OPERATIONAL DEEP DIVE

When paper plans meet the foundry: Operationalizing hybrid manufacturing.

A look at how field training is redefining military readiness and industrial capability.

advanced manufacturing · military sustainment · workforce development · operational technology

> The newsletter for defense leaders who prefer operational reality over theoretical design specs.

The gap between 'advanced' and operational readiness

There is a significant difference between owning an advanced machine and possessing the capability to operate it under pressure. In many industrial settings—especially those with high stakes, such as military logistics or critical infrastructure—we see a recurring trap: **The Capability Mirage.** This is the belief that because you have purchased a 5-axis CNC mill or a metal additive manufacturing system, your team "has" the capability to produce parts in any environment.

They do not. Having a machine is an acquisition; operational readiness is a discipline.

I’ve seen it happen on the floor: a facility gets its hands on high-end hybrid manufacturing equipment, but the operators only know how to run it when every condition is perfect—when the power is stable, the parts are standard, and no one is watching the clock. The moment that machine moves from a controlled lab into an austere environment or a high-tempo production line, the lack of "grit" in the training shows. If the operator doesn't know how to troubleshoot a feed rate issue on a non-standard part

or recalibrate for material drift, they aren't operating; they are just following a script that is no longer applicable because the environment changed.

A machine is not a capability. A piece of equipment sitting in a shop is not an operational solution until it is backed by a workforce that can troubleshoot, iterate, and adapt when the first part comes off the bed warped or the feed-rate causes chatter. We must stop confusing "having" with "doing."

Why high-tech training programs are essential for modern sustainment

Standard manuals were written for standard environments. In hybrid manufacturing—where we combine traditional CNC machining with additive processes—the variables change too fast for a static manual to be the only point of reference. When your goal is sustaining complex systems in the field, you cannot rely on "off-the-shelf" instructions that assume everything will go right the first time.

We need training that focuses on **intentional failure.** Instead of just teaching how to run a program successfully, high-tech training must teach what to do when the program fails. This is where hybrid manufacturing becomes powerful: it allows for rapid iteration. If a part fails during an additive build or a machining pass isn't hitting its tolerances, the operator needs the skill set to identify *why* and adjust the parameters immediately.

Training Type	Standard Approach (The Manual)	Advanced Hybrid Training (The Practice)
Primary Goal	Following a pre-set path	Diagnosing and correcting deviations
Success Metric	First_pass yield in a lab	Capability to recover from failure in the field
Tooling Knowledge	Knowing what tool to use	Understanding how different materials react under stress
Problem Solving	Escalation to "the experts"	Localized adjustment and iteration

Training must move away from "how-to" checklists and toward "what-if" scenarios. When a part is out of spec, does the operator know which variable—powder flow, laser intensity, or spindle speed—needs to be adjusted? If they have to call someone else every time something deviates by one millimeter, your manufacturing isn't advanced; it’s just remote-controlled.

The cost of assuming 'off-the-shelf' training is enough

There is a temptation to cut corners on training because the "basic" certification seems sufficient for daily operations. This leads to what I call **The Procurement Shortcut.** It feels like progress to check the box, but it creates a massive hidden liability in your system.

When you rely on basic knowledge for complex systems, the cost of failure isn't just a scrapped part; it’s an entire stalled operation. If a maintenance team is trying to fix a critical component and they only

have "basic" training on the manufacturing equipment used to create that part, they will eventually hit a wall where they cannot innovate their way out of a problem.

The escalation logic here is simple:

1. **The immediate cost:** Saving time/money by skipping advanced technical training for operators.
2. **The delayed consequence:** A catastrophic failure in the field because an operator didn't have the depth to troubleshoot a nuanced manufacturing error, leading to long lead times, broken promises of readiness, and massive costs in logistics and repair.

A "good enough" understanding is often just a way of deferring a hard problem until it becomes an expensive one. We aren't looking for people who can follow instructions; we are looking for technicians who can own the process. If they don't understand the *why* behind the hybrid manufacturing steps, they will be helpless when the "how" stops working.

Three operational tests for advanced manufacturing capability

To determine if your team is actually ready and not just comfortable with a machine, you must audit them against three specific criteria. This isn't about their ability to press buttons; it’s about the depth of their technical ownership.

1. Process Flow under Stress Can the operator manage the transition between additive and subtractive processes when things go wrong? If the 3D-printed "near net shape" has a surface defect, can they adjust the CNC toolpath on the fly to compensate? We need to see them handle non-standard geometry and imperfect inputs without stopping the line to ask for permission.

2. Training Depth & Durability Is their knowledge of the machine's capabilities deep enough to survive "the first time it breaks"? This means understanding tolerances, material properties (like how different metals react to heat during a build), and tool wear. If they can only operate the machine within a 5% variance of the original design, they aren't trained for hybrid manufacturing; they are just following a script.

3. Supply Chain Adaptability Can they produce parts with whatever materials or tools are currently available? In many "ready" environments, you don't get your first choice of material every time. A capable operator should be able to adapt the manufacture when the primary supply chain fails—using different alloys, alternative tool coatings, or adjusted machining speeds to get a usable part into the field.

What you can do on your next Gemba walk

When you step onto the floor this week, stop looking at the machine's output and start looking at the operator’s decision-making process. You want to see if they are "thinking" or just "reacting."

Here is what I want you to look for:

- **The Correction Test:** Find an instance where a part was out of spec or a machine threw a warning code. Ask the operator, *"What did you do when this happened?"* If their answer is "I called my supervisor" or "I restarted the cycle," they need more training in troubleshooting and process ownership.
- **The Tooling Audit:** Look at how they handle tool changes or material swaps. Are they using standard work instructions that are clearly outdated, or do they have a clear understanding of why certain parameters were chosen? If it’s the former, your "standard" is just an obstacle to their ability to adapt.
- **The Scenario Drill:** Ask them what they would do if the primary material for this part was unavailable tomorrow. Could they pivot the manufacturing process to use a substitute? This identifies whether they understand the *physics* of the hybrid process or just the buttons on the console.

Don't let your team settle for being "good enough" operators in a perfect world. They need to be masters of their craft in an imperfect one. Move them from simply operating machines to owning the manufacturing capability.

Call to Action

What process or skill set is currently lagging between your strategic plan and your actual operating capacity? Share this issue with a colleague who needs to see the difference between 'capability' and 'competency'.

Newsletter replies: newsletter@sixsigmakaizen.com · X: @kaizen_6sigma

Stay curious, stay improving,

David Rodgers
SixSigmaKaizen.com

References: Phillips Federal Adds Hybrid and Additive Manufacturing Navy Training (Advanced Manufacturing)