

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				<i>Form Approved</i> OMB No. 0704-0188	
The public reporting burden for this 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 the burden, to the Department of Defense, Executive Service Directorate (0704-0188). Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ORGANIZATION.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE				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)				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					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code)

UNCLASSIFIED



AIR FORCE CYBERWORX REPORT 19-006

High Frequency Technical Discovery Event

VEL PRESTON, AF CYBERWORX
Lead UX Designer

WILLIAM WAYNICK, Colonel, AF CYBERWORX
Project Officer

EVENT CONDUCTED
29 – 30 NOV 19, AF CyberWorx

Produced with input from Headquarters Air Staff A2 and A5, ACC/A6, 1 SOCS, 27 SOCS, 1 CBCS, GCS Program Office, Joint Communication Support Element, 254 CCG, 5 CCG, 10 SFG and our partners in industry.

Air Force CyberWorx™
2354 Fairchild Dr, Ste 2N300
USAF Academy, CO 80840
AFCyberWorx@usafa.edu | @AFCyberWorx | (719) 333-4278

The wording of the distribution statements specified by this Instruction may not be modified to accommodate additional distribution, such as distribution to foreign governments. Such release is outside the scope of secondary DoD distribution.

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A. Approved for public release: distribution unlimited.

UNCLASSIFIED

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Background	2
Participants.....	2
Scenario Focus	3
Knowledge Discovery Session	5
Problem Solving Session	7
Recommendations.....	7
Glossary	11
Appendix 1: Proposed Changes/Things to Try	14

Executive Summary

04 NOV 2019

High Frequency Technical Discovery Event

On 29 & 30 October 2019, twenty-one Air Force, Army, and industry experts formed a team to explore the viability of High Frequency (HF) radio within the current Department of Defense (DoD) Primary, Alternate, Contingency, and Emergency (PACE) plans. The team learned about the current capabilities, the physical limitations, and future growth potential of HF communication through a question and feedback session with subject matter experts. They followed that knowledge discovery with a problem solving session where they developed a way forward with suggested avenues of further research as well as suggestions for earmarks for the FY22 Planning Choices.

Scenario Focus and Knowledge Discovery

How might we better and more quickly employ C2-worthy HF capability to the permissive and non-permissive edge?

As per the initial problem statement developed by the stakeholders, participants based their discovery on the ability to C2 with HF. A question/feedback session with subject matter experts focused on two categories: What is the resiliency of an HF network considering both environmental and threat factors? What are the capabilities and limitations of HF technology today and in the future?

Key information gained during this session included what environmental and threat factors would affect HF capability, security concerns of HF use in a threat environment, potential bandwidth, physics and technological limitations, and physical support needed for HF integration in operations.

Problem Solving Session

After knowledge discovery, the team discussed what the AF needed to make HF more effective and practical for PACE use. Participants determined the best way to integrate effective HF usage would be to “bake it in” to current operations. Through discussions, and based on knowledge gained during the question/feedback session, the team wrote suggestions to integrate HF usage into normal operations. These ideas included incorporating HF usage into exercises and plans; developing a stronger infrastructure that would support HF; procuring modern equipment such as newer composite antennas and encryption technology; and developing a more intuitive user interface for the current radios to mitigate loss of knowledge due to lack of everyday use.

While further exploring the concept of “bake it in,” the team separated further research suggestions into three main categories: what was currently available for the AF to gain, what still needed to be developed, and what TTP’s needed to be considered. With those categories in mind, the team created suggested guides for the next steps in exploring the efficacy of HF usage.

High Frequency Technical Discovery Event

On 29 & 30 October 2019, twenty-one Air Force, Army, and industry experts formed a team to explore the viability of High Frequency (HF) radio within the current Department of Defense (DoD) Primary, Alternate, Contingency, and Emergency (PACE) plans. The team learned about the current capabilities, the physical limitations, and future growth potential of HF communications through a question and feedback session with subject matter experts. They followed knowledge discovery with a problem solving session where they developed a way forward with suggested avenues of further research as well as suggestions for earmarks for the FY22 Planning Choices.

Background

The DoD prioritizes maintaining a competitive superiority no matter the situation or working environment. As such, DoD leadership recognizes the need for command, control, and communications resiliency in permissive, semi-permissive, and non-permissive environments. Other applications of HF identified early on included agile basing. Stakeholders identified the need to explore current HF capabilities and potential future applications and directions of growth, especially in the area of command and control (C2) and on the tactical edge. In this early stage of investigation, participants were more interested in the high-level capabilities and security of HF usage instead of the end user application and usability. Feasibility of front-line use included some of that information.

