

73rd MORSS CD Cover Page

712CD

UNCLASSIFIED DISCLOSURE FORM CD Presentation

For office use only 41205

21-23 June 2005, at US Military Academy, West Point, NY

Please complete this form 712CD as your cover page to your electronic briefing submission to the MORSS CD. Do not fax to the MORS office.

Author Request (To be completed by applicant) - The following author(s) request authority to disclose the following presentation in the MORSS Final Report, for inclusion on the MORSS CD and/or posting on the MORS web site.

Name of Principal Author and all other author(s): LTC Jeffery Joles; Ms. Pam Blechinger; LTC Bruce Gorski

Principal Author's Organization and address:

Phone:_(913)684-9298_

Fax :_(913)684-9288 __

Email:_jeffery.joles@us.army.mil

Original title on 712 A/B: Network Representation in Army Force-on-Force Models

– Reducing the Risk of Irrelevance


Revised title:_No Change_____

Presented in (input and Bold one): WG-6

This presentation is believed to be:
UNCLASSIFIED AND APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE

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 30 SEP 2005		2. REPORT TYPE N/A		3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Network Representation in Army Force-on-Force Models Reducing the Risk of Irrelevance				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) TRADOC Analysis Center				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 ADM201946, Military Operations Research Society Symposium (73rd) Held in West Point, NY on 21-23 June 2005. , The original document contains color images.					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 18	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Network Representation in Army Force-on-Force Models – Reducing the Risk of Irrelevance



MORSS 2005, West Point, New York

21 June 2005

This briefing is UNCLASSIFIED

Agenda

- **The importance of network modeling**
- **Progress in Force-on-Force simulation models**
- **Network modeling challenges**
- **Example: The network data challenge**
- **Overcoming the challenges**


Network Definition and Scope

Network Definition:

Infostructure providing end-to-end movement of data, information & knowledge

Source: "LandWarNet: Network Strategy for Land Combat," TRADOC Futures Center, Dec 03.
& "Network Information Brief," TRADOC Futures Center, Aug 03

The Warfighter's Network



LandWarNet: "The globally interconnected, end-to-end set of Army information capabilities, associated processes, and personnel for collecting, processing, storing, disseminating, and managing information on demand, supporting warfighters, policy makers, warriors, and support personnel."

"LandWarNet - Network Development and Integration White Paper" TRACOC Futures Center, Nov 04

Why this focus?

“The two *truly transforming things*, conceivably, might be in information technology and information operation and *networking and connecting things* in ways that they function totally differently than they had previously. And if that's possible, what I just said, that possibly the *single-most transforming thing* in our force will not be a weapon system, but *a set of interconnections* and a substantially enhanced capability because of that awareness.”

-- Secretary Rumsfeld - Aug 9, 2001

“Joint integration and *improvements in command and control capabilities* have multiplied the effectiveness of small, agile land forces and *changed the character of tactical and operational-level warfare*. Operations have become more dispersed across greater spaces, more efficient in use of time and precision strike capabilities, and more capable of collecting, processing, and distributing information. ...*Integrating intelligence, fires, and maneuver with advanced information technologies greatly magnifies the effectiveness of small units.*”


-- Army Comprehensive Guide to Modularity



What was the state-of-the-art?

- As recently as five years ago, most force-on-force analysis was conducted assuming *largely perfect communications*
 - Minimally impacted by attrition, terrain, foliage, operational distances or reliability limits,
 - Marginally informed by architectural products or organizational options,
 - Resistant to enemy activity,
 - Capable of providing a continuous flow of information and fusion products, enabled by sensor performance and a minimal location error, to all nodes.

But the capability to model communications has evolved dramatically over the last decade




1990s → 2005 →


What do current models represent?

- The expected *Future Force architectural design* to include
 - number of radios and relay nodes by type and location,
 - expected performance characteristics of those systems,
 - loss of those systems due to enemy or mechanical factors.
- The *impact of foliage, distance, and terrain* on the expected performance of the communications systems.
- The capability to represent the *connectivity and throughput* differences of various network types.
- The *ability of the threat force* to destroy communications nodes or to deny service through jamming.
- The *user-offered load* (IER-based messages) that is generated based on conditions in the operational environment; *background load* to represent other traffic.
- The ability to assess the *operational impact* of significant changes to the network.


