



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE
DEFENCE SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY ORGANISATION


DSTO

MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS FOR MARITIME AREA AIR DEFENCE

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 01 OCT 2003		2. REPORT TYPE N/A		3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Measures Of Effectiveness For Maritime Area Air Defence				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) Defence Science and Technology Organisation Australia				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 ADM001929. Proceedings, Held in Sydney, Australia on July 8-10, 2003., The original document contains color images.					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 31	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			


PRESENTATION OUTLINE

- Statement of Area Air Defence Problem
- Comparison with Anti-Ship Missile Defence
- Area Air Defence MOEs
- Threat Resolve
- High Altitude Air Denial
- Low Altitude Air Denial
- Questions



Area Air Defence (AAD)

Aim: Maritime AAD relates to the situation where a surface ship employs its sensors and weapons to deny a region of airspace to enemy aircraft.



Airspace denial is defined in terms of the risk the aircraft has to tolerate as it approaches the ship.


Semi-active SAM engagement sequence

Surveillance region

Aircraft track
Radar Horizon

SAM launch

Terminal illumination





Comparison with ASMD

- AAD traditionally couched in terms of an ASMD scenario
- ASMD is a one-sided problem defined from the instant of ASM launch: namely, to defeat the incoming ASM before it reaches some keep out range from the ship
- Whereas ASMD may be likened to shooting the arrow, AAD is akin to shooting the archer



Comparison with ASMD

- Compared with ASMD, AAD is a more complex, two-sided problem:
 - Neither the ship nor the enemy aircraft are aware of how, when or if the other is going to react
 - MOEs need to be developed which do not depend on the response of either the ship or the aircraft

AAD MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS (MOEs)

- Obvious MOE is the SAM's maximum intercept range:
 - Common measure of maximum range
 - Relevant to high level approach at long range
 - Can be compared with maximum range of ASM, etc...
- **HOWEVER**, the region around a ship within the intercept range is not necessarily denied to an enemy aircraft

AAD MOEs Contd.

- Within the MEZ, the risk of being intercepted by a SAM launched by the ship will vary
- The boundaries of the transition from one risk level to another will depend, in part on the maximum intercept range, but also on other factors
- These boundaries serve to categorise the airspace surrounding the ship according to risk of intercept
- Their magnitudes provide MOEs for the AAD problem in the context of THREAT RESOLVE

[BACK TO CONTENTS](#)

Threat Resolve

- Threat resolve is characterised by the risk that an attacking aircraft is willing to tolerate in approaching an AWD
- As a “first cut”, the air space surrounding the ship is divided into TWO coarse levels of risk to an aircraft:
 - **DANGER ZONE (DZ)**
 - **SAFETY ZONE (SZ)**
- **DZ** is defined as the region within which intercept is *possible*
- **SZ** is the region outside of the SAM engagement envelope where non-interception is guaranteed

Threat Resolve

- Intercept is possible at any point that is NOT in the SZ
- DZ is thus couched in terms of not being the SZ and so is the *region outside of which, escape is guaranteed, regardless of warning*



SZ

Extends
indefinitely

Threat Resolve

The DZ may be further divided into three specific levels of risk of intercept to the aircraft. These are, in increasing order of risk:

Warning Zone (WZ) – the region within the SAM engagement envelope that allows an aircraft, following illumination, to escape prior to intercept. Escape is guaranteed with warning, but intercept is also possible if the warning is ignored.

No safety zone (NSZ) – the region within which the aircraft has the possibility of escape following SAM engagement, but at the same time can't guarantee its own safety. This applies regardless of warning.

No escape zone (NEZ) – the region within which the aircraft cannot escape following SAM engagement, regardless of warning.


[BACK TO CONTENTS](#)



High Altitude Air Denial

- For a high altitude target (eg 30 kft), there will be no issue with radar horizon
- The categorisation of the airspace is thus 1D, with the boundaries of the **SZ** and the regions within the **DZ** corresponding to the three distinct levels of danger to the aircraft being determined by:
 - the SAM's capability (speed, maximum range)
 - the aircraft's capability (speed, turn times, reaction time) and
 - the ship's reaction time


Categorisation of High Altitude Airspace




No Escape Zone - intercept guaranteed, regardless of warning



No Safety Zone - no guarantee of escape, regardless of warning



Warning Zone - escape guaranteed, with warning



Safety Zone - Guaranteed escape, regardless of warning



High Altitude Air Denial- NEZ Radius

- **NEZ** characterised by a radius r_{nez}
- Essentially a correction to the SAM engagement envelope, r_0 , at the height of the aircraft
- Guaranteed intercept of aircraft flying at or within r_{nez} of ship, *regardless of warning time given to aircraft*
- Calculation is worst case from the point of view of the ship
- Allows for possibility that aircraft has turned before ship is aware of the manoeuvre



High Altitude Air Denial - NEZ Radius

- If the aircraft is assumed to have a constant speed v_{ac} , then an aircraft at r_{nez} at the time it decides to turn and flee will just be intercepted at r_0 , where r_{nez} is given by

$$r_{NEZ} = r_0 - v_{ac} (t_{of} + t_{ship} - t_{turn})$$

SAM flyout time

Ship latency

180-deg turn time

- **NEZ** is thus a sub-level of the **Danger Zone** with a radius inside the SAM range envelope



High Altitude Air Denial - DZ Boundaries

- Let the **danger zone** be characterised by a radius r_{dz}
- This is defined as $r > r_{dz} \Rightarrow r \in$ **Safety Zone**
- For $r < r_{dz}$, interception is possible. Guaranteed for $r < r_{nez}$
- Hence the region *between* the **NEZ** and the **SZ** constitutes a region where interception is possible, but not guaranteed
- It is next shown how this region may be divided further into the two distinct levels of air denial described previously:
 - (i) **warning zone**
 - (ii) **no safety zone**