Participants

Twenty-one participants came from a wide range of experiences. Seventeen military members came from Headquarters Air Staff organizations A2 and A5, ACC/A6, 1 SOCS, 27 SOCS, 1 CBCS, GCS Program Office, Joint Communication Support Element, 254 CCG, and 5 CCG. The Army also participated with two members from the 10 SFG. Four industry specialists attended from NTIA, Teledyne, Raytheon, and GIRD Systems to provide their expertise on the subject outside of current DoD use.

NTIA, the Institute of Telecommunication Sciences, provided proven skills in the areas of LTE, statistical data analysis, antennas, radio frequency (RF), and network analyzers. The NTIA

UNCLASSIFIED

representative who attended the event had a strong electrical engineering background to share expertise in the HF field. Teledyne Brown Engineering brought a mixture of military and Missile Defense Agency experience. Teledyne specializes in providing disciplined planning and enterprise integration to overcome complex challenges. Raytheon engineers generalize across many areas the DoD operates in including aerospace, defense, and civil government. GIRD Systems focuses on applying the latest digital signal processing research to DoD and other government agencies in communications and electronic warfare. All four industry specialists brought a broad range of experience and specialized knowledge to the event for technical discovery and to answer technical questions.


The diversity of the team gave value by breaking down traditional military and organizational barriers, allowing all viewpoints to be shared and heard. Key insights from industry partners helped shape the team's efforts, expanding knowledge beyond current Air Force capabilities.

Scenario Focus


How might we better and more quickly employ C2-worthy HF capability to the permissive and non-permissive edge?

Stakeholders identified the initial problem statement stated with the focus on C2 capabilities of HF technology for PACE plans from the Tactical Edge perspective. Per this focus, the team based their discovery on the ability to C2 with HF. The team used diagrams of a pennant and funnel to represent high-level organizational requirements. After questioning whether each organization needed all their desired options to be effective, the team decided to focus on the base needs of C2: communication and situational awareness.

For organizations to be effective at C2, the preferred communication method is satellite communications for speed, capability, and bandwidth. HF is much more limited...



The pennant diagram lists the organizational requirements given a specified amount of capability. The left side represents the greatest capability with the right side representing the least.



The funnel diagram gives a visual representation of how much data can be transmitted given communications capabilities. Satellite communications provides the greatest capability, HF the least.

For organizations to be effective at C2, the preferred communication method is satellite communications for speed, capability, and bandwidth. HF is much more limited, but a potential for situations where satellite communications are degraded or unavailable. To further focus the discovery process, the team asked three main questions. **(1) What are the wants versus needs for the warfighter requirements?** **(2) How can we make more of the requirements available at the narrow end of the pennant now and in the future?** **(3) What are the high bandwidth capabilities of HF in the future?**


Knowledge Discovery Session

With the team's focus on communication capabilities, the team expanded the three questions into eleven more specific questions. Subject matter experts – both military and industry specialists – fielded a question/feedback session for each question to investigate in-depth knowledge discovery. This allowed the team to clarify concerns and gain a better understanding of the capabilities of HF.


1. How resilient is HF considering environmental and non-permissive conditions?
 - Post-nuclear
 - Jamming
 - Solar activity/weather
 - Space-denied environment
2. How much bandwidth is possible now and in the future with HF?
3. What will radio channels give us? (Point to point? Area broadcast?)
4. How far can we push communication beyond line of sight?
 - How far do we need to push?
 - What would the footprint be for that?
5. What are the user interface needs?
 - Easy to use?
 - Deployable?
 - What platforms are needed/used?
 - What are its power needs?
 - Does it have data entry operability?
6. What base of support is required?
7. What concerns are there about frequency management and interference?
8. Can we live stream with HF? What would be the FPS? COP data?
9. What is the smallest, most powerful form factor?
10. What security concerns are there? Encryption capability?
11. What is the user maintainability? Is Reachback needed?

One of the key concerns which came out of the question/feedback session was the resiliency of an HF network due to both environmental and threat factors.

Identified environmental factors affecting HF effectiveness included atmospheric changes due to solar activity, weather, time of day, seasons, and geographic obstacles. Threat factors included post-nuclear changes to the atmosphere, susceptibility to identification and interception by the enemy, and jamming interference.




