




**Army Science Board
FY2009 Summer Study Follow-On Report**

November 2009

**PLATFORMS FOR PERSISTENT
COMMUNICATIONS, SURVEILLANCE
AND RECONNAISSANCE – II**



**Department of the Army
Assistant Secretary of the Army
(Acquisition, Logistics and Technology)
Washington, D.C. 20310-0103**

Distribution Statement:

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

20100907148

DISCLAIMER

This report is the product of the Army Science Board (ASB). The ASB is a Federal Advisory Committee established to provide independent advice to the Secretary of the Army (SA) and the Chief of Staff, Army (CSA). Statements, opinions, conclusions, and recommendations contained in this report are those of the Army Science Board and do not necessarily reflect any official position of the United States Army or the Department of Defense.



ARMY SCIENCE BOARD
2511 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
SUITE 11500
ARLINGTON, VA 22202-3911

16 April 2010

MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FOR
ACQUISITION, LOGISTICS AND TECHNOLOGY

SUBJECT: Report of the 2009 Army Science Board Summer Study on
Persistent Communications, Surveillance and Reconnaissance-II

I am pleased to forward the final report of the Army Science Board (ASB) Study on Persistent Communications, Surveillance and Reconnaissance-II. The report offers recommendations to the Army on enhancing and optimizing the mix and capabilities of communications, surveillance and reconnaissance mission payloads and platforms.

The Terms of Reference signed by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology in 2008 tasked the ASB to analyze the complexities of providing communications, surveillance and reconnaissance (CSR) for a broad range of support missions. Improvements in these areas will enhance the capabilities and security of all Army ground forces. Support for continuous high bandwidth communications on the move and providing timely high quality surveillance and reconnaissance information are prerequisites for the netcentric operations envisioned for the future Army. Particularly relevant to effective future CSR are the capabilities and benefits of high altitude airships and aerostats which offer the potential for extraordinary endurance, low operational cost and modest support requirements in both equipment and manpower.

The report includes discussion of a flexible analytical model that was essential in arriving at the findings and recommendations of the study and can be used to compare the relative values of different combinations of aerial platforms and associated payloads to accomplish specified CSR missions.


I endorse the study's findings and recommendations and encourage you to forward this report to the Secretary of the Army.

Frank H. Akers, Jr.
Chair, Army Science Board

CONTENTS

Final Briefing	1
Backup Slides.....	44
Annex A – Terms of Reference	49
Annex B – Sponsor Direction	51
Annex C – Bibliography.....	53
Annex D – Example S&R Sensor Systems.....	59
Annex E – Additional Charts/Information.....	63
Annex F – Abbreviations	77


**FINAL BRIEFING OF THE
2009 ARMY SCIENCE BOARD
ON
PERSISTENT COMMUNICATIONS,
SURVEILLANCE AND RECONNAISSANCE
PHASE II**



This report provides an assessment of multiple aerial platform and payload combinations that could be employed to conduct persistent communications, surveillance, and reconnaissance (PCSR) missions in current conflict scenarios.

It summarizes the results of a two phase Army Science Board Summer Study. Phase I of the study, conducted in 2008, evaluated 12 classes of unmanned aerial platforms. Phase II of the study, conducted in 2009, identified payloads for potential deployment on those platforms and evaluated 36 payload/platform options for PCSR. Conclusions and recommendation are included in this report for the Army's consideration.

The sponsor for this study was the Commander of the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command/Army Forces Strategic Command (SMDC/ARSTRAT), LTG Kevin Campbell. The Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisition, Logistics and Technology) (ASA(ALT)), Mr. Dean G. Popps, tasked the ASB to perform the PCSR study with a focus on the needs of the brigade combat team (BCT) and below.



-

The figure on the right of the slide shows coverage areas from platforms operating at altitudes extending from 1,000 to 65,000 feet. It is superimposed over Afghanistan. Although satellites are not shown on the chart, an analysis of satellites for communications missions are included. Satellites used for surveillance and reconnaissance missions were not within the scope of this study. Note that the actual coverage that can be achieved within the concentric circles will be affected multiple factors like terrain, weather, and payload characteristics, which are included in our analysis.



Persistent CSR II Study Membership

Co-Chairs

LTG (Ret.) William Campbell

Mr. Charles Vehlow

Study Teams

SMDC/ARSTRAT Advisor –
Mr. Tom Pagán

Study Manager
Ms. Anorme Anim – ASB

Communications (Comms) Team

Dr. Allen Adler
Dr. Peter Swan
BG(Ret) Robert Wynn

Surveillance & Reconnaissance (SR) Team

Dr. Darrell Collier
Mr. Gary Glaser
Mr. Steve Scalera

Study Team Support

Mr. Bruce Held – RAND
Dr. James Providakes – MITRE
Mr. Michael Groenert – NVL

Mr. Patrick Heaney – HQDA(G-2)
Cadet Poga Ahn – USMA

The composition and structure of the Army Science Board panel that conducted the study are shown here. Although its membership is relatively small, the panel includes a diverse set of professionals with military, business, and academic credentials as well as expertise in the disciplines of engineering, science, communications and sensor/radar systems, and military operations. Detailed backgrounds of panel members can be found in the Army Science Board Biographical Sketch Book.



2008 PCSR I to 2009 PCSR II

- Persistent CSR capabilities studies roadmap
 - PCSR I platform findings:
 - Medium- and High-Altitude Lighter Than Air (LTA) airships (untethered) were about equal to or better than Unmanned Air Vehicles (UAVs) at comparable altitudes for Persistent CSR
 - Medium-altitude LTA airships offer promising capabilities for CSR in the near term
 - LTA aerostats (tethered) compared poorly to LTA airships (untethered)
 - For Persistent CSR, Innovative Low Earth Orbit (LEO) did not rate well
 - Geosynchronous Earth Orbit (GEO) SATs have high potential value
 - PCSR II assessed payload performance and compatibility for the platforms evaluated in PCSR I

This slide presents a roadmap from the Phase I study completed in 2008 to the Phase II study completed in 2009. Last year the panel assessed platforms; this year the panel assessed platform and payload combinations.

Last year's study showed that medium- and high-altitude airships have very high value and compare well to unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) at the same altitudes. Moreover, medium lighter-than-air (LTA) platforms offer promising capabilities in the near term. The 2008 study also found that LTA aerostats that are tethered compared poorly to untethered LTA platforms because of mobility issues. Note, however, the tethered variant would be preferred in certain situations (like base camp security missions). Geosynchronous Earth orbit (GEO) satellites were found to have high potential value, while low Earth orbit (LEO) satellites (for example, "operationally responsive space" satellites) had low value due to time-on-station issues.

The following summarizes the 2008 PCSR I study and its findings and recommendations.

Studies of military operations indicate a need for improvements in persistent communications, reconnaissance, and surveillance (PCSR).

The Army Science Board (ASB) investigated capabilities of platforms deployed in space, near space, and lower altitudes and assessed tradeoffs among benefits, weaknesses, costs, and logistics burdens associated with platform types. The study used a model to assess platform types versus relevant characteristics. Key findings include: persistence is not well defined; coverage gaps exist; communications relay capabilities are inadequate; use of commercial space platforms for communications relay is very costly; large aircraft

(e.g., KC-135) could be utilized for communications relay; proponenty for CSR platforms is distributed and many solutions are ad hoc; no integrated mission analysis of alternatives (AoA) was found; satellites are not sufficiently responsive to lower echelon commanders; unmanned platforms are increasingly effective and accepted; and LTA platforms have great potential.

Major recommendations include: assign proponenty for LTA to the Aviation Center; retain proponenty for high-altitude LTA platforms at the Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC); accelerate medium-altitude LTA (untethered) prototypes for joint CSR experiments; invest to mature high-altitude LTA airship CSR platforms; form an LTA integrated product team (IPT) of technologists, material developers, and combat developers; and conduct an integrated AoA for CSR platforms mixes.

The study sponsor requested that the team continue its assessment of PCSR by evaluating combinations of platforms and associated communications, surveillance, and reconnaissance payloads and identifying those configurations that would best satisfy PCSR missions.



Persistent CSR II Terms of Reference (TOR)

The goal of this study is to suggest best uses of PCSR assets, including reporting on:

- Capabilities of platforms (satellites, UAVs, airships) deployed at various altitudes including space, near-space, high altitude, medium altitude, and lower altitudes
- PCSR payloads
- Benefits and weaknesses of potential payload / platform options
 - Mobility, sustainability, and the support burden for PCSR assets used in the current and future force
 - Cost comparisons of payload and platform options
- The utility of the analytic models for conducting analyses to support decisions involving complex issues (Internal task to ASB Study Group)

The goal of the study as defined in the Terms of Reference (TOR) (Appendix A) was to suggest best uses of PCSR assets to include reporting on (1) platforms (including space- and near-space-based capabilities; high- and medium-altitude long endurance UAVs and airships; and lower altitude UAVs); and (2) payloads that could be deployed on those platforms.