High Altitude Air Denial - WZ Radius

- Suppose aircraft has a warning of $t_l \leq t_{of}$ seconds of SAM launch before intercept at r_0 (eg., CWI from a ship's FCR)
- Again consider engagement at SAM range envelope, r_0
- A WZ radius, r_{WZ} , may be defined such that **an aircraft at that distance from the ship will *just* be intercepted at r_0 if it immediately opens its range upon receiving the warning**
- Consequently, an aircraft at any range $r > r_{WZ}$ will be guaranteed escape if it heeds the warning



High Altitude Air Denial - WZ Radius

- So the net “useful” amount of time available to the aircraft to flee the SAM from commencement of illumination to intercept at r_0 will be $t_I - t_D - t_{\text{turn}} - t_{\text{acq}}$. Hence the **WZ** radius will be given by:

$$r_{\text{WZ}} = r_0 - v_{\text{ac}} (t_I - t_D - t_{\text{turn}} - t_{\text{acq}})$$

Dither time

Turn time

Acquisition time

- Since $t_I \leq \text{tof}$, $r_{\text{NEZ}} \leq r_{\text{WZ}}$
- An aircraft at r_{WZ} will just be intercepted at the SAM's maximum range and so $r > r_{\text{WZ}} \Rightarrow$ **guaranteed escape with warning**



High Altitude Air Denial - No Safety Zone

- But what about an aircraft at a range greater than r_{NEZ} but less than r_{WZ} ?
- Outside **NEZ** $\Rightarrow$ interception not guaranteed (regardless of warning)
- $r < r_{WZ} \Rightarrow$ escape with warning not guaranteed either
- Thus for an aircraft in the range $r_{NEZ} < r < r_{WZ}$ there is the possibility of escape, regardless of warning, but that escape cannot be guaranteed
- So in the **NSZ**, both intercept and escape are *possible*, but neither are guaranteed

High Altitude Air Denial - DZ Radius

- To determine the boundary of the DZ, the warning terms in the equation for the WZ radius are set to zero
- Since the WZ determines the range beyond which escape is guaranteed *with warning*, then the zone so determined gives the range beyond which escape is guaranteed *regardless of warning* – ie., **the boundary of the DZ**




High Altitude Air Denial - DZ Radius

- If the illumination time is set to zero, then the acquisition time will also be zero and the **DZ** radius will thus be given by

$$r_{DZ} = r_0 + V_{ac} (t_D + t_{turn})$$

- Note that $r_{NEZ} \leq r_{WZ} \leq r_0 \leq r_{DZ}$. The outer boundary of the **DZ** is outside the SAM engagement envelope
- So an aircraft at a distance r_{DZ} from the ship at the decision to turn will just reach the SAM envelope after completing the turn in a time $t_D + t_{turn}$ (worst case from point of view of the aircraft)


Categorisation of High Altitude Airspace




No Escape Zone - intercept guaranteed, regardless of warning



No Safety Zone - no guarantee of escape, regardless of warning



Warning Zone - escape guaranteed, with warning



Safety Zone - Guaranteed escape, regardless of warning




Low Altitude Air Denial

- Denial of airspace for aircraft escaping below the radar horizon
- Conceptually the same as high altitude denial, but with the added condition that aircraft can escape below the radar horizon

[BACK TO CONTENTS](#)

Low Altitude Air Denial – Aircraft perspective

- What is the risk to an aircraft at a given point in space?:





Low Altitude Air Denial

- The corresponding expression for the boundary between the Safety Zone and Danger Zone becomes:

$$r_{DZ}(h) = \text{Min} [H_{rad}^{-1}(h), r_0 + v_{ac}(t_D + t_{turn})]$$

- The boundary between the Warning Zone and No Safety Zone can be parameterised by the range of aircraft escape:

$$\begin{cases} h_{WZ}(r_{esc}) = H(r_{esc}) + T_{warning} v_{ac} \sin \theta_{MAX} \\ r_{WZ}(r_{esc}) = r_{esc} - T_{warning} v_{ac} \cos \theta_{MAX} \end{cases}$$

$$T_{warning} = t_I - t_{acq} - t_D - t_{turn}$$

where t_I and hence $T_{warning}$ may depend on r_{esc} :



Low Altitude Air Denial

- Similarly the boundary between the No Safety Zone and No Escape Zone becomes:

$$\begin{cases} h_{NEZ}(r_{esc}) = H(r_{esc}) + T_{engage}(r_{esc}) v_{ac} \sin \theta_{MAX} \\ r_{NEZ}(r_{esc}) = r_{esc} - T_{engage}(r_{esc}) v_{ac} \cos \theta_{MAX} \end{cases}$$

$$T_{engage}(r_{esc}) = t_{flyout} + t_{ship} - t_{turn}$$


where t_{flyout} is a function of r_{esc} :




Low Altitude Air Denial

- **Note that significant operational complexities can be included in these calculations, such as:**
 - **Minimum aircraft flying altitudes,**
 - **Modified SAM kinematic horizons,**
 - **Support from Airborne Early Warning Aircraft,**
 - **Missiles with active seekers,**
 - **etc.**


2-D Categorisation of Airspace



Low Altitude Air Denial – Ship's perspective




Low Altitude Air Denial - Combined perspective





QUESTIONS



Well,,,,, ACTUALLY

[BACK TO OUTLINE](#)

[1D AIRSPACE SCHEMATIC](#)