Language Course Placement Test, which scores like the ECL test, can be used) and technical background information on prior training and experience (locally made questionnaires may be used). After these data are assembled, language trainers will forecast ELT durations for each candidate.

During these preliminary activities, the SAO training officer will probably be receiving periodic updates from U.S. training commands on the case's training schedule. As soon as Work Sheet Control Numbers (WSCNs) have been assigned and report dates are known, he can "go to press" with a locally prepared ELTP STL, such as that shown in Figure 1. This listing can be prepared manually or by computer and provided routinely to host-country training and ELTP managers to assist them in meeting training deadlines. The listing can be tailored to present crucial data. In the example shown, the 105-day ECL testing date defines the outer limit at which final ECL testing may take place, and the 60-day cancellation date marks the date beyond which cancellations incur cost penalties. As a management tool, the ELTP STL keeps program managers advised on the critical 45-day window during which ECL qualification must occur for each WSCN.

FIGURE 1
ELTP Report on "X" Program

| WSCN | COURSE | SC | DUR | RANK | NAME | REPORT | START | GRAD | LOC | REQ:ECL | SCR:ECL | DLI:ECL | 105:DATE | CNX:DATE |
|-------|-------------------------|----|-----|------|------|----------|----------|----------|-----|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|
| 0074L | SET | E | 9 | | | 11/04/87 | 11/09/87 | 01/08/88 | DLI | 70SR | | | 07/24/87 | 09/10/87 |
| 0074A | CONTRACTOR (ENG-1) | E | 16 | | | 01/11/88 | 01/12/88 | 04/27/88 | PWA | 70SR | | | // | // |
| 0075L | SET | E | 9 | | | 11/04/87 | 11/09/87 | 01/08/88 | DLI | 70SR | | | 07/24/87 | 09/10/87 |
| 0075A | CONTRACTOR (ENG-1) | E | 16 | | | 01/11/88 | 01/12/88 | 04/27/88 | PWA | 70SR | | | // | // |
| 0076L | SET | E | 9 | | | 11/04/87 | 11/09/87 | 01/08/88 | DLI | 70SR | | | 07/24/87 | 09/10/87 |
| 0076A | CONTRACTOR (ENG-1) | E | 16 | | | 01/11/88 | 01/12/88 | 04/27/88 | PWA | 70SR | | | // | // |
| 0077L | SET | E | 9 | | | 11/04/87 | 11/09/87 | 01/08/88 | DLI | 70SR | | | 07/24/87 | 09/10/87 |
| 0077A | CONTRACTOR (ENG-1) | E | 16 | | | 01/11/88 | 01/12/88 | 04/27/88 | PWA | 70SR | | | // | // |
| 0100L | SET | E | 9 | | | 11/11/87 | 11/16/87 | 01/15/88 | DLI | 70SR | | | 07/31/87 | 09/17/87 |
| 0100A | CONTRACTOR (SIR RPR) IN | E | 15 | | | 01/18/88 | 01/19/88 | 04/28/88 | GEN | 70SR | | | // | // |
| 0100B | OBSERVER | E | 2 | | | 04/29/88 | 05/02/88 | 05/13/88 | VAR | 70SR | | | // | // |
| 0101L | SET | E | 9 | | | 11/11/87 | 11/16/87 | 01/15/88 | DLI | 70SR | | | 07/31/87 | 09/17/87 |
| 0101A | CONTRACTOR (SIR RPR) | E | 13 | | | 01/18/88 | 01/19/88 | 04/15/88 | GEN | 70SR | | | // | // |
| 0102L | SET | E | 9 | | | 11/11/87 | 11/16/87 | 01/15/88 | DLI | 70SR | | | 07/31/87 | 09/17/87 |
| 0102A | CONTRACTOR (SIR RPR) | E | 13 | | | 01/18/88 | 01/19/88 | 04/15/88 | GEN | 70SR | | | // | // |
| 0103L | SET | E | 9 | | | 11/11/87 | 11/16/87 | 01/15/88 | DLI | 70SR | | | 07/31/87 | 09/17/87 |
| 0103A | CONTRACTOR (SIR RPR) | E | 13 | | | 01/18/88 | 01/19/88 | 04/15/88 | GEN | 70SR | | | // | // |
| 0104L | SET | E | 9 | | | 11/11/87 | 11/16/87 | 01/15/88 | DLI | 70SR | | | 07/31/87 | 09/17/87 |
| 0104A | CONTRACTOR (SIR RPR) | E | 13 | | | 01/18/88 | 01/19/88 | 04/15/88 | GEN | 70SR | | | // | // |
| 0110L | SET | E | 9 | | | 08/19/87 | 08/24/87 | 10/23/87 | DLI | 70SR | | | 05/08/87 | 06/25/87 |
| 0110A | CONTRACTOR (APG)II IN | E | 19 | | | 10/26/87 | 10/27/87 | 03/07/88 | GEN | 70SR | | | // | // |
| 0110B | OBSERVER | E | 2 | | | 03/08/88 | 03/09/88 | 03/23/88 | VAR | 70SR | | | // | // |
| 0111L | SET | E | 9 | | | 08/19/87 | 08/24/87 | 10/23/87 | DLI | 70SR | | | 05/08/87 | 06/25/87 |
| 0111A | CONTRACTOR (APG)II IN | E | 19 | | | 10/26/87 | 10/27/87 | 03/07/88 | GEN | 70SR | | | // | // |
| 0111B | OBSERVER | E | 2 | | | 03/08/88 | 03/09/88 | 03/23/88 | VAR | 70SR | | | // | // |