The TOR also asked for an assessment of benefits and weaknesses of payload/platform options to include such criteria as mobility, sustainability, support burden, and costs. This type of assessment clearly requires a model tailored to facilitate comparative analysis with the flexibility to vary the weights of the criteria in order to gain insight into the relative values of the options under varying conditions and priorities.

As a consequence, the panel chose to use the same type of Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) model that was employed in the Phase I study. This approach was considered to be appropriate because it supports decisions that involve both tangible and intangible features that need to be measured and traded off to determine how well the options meet the objectives of the decisionmaker.

Beyond the immediate goal of suggesting best uses of PCSR assets, the panel was also asked to provide its views on the utility of analytical models of this nature for conducting analyses in support of decisions involving complex issues.




Study Assumptions and Scope

- Assume Afghanistan and Iraq
- Assume existing / planned sensors and comms devices
 - Focus on unmanned air/space platforms
 - Do not consider ground-based systems
- Focus on Brigade Combat Team (BCT) and below
- SR in theater is near-real time and sensor data links are integral to the system
- Intelligence dissemination and fusion were not considered; evaluated sensors only
- Analysis of Comms and SR will be done independently and then merged
- Focus on 3–5-year timeframe

The study was bounded by the key assumptions shown on the facing slide. The mission was constrained to the current conflict and enemies; CSR payloads were limited to those that currently exist or are planned for acquisition and deployment within the 3- to 5-year timeframe; and the focus was on unmanned aerial platforms and space platforms. Ground-based systems were not addressed. The study focused on the needs of the brigade combat team (BCT) and lower echelons with service to the disadvantaged user being a matter of key importance.

For surveillance and reconnaissance, we assumed that collection would be accomplished in the theater of operations and that sensor data links would be integral to all collection platforms to enable near-real-time support to end users. The intelligence function was not addressed per guidance from the sponsor. Satellite platforms were not included in the surveillance and reconnaissance options that we assessed due to security classification constraints. However, satellites were included in the analysis of communications options.

To reduce complexity of the analysis and to ensure that mission-related insights were not lost through aggregation, the analysis was conducted by separate subpanels, one focused on communications and the other on surveillance and reconnaissance. After the analysis was completed by each subpanel, the full panel came together and conducted an assessment of options to execute integrated PCSR operations concurrently on the same platform.



The above slide provides a frame of reference for the study by showing aerial and space-based PCSR assets that could provide support to a BCT. It shows nodes and platforms in the global information grid (GiG) system of systems at multiple layers from mud to space that are anticipated in the 2013 timeframe.

The graphic shows the interactions between the architecture and its environment, and among systems in the architecture. It provides a quick, high-level description of the architecture, its coverage, and its connectivity.

This operational view served as the starting point for identifying opportunities to enhance, thicken, and modify the network to improve its capacity to deliver support to commanders at all levels "...what they need, when they need it, for as long as they need it." It also allowed us to evaluate other assets (e.g., tethered aerostats) in the context of the overarching framework.



Visits/Contacts

Army

SMDC/ARSTRAT
HQDA (G-6 G-2)
TRADOC HQ
Ft. Monmouth
Night Vision Lab
PEO Aviation
AMCOM

Air Force

Kirtland AFB –
Operationally Responsive
Space (ORS)

Other

DRAPER LAB
LINCOLN LAB
OSD
DARPA
MITRE
RAND

Industry

AeroEnvironment
BAE Systems
General Atomics
Harris Corporation
ISL Corporation
Lockheed Martin

The panel met with representatives of multiple organizations to gain insights on technology, material development efforts, combat development activities, and warfighters' needs based on recent combat experience in irregular warfare environments. This included reviews of the documentation collected in PCSR I study and other relevant documents provided by federally funded research and development centers, defense industrial firms, Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) elements, and Air Force and Army organizations shown on this slide. (Annex C provides greater detail on our visits and contacts.)



Key Findings from Visits/Contacts

- “Persistence” in the communications domain generally means 24/7 connectivity for narrow band and broad band communications.
- “Persistence” in the SR domain generally means coverage where, when, and for how long it is needed.
- A tailorable mix of PCSR assets deployed at low, medium and high altitudes is envisioned.
- Satellites are viewed as essential components of the PCSR mix.
- There are several new PCSR initiatives underway (e.g., 39 Air Force Liberty Ship C-12 platforms with sensors; OSD Hybrid LTA initiative)
- There is growing acceptance of untethered LTA airships in OSD and the Army for PCSR.
- 2009 ASB LandWarNet study emphasized need for multipayload aerial communications relay capabilities and Capstone experimentation.
- Army concept for modernizing the network is occurring in 2-year cycles with agile / rapid acquisition.

Key findings from our interactions with experts are shown on this slide. They are key because they had a significant impact on the construction of our analytical model and execution of the analytical process.

Persistence has varying definitions. For communications, it means providing connectivity 24/7/365 in both wideband and narrowband domains; for surveillance and reconnaissance missions, however, it generally means providing commanders coverage where they need it, when they need it, and for the duration they require it.

There is no single silver bullet. Consequently a tailorable mix of PCSR assets deployed at low, medium, and high altitudes is envisioned. Satellites are widely deployed and are viewed as essential components of the PCSR mix.

In addition to the variety of aerial and space PCSR capabilities deployed today, there are several new initiatives underway. Some are programs of record (PORs), while others are initiatives responding to urgent operational needs stated by combatant commanders or outgrowths of high-level studies. Among the latter category are two that warrant special mention: (1) the Air Force initiative to acquire 39 Liberty Ship (C-12) platforms equipped with sensor packages, and (2) a hybrid LTA initiative sponsored by the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I)) that has been delegated to the Army for execution.

There is growing recognition of the potential value of untethered LTA airships and acceptance of this option for operational experimentation and deployment. The 2008 Phase I PCSR report was used by OSD in a recent Deep Dive study. The USD(I) and

Army G-2 were personally briefed on the Phase I study and asked to be briefed on the results of the Phase II study.

Multiple findings by the PCSR II study and the ASB LandWarNet 2009 study converge. Both see the need for multi-payload packages, aerial communications relay capabilities, and capstone experimentation. Both also see the need for agility in the acquisition process to accommodate the Army's emerging concept to modernize the network incrementally in 2-year cycles in lieu of the traditional DoD 5000 process that is designed to deliver complete solutions via an elongated acquisition process



Study Methodology

- Focused on the Irregular Warfare environment and related communications and surveillance / reconnaissance into 18 missions
- Organized around three major thrusts
 - Communications solutions—radios paired with platforms
 - Surveillance and reconnaissance solutions—sensors with downlinks paired with platforms
 - Integrated CSR solutions—radios and sensors paired with platforms
- Gathered data on payloads and their characteristics
- Identified multiple criteria for analyzing options:
 - Total Cost of Ownership (3 sub-criteria)
 - Operational Flexibility (5 sub-criteria)
 - Maturity (1 criterion)
 - Operational Utility (18 missions as sub-criteria)
- Selected and populated a model; conducted comparative value analyses of 36 payload and platform options
- Performed sensitivity analysis

We used a structured process to assess the relative value of various payload and platform combinations to accomplish PCSR missions.

10

The study panel's overarching methodology was to use meetings, visits, and document research to collect an updated baseline of information; employ the baseline as a point of reference when developing an analytical model; and apply the model to assess options, draw conclusions, and make recommendations. As indicated in the blue banner on the slide, we employed a structured process to evaluate the potential means (i.e., payload and platform combinations) to accomplish a well-defined suite of communications and surveillance and reconnaissance missions.

We began by decomposing the generic communications and surveillance and reconnaissance missions into 18 more detailed sub-missions. Next we organized our study activities into three discrete thrusts:

- Radios were paired with platforms as potential means to accomplish communications missions.
- Sensors were paired with platforms as potential means to accomplish surveillance and reconnaissance missions.
- Integrated sensor/radio combinations were paired with platforms as potential means to accomplish composite communications and surveillance and reconnaissance missions.

After determining the feasibility of the potential payload/platform combinations based on known size, weight, and power (SWAP) characteristics, we selected 17 potential communications solutions, 13 potential surveillance and reconnaissance solutions, and 6 poten-


tial integrated communications and surveillance and reconnaissance solutions for evaluation.

Next, we identified criteria to be used in the evaluation process. The top-level criteria were total cost of ownership, operational flexibility, maturity, and operational utility (i.e., mission effectiveness).

Finally, we exercised a tailored AHP model to conduct a comparative analysis of 36 payload/platform options versus the criteria that included the 18 sub-missions previously discussed. We ran multiple iterations of the model, varying the weights of the criteria to show how the relative values of the options changed as decision criteria were modified.



Analysis Model



This slide shows the top-level evaluation criteria with their subcriteria that were used in evaluating the 36 PCSR options summarized on the right half of the slide. All major criteria were equally weighted for base case analysis (i.e., 25 percent each). All subcriteria were equally weighted as components of their parent category. During sensitivity analysis, the weights were varied according to diverse assumptions about the decisionmakers' preferences.

