



RDECOM



TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.

Analysis of the Operational Effect of the Joint Chemical Agent Detector Using the Infantry Warrior Simulation (IWARS)

MORS: 10-12 June 2008

David Gillis

Approved for PUBLIC RELEASE;
Distribution is UNLIMITED

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 JUN 2008		2. REPORT TYPE N/A		3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Analysis of the Operational Effect of the Joint Chemical Agent Detector Using the Infantry Warrior Simulation (IWARS)				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) RDECOM				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 ADM202527. Military Operations Research Society Symposium (76th) Held in New London, Connecticut on June 10-12, 2008, The original document contains color images.					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 17	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

- Integrate chemical agent and defense capabilities into a combat simulation in order to derive quantitative Measures of Effectiveness
- Use to support CBD systems evaluations
 - JCAD Inc. 1 as test case
 - Comparative analysis against current capabilities

Infantry WARrior Simulation (IWARS):

- A M&S tool for conducting Infantry Soldier Analyses, developed jointly by AMSAA and the Natick Soldier Center
- Focuses on dismounted individuals, small units, and their equipment for assessing operational effectiveness across the spectrum of missions, threats and environments
- Development heavily influenced by Army analysis needs (e.g., Land Warrior Program)

IWARS combines:

- Soldier equipment
- Soldier behaviors
- Algorithms and data



IWARS is:

- Constructive
- Agent-based
- Multi-sided
- Focused on soldiers and small-units

IWARS Development:

- Version 1.0 approved May 2006 for:
 - Small Arms Analysis
 - Sensor Analysis
 - Lethality/Survivability Analysis
 - Limited Battle Command Analysis
- Continually integrating best available methodology/data

IWARS Supports a Range of Individual and Small-Unit Analyses

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.


- Lightweight and portable chemical agent detector
 - About 2 lb and 45 in.³
- Unobtrusive
- Visual and audio alarms
- Uses
 - Fixed or mobile platforms
 - Survey instrument
- Incremental development (Incr. 1 shown)



TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.


- **Modification of IWARS**
 - Chemical agent vapor plume modeling
 - Detector alert responses
 - CBD system performance integration
 - Soldier CB response behaviors/tactics
 - Code alteration
 - Toxological level modeling
- **Data Collection**
 - External modeling plume using HPAC
 - Scenario design w/ SMEs
 - Verification and Validation
 - Requirements data presented
- **Production Runs**
- **Documentation**
 - V&V Plan and Report
 - Event Design Plan
 - Analysis Report

- Use existing IWARS spherical smoke cloud methodology
- Edge of sphere used to trigger Soldier behaviors/effects inside chemical plume
- Time and range from center of cloud used to determine concentration ring
- Concentric rings each have a different concentration level, yet uniform within
- File created describing the $p(\text{detect})$ for different concentration levels (based on JCAD requirements)
- Detector alerts if random draw meets $p(\text{detect})$ value
- Cloud parameters (expansion rate, wind speed, wind direction) are data driven




1. Agent Cloud modeled in HPAC offline
 - No wind or terrain effects
2. Data collected
 - Maximum concentration
 - Distance from center to 0.004 mg/m³ (AEGL-1)
3. Gaussian distribution adjusted to match maximum concentration and distance to AEGL-1 level
4. Concentration per meter from the center of mass of the cloud exported to IWARS

1st Order Approximation



HPAC output of agent cloud at 5 minutes



Concentration of agent vs distance at 5 minutes
TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.

- Example data:
 - $P(d)_{cum} = 0.9$, 30 sec response time at 0.1 mg/m^3
 - $P(d)_{cum} = 0.9$, 10 sec response time at 1.0 mg/m^3
- Equation for single sample (every 5 sec) $p(d)$ derived
 - $p(d) = 1.0 - \sqrt[6]{1.0 - p(d)_{cum}}$
- Linear function generated from given data

Sample Calculations for 0.1 mg/m^3


Sample Interval = 5.0 sec

$p(d)$ cumulative = 0.9

Response Time = 30.0 sec

Samples per time (s) = $30.0 / 5.0 = 6$

$$p(d) = 1.0 - \sqrt[6]{1.0 - 0.9} = 0.319$$



Verification tests




- Chemical cloud
 - Creation, expansion, movement with wind, dissipation
 - Concentration band determination
- Alert device
 - Operating modes (survey, monitor) and audible range
 - Probability of detection and false alarm rate
- Soldier entity
 - Accumulation and reaction to chemical agent dosages
 - Use of protective gear to limit exposure time and level
 - Degraded mobility, acquisition, delivery accuracy in protective gear