The key, and often the most difficult, action to accomplish at this stage is to encourage rapid action by the host-country in selecting personnel for each WSCN. These decisions within the client's services are often slow in coming, but the English language training cannot get off the ground until trainees have been identified by name. Only when that has occurred can language trainers and the SAO training officer monitor student input to ELT, academic progress, and overall ELTP status.

The task of the training team would not be complete without evaluating the country's or service's capability to absorb the ELT demands of the new system and still successfully accomplish its mission. For example: What will student throughput be when all of the client's ELT requirements are totaled up? What will the student load be at periods of peak enrollment? Will sufficient numbers of instructors be available to handle peak enrollment? What is the planned student/instructor ratio at peak periods, and is it realistic? Are there sufficient classrooms, language labs and course materials to support increased enrollment? If the evaluation reveals any potential deficiencies, early corrective action will be necessary in view of the extremely long lead times required for some situations. For example, it may be necessary for the client service to

budget, fund and build extra classrooms. Additional lab equipment and course materials may have to be procured. If additional teachers will be needed and there is not enough time to train them in the CONUS, they would either have to be locally recruited and trained, if such resources exist, or brought in from outside the country. An alternative to be considered in this instance would be a DLIELC MTT to augment the local instructor staff, funded from the FMS case.

TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

Training requirements should include at least three separate areas: immediate needs, continuing needs, and future needs.

The *immediate needs* of the new system sale are probably the easiest of the three to identify and define. Today, the most common method for introducing a new system into a country's inventory is the cadre approach. This approach uses a small number of host country students to attend training in the CONUS (many times only three students per specialty) with one or two from each specialty becoming instructors. A typical cadre for an F-16 aircraft will include 4 to 6 pilots and approximately 60 to 80 maintenance technicians. (Figure 2 provides a breakout of a typical F-16 initial cadre). The cadre group, upon return from the CONUS, will then be able to provide adequate personnel to support, maintain, and operate the initial delivery of a new system, as well as implement an in-country, self-sufficient training program. Once the students return home, it is critical that they enter into an on-the-job training (OJT) program to use and enhance their newly learned skills. Returning to the F-16 example, it must be realized up front that a student who receives training in the CONUS will return only partially proficient in the newly learned skill. It will require the host country to provide a structured upgrade training program which will allow the students to raise their skill levels. This program should include additional training as well as job experience to become fully qualified technicians. Without this OJT program, the skills of the maintenance personnel will suffer until there is marked degradation in their skills; this, in turn, may require repeat CONUS training and increased or continued reliance on USG/contractor personnel to operate and maintain the new system.