Total cost of ownership had three equally weighted subcomponents (procurement/acquisition costs; maintenance and operations costs; and infrastructure costs).

Operational flexibility had five equally weighted subcomponents (mission agility; all-terrain operations; all-weather operations; airspace management; and vulnerability).

Maturity had one subcomponent (technology readiness level).

Operational utility consisted of submissions identified for three broad categories of operations with each submission having equal weight within their category. For purposes of this study, we structured the analysis specifically on irregular warfare operations, which had 18 sub-missions assigned across the communications and surveillance and reconnaissance domains. Those sub-missions are evaluated on succeeding slides.

Note: We did not attempt to evaluate the areas of major combat operations or stability operations because the focus of this study was directed to be on current conflicts. Inclusion of all three types of operations in our evaluation would have distorted the results of an analysis that was essentially focused on current operations in Afghanistan. Nonethe-

less, the model can be used in the future to evaluate these additional operational domains either individually or collectively.

We chose the AHP model because it is a proven structured technique that is useful in complex decisionmaking, particularly where there is a lack of comprehensive quantified empirical data. It helps decisionmakers understand the problem and select solutions that satisfy the decision criteria they choose. The model incorporates psychology and mathematics in a manner that supports quantifying the elements of the problem (using quantitative data when available and expert judgment when it is not), associating the criteria with objectives, and evaluating options using pair-wise judgments about the relative value (e.g., “twice as good”) of each solution versus each of the others for each evaluation criterion and the missions.

The “hierarchy” element of the process involves decomposing the problem into a hierarchy of subcomponents as we did with the missions and criteria that are discussed in more detail in succeeding slides. We compared elements of the solution to one another in a pair-wise manner based largely on expert judgments made by the panel and entered the relative evaluations (on a scale of plus 9 through minus 9) into the model. The model converted these evaluations into values that were processed and compared over the complete set of potential solutions being considered, and histograms were generated to show the relative values of the potential solutions both numerically and graphically.



Communications Analysis

12

The next set of slides shows the elements of analysis for communications missions and the comparative evaluation of the options.




Communications Missions Analyzed In Irregular Warfare Operations

1. Provide High Bandwidth Network Node Service
2. Provide Low Bandwidth Network Node Service
3. Provide Low Bandwidth Sensor Data Exfiltration
4. Broadcast Blue Situational Awareness
5. Broadcast High Bandwidth
6. Relay Low Bandwidth Digital, to Include Disadvantaged Users
7. Relay High Bandwidth Digital
8. Provide Combat 911 Services to Include Search and Rescue and Medical Evacuation
9. Relay Low Bandwidth Voice
10. Provide Telecom Trunking and Gateway Services
11. Provide Network Situational Awareness

13

This slide shows how we decomposed the communications mission in irregular warfare operations into 11 subcomponents. The missions include high-bandwidth and low-bandwidth voice, data, and video media. Specialty missions like Blue Force Tracking, Combat 911 (Sheriff's Net), and connectivity to disadvantaged users were included. Collectively, these missions provide a comprehensive suite of capabilities at the granularity required for a rigorous analysis of options.



Payload Classes	Exemplars
Low Data Rate and Voice Waveform	SINCGARS
Low Data Rate, No Voice	EPLRS
Soldier Radio Waveform	SRW (JTRS Waveform)
Commercial Cell Phone & Gov. Satellite Low Data Rate	Iridium/MUOS
Government GEO Comm Sat & Commercial Comm Satellites	WGS & GEO Satellites
Wideband Government Waveform and Radio Packages	WNW (JTRS Waveform)
Wideband Government Waveform and Radio Packages	MR TCDL
Wideband Government Waveform and Radio Packages	HNW (WIN-T Waveform, broadband)

Platform Classes	Exemplars
Low Altitude, Fixed Wing (LAFW)	Shadow
Medium Altitude, Fixed Wing (MAFW)	Warrior
Medium Altitude, Lighter Than Air, Medium Lift (MALTAML)	MALTAMED LIFT
High Altitude, Fixed Wing (HAFW)	Global Observer
High Altitude, Lighter Than Air (HALTA)	HAAIRSHIP
Low Data Rate Satellites (LDRS)	Iridium MUOS
High Data Rate Satellites (HDRS)	WGS Commercial

- **SINCGARS:** The Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio System is a widely deployed narrowband tactical radio providing voice and data communications.
- **EPLRS:** The Enhanced Position Location Reporting System is a legacy tactical radio system providing narrowband data transmission capabilities on the battlefield. It is the backbone of the Tactical Internet deployed by the Army.
- **SRW:** Soldier Radio Waveform is a transformational capability being delivered by the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) program to provide secure networked communications for dismounted warfighters on the battlefield.
- **Iridium/MUOS:** Iridium is a commercial satellite constellation that can provide secure voice and data support to military users with special narrowband satellite phones; MUOS is the next-generation UHF narrowband military satellite.

- WGS and GEO Satellites: WGS, previously named Wideband Gap-Filler Satellite, is a military system providing broadband communications support; GEO refers to commercial geosynchronous satellites providing broadband capabilities.
- WNW: Wideband Networking Waveform is a broadband transformational capability being delivered by the JTRS program to provide secure networked communications for mounted warfighters on the battlefield.
- MR TCDL: Multirole Tactical Command Data Link is a secure data link used to send secure data and streaming video links from airborne platforms to ground stations.
- HNW: Highband Networking Waveform is a broadband transformational capability being delivered by the Warfighter Information Network (WIN-T) program to provide secure battlefield connectivity and reachback.
- Communications platform exemplars include low-, medium-, and high-altitude platforms and satellites. The UAVs and airships are further characterized in the backup slides.



Communications Payload and Platform Options Analyzed

Platform	Payload
One High-Altitude LTA	Wideband Comms Package (MR TC DL)
One High-Altitude LTA	Wideband Comms Package (HNW)
One High-Altitude Aircraft	Wideband Comms Package (HNW)
Three Medium-Altitude LTA	Wideband Comms Package (MR TC DL or HNW)
Three Medium-Altitude LTA	Wideband Comms Package (WNW)
One High-Altitude Aircraft	Wideband Comms Package (MR TC DL)
Three Medium-Altitude LTA	Narrowband Comms Package (SRW)
Three Medium-Altitude LTA	Narrowband Comms Package (SINCGARS)
Three Medium-Altitude LTA	Wideband Comms Package (HNW) and Narrowband (SINCGARS)
Three Medium-Altitude Aircraft	Wideband Comms Package (HNW) and Narrowband (SINCGARS)

Platform (cont'd)	Payload (cont'd)
Three Medium-Altitude Aircraft	Wideband Comms Package (MR TC DL or HNW)
Three Medium-Altitude Aircraft	Wideband Comms Package (WNW)
Three Medium-Altitude Aircraft	Narrowband Comms Package (SRW)
Three Medium-Altitude Aircraft	Narrowband Comms Package (SINCGARS)
Ten Low-Altitude Aircraft	Narrowband Comms Package (802.11 or SRW or SINCGARS)
Mobile Satellites	Narrowband Comms Package (Inidium, UHF TACSAT, MUOS)
WB Satellite	Wideband Comms Package (FDMA or TDMA)

15

This slide shows the 17 payload/platform combinations chosen for analysis. Most of these are single-payload options, but some options include combinations of wideband and narrowband payloads on platforms that have the SWAP capacity to accommodate multiple payloads.


To ensure that we were making realistic comparisons of options for “persistent” communications, we used the following quantities of platform/payload combinations to provide for 24/7 coverage:

- Low-altitude aircraft: 10
- Medium-altitude UAVs and aerostats: 3
- Satellites and high-altitude UAVs and aerostats: 1

Central to the value analysis of each option is the pair-wise comparison of the relative merit of each option to each other option for each criterion as described in the preceding discussion of the AHP model.



Comparative Value Analysis of Persistent Communications Options



Weighting Criteria:

Cost (.23), Operational Flexibility (.12), Maturity (.12), Operational Utility (.53)

Insights:

- Satellites were highly valued. Iridium and UHF TACSAT are in orbit and affordable. However, capacity (# of users) is limited. They must be supplemented by other assets.
- The blue shaded payload-platform combinations are high-value candidates. The analysis indicates operational needs are best met with a combination of low- and high-bandwidth radios at medium and high altitudes.
- The relative value of payload combinations at varying altitudes provides insight the Army can use when deciding how to meet its capability gap resulting from a lack of "Line of Sight Networked Aerial Communications Relay."

This slide shows the results of *one* representative run of the model.

The Weighting Criteria in the middle of the page is the "derived base case" used for comparison in this report. It heavily weights operational utility at about half; with cost about half as important as operational utility; and with operational flexibility and maturity each about one-fourth as important as operational utility.

