



# Ensuring Schedulability in the Weapon Target Assignment Problem

Debbie Pederson  
June 12, 2008

**76<sup>th</sup> MORS Symposium**  
**WG-4, Air and Missile Defense**

*A Systems Engineering  
Company Providing  
Analytical Solutions To  
Complex Problems*

Approved for Public Release  
08-MDA-3469 (15 MAY 08)

# 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<br><b>01 JUN 2008</b>  |                                    | 2. REPORT TYPE<br><b>N/A</b>        |                            | 3. DATES COVERED<br><b>-</b>             |                                 |
| 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE<br><b>Ensuring Schedulability in the Weapon Target Assignment Problem</b>   |                                    |                                     |                            | 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)<br><b>Decisive Analytics</b>   |                                    |                                     |                            | 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<br><b>Approved for public release, distribution unlimited</b>   |                                    |                                     |                            |  |                                 |
| 13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES<br><b>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.</b> |                                    |                                     |                            |  |                                 |
| 14. ABSTRACT  |                                    |                                     |                            |  |                                 |
| 15. SUBJECT TERMS   |                                    |                                     |                            |  |                                 |
| 16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:   |                                    |                                     | 17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT | 18. NUMBER OF PAGES                      | 19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON |
| a. REPORT<br><b>unclassified</b>  | b. ABSTRACT<br><b>unclassified</b> | c. THIS PAGE<br><b>unclassified</b> |                            |  |                                 |




- The Weapon-Target Assignment Problem
- Deployment Related Issues
- Separability
- Conclusion

# Weapon Target Assignment (WTA)

Given a set of weapon batteries and a set of incoming targets, what is the assignment of interceptors to targets that will maximize the value of targets killed?

- Difficult problem to solve optimally for large numbers of weapons/targets.
- May need to be re-solved repeatedly as battlespace evolves.
- Need good, quick solution method



# Previous Work

- Maximum Marginal Return (denBroeder et al, 1958)
  - Greedy algorithm makes assignments to maximize marginal contribution
  - Optimal in some instances
- Network Flow (Castanon et al, 1987)
- Genetic Algorithms (Grant et al, 1993)


These approaches will solve the allocation problem, but do not consider the schedulability of the results

- The Weapon-Target Assignment Problem
- Deployment Related Issues
- Separability
- Conclusion



# Schedulability

- Individual weapon site's scheduling system could invalidate allocation
  - Default schedule might conflict with other site's default schedule
  - Allocated more than are launchable
  - Required time between intercepts
- Benefits from coordination
  - Inter-site Shoot-Look-Shoot



# Scheduling Constraints

- Inter-site coordination introduces a different set of problems
  - Inter-intercept requirements
  - Communication of kill assessment
- Other constraints include
  - Inter-launch requirements
  - Maximum number of interceptors in air at a time
  - Maximum number of distinct threats targeted

# Weapon Allocation + Scheduling

Maximize expected value of threats intercepted

subject to

$$\sum_{j=1}^n V_j \left[ 1 - \prod_{i=1}^m (1 - p_{ij})^{x_{ij}} \right]$$


- Inventory
- Min/max allocation limits
- Inter-launch timing
- Inter-intercept timing
- Max in the air at a time
- Max # distinct threats engaged

- The Weapon-Target Assignment Problem
- Deployment Related Issues
- Separability
- Conclusion



# Solution Approach

- Goal: Compute a schedulable allocation of interceptors to threats within a relatively short amount of time
- Adding scheduling to the WTA problem drastically expands the problem size
- Propose problem separation
  - Solve WTA
  - Attempt to schedule this allocation
  - If not all scheduled, constrain the WTA problem and repeat
- WTA/Scheduling share objective function; both working toward same goal



# Benefits

- Separability makes it possible to solve allocation and scheduling problem separately in a reasonable time
  - Implemented in Matlab, meets given run time specification
- Could implement different (related) goals for allocation/scheduling portions. For example:
  - Allocation module uses tactics (coordinated interceptor plans from multiple sites)
  - Scheduling is done interceptor by interceptor, addressing highest valued threat first
- Modular algorithm improvements
  - Replace Allocation or Scheduling section without affecting the other

# Modular Development Example

- Problem: Operators want to be able to ensure all threats are engaged
- Previously had been solving allocation problem with tactics-based MMR, which tended to lead to over-engagement of high valued threats
- Solution: Implement two-pass allocation algorithm
  - First pass: Constraint programming inspired solution ensures operator's goal is met
  - Second pass: MMR-like improvement

- The Weapon-Target Assignment Problem
- Deployment Related Issues
- Separability
- Conclusion



# Improvements & Future Work

- Allocation
  - Incorporate MHMMR to improve responsiveness to changing mission value functions
- Scheduling
  - Develop a less rudimentary heuristic
  - Incorporate time-varying success probabilities

# Conclusion

- Classic WTA solutions are not concerned with the schedulability of the allocations
- Any deployed coordination system must take the scheduling of interceptors into account
- To maintain reasonable run-time, we have implemented a allocate/schedule cycle. Each part solves a small problem quickly
- This also provides a good basis for quickly incorporating improved algorithms

# Backup

# References

- denBroeder, G.G., Ellison, R.E. and Emerling, L., "On Optimum Target Assignments", *Operations Research*, Vol.7, pp. 322-326, 1959.
- Lloyd, S.P. and Witsenhausen, H.S., "Weapons Allocation is NP-Complete", Proceedings of 1986 Summer Conference on Simulation, Reno, Nevada, July 1986.