Subject matter experts gave detailed information about the current and potential future capabilities with knowledge of physics and technological limitations.



Subject matter experts also outlined the physical limitations to how far HF could feasibly be pushed and what would be needed to extend beyond those limitations.

Another key concern identified during the question/feedback session was what the specific capabilities and limitations of HF technology are today and in the future. Specifics included potential bandwidth, availability of live feeds and video, speed of communication, and physical support needed for HF use.



With portability in mind, subject matter experts described the best value on the market that combines compact size and power.

Problem Solving Session

After knowledge discovery, the team discussed what was needed to make HF more effective and practical for PACE use. Building off the knowledge gained during the question/feedback session, the team listed potential changes and things to try from previous discussions. (Transcribed list of ideas in the proposed changes/things to try list found in Appendix 1.) Some key ideas included incorporating HF usage into exercises and plans, developing a stronger infrastructure that would support HF, and designing a stronger user interface to mitigate loss of knowledge due to lack of everyday use. These all would ideally lead to HF capability being “baked in” to the system to better integrate current capability and encourage continued technological growth through end user innovation.

To better understand the problem solving direction they needed to take, the team dug deeper into the proposed change of “bake it in.” The resulting questions led in to a separation of categories for further research. The team separated further research suggestions into three main categories.

-
- **What’s currently available for the AF to gain?**
 - **What’s missing that we can build or R&D?**
 - **What TTPs need to be considered?**
-

Recommendations

The list of action items, next steps, and physical equipment ranged from extremely specific to general items of interest. “The Menu” contained specific items dealing with equipment and software development and acquisition. Action Items suggested directions for further research. Categorized research items listed necessary actions and changes to current organizational operations.

The Menu

Equipment and software that needs to be acquired or further developed.

Modems/Radios

- German-made Military handsets – Handsets to translate analog to digital not currently made in the USA
- LPI/LPD – Low Probability of Interference/Detection; most expeditionary units do NOT have this capability but are required
- Non-CCI encryption – More for policy. In most cases, radios have NSA-approved software encryption, making hardware encryption unnecessary. Taking out the hardware layer reduces bandwidth overhead.
- Wave Forms
 - Wave forms need to be standardized.
 - Messaging applications between HF GCS and end user radios are currently incompatible but need to work together.
- Predictive capability should be built in to better find the proper frequencies

Antennas (available now)

- purpose built/scalability
- material/new models
- passive Sounder Receivers (suggested)

Supporting


- Output power/Amplifiers (available now)
- Industry can help develop a better User Interface.
- Need better compression software to enable more data to be transmitted (i.e. video) (suggested)-can be developed by Compix (used by UK)
- Sufficient physical space for extended field operations
- Split-site capability with remote antennas to avoid enemy targeting
- Use of HF to C2 and not just test how much power the operator can produce
- Better interoperability between HF GCS and end user
- Identify where ground relay stations are needed and procure/field equipment
- Use of airborne assets for relay to include aerostats, BACN, etc.

Emerging Technology

- TAC CHAT software upgrades
- File compression and apps can mitigate HF physical and environmental limitations.

Action Items/Next Steps

What needs to be done as soon as possible to further explore HF for modern operations?



- Inventory HF capability. AOC, WOC, and Expeditionary Units have different HF capabilities. Need to know what's in the inventory and what we are missing, i.e. antennas, LPI/LPD, amps, etc. (POC: ACC)
- Exercise/Test HF capabilities with real world scenarios to develop TTPs vs just doing power checks and pings between radios (POC: MAJCOMs, units)
- What chat software/applications/mesh networks are available? (POC: AF CyberWorx)
- UX prototyping session for end user (receiver) (POC: AF CyberWorx)
- Receive inventory (MTOE) from 10 SFG and 1 SFC (POC: 10 SFG/AF CyberWorx)

Categorized Research Items

What's currently available for the Air Force to gain?

- Modern antennas (POC: 10 SFG)
- LPI/LPD (POC: 10 SFG and 1 SFC)
- Passive sound receivers (POC: AF CyberWorx/Industry partners)
- Split operations capabilities (POC: 10 SFG)
- Relay station capabilities (POC: HF GCS/CCC)
- Amplifiers (POC: 27 SOCS)
- New generator capabilities (POC: AF CyberWorx)

What's missing that we can build or R&D?

- Better messaging
- Short burn decoy antennas
- Messaging interoperability (GCS vs Tactical Edge)
- Compression software and transcoding (POC: Compix (Industry partner))
- New apps with UX built-in
- Airborne Relay (e.g. drones)

What TTPs need to be considered?