The upper left portion of the slide shows the 17 options arrayed by relative value. The numbers to the immediate right of the options are the values computed by the AHP model. The numbers add to 1.000, with a high of 0.111 for a constellation of Iridium, UHF TACSAT, and MUOS narrowband satellites and a low of 0.035 for an option of three medium-altitude aircraft (Warrior).

The upper right of the slide shows the values relative values in histogram form.

Looking at the results of the run, we can see that, as expected, there is no silver bullet than meets all of the missions. Rather, a combination of payload/platform options will be necessary to meet the full suite of missions effectively.

The green highlighted options at the top of the chart (narrowband and wideband SAT-COM) indicate that satellites have very high value. However, the number of users they can support is not sufficient, so they will have to be supplemented by other assets.

The blue highlighted options near the top of the chart are high-value candidates that in combination can provide narrowband and broadband capabilities.

The relative value of the payload combinations deployed at varying altitudes provides insight that the Army can use in considering options to meet its acknowledged capability gap resulting from a lack of “Line-of-Sight Networked Aerial Communications Relay.”

Although the values computed for some options are relatively low when considering their capacity to meet all II communications sub-missions, these options may be the best solutions for individual sub-missions.



Persistent CSR II

Surveillance and Reconnaissance Analysis

17

The next set of slides shows the elements of analysis for surveillance and reconnaissance missions and the comparative evaluation of the options.



Surveillance and Reconnaissance Missions in Irregular Warfare Operations

1. Provide data to locate, identify and track counterinsurgents
2. Provide data to locate, identify and track vehicles
3. Provide data to locate and identify IEDs and ambushes
4. Provide data to locate and identify enemy weapons (e.g., mortars, rocket launchers, etc.)
5. Provide route reconnaissance
6. Provide area surveillance for force security
7. Provide surveillance of borders

This slide shows how we decomposed the surveillance and reconnaissance mission in irregular warfare operations into seven subcomponents. The missions include tracking, locating, and identifying people, vehicles, and weapons as well as route reconnaissance, force security, and border surveillance. Collectively, these missions provide a comprehensive suite of capabilities at the granularity required for rigorous analysis of options.



SR Payloads and Platforms Considered

Payload Classes	Exemplars
Full Motion Video; EO/IR	POP300
Full Motion Video; Image Intensification; EO/IR	MTS-B
Flash	Flash (overwatch MWIR)
Hyperspectral Imagery	Aurora+
SIGINT	TSP
RADAR/Ground Moving Target Indicator – Vehicle	Lynx
RADAR/Ground Moving Target Indicator – Dismount	ARTEMIS
RADAR/Ground Moving Target Indicator – Dismount	VADER
Wide Area; Optics; Ground Moving Target Indicator – Dismount	AWAPSS+
Wide Area; Optics; Ground Moving Target Indicator – Dismount	ARGUS+

Platform Classes	Exemplars
Low-Altitude Fixed Wing (LAFW)	Shadow
Medium-Altitude, Fixed Wing (MAFW)	Warrior
Medium-Altitude, Rotary Wing (MARW)	Firescout
Medium-Altitude, Lighter Than Air, Medium Lift (MALTAML)	MAMED LIFT
Medium-Altitude, Lighter Than Air, Heavy Lift (MALTAHL)	MA HEAVY LIFT
High-Altitude Fixed Wing (HAFW)	Global Observer
High-Altitude Lighter Than Air (HALTA)	HAAIRSHIP

Note: SR platforms also included Common Data Link (CDL) and/or Tactical Common Data Link (TCDL) for real-time surveillance

This slide identifies the classes of payloads and platforms used to form payload/platform options for analysis as potential “means” to accomplish the full suite of surveillance and reconnaissance missions identified on the previous slide. Exemplars including legacy and developmental options are shown for each class of payload and platform. Two variations of medium-altitude airships are included. Satellites were excluded from analysis of surveillance and reconnaissance as discussed earlier. Also, every option includes embedded data links (common data link (CDL) or tactical CDL (TCDL)) to support real-time down-linking of data collected.

The alphabet soup of payload exemplars is defined in terms of characteristics and capabilities in the backup slides. The UAVs and airships are also further characterized in the backup slides.



13 SR Payload and Platform Options Analyzed

Platform	Payload/Sensor with Downlink	Platform (cont'd)	Payload/Sensor with Downlink (cont'd)
Two Low-Altitude Fixed Wing (Shadow-C)	FMV; EO/IR "Mini" SIGINT TCDL	Two Medium-Altitude Fixed Wing (Warrior)	FMV; EO/IR Wide Area Optics/GMTI-Dismount CDL
Two Medium-Altitude Rotary Wing (Firescout)	FMV; II; EO/IR Flash TCDL	Two Medium-Altitude Lighter Than Air Medium Lift (Airship)	FMV; EO/IR Wide Area Optics/GMTI-Dismount CDL
Two Medium-Altitude Rotary Wing (Firescout)	WA Optics/GMTI-Dismount CDL	One Medium-Altitude Lighter Than Air Heavy Lift (Hybrid)	FMV; II; EO/IR Wide Area Optics/GMTI-Dismounts RADAR/GMTI-Dismount SIGINT Flash TCDL
Two Medium-Altitude Rotary Wing (Firescout)	FMV; II; EO/IR SIGINT HSI CDL	One High-Altitude Fixed Wing (Global Observer)	SIGINT TCDL
Two Medium-Altitude Rotary Wing (Firescout)	FMV; II; EO/IR RADAR/GMTI-Dismount TCDL	One High-Altitude Lighter Than Air (HA, Airship)	SIGINT TCDL
Two Medium-Altitude Fixed Wing (Warrior)	FMV; II; EO/IR SIGINT RADAR/GMTI-Vehicle TCDL	One High-Altitude Lighter Than Air (HA, Airship)	HSI Flash TCDL
Two Medium-Altitude Fixed Wing (Warrior)	FMV; II; EO/IR Flash HSI TCDL		

This slide shows the 13 payload/platform combinations chosen for analysis of surveillance and reconnaissance options. All are multiple payload options, and all include integrated data links. The types of payloads selected for the various platforms reflect the desire to deploy complementary sensors to facilitate cross-cueing and the SWAP capacity of the platforms.


To ensure making realistic comparisons of options for "persistent" communications, we used the following quantities of platform/payload combinations to provide for "as-required" coverage (*not* 24/7 coverage everywhere all the time):

- Long-endurance platforms: 1
- All others: 2

Central to the value analysis of each option is the pair-wise comparison of the relative merit of each option to each other option for each criterion as described in the earlier discussion of the AHP model.



Comparative Value Analysis of Persistent SR Options (Based Solely on Operational Utility)



Weighting Criteria:

Operational Utility Only; Cost, Operational Flexibility, Maturity not considered

Insights:

- A large persistent platform is preferable. Hybrid airship meets multiple missions due to payload weight capacity and operating altitude.
- Middle altitude is best considering payload weight capacity, resolution, low vulnerability (in irregular warfare), and coverage.
- There is no "golden sensor." A mix of sensors is needed to satisfy the missions.

This slide shows the results of one special run of the model that gave 100 percent weight to operational utility. It answers the question, "What option is best if cost, maturity, and operational flexibility are not considered?" The answer is clearly the Medium-Altitude Heavy Lifter Airship with a comprehensive suite of sensors as indicated by the green line at the top of the chart with the red arrow. It had a value more than twice as high as the next option.

Other options with high values are shown in the blue cluster.

The upper right of the slide shows the values relative values in histogram form.

This demonstrates that large persistent platforms, as expected, have high value. The hybrid airships ranked high because of their endurance, altitude, and capacity to carry multi-mission payloads. Medium-altitude platforms ranked high because of the resolution their sensors can achieve, low vulnerability in irregular warfare environments, and the extent of their area coverage.


At present, there is no "golden sensor," so a mix of sensors is required to satisfy all the missions.

The option marked with the blue arrow in the middle of the list is the Shadow UAV with a mini-sensor package. It is identified as an option that will be tracked and compared to the Medium-Altitude Heavy Lifter as the weights of the criteria are modified in the sensitivity analysis.

Note: Although the shorthand notation on the chart for the blue arrow Shadow-C option identified the sensor as “TSP300,” the actual suite of payloads evaluated included miniaturized sensors with full motion video, electro-optic/infrared (EO/IR), signal intelligence (SIGINT), and TCDL data link capabilities. This provided a multi-intelligence package, but it was not as capable as the robust sensor suite on the red arrow option.




Sensitivity Analysis: Comparative Value Analysis of Persistent SR Options



Weighting Criteria:

Cost (.23), Operational Flexibility (.12), Maturity (.12), Operational Utility (.53)



Weighting Criteria: Cost (.20), Operational Flexibility (.10), Maturity (.51), Operational Utility (.19)

Insight:

Varying weights of the criteria radically shifts the conclusions about the relative value of the options. Decisionmakers must add their seasoned judgment to the model's output before reaching final decisions.

