

JA and Technology Transfer

I HAVE decided to become an activist in the area of technology transfer through the pages of your Journal. We're all facing a situation of increasing restrictions on the international flow of aircraft technology. Pressures driving this problem primarily include military critical technology restrictions and protection of competitive position. While normally well founded and enforced through the public release process, there still remains a large volume of important technical information that may be "cleared for public release." I want to publish the best of that material, generated throughout the world, in the *Journal of Aircraft*.

As an important initial step, one of my Associate Editors, Dr. B. L. Nagabhushan, and I have re-initiated the International Board of Editors. Although not quite finalized, the names and associated countries of this new Board appear on the inside front cover of this issue. You immediately notice several new countries represented. I am absolutely delighted with the response to our invitations and the enthusiasm reflected by our new Board.

I am asking each member to serve a three-year term beginning this month. Their duties include seeking good-quality papers, serving as an AIAA point of contact for assistance to authors and Journal subscribers, bringing the Journal and AIAA to the attention of aircraft technologists, helping members to gain access to literature bases, interpreting the details of the public release process, and preparing or assisting in the preparation of an article depicting key technical aircraft-related activities in his or her country.

I would appreciate any comments or suggestions you may have to assure their effectiveness and success in achieving solid technology transfer. I'll be happy to pass these comments along to my Editorial Staff.

Turning to another subject, I'd like to briefly address a growing problem for us in getting papers into print. The problem is with revision time. We ask that authors complete revisions of their papers in three weeks. The current average is closer to three months. This situation results in lost time value of the material and creates additional delays as author, editors, and reviewers must deal with material after first seeing it months after review. The likelihood of ever finishing revisions decreases with time as the press to get on with the next project continues. As an author, you need to be in a position to return your revision within the three-week guideline. I'll make certain that your paper is then published as soon as possible after receipt of your revision.

Last year I asked for your help in developing good papers in the area of Reliability and Maintainability (R&M). I am always looking for good papers in untapped (or undertapped) areas such as systems development and manufacturing technology. However, my main message still is that we are not receiving much on this critical area of R&M improvement. It has taken on all the importance of the classical search for performance. According to the First Air Force Systems Com-

mand Annual Reliability and Maintainability Plan, one of the most urgent needs is in the area of metrics for R&M; how do we define and measure it? The problem is complex because of the diversity of viewpoints by different sectors of the aircraft community. Operational users may relate to such measures as Maintenance Man-Hours per Flight Hour or Mean Time Between Failure, etc. The manufacturer, however, will focus on the definition of "failure" and how this definition determines the parameters of his responsibility under his control. Another challenge lies in the very nature of the definitions required. They are simultaneously too broad and too narrow: too broad because it currently is difficult to separate R&M from safety, structural integrity, human factors, testability, policy, etc., and too narrow since present definitions largely deal with electronic hardware and must be expanded to address software and mechanical systems as well as fault detection and isolation adequately. There are very few full-time R&M engineers, and the subject is finding its way into engineering curricula. Meanwhile the concept of "every engineer and R&M specialist" will have to be exploited. I hope some of you R&M specialists will take the time to write papers on the subject for this Journal. Survey papers as well as technical and economic-based articles will be welcomed by the aircraft community and will be featured.

Now let me turn to one of my more enjoyable duties as Editor-in-Chief, namely, recognition. The 1987 Team of volunteer Editors appears herein. They are the backbone of the process that assures timely publication of quality material. They seek reviewers and in the end decide on which papers will be published. Please look them up at technical meetings and discuss your views for improved Journal quality.

The Team of Associate Editors is backed up by a professional staff at the Headquarters in New York. Their Director is Norma Brennan, who has applied her excellent management skills to the staff and her great depth of understanding to the Publications Committee, led by Dr. William Heiser, VP—Publications. She assures that top talent Managing Editors, like Robert Inman, and Senior Editors like Ed McKenna are available for day-to-day issues and problem solving. I could ask for no better resource person than Ed.

The list of Reviewers for 1986 is also provided. I hope we haven't missed anyone. If so, let me know so that I can recognize your services next time. Reviewers provide the make-or-break decision recommendations. They normally provide the author with a sound critique of his or her paper regardless of the outcome. It is this critical peer review process that justifies journal publication as opposed to nonreviewed preprint or technical-report types of publications. I salute these dedicated reviewers for their devotion to excellence in aircraft technology reporting.

Thomas M. Weeks
Editor-in-Chief