FIGURE 2
F-16 Typical Training Cadre

| <u>SPECIALTY</u> | <u>(AFSC)</u> | <u>INSTRUCTORS</u> | <u>DIRECT CADRE</u> |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| FLIGHT CONTROLS | (326X7) | 1 | 3 |
| COM/NAV/ECM | (326X8) | 1 | 3 |
| ATTACK AVIONICS | (326X6) | 2 | 4 |
| ELECTRICAL | (423X0) | 1 | 3 |
| ECS | (423X1) | 1 | 3 |
| EGRESS | (423X2) | 1 | 2 |
| FUELS | (423X3) | 1 | 2 |
| PNEUDRAULICS | (423X4) | 1 | 4 |
| ENGINE-ORG | (426X4) | 1 | 5 |
| ENGINE-INT | (426X4) | 1 | 5 |
| STRUCTURAL REPAIR | (427X5) | 1 | 2 |
| APG | (431X1) | 3 | 20 |
| ARMAMENT | (462X0) | 1 | 2 |
| NDI | (427X0) | 1 | 2 |
| PMEL | (324X0) | 1 | 3 |
| AIS | (326X4) | 3 | 9 |
| | MAINTENANCE SUB-TOTAL | 21 | 72 |
| PILOTS | | 6 | |
| | PILOT SUB TOTAL | 6 | |

The *continuing training requirements* associated with a new weapon system seem to be harder to define, but in fact are only a continuation of the immediate training needs. In fact, they involve the rest of the individuals needed to be trained to completely operate and maintain the new system (minus the initial cadre). Once the CONUS students have returned home with their newly learned skills, and the system has been delivered, the emphasis on training must continue. If the Unit Manning Document (UMD) was created in the early portion of the program, the total number of personnel required to maintain and operate the new system has already been identified. Depending on the preference of the host country, future requirements can be accomplished in many different ways. If the country has a considerable manpower base, and a great deal of money, this additional training can be accomplished in much the same manner as the initial cadre. A second, and possibly third cadre of students would be sent to the CONUS to attend training. Or, the host country could pay for USG or contractors to come in teams (Mobile Training Teams, Field Training Services Teams (FTS), etc) to set up in-country training facilities and teach all the available students. However, this is not the case with most countries. Much of the time this additional training will come from the host country's own resources utilizing the instructors who have just returned from CONUS training. The SAO training officer must insure that the host country has both the capability and the capacity to conduct such training. The new courses may be set up in an already existing in-country school, or at a newly established Field Training Detachment (FTD). Under normal circumstances, the creation of a FTD comes only with the purchase of a new weapon system (i.e., aircraft, ship or tank) where there is a requirement for many students to be trained on a system that did not exist in the country before. Another option for this training would be with a third country which already has the existing capability. This preference of a country to train with another country that is geographically closer, or with which they have military agreements is reasonable. Nevertheless, either the purchase of more training to round out the total TPR (through US or third country agreements) or the creation of the new in-country capability, it is important to identify that source of training which will allow the country to complete its training needs.

A third area of training considerations is the *future needs* factor. Within two to four years after delivery date, the new system is fully integrated into the continuing training needs of the host country. By that time, the new system has lost its identity and has been placed in with all of the other Security Assistance Training Program (SATP) requirements for a country. Once a new course is included in an existing schoolhouse, or a FTD is created, the training requirements do not end. There will always be the need for some additional training on selected subjects of the newly acquired system above and beyond their in-country capability. Whether it is for in-country instructors, for upgrade training for maintenance technicians or operators, or a need generated by attrition, the requirement will always exist. The vehicle used to accommodate these training needs will come from your host country's SATP.

MASTER SCHEDULE

The fourth and final section of the SSTP is the Master Schedule section. This section should include training milestones for the entire program. Items that should be taken into consideration include the full complement of meetings/conferences. Large meetings such as: site surveys, definitization conferences, and management reviews, as well as smaller in-country "training only" meetings should be included.