Operational IERS



Bandwidth Estimates over time




Mission Threads



What has enabled this evolution?




Developing Partnerships



Emerging Architectural Products

OBJECTIVE FORCE C4ISR MODELING AND ANALYSIS WORKING GROUP (MAWG) EVALUATION REPORT






Continuing Self-Assessments

Future Combat Systems (FCS) Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) Network Assumptions White Paper



TRADOC Analysis Center
255 Sedgwick Avenue





Maturing Tools

C4ISR Network Representations Lessons Learned




What challenges does this evolution face?

- Development of *scenarios that are more sensitive to information flow* and allow exploration of the *network in urban and complex terrain*.
- *Development of data* that represents all *network traffic* and the performance of the network under very dynamic conditions.
- *Standardization of terms* to define the network and its component elements, characteristics and functions.
- *Documentation of the body of assumptions* about the network being made by various agencies.
- The requirement for *significant computational power* to provide a high fidelity representation of expected traffic loads.
- *Definition of metrics* to assess network performance, the value of information, and contributions of the network to force effectiveness.


[illegible]

	Balkans STRYKER Bde*	Caspian UA**
Scenario development time	2.5 mos X 3 personnel	6 mos X 8 personnel
Number of Blue Soldiers/systems	1,887	3,694
Number of Red Soldiers/systems	922	5,221
Number of decision tables	2,224	13,479
Number of combat orders	9,537	62,464
Mission time	33 hrs	44 hrs
Computer run time (1 rep)	4.5 hr	84 hrs
Output file size	.14 GB/rep	7.5 GB/rep
Machine speed	1 GHz	3 GHz
Virtual memory required	128 MB	3 GB

What is our “Communications Data Business Model”?




But is this process sufficiently responsive?



What would cause us to initiate this cycle?

Requirement to Update Network Performance Characterization:

		Process Sensitivity		
		Algorithms	Performance Data	Implicit Mappings
 IERS updated when:	Force Structure	None	Low	Low
	IERS	None	Moderate	Moderate
	Scenario	None	Low	High
	Comms Systems	High	High	Moderate

"Modeling C4ISR for the Future Combat Systems (FCS) System Development and Demonstration", by Boeing, IBN Technologies, and ITT Aerospace, April 2004.

Requirement to Update Traffic Representation (a.k.a. "Scenarioize" IERS):

		IERS Sensitivity
Δ	Force Structure	Moderate
	Scenario: Timeframe	Low
	Scenario: Entities, Locations, Taskorg	High
	CONOPS - Info Flow, Network Services	High
	Comms Systems	Moderate

Any significant changes to the scenario or communications systems would cause us to generate new network performance data.

And how long does this cycle take?

	Input	Tasks	Products
I. Define Communications Modeling Requirements (~1 month) TRAC	- Scenario: - Timeframe - Force Structure - CONOPS - Network OVs/SVs*	- Determine entities that will communicate - Determine device distribution and general network structure	- Identification of comms systems and entities to be modeled - Understanding of general network
II. Develop Network Traffic (New: ~6 months) (Update: ~3 months) AIMD; BCBL-G	- Scenario: - Force Structure - CONOPS - Network Entities to be modeled	Select applicable traffic from generic IER database** Augment or adjust traffic to reflect entities and operation to be modeled Correlate IERs to scenario events Identify critical foreground IERs for explicit modeling - Produce scenarioized IER files	- Scenarioized IERs - foreground and background "Scenarioized" = Tailored to scenario entities Comprehensive for all potential information exchanges Appropriate sizes and frequencies Time sequenced to reflect CONOPS Prioritized for explicit or implicit modeling

* Assumes required **architectures** are available (AIMD validated).

** Assumes representative **generic IER database** is available.

Key Assumptions

... oh, so long?