This slide shows how the relative values of the 13 options changed as the weights of the criteria changed.

Looking at the top block on the slide, we see that when we use the baseline weights with operational utility at approximately half the total weight, the Medium-Altitude Heavy Lifter Airship with a comprehensive suite of sensors remained the top-ranked option as indicated by the green line at the top of the chart with the red arrow. However, its value dropped from 0.253 on the previous chart to 0.160 in this excursion. Also, the Shadow-C with the mini-sensor package jumped from 8th place to 3rd place.

In the bottom half of the chart is an excursion with maturity weighted at about half of the total weight and operational utility weighted at about one-fifth. In this case, the Medium Heavy Lifter Airship with a comprehensive suite of sensors (red arrow) dropped to 7th place and the Shadow-C jumped to the top position.

The obvious conclusion is that weights matter, and the results of the value analysis shift dramatically as the decisionmaking criteria change. It is also apparent that the final judgment on which options are preferred requires further detailed comparison of the performance of the payloads and platforms against the specific missions requiring priority support.



Integrated Communications, Surveillance and Reconnaissance Analysis

23

The next set of slides shows the elements of analysis for integrated communications, surveillance, and reconnaissance missions and the comparative evaluation of the options



Integrated PCSR Missions Analyzed

Comms Missions

1. Provide High-Bandwidth Network-Node Service
2. Provide Low-Bandwidth Network-Node Service
3. Provide Low-Bandwidth Sensor Data Exfiltration
4. Broadcast Blue Situational Awareness, as in the Satellite Version of Blue Force Tracker
5. Broadcast High Bandwidth
6. Relay Low-Bandwidth Digital, to Include Disadvantaged Users
7. Relay High-Bandwidth Digital
8. Provide Combat 911 Services to Include Search and Rescue and Medical Evacuation
9. Relay Low-Bandwidth Voice
10. Provide Telecom Trunking and Gateway Services
11. Provide Network Situational Awareness

SR Missions

1. Provide Data to Locate, Identify, and Track Counterinsurgents
2. Provide Data to Locate, Identify, and Track Vehicles
3. Provide Data to Locate and Identify IEDs and Ambushes
4. Provide Data to Locate and Identify Enemy Weapons (e.g. Mortars, Rocket Launchers, etc.)
5. Provide Route Reconnaissance
6. Provide Area Surveillance for Force Security
7. Provide Surveillance of Borders

24

This slide shows the composite suite of 18 PCSR missions that were previously addressed by major mission area.



PCSR Payload and Platform Options Analyzed

PCSR Capability Package	Platform	SR Payload	Comms Payload
- Full Motion Video, SIGINT, IR FLASH - Wide- and Narrowband Comms	Medium Altitude (Firescout)	MTS-B and TSP and IR Flash Detector	HNW and SINCGARS++
- Full Motion Video, SIGINT, Ground Movement Target Indicator, Synthetic Aperture Radar - Wide- and Narrowband Comms	Medium Altitude (Warrior)	MTS-B and Tactical SIGINT Payload and Lynx SAR/GMTI	HNW and SINCGARS++
- Full Motion Video, Wide Area/Optics/Ground Movement Target Indicator-Dismount - Wide- and Narrowband Comms	Medium-Altitude Medium Lifter Airship	MTS-B and TSP and Artemis	HNW and SINCGARS++
- Full Motion Video, Wide Area/ Optics, GMTI-Dismounts - Wide- and Narrowband Comms	Medium-Altitude Medium Lifter Airship	POP and ARGUS+	HNW and SINCGARS++
- Full Motion Video, SIGINT, RADAR/GMTI, Wide Area/Optics, GMTI-Dismounts, IR FLASH - Wide- and Narrowband Comms	Medium-Altitude Heavy Lifter Hybrid Airship	MTS-B and ARGUS and ARTEMIS and TSP and IR Flash Detector	HNW and SINCGARS++
- SIGINT - Wideband Comms - Airborne Cellular Access Point	High-Altitude Airship	Tactical SIGINT Payload	HNW and Airborne Cell Tower

Six integrated communications, surveillance, and reconnaissance options were evaluated. The first five use medium-altitude platforms equipped with a TCDL, a common set of communications payloads (HNW and SINCGARS++), and different combinations of multi-intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance payloads. The sixth option is a high-altitude airship with a SIGINT payload sensing and a communications payload consisting of HNW and an Airborne Cell Tower.




Baseline Weighting Factors (Cost = 22%, Ops Flexibility = 12%, Maturity = 12%, Operational Utility = 53%)

- Medium-Altitude Heavy Lift LTA and Warrior with robust payloads have highest value for integrated CSR missions (all missions met)
- Medium-Altitude Heavy Lift LTA has best overall SR value
- Warrior, while second overall, has better performance on route reconnaissance and border surveillance missions
- Medium-Altitude Medium Lift LTA with enhanced mission package is a strong contender
- All options, except High-Altitude LTA with HNW and Airborne Cell Tower, meet all Comms missions
- There are multiple options that allow a single integrated CSR platform to meet all 18 BCT missions (to varying degrees)

Multiple options allow a single integrated CSR platform to meet all 18 BCT missions (to varying degrees).



Sensitivity Analysis: Comparison of Communications and Surveillance/Reconnaissance Missions for Integrated PCSR Platforms



Weighting Factors for All (Cost = 23%, Ops Flexibility = 12%, Maturity = 12%, Operational Utility = 53%)

Insights:

- Medium-Altitude Heavy Lift LTA combination remains the best overall option when SR and Comms weights are modified
- Warrior combination remains a second or close third

This slide shows the results of sensitivity analysis excursions with emphasis on tracking the Medium-Altitude Heavy Lift LTA (red arrow) versus the Warrior (blue arrow). The histogram at the top of the chart shows the base-case analysis presented on the prior slide and is repeated here as a reference point. Within the operational utility criterion, the communications missions are weighted as equal to reconnaissance and surveillance missions.

The histogram in the middle of the slide shows the results when the operational utility criterion is factored so that the communications missions are weighted at 25 percent and reconnaissance and surveillance missions are weighted at 75 percent.

The histogram at the bottom of the slide shows the results when the operational utility criterion is factored so that the communications missions are weighted at 75 percent and reconnaissance and surveillance missions are weighted at 25 percent.

The results show that the Medium-Altitude Heavy Lift LTA combination remains the best overall alternative when communications and reconnaissance and surveillance weights are modified, although the relative value for the excursion giving higher weights to the reconnaissance and surveillance missions was much higher.

In both excursions, the Warrior combination remained a second or close third.



- The Warrior combination is best choice when maturity is heavily weighted or when maturity, operational utility and cost are equally weighted
- The Medium-Altitude Heavy Lift LTA combination drops from first to fourth when weights are shifted from operational utility to maturity/cost

Clearly, the decisionmaker's time horizon and tolerance for risk will be key determinants of the valuation of options. The AHP model has the capacity to show the results of those preferences and the marginal changes in valuation as criterion weights are adjusted.



Further Analytical Excursions

- The preceding analysis compared each platform / payload combination's performance in executing ALL 11 Communications missions, ALL 7 Surveillance & Reconnaissance missions, or ALL 18 missions.
- The AHM model used in these analyses is a powerful tool that can be tailored for analyses of two or more platform / payload suites versus any user-selected mission sets (1 to 'N').
- "What if" and sensitivity analyses can be accomplished interactively with the model using simple "click and drag" techniques to change mission sets, relevant criteria, and weighting.
- Selected insights from limited analytical excursions:
 - While tethered airships did not have high value for full suites of missions, they could be optimal for PCSR support to a base camp
 - JTRS Small Form Factor (HMS) on a Shadow UAS may be optimal for range extension support to teams using Rifleman's Radios
 - For 24/7 connectivity, the best solution set may include Comms-only options

29

As indicated in the preceding slides, the model can answer questions relating to how well a series of options can meet a full suite of missions; but the model can be tailored for analysis of any particular PCSR mission or combination of missions.

Single-mission analysis can be conducted interactively with "click and drag" adjustments to criteria weights. Some relevant insights derived from such analysis are:

- While tethered airships did not have high value for full suites of missions, they could be optimal for PCSR support to a base camp.
- JTRS handheld, manpack, small form factor (HMS) on a Shadow unmanned aerial system (UAS) may be optimal for range extension support to teams using Rifleman's Radios.
- For 24/7 connectivity, the best solution set may include communications-only options.