- AES Encryption
- Split operations
- Mesh network
- (Live) EW
- Practice C2 on HF
- Relays

Conclusion

The final take-aways from the problem-solving event included key needs to determine the efficacy of HF for C2 and the Tactical Edge in a PACE plan.

1. There needs to be an inventory of what capabilities the AF already has and what it needs.
2. HF capabilities need to be incorporated into exercises to test specific applications, usability, and feasibility.
3. Required/relevant information for operational C2 needs to be identified for the individual warfighter when limited to HF.
4. More discovery with the National Labs needs to be done to determine current HF capabilities.
5. HF infrastructure needs to be incorporated into existing AF infrastructure. Research and development needs to continue to expand HF infrastructure capability.



Glossary

ACC	Air Combat Command
AES	Advanced Encryption Standard
AF	Air Force
AFSOC	Air Force Special Operations Command
AOC	Army Operations Center
AOR	Area of Responsibility
ASOC	Air Support Operations Center
AWACS	Airborne Warning and Control System
BACN	Battlefield Airborne Communications Node
BOG	boots on ground
C2	Command and Control
CCG	Combat Communications Group
CCI	Co-Channel Interference
CCS	Combat Communications Squadron
COP	Common Operational Picture
DASC	Direct Air Support Center
DoD	Department of Defense
EW	Electronic Warfare
FOB	Forward Operating Base
FPS	Frames per second
FY22	fiscal year '22
GCS	Global Communications System
HF	High Frequency
HFGCS	High Frequency Global Communications System
H.O.T.	Human/Organization/Technical needs triad
Hz	Hertz
JOC	Joint Operations Center
JSTAR	Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System
Kbps	Kilobits per second
LEO	low earth orbit

UNCLASSIFIED

LINK-16	ECM resistant tactical data exchange link
LMR	Land Mobile Radio
LPD/LPE/LPI	Low Probability of Detection/Exploitation/Intercept
LTE	Long Term Evolution
MAJCOM	Major Command
MANET	Mobil Ad Hoc Network
MARS	Military Auxiliary Radio System
MISCAP	Mission Capability statement
MTO	Mission Tasking Order
MTOE	Modification Table of Organization and Equipment
NGB	National Guard Bureau
NSA	National Security Agency
NTIA	National Telecommunications and Information Administration
O3B	a satellite network
OPLAN	Operations Plan
PACE	Primary, Alternate, Contingency, Emergency
POC	Point of Contact
PRC	Portable Radio Communications
RF	Radio Frequency
SA	situational awareness
SADL	situational awareness data link
SATCOM	satellite communications
SFC	Special Forces Command
SFG	Special Forces Group
SOCS	Special Operations Communications Squadron
TAC CHAT	Tactical Chat
TOC	Tactical Operations Center
TROPO	Tropospheric scatter transmission
TTP	Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures
UAV	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle
UHF	Ultra-High Frequency

UNCLASSIFIED

UK	United Kingdom
UX	User Experience
WOC	Wing Operations Center

Appendix 1: Proposed Changes/Things to Try

- Sounding capability
 - turning every node into HF base station (relays, decoys, ionosphere conditions)
 - employ HF radios in TOC/JOC/ASOC/DASC
- Bake it in
 - Exercises
 - OPLANs
 - MISCAPs
 - Customer expectation
 - Expand supporting assets
- MTO ops/“last known order” with disconnected ops utilizing HF
 - Issue movement commands, etc.
- Airborne platforms
 - conventional
 - Drone radio relay
 - Dirigible
 - Drone HF antenna
 - Carrier pigeons
- Commercial LEO
- Mesh Networks
 - oneweb
 - O3B
 - Starlink
- Combined training effort for advanced HF training on current suite of equipment
- MANET
 - Provides C2 in a mesh network in a small 20-30 mile AOR
- Sharks with laser beams attached to their foreheads!
- Scalable messages
 - Notepad (outstation) -> Java (FOB) -> Sharepoint
- TROPO-Army tested! Army approved!
- SADL-LINK16
- Use/Practice AWACS/JSTAR as HF/L16 “portals” for BOG and Airborne assets
- Practice degraded environment in Saber Strike/Defender
- Compression software to streamline data packages
- Wave and Riverbed
- Actually C2ing across HF vs just ping
- HF Node on everything
- Actually practice Mesh networks