In addition to the meeting schedule, it is a good idea to include the milestones for the TPR as well. (Figure 3 shows a typical milestone chart.) Information such as student language screening dates, student selection dates, in-country ECL training, CONUS training, prerequisite training and CONUS course dates. Much of this information is not available on the MILDEP Standardized Training Listings (STLs) which only reflect CONUS training and in-country MTTs. Through the creation of locally made products, the SAO training officers can monitor not only the CONUS students, but track individual in-country students as well. (Figure 4 shows a locally made STL

type product). This information is extremely helpful to the host country as well as the SAO training officer in the tracking and management of all students who will receive training in the particular program.

FIGURE 4
Country "X" Student Project Record

| WSCN | MASL | COURSE | SC | DUR | QTR | FY | REPORT | START | GRAD | LOC | SOURCE | UP | ID CODE | NOTES |
|-------|---------|------------------------|----|-----|-----|----|--------|-------|------|-----|----------|--------|---------|-------|
| 0150L | D177008 | SET | 0 | 9 | 4 | 87 | | | | DLI | USAF | 1550 | | |
| 0150A | D141019 | AC MAINT OFFICER | 0 | 22 | 1 | 88 | | | | CHA | USAF | 7660 | 0 | |
| 0150B | D141020 | AC MAINT QUAL | 0 | 4 | 3 | 88 | | | | VAR | USAF | 580 | | |
| 0160L | D177008 | SET | 0 | 9 | 4 | 87 | | | | DLI | USAF | 1550 | | |
| 0160A | D133046 | C-E SYS/MAINT OFF | 0 | 26 | 1 | 88 | | | | KEE | USAF | 8770 | 0 | |
| 0160B | D131065 | INT AVIONICS QUAL | 0 | 4 | 3 | 88 | | | | VAR | USAF | 580 | | |
| 0161L | D177008 | SET | 0 | 9 | 4 | 87 | | | | DLI | USAF | 1550 | | |
| 0161A | D133046 | C-E SYS/MAINT OFF | 0 | 26 | 1 | 88 | | | | KEE | USAF | 8770 | 0 | |
| 0161B | D131065 | INT AVIONICS QUAL | 0 | 4 | 3 | 88 | | | | VAR | USAF | 580 | | |
| 0170L | D177008 | SET | 0 | 9 | 2 | 88 | | | | DLI | USAF | 1550 | | |
| 0170A | D141031 | AS MAINT STAFF OFFICER | 0 | 3 | 2 | 88 | | | | LOW | CONTRACT | 840 | 0 | |
| 0170B | D141020 | AC MAINT QUAL | 0 | 4 | 3 | 88 | | | | VAR | USAF | 360 | | |
| 0171L | D177008 | SET | 0 | 9 | 2 | 88 | | | | DLI | USAF | 1550 | | |
| 0171A | D141031 | AS MAINT STAFF OFFICER | 0 | 3 | 2 | 88 | | | | LOW | CONTRACT | 840 | 0 | |
| 0171B | D141020 | AC MAINT QUAL | 0 | 4 | 3 | 88 | | | | VAR | USAF | 360 | | |
| 0200L | D177008 | SET | 0 | 9 | 3 | 87 | | | | DLI | USAF | 1550 | | |
| 0200A | D147037 | CONTRACTOR (F-16) | 0 | 23 | 4 | 87 | | | | TBD | CONTRACT | 0 | 0 | |
| 0201L | D177008 | SET | 0 | 9 | 3 | 87 | | | | DLI | USAF | 1550 | | |
| 0201A | D147037 | CONTRACTOR (F-16) | 0 | 23 | 4 | 87 | | | | TBD | CONTRACT | 0 | 0 | |
| 0202L | D177008 | SET | 0 | 9 | 3 | 87 | | | | DLI | USAF | 1550 | | |
| 0202A | D147037 | CONTRACTOR (F-16) | 0 | 23 | 4 | 87 | | | | TBD | CONTRACT | 0 | 0 | |
| 0300L | D177008 | SET | 0 | 9 | 1 | 88 | | | | DLI | USAF | 1550 | | |
| 0300A | D115045 | F-16 CONVERSION | 0 | 12 | 1 | 88 | | | | LUK | USAF | 367750 | 0 | |
| 0300B | D115033 | F-16 SATP/IP | 0 | 7 | 2 | 88 | | | | LUK | USAF | 218190 | | |

A SAO training officer who ensures that a training plan is written that includes not only immediate needs which cover the initial operation and maintenance of a new system, but considers also continuing and future needs of the host country, can rest assured of placing that host country in the best possible position for achieving the training needs required to fully support that system.