# Maximum Marginal Return

- Greedy heuristic for solving the WTA problem
- MMR procedure
  - Calculate the marginal value that would result for all possible interceptor/target pairings
  - Find the maximum contribution, assign that interceptor to the target
  - Recalculate the marginal values, repeat until all available interceptors have been assigned


Graphical example assigning two interceptors:



# Maximum Marginal Return

- Greedy heuristic for solving the WTA problem
- MMR procedure
  - Calculate the marginal value that would result for all possible interceptor/target pairings
  - Find the maximum contribution, assign that interceptor to the target
  - Recalculate the marginal values, repeat until all available interceptors have been assigned


Graphical example assigning two interceptors:



# Maximum Marginal Return

- Greedy heuristic for solving the WTA problem
- MMR procedure
  - Calculate the marginal value that would result for all possible interceptor/target pairings
  - Find the maximum contribution, assign that interceptor to the target
  - Recalculate the marginal values, repeat until all available interceptors have been assigned

Graphical example assigning two interceptors:



# Adapting MMR

- Pros
  - Very fast: Run-time proportional to inventory
  - Good solution: Guaranteed optimal for target-based mission value if kill probabilities are equal between sites
- Cons
  - Limited scope: Unable to solve asset-based WTA because only considers single interceptor assignments
  - Not optimal in general: Susceptible to localized maxima

**Goal: Adapt MMR to make a more flexible algorithm to use when final form of mission value is uncertain.**

- Maximum Marginal Return (MMR)
- Multi-Hypothesis MMR
- Results
- Conclusion




# Multi-Hypothesis MMR

- Goals
  - Better -- Improve on MMR solution
  - Fast -- Maintain run-time
  - Flexible -- applicable to more possible Mission Value functions
  - Quick development of algorithm
- Enumeration provides optimal solution, but quickly becomes intractable as # targets or inventory grows
- Other methods may give optimal solution for particular Mission Value functions

MHMMR combines search properties of Enumeration and speed of MMR to provide good, fast solution for variety of objectives

# MHMMR - Branch


## Procedure for Multi-Hypothesis MMR



## MHMMR

- Marginal mission value arrays are calculated for each candidate allocation
- **Branch:** create  $b$  hypotheses for each candidate allocation


## Procedure for MMR



## MMR

- One Marginal Mission Value array is calculated
- Assign interceptor to site/threat combo that maximizes marginal MV


# MHMMR - Prune



## MHMMR

- **Prune:** maintain the  $p$  best hypotheses as candidate allocations


## Procedure for MMR



## MMR

- One Marginal Mission Value array is calculated
- Assign interceptor to site/threat combo that maximizes marginal MV

# MHMMR – Branch and Prune



# MHMMR – Conclusions


- Implementation details
  - Branching needs to be independent of specific mission value function used. Maintain modularity.
  - Pruning needs to give distinct candidate allocations. If same hypothesis arises from two different candidates, include it at most once in next set of candidates.
- Branch/Prune parameters
  - Since all marginal mission values are calculated to determine branching, low additional computation cost required to maintain large number of branches.
  - Using only 1 branch reduces MHMMR to classic MMR. Since MHMMR contains MMR, MHMMR is guaranteed to outperform (or at least equal) MMR.
- Quick to implement

- Maximum Marginal Return (MMR)
- Multi-Hypothesis MMR
- Results
- Conclusion



# Target-Based Mission Value

- Goal: Maximize the total expected value of targets (incoming threats) destroyed
- 3 targets with values 10, 10 and 40
- 2 sites, both with 3 interceptors.
- $pK = \begin{bmatrix} .99 & .9 & .5 \\ .5 & .01 & .4 \end{bmatrix}$




|               | MMR Results   | MHMMR Results    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---------------|---|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Allocation    | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </table> | 1                | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 1             | 0   | 2                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 0             | 0   | 3                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1             | 1   | 1                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 0             | 0   | 3                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Mission Value | 47.74   | 54.58 (optimal!) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Run-time      | 0.01 sec  | 0.015 sec        |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

Mission Value Function

$$\sum_{j=1}^n V_j \left[ 1 - \prod_{i=1}^m (1 - p_{ij})^{x_{ij}} \right]$$

# Asset-Based Mission Value


- Goal: Maximize the total expected value of assets protected
- 3 targets with values 10, 10 and 40
- 2 sites, both with 3 interceptors.
- $pK = \begin{bmatrix} .99 & .9 & .5 \\ .5 & .01 & .4 \end{bmatrix}$



|               | MMR Results   | MHMMR Results    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---------------|---|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Allocation    | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </table> | 0                | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 0             | 0   | 3                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 0             | 0   | 3                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1             | 1   | 1                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 0             | 0   | 3                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Mission Value | 38.92   | 44.59 (optimal!) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Run-time      | 0.01 sec  | 0.05 sec         |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

# MHMMR Performance

- Adjusting branching and pruning parameters changes behavior:
  - If one branch is kept and one branch is created, MHMMR is equivalent to MMR
  - If no branches are pruned and all branches are created, MHMMR is equiv. to enumeration
- Increasing the number of branches kept increases expected mission value
- Increasing the number of branches may increase expected mission value



- Maximum Marginal Return (MMR)
- Multi-Hypothesis MMR
- Results
- Conclusion



# Conclusions

- MHMMR is a fast algorithm that is appropriate for solving the WTA problem for a wide variety of MV functions
  - Demonstrated optimal performance on specific scenario with target-based and asset-based MV.
- It may be possible to develop better approaches for any particular MV function, but MHMMR provides a quick check that is better than the classic MMR
  - Classic MMR is unable to solve asset-based MV. MHMMR could with no modifications to underlying algorithm
- Does not require much labor to implement; low risk development