	Input	Tasks	Products
III. Produce Unit Location Data (~2 weeks) TRAC	Dynamically gamed scenario (maneuver)	- Run maneuver portion of scenario in combat model - Record unit/entity locations	Entity locations and combat postures -30 minute (max) intervals
IV. Model Network Performance (New: ~6 months) (Update: ~3 months) CERDEC-MITRE; AMSAA; BCBL-G	- Scenarioized IERs - Entity locations, equipment types, and combat postures - Network architectures and technical data	Update and validate algorithms and device models as required* - Produce background traffic estimates Model representative portions of network Produce performance curves/data Certify results	Certified performance data for each system and waveform: - completion rates - delay times - background traffic levels
V. Incorporate Comms Data Into Combat Model (~1 month) TRAC	Performance data	Map performance data to combat model message sets - Load data; test	Network representation in force-on-force model

* Assumes required **algorithms and device models** are available.




What is the impact on specific studies?

Theoretical



Actual



What can be done to reduce this timeline?

• Collaboration

- Baseline of current networks
- Documentation of assumptions
- Sharing of data and models
- Standardization of network modeling processes
- Configuration management of models and data

INAP Purpose

In support of the Integrated FCS Analysis Plan, “recommend steps to integrate the network evaluation process with ongoing FCS program activities and deliverables.”

Blue Team Terms of Reference paragraph 5e

Purpose

- Set conditions for synchronized, relevant and credible network analysis to understand how the Army will “change, invest & fight as a networked force.”
- Provide mechanisms to track the evolution from currently fielded configurations through modernization of the modular units to objective network design.
- Define the issues of concern associated with those configurations. Link the resolution of those issues to key decision points and monitor progress.
- Propose an evaluation framework for the objective and comprehensive evaluation of alternative network design configurations.
- Define the process for developing and maintaining appropriate data sources for network analysis.

But to be effective, some governing body must assume ownership & provide the oversight, direction, resourcing & management of the plan.

16

• Development of Scenario Independent Network Data

- Isolation of the key components that drive completion rates and delay
- Development of network performance data that accounts for:

Sender-Receiver Prototype Pairings

Type Battle Command Software


Combat Postures

Terrain Characterization

Distances


Precedence (Cat I-IV)

UAV Profiles



What must be done to continue the progress?

- Defining and depicting communications for *current and modernized* forces.
 - Enhancing the models to better represent the *non-homogeneous force* – SBCT, TF Modularity, FCS BCT.
 - Including the *full set of user options* in represented traffic (VOIP, IM, E-mail, VTC etc).
 - Replicating the full set of *threat network attack* options.
 - Developing data to represent the impact of the *urban environment*.
 - Introducing the impact of *Processing and Cognition* in the models.
 - Replicating *functionality that will reside in the future network* – automated BDA, distributed fusion, C2 of networked fires.
 - Developing an *efficient, sustainable business model* for communications modeling and analysis at engineering performance & force effectiveness levels.
-
- The diagram illustrates the 3D TF Modularity Architecture. It features a central Ku-Band Satellite and an SHF X-Band Satellite. The Ku-Band Satellite is connected to a JTF (Joint Task Force) and a Unit Ku-Band Hub. The SHF X-Band Satellite is connected to an INMARSAT L-Band Satellite. The INMARSAT L-Band Satellite is connected to a Vendor L-Band Hub. The Vendor L-Band Hub is connected to ISDN LINES and a LEASE CIRCUIT or DISN. The Vendor L-Band Hub is also connected to a TSC-93 and a TSC-85. The TSC-93 and TSC-85 are connected to a JNN (Joint Network Node) and a DTAC (Data Transfer and Control). The JNN and DTAC are connected to a UA (User Agent) and a SMART-T (Smart Targeting). The UA and SMART-T are connected to a TDMA-IP (Time Division Multiple Access - Internet Protocol) network. The diagram also shows a STEP Site DISN Services cloud connected to the Ku-Band Satellite. The architecture is divided into two main sections: a left section with a green background and a right section with a blue background. The left section shows a UA and a SMART-T connected to a TDMA-IP network. The right section shows a UA and a SMART-T connected to a TDMA-IP network. The diagram is labeled '3 ID TF Modularity Architecture' at the bottom.



3 ID TF Modularity Architecture