EXISTING COUNTRY REQUIREMENTS

It is easy to see that a training officer can be wrapped up with one weapon system and not consider its impact on other existing weapon systems. It is only natural that when a new system comes on line (i.e., an F-16) that the host countries military wants to ensure that the "finest and best qualified" personnel are chosen as the initial operators and maintainers of the new "front line" system. This can be considered normal procedure as well as fostered by the stringent training requirements placed on the country, especially when the cadre approach is employed. For the most part, initial cadres require experienced pilots and maintenance technicians. It is not uncommon to have pilots with over 1000 hours of flying time and maintenance technicians with a 5+ skill level being sent to the CONUS. The best place to find these highly qualified personnel is in the squadrons of existing similar weapons systems. In the process of ensuring that the new system is "fully manned", one may not realize that this leaves a void in the experience level of the already existing weapon systems. While it may not initially seem like many personnel, one must stop to consider that 80 to 100 personnel alone are required to fill the initial cadre of the new system. This is not to mention the full complement of personnel required to man the new system. If the host country is small, the impact could prove to be significant. While this could be a "blind spot" for the SAO training officer, it can be alleviated if there is planning for either in-country schooling or additional SATP training. It works much like the training plan of the new system.

Once the original cadre has been chose, the training officer must talk to the host country counterparts to find out where the students will come from (physically located) and exactly what

systems they had been working on before they were chosen to form the basis of the new weapons system cadre. After doing so, it is possible to formulate an idea that additional manning requirements are needed for the existing systems. There are several means in which to resupply the older systems with new personnel. The first way is to encourage self-sufficiency by use of host country schools. If it is determined that such training is not available in-country, and that third country training does not exist, then it is time to think about programming training under SATP. If it is determined that more personnel will be pulled out of an existing system, then it might be advantageous for the country to consider the creation of an in-country school to satisfy this need, similar to the new weapon systems FTD. When you have compiled a list of the number of students who need training in particular systems, you need to make a training plan to ensure that all valid training requirements are met.

This training plan is very similar to the new weapon sale plan in that it lays out for all concerned just what needs to be done to meet these valid requirements. It may require coordination between the SAO training officer and service counterparts (subject matter experts) to decide which is the best method for achieving these training requirements. As a SAO training officer you will have many resources at your grasp to meet these requirements. There are programs such as FMS, IMET, and MAP to help fund this training. Within those programs, you have the option of trying to send students to the CONUS, or in some cases provide MTTs or FTSs.

CONCLUSION

Training for a major weapons sale need not be handled in a crisis management mode if the SAO training officer, as well as the host country, is prepared to not only provide a training plan for the new system, but for the replacements that will be taken out of the existing weapons systems. In both cases, a solid training plan can prove to be the vehicle for success.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Captain Michael J. Maloney, USAF, is a Foreign Military Training Officer assigned to the Joint U.S. Military Advisory Group, Thailand. Previous assignments include duty as the Assistant Chief, Asia/Pacific Branch, Foreign Military Training Affairs Group, Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, and as a Security Assistance Training Program Instructor, Mather Air Force Base, California. He holds a BS degree in Education from the University of Portland, and an MA degree in Education from California State University, Sacramento.

Mr. John O. Lincoln serves as the Chief of the English Language Training Detachment for the Joint U.S. Military Advisory Group, Thailand. He has held English language training assignments previously in North Yemen (Sana), Tunisia, Turkey, and Morocco, and he holds a BA degree from St. Mary's University of Texas.