- 3

Platforms for Persistent CSR II – 39

Combined PCSR options are feasible and have high potential value:

- Warrior with robust payloads is preferred in the near term.
- The Medium-Altitude Heavy Lift airship with robust payloads is preferred when the platform matures.
- Tailored AHP models have high value for analysis of complex problems



Recommendations

- Use the results of this study (and the accompanying model) to support decision processes for PCSR acquisition and 2-year network modernization cycles—TRADOC
- Share the results of this study with Army and OSD elements involved in the near-term acquisition of a Long Endurance Multi-intelligence Vehicle—ASA(ALT)/SMOC/G-2
- As design features, include sensor data links on all persistent SR platforms and include high-/low-bandwidth Comms payloads on large SR platforms (make PCSR happen) —ASA(ALT)
- Accelerate development of LTA platforms with emphasis on medium-altitude heavy lifter airships—ASA(ALT)
- Foster a rigorous PCSR experimentation campaign to include participation in the LandWarNet Capstone Experimentation, JFEXs, and similar events using prototypes—ASA(ALT)/G-3
- Conduct an integrated AoA that includes PCSR payloads, UAV and LTA platforms, and commercial and military satellites that explicitly addresses optional mixes of capabilities—TRADOC
- Adopt the AHP model when appropriate for use in ASB studies and encourage broader use within the Army—ASA(ALT)
- Implement the recommendations from the Phase I PCSR study. Add the PEOIEWS and PEOC3T to the membership of the LTA IPT—ASA(ALT)

31

Summary of Recommendations

Each of the following recommendations includes a suggested lead agency for implementation:

Use the results of this study (and the accompanying model) to support decision processes for PCSR acquisition and 2-year network modernization cycles—TRADOC.

Share the results of this study with Army and OSD elements involved in the near-term acquisition of a Long Endurance Multi-Intelligence Vehicle—ASA(ALT).

Include sensor data links as design features on all persistent surveillance and reconnaissance platforms and include high-/low-bandwidth communications payloads on large surveillance and reconnaissance platforms (make PCSR happen)—ASA(ALT).

Accelerate development of LTA platforms with emphasis on medium-altitude heavy lifter airships—ASA(ALT).

Foster a rigorous PCSR experimentation campaign to include participation in the LandWarNet Capstone Experimentation, joint forces exercises (JFEXs), and similar events using prototypes—ASA(ALT)/G-3.

Conduct an integrated AoA that includes PCSR payloads, UAV and LTA platforms, and commercial and military satellites that explicitly addresses alternative mixes of capabilities—TRADOC.

Adopt the AHP model when appropriate for use in ASB studies, and encourage broader use within the Army—ASA(ALT).

Implement the recommendations from the Phase I PCSR study. Add the PEO IEWS and PEO C³T to the membership of the LTA IPT—ASA(ALT).



Recommendations from (PCSR I --2008)

- Assign proponentcy for LTA in the controlled airspace to the Aviation Center TRADOC
- SMDC should retain proponentcy for High Altitude
- Accelerate employment of Medium-Altitude LTA (untethered) prototypes for joint CSR experiments in operational environments (e.g., Ft. Bliss, JEFX) ASA(ALT)
- Increase the investment in technology to mature High-Altitude LTA airships for use as CSR platforms. ASA(ALT)
- Form collaborative LTA Integrated Product Team (IPT) of technologists, material developers, and combat developers ASA(ALT) / G-3
- Conduct an integrated AoA that includes persistent comms and SR payloads, UAV and LTA platforms, large aircraft (e.g., KC-135), and commercial and military satellites that explicitly addresses alternative mixes of capabilities. TRADOC

32

Our recommendations from the PCSR Phase I study were held in abeyance until the completion of this Phase II report. They are still valid, and we recommend their adoption

There is currently no proponent for LTA airships in the controlled airspace; this proponentcy should be assigned to the Aviation Center by TRADOC.

There is great value in continuing to examine the viability of LTA airships in medium-altitude operational scenarios; therefore, accelerate LTA development and operational employment in experiments such as the FCS exercises at Ft. Bliss or the annual Joint Expeditionary Force Experiment (JEFX).

The maturation of high-altitude LTA airships could also be hastened by increased investment; resources in this area need to be increased.

A collaborative organization is needed that will enable the LTA community to support the continued development and fielding of LTA at low, medium, and high altitudes. Accordingly, it is recommended that a collaborative LTA IPT be formed, including but not limited to AMCOM, AMRDEC, PEO Aviation, the Aviation Center, PEO Space and Missile Defense, and SMDC/ARSTRAT.

The Army should conduct an integrated AoA that includes persistent communications and surveillance and reconnaissance payloads, UAV and LTA platforms, large aircraft (e.g., KC-135), and commercial and military satellites. The AoA should explicitly address alternative mixes of capabilities. Inputs from the LTA IPT should be available to assist in conducting the LTA aspects of the AoA.



Persistent CSR II

Backup Slides

33



AHP Methodology

"Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) is an approach to decisionmaking that involves structuring multiple-choice criteria into a hierarchy, assessing the relative importance of these criteria, comparing alternatives for each criterion, and determining an overall ranking of the alternatives," as defined by [DSS Resources](#).

The concept of AHP was developed by **Thomas Saaty**, an American mathematician working at the University of Pittsburgh.

▪ What is analytic hierarchy process (AHP)?

- Organizing and assessing alternatives against a hierarchy of multifaceted objectives
- Provides a proven, effective means to deal with complex decisionmaking.
- Allows a better, easier, and more efficient identification of selection criteria, their weighting and analysis.
- Drastically reduces the decision cycle.
- AHP Steps are (1) Decomposing, (2) Weighting, (3) Evaluating, and (4) Selecting

AHP Methodology Employed To Validate Ordinal Decision Matrix Approach

As part of an analytical process used in the study, a sensitivity analysis was explored. The Saaty Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) was used to add confidence to our results. The AHP is a well-known formal method of performing the same types of evaluations as used in this study.


This chart is from a website that provides an implementation of the AHP.

Time constraints would not allow a full implementation of the problem in AHP, so a partial implementation was pursued. The surveillance and reconnaissance mission area was chosen as the example, and the weights and scores were translated into the AHP pair-wise comparison. Because of limitations in the software package used, the attributes were reduced from 15 to 16—user SWAP was deleted.

Additionally, the attributes were not arranged in a hierarchy of criteria as provided in AHP. Rather, the flat structure of the existing process was used.




Analytic Hierarchical Structure



AHP Methodology

Assess the utility of the AHP models in conducting analyses of complex analytical and decision processes and provide insights and recommendations





AHP Methodology and Recommendations

- AHP model shows good utility and flexibility in the assessment of multiple criteria alternatives. It is relatively easy to learn.
- ASB should acquire the software for an AHP model and have it available for use by ASB study teams
- ASB needs to train staff and support personnel in the use of the AHP model so that capability becomes part of the resident ASB staff



Annex A

Terms Of Reference (TOR)



Terms Of Reference (TOR)

Persistent CSR (Communications Surveillance and Reconnaissance) for the Current and Future Force —Phase II 2/23/09

Current studies of the military operations in both OEF and OIF as well as predictions concerning similar future operations indicate a need for better (increased or more efficient) communications coverage as well as enhanced sensor capability for reconnaissance and surveillance. "Better" and "enhanced" can assume a broad range of meanings depending on the situation and echelon involved; however, it is generally accepted that one goal relates to persistence of communication and sensing, another relates to clarity or fidelity, and a third relates to available bandwidth. In three previous ASB studies, two involving Intel and one involving Land War Net, persistent CSR contact among all echelons has been suggested and persistent overwatch and surveillance has been sought. These improvements are especially necessary in order to maintain situational awareness and reachback for supporting fires as well as providing knowledge of location and condition of friendly and enemy units. Further, information requirements of forces (whether large or small) in imminent contact with enemy forces demand nearly continuous, timely, information flow, better insuring the safety of forces and increasing the margin of victory.

Expanding situational awareness and facilitating communications among units allows all types of modular brigades to enjoy greater mobility especially if communications can be maintained while "on-the-move" and in austere environments. Such capability will also improve reachback for support from non-organic fires and intelligence.

Obtaining the best balance between performance, mobility and supportability of communications and sensing capabilities is critical to enhancing the effectiveness of combat units at every level of command. Thus, organizing appropriate combinations of communications equipment and sensors is a focal point of this study in support of the operational concepts for the current and future forces. In some cases, combinations of highly elevated platforms are most efficient in providing necessary capabilities. In other cases, ground-based sensors might be the most useful. In any event, a systematic approach to developing a model for communications and sensing using combinations of available assets is necessary to utilizing those assets in the most efficient fashion.

The goal of this follow-on Phase II study is to suggest a concept and structure for best use of CSR assets and their payloads, including reporting on:

1. What payload capabilities are possible from Space-based, "Near-Space" based, High-Altitude Long-Endurance UAV-based or Airship-based platforms reviewed in Phase I?
2. How do these payload capabilities compare to those available on lower altitude UAVs as well as ground-based and other assets?
3. How does one trade off the benefits and weaknesses of each type of asset?
4. To what degree can both the current and the future forces increase mobility and sustainability through integration and systematic use of such assets?
5. To what degree do such payloads decrease the logistics and support burden for sustained operations?
6. How does cost of each type of payload compare?

Additionally, the team will assess the utility of AHP models in conducting analyses of complex analytical and decision processes and provide insights and recommendations to the ASB Red Team.