Sensitivity runs


- Detector performance (50% decrease, 50% increase)
- False alarm rate (probabilities: 0.25, 0.50)
- Chemical agent susceptibility (50% decrease, 50% increase)
- Masked audible range (50% decrease, 100% increase)

Sample study

- 5 cases combine chemical agent use, MOPP gear, JCAD
- Results assess mission completion rate, mission time, small-arms losses, exposure level, exposure time




- Infantry Battalion assault on OBJ SOX
 - A Company to secure OBJ BLUE
 - 1st Platoon: Secure Route A, then building west of Route A in OBJ BLUE
 - 2nd Platoon: Provide supporting fire to 1st Platoon. After 1st Platoon has secured Route A assault to secure buildings east of Route A in OBJ BLUE
 - 3rd Platoon: Reserve (not shown)
- Threat
 - OPFOR has not used chemical agents in past; capability limited to isolated recovered munitions
 - OBJ SOX may contain an IED production site
 - BLUEFOR starts in MOPP level 2, assumes MOPP level 4 upon alarm or onset of symptoms; auto-masking for artillery/mortars
 - OPFOR previously emplaced an IED near Route A (mistakenly used old, unmarked 152mm chemical round)
- Environment
 - Nominal Temperature
 - Neutral Air Stability
 - Wind: 1 m/s SE



* Coordinated w/ US Army CBRN School, MANSCEN

Case #	Short Description	Description
1	Baseline without JCAD	Squad will move to the top of the hill and wait (will engage OPFOR from the top of the hill). In response to a chemical agent alert, Soldiers assume MOPP 4 and withdraw to starting point.
	Baseline with JCAD	Same as case #1, except: JCAD mounted to carrier.
3	Assault, No JCAD	Squad will begin assault of OPFOR building after IED detonation. When chemical symptoms are recognized, Soldiers will assume MOPP 4 and continue the assault. There will be no JCAD.
	Assault, JCAD on Squad Carrier	Same as case #3, except: JCAD mounted to squad carrier and operated continuously.
	Assault, JCAD carried by squad	Same as case #3. Squad leader will carry the JCAD during the assault.




- No Assault: Significant* Reduction (78%) with JCAD
- Assault: Significant* Reduction (91%) only with JCAD on Squad leader

* 95% Confidence

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.

Results: Average Number BLUEFOR Experiencing at Least Initial Effects




- No Assault: Average number of BLUEFOR experiencing initial effects significantly* reduced
- Assault: No significant* reduction in the number of BLUEFOR experiencing initial effects except* when the Squad Leader has the JCAD

* 95% Confidence

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.

Results: Average BLUEFOR CWA Exposure Time



- No Assault: Significant* Reduction (52%) with JCAD
- Assault: Significant* Reduction (61%) only with JCAD on Squad leader

* 95% Confidence

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.

- **Successfully demonstrated ability to integrate chemical agent effects, soldier behaviors, chemical detector capabilities into IWARS combat simulation**
- **Better evaluation of CBD system operational effectiveness by allowing determination of quantitative MOEs**
- **Additional applications to operational planning, development of tactics, techniques, and procedures**

Backup Slides

- AEGL – Acute Exposure Guidance Level
- AMSAA – US Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity
- BLUEFOR – Blue (friendly) Force
- CBD – Chemical and Biological Defense
- HPAC – Hazard Prediction and Assessment Capability
- IED – Improvised Explosive Device
- IWARS – Infantry Warrior Simulation
- JCAD – Joint Chemical Agent Detector
- M&S – Modeling and Simulation
- MOE(s) – Measure(s) of Effectiveness
- MOPP – Mission-Oriented Protective Posture
- OBJ BLUE – BLUEFOR company objective
- OBJ SOX – Assaulting force's target
- OPFOR – Opposition (non-friendly) Force
- SME(s) – Subject Matter Expert(s)
- V&V – Verification and Validation