Annex B

Sponsor Direction



Sponsor Direction

Sponsor is asking for a next step from the platform study

- Comms is the Army's greatest shortfall; however, focus on both Comms and SR.
- Study targets are TRADOC, ARCIC, G2, G3 and G6. Sponsor introduced high altitude platforms at Army Space Conference, and got the giggle factor. HA platforms have some very attractive platforms. Weight the study a bit more on HA platforms. Space-based capability could be value added.



Sponsor Direction – (continued)

- How do you measure taskability for the operational commander?
- Do not weight C or S or R—balance as in the Phase I effort completed last year
- Ft. Bliss is struggling with JLENS—is it worth it? They are also fighting perceptions on their LTA. LTA was an interesting platform the ASB group saw last year. The problem is the weight factor and the logistic tail. Going to Ft. Bliss and visiting the FCS FFID will be good.
- Look at JCTDs as source of commercial technology for mature IP router that could be deployed on a local airship. It will be helpful for ASB group to investigate.
- Time frame is still 3–5 years; the clock started last year.

Updated Guidance: In conjunction with the DoD ISR Surge, assist the G-2/SMDC in conducting a baseline assessment of Lighter Than Air (LTA) capabilities



Annex C

Bibliography



Bibliography Introduction

- The Persistent CSR II study team compiled a large number of references in the course of the study. These documents supported the analysis and provided ready reference to help answer questions and to learn more about systems and capabilities.
- The bibliography is organized in the same manner as the visits made by the Persistent CSR II team. The visit schedule lists the trips. Following this “table of contents” is a detail of each visit, including the titles of the presentations provided to the Persistent CSR II team during their visit. The electronic copy of the briefing can be found in the ASB CSR II Knowledge Center, filed under the title of the trip or visit.
- Should you have any questions, please contact the ASB Persistent CSR II Study Manager, Ms Anorme Anim.



ARMY VISITS

- SMDC/ARSTRAT
 - High Altitude Payload, Boston—Mar 25
 - TacSat-3 & 4 Update, Pentagon City—Jun 9
- G-2, Pentagon—Mar 19, Apr 6, Apr 17
 - Tactical Airborne Radar Technical Parameters
 - ISR Surge Documentation
 - PA&E Cross-Cutting Study
- ASB LWN Study, Summer Session—Jul 17
 - Army Global Network Enterprise Construct (GNEC) by CIO/G-6
 - OEF Initial Observations by G-3/5/7
 - LWN III Overview
 - 16 JUN 09 GOSC ICT



ARMY VISITS

- TRADOC HQ, Telecon - Mar 4, Ft. Monroe - May 19
 - Initial Capabilities Document For Aerial Layer Network Transport
 - High Altitude Enabled Capabilities Assessment
 - High Altitude Enabled Capabilities Assessment Operational Concept
 - SHADOW CRP-L
 - NT CBA Schedule
 - Aerial Sensor and Relay Capabilities Based Assessment



ARMY VISITS

- CECOM/CERDEC, Ft. Monmouth – April 28-29
 - ISR Architectures
 - TRACER
 - FORESTER
 - VADER
 - ARTEMIS
 - Sledgehammer
 - Remote Monitoring System (RMS)
 - Integrated Tactical Airborne Deployable System (ITADS)
 - Stargazer
 - Electronic Support to the Future Force (ESFF)
 - MR-TCDL
 - I-ASE/BIAS Battle-space integrated aircraft survivability
 - TSP
 - WIN-T Increment 3 comms range ext.
 - FCS NAIL Sensor Analysis Tool
 - Beyond Line of Sight Tactical Comms Relay (BTCR)
 - Antennas and CJSMP T
 - PMC4ISR OTM
 - Intelligence Communications Requirements to WIN-T JTRS



ARMY VISITS

- Night Vision Lab, Ft. Belvoir – May 20
 - NVESD Technologies for Persistent Surveillance
 - Tactical Aircraft to Increase Long Wave Infrared Nighttime Detection (TAILWIND)
 - D.CER. 2010.01 / Advanced Common Sensor Payload
 - Ground-to-Ground Hyperspectral Sensing
 - Airborne Hyperspectral Systems
 - Tower Mtd Sensor Technology for Expeditionary Persistent Surveillance
 - Constant Hawk Night Advanced Wide Area Surveillance System (AWAPSS)
 - CH-A Airborne Mission Payload
 - EO Sensor Suite
 - Autonomous Real-time Ground Ubiquitous Surveillance - Imaging System (ARGUS-IS)
- AMCOM, Summer Session – July 15
 - Unmanned Airships Can Address Current Battlefield ISR & Communication Shortfalls



- Defense Science Board Report on Integrating Sensor – Collected Intelligence

- Communications and Information Technology Overview
- Lasercom Support of Tactical ISR
- Advanced Tactical ISR and Communications Technologies
- ISR Systems and Technology Overview
- Advanced SIGINT Receivers
- SAR Change Detection for Persistent Surveillance
- Decision Support for ISR Systems



- SECDEF ISR TF Initiatives of Interest
- JCTDs Addressing Persistent ISR

- DARPA VIRAT
- VULTURE
- Optical RF Communications Adjunct ORCA
- Mobile Ad hoc Interoperability Network GATEway (MAINGATE)

- Capabilities-Based Analysis of UAV Sensors for Afghanistan



INDUSTRY VISITS

- AeroEnvironment
- BAE Systems
 - Spectral Infrared Remote Imaging Transition Testbed (SPIRITT)
 - Airborne Wide Area Persistent Surveillance Sensor (AWAPSS)
 - AURORA & PASS Sensors
 - ISR Capabilities
 - Sensor Systems, Identification and Surveillance
- General Atomics
 - NightHawk Wide Area Persistent Surveillance



INDUSTRY VISITS

- Harris Corporation, Summer Session – Jul 14
 - Highband Network Waveform for Airborne Networks
 - WIN-T Overview
 - MR TCDL
- ISL Corporation, Summer Session – Jul 15
- Lockheed Martin, Pentagon City – Apr 15
 - HUAV Hybrid Unmanned Air Vehicle



Annex D

Example S&R Sensor Systems



Example S&R Sensors (cont.)

Narrow FOV – POP 300

- 640 x 480 Thermal Imager (3 – 5 μm)
 - FOVs – 29 x 22° ; 9.2 x 6.9° ; 2.3 x 1.7° ; 1.15 x .86°
- Color CCD with near IR capability
 - FOV – 1.0 x 22.5°
 - Zoom – 1:45
- Dimensions - 10" x 15"
- Weight – 35 Lbs
- Power – 120 watts



Example S&R Sensors (cont.)

SIGINT:

The Tactical SIGINT Payload (TSP):

Provides BCT with overwatch and SIGINT system which detects, locates and geolocates on RF entities throughout AO in near real-time

TSP – Weight < 100 Lbs

Size < 2 Ft

Power < 1 KW

TSP – Lite – Weight < 50 Lbs



Example S&R Sensors (cont.)

Wide-area coverage:

Advanced wide-area surveillance system – AWAPSS

Area coverage – 8 km diameter @ 18 kft

GSD: < 1 to 1.5m (IR), < 0.75 to 1.1m (V)

Data rate: 470 MB/sec (EO & IR)

SWAP: sensor & turret – 204 Lbs/471 watts

Autonomous real-time ground ubiquitous surveillance – imaging system – ARGUS-IS

IMINT EO System

65 steerable video streams

Compressed data to fit CDL

Area coverage – 7 km @ 20 kft

GSD: 15 cm @ FOV center

Global Moving Target Indicator for vehicles

Report locations in real-time

Keep history of moving targets



Example S&R Sensors (cont.)

Radar

LYNX SAR/GMTI

Detection of vehicles

Designed for UAS (Predator, Firescout)

Resolution – 0.3 to 3m in stripmap mode

0.1 to 3m in spotlight mode

SWaP – 52 Kg

Operations: Identified AOI in stripmap mode then switch to spotlight and zoom up to 0.1 m resolution

GMTI mode – 10 to 70 Km/hr

Area Coverage: 25 Km²/minute @ 1 meter

300x170 meters 2/minute @ 10 cm

ARTEMIS SAR/GMTI

GMTI detection of dismounts: 0.5m/sec

Detection of vehicles: 2m/sec

10 Km/ accuracy 100m

3 Km/ accuracy 30 m

SAR: Resolution – 1m stripmap mode

1m spotlight mode

Accuracy - < 25m @ 15Km



Annex E

Additional Charts/Information




SR Platform Capacity

Platform	Weight Cap (lbs)	Payload/Sensor	Sensor and Telemetry Weight (lbs)
Shadow-C	91	POP 300 and "Mini Tactical SIGINT Payload"	80
Firescout	500	MTS-B and MWIR/Flash Detection	350
Firescout	500	ARGUS	590
Firescout	500	Aurora and MTS-B and Tactical SIGINT Payload	538
Firescout	500	ARTEMIS and MTS-B	470
Warrior	575	MTS-B and Lynx SAR/GMTI and TSP	560
Warrior	575	MTS-B and MWIR/Flash Detection and Aurora HSI	385
Warrior	575	POP300 AND ARGUS	500
MA Medium Lifter	500	ARGUS and POP 300	500
MA Heavy Lifter	2500	MTS-B and ARGUS and ARTEMIS and Tactical SIGINT Payload and MWIR/Flash Detection	1935
Global Observer	400	Tactical SIGINT Payload	165
HA Airship	400	Tactical SIGINT Payload	165
HA Airship	400	Aurora HSI and MWIR/Flash Detection	245

500 lb payload capacity is too small. We could not fill up a 2500 lb payload. The sweet spot is somewhere in the middle.



Task Force Alternative - Multi-Int Sensor Integration GWOT Persistence Path





Warrior UAV

Mission: To provide dedicated mission configured, UAV support to the Fires and Battlefield Surveillance Brigades, Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs), and other Army and Joint Force units based upon the Commander's priorities.



Characteristics / Description:

- Length: 28 ft
- Wing Span: 56 ft
- Max GTOW: 3000 lbs with growth plan to 3600 lbs
- Loiter Speed: 60-75 kts
- Max Speed: 150 kts
- Range Mission Mode: 350 km
- Range W/Relay: 500 /1200 km (ADR/SATCOM)
- Takeoff Distance/Landing: 3800 ft @ 9k ft DA
- Service Ceiling: 29,000 ft
- Max Endurance w/250 lbs payload: 40 hours
- Hardpoints rating: 2 @250 lbs, 2 @500 lbs

Mission Requirements:

- Near real time information /Dynamic re-tasking
- Immediately responsive ISR/RSTA
- Persistent surveillance
- Target acquisition, designation, attack, and BDA
- Reinforce Brigade Combat Team (BCT) capabilities
- Manned-Unmanned (MUM) teaming
- 2 Sensor Payloads, Communications Relay, Weapons
- System Target Location Accuracy of 25 meters
- Heavy Fuel Engine

System Configuration:

- 12 multi-role Air Vehicles (6 with SATCOM)
- 5 Ground Control Stations
- 2 Portable Ground Control Stations
- 5 TCDL Ground Data Terminals
- 2 TCDL Portable Ground Data Terminals
- 1 Ground SATCOM system
- 4 Automatic Takeoff and Landing Systems
- Payloads: 12 EO/IR, 12 SAR/MTI, 8 WIN-T Communications Payload (WCP)
- Ground Support Equipment



High Altitude - Defined





AIRSHIP OPERATIONAL COST

OPERATIONAL COST PER HOUR BASED ON ONE YEAR IN-THEATER

(Total hours per year = 27 X 1 X 365 = 9,855)

	Cost	Unit	Total	Per Hour
1 POL				
Diesel: 4 gal per hr	\$16.00	9,855	\$167,680.00	\$16.00
Oil = 8 qts every oil change each 60 hrs	\$32.00	329	\$10,528.00	\$1.07
Miscellaneous grease/filters/clamps, etc. per yea	\$20,000.00	1	\$20,000.00	\$2.03
2 Spares				
3 engines per airship (platoon has 2 airships)	\$135,000.00	2	\$270,000.00	\$27.40
Other spares	\$150,000.00	12	\$1,800,000.00	\$182.65
Spare envelopes	\$200,000.00	2	\$400,000.00	\$40.59
3 Support Labor - Mechanics				
8 major overhauls	\$30,000.00	16	\$480,000.00	\$48.71
16 minor overhauls per platoon	\$10,000.00	16	\$160,000.00	\$16.24
4 Depot Level Support				
6 people providing logistics support	\$900,000.00	1	\$900,000.00	\$91.32
5 Ground Support Operations				
13 people each OCONUS per platoon	\$280,000.00	13	\$3,640,000.00	\$369.36
6 Helium				
Initial fill = 90,000 ft ³ X \$0.50 ft ³ X 2 X 2	\$45,000.00	4	\$180,000.00	\$18.26
Leakage per year = 0.75% per day X 365 X 2	\$123,187.50	2	\$246,375.00	\$25.00
Operating Costs for Airship:				\$838.62
7 Sensor pod support				
Spare sensor pod & support equipment	\$3,200,000.00	1	\$3,200,000.00	\$324.71
8 people for pod support	\$280,000.00	8	\$2,240,000.00	\$227.30
Operating Costs for sensor support:				\$552.00
Total Operating Costs for PCOS:				\$1,390.62



AIRSHIP COMPARISONS by AMCOM

Airships Capable of Extended Military Missions

Characteristic	BA-71	BA-145*	A-170	A-200+	Skyship600	BA-500
Airship Type	Unmanned	Unmanned	Manned	Manned or unmanned	Manned	Unmanned
Envelope Size (l/h/w)	125 / 47 / 34	150 / 53 / 42	178 / /	224 / 68 / 54	197 / 51 / 63	232 / 72 / 60
Envelope Volume (ft ³)	71,300	145,500	170,000	340,000	247,500	497,000
Weight (lbs dry)*	5,040	4,876		9,338		9,658
Payload Capacity (lbs)	450	1,000	2,200	2,500 / 1,000	14 people, plus TV cameras	4,000 lbs max at altitude 5,000'
Endurance (hrs)	18	10	10	>48	50	270 @ 5,000' w/ 1,000lb payload
Speed (cruise / max - mph)	59	55	46		40 / 65	59
Operational Altitude (ft)	10,000	10,000	5,000	15,000 / 20,000	10,000 max	15,000 / 23,000
O&B Cost / year	\$7.3M	\$7.3M				\$9M
Schedule	Available	Deliver in 6 mon			Available	Deliver in 1 yr
Current Status	Operational	Ready for production	Operational	In design stage	Operational for commercial use	In design stage

* Weight does not include fuel, helium, or payload






MISSION TRADE-OFF OPTIONS

Operational Trade-offs


- Fuel Weight (endurance & range)
- Payload Weight (sensors / radios)
- Altitude (AGL)



A Possible Solution

An Unmanned Airship

Easily integrated antennas can be placed to avoid side-lobe interference



Airship Sized for Communications Relay

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| • Length: 120 ft | • Fuel Capacity: 1,320 lb (220 gal) |
| • Airship Diameter: 34 ft | • Payload Weight: 250 lbs |
| • Airship Volume: 72,000 ft ³ | • Twin Rotax Engines: 95 hp / ea |
| • Endurance: 2-1/2+ days (62 hrs) | • Working Altitude: 10k ft AGL |



THE UNMANNED AIRSHIP PLATOON

Unmanned Airship Platoon

-- 1 Lt, 4 NCO's, & 15 EM --



Envelopes with Power Carts & Payloads--3 (2 Operational + 1 Backup (Crated))



HMMVVs with Shelters & Generators for GCS--3



Remote Video Terminal--3
Portable Ground Control Station & Data Terminal--1



Inside the GCS



Mooring Masts--3



FMTV--3

Platoon Organic Assets

Essential External Support (available in theater)



Bucket Truck--1



Helium Gas Tankers--3



HMMVV--3



Ground Data Terminal--3

Storage Trailers--6

OPERATIONAL COST COMPARISONS

Cost and Flight Endurance of Persistent Surveillance Platforms (Sensor cost not included) *

USN Study

Platform	Cost / Flight Hour	Endurance (unrefueled)
AWACS	\$20,000	11 hours
JSTARS	\$26,500	11 hours
E-2C	\$18,700	5 hours
Global Hawk	\$26,500	35 hours
Predator	\$5,000	40 hours
420K TARS (Stationary Aerostat)	~\$400**	~500 hours
Unmanned Airship	~\$800***	48+ hours

The most cost-effective persistent surveillance platform is an unmanned airship

* "Lighter-than-Air Systems for Future Naval Missions," Naval Research Advisory Committee, 4 Oct 2005

** Requires constant security force at tethered location on ground - those costs not included

*** Current projection is approximately \$1,200/hour

AWACS



JSTARS



E-2C



Global Hawk



Predator



TARS



Unmanned Airship





Alternative Systems and Technologies

Best speed range
for aerial radio relay

Longest
endurance



Item	Unmanned Airship	King Air 350	Hunter UAV
Speed (mph)	0 - 55	264	127
Mission altitude (ft AGL)	10,000	10,000	10,000
Endurance (hours per sortie)	62	6	9
Mission payload Weight (lbs)	250	250	250
Aerial platforms per Platoon*	3	6	4
Crew support reqmt for 6 months	9 pilots/11 crew	12 pilots/12 crew	9 pilots/17 crew

* Only one aerial platform on station at a time.

Least
personnel



COST SUMMARY COMPARISONS

Cost comparisons include development, procurement, & operations


Development (\$M)	4	Unknown *	Unknown **
Cost Items	Unmanned Airships	King Air 350	Hunter UAV
Procurement (\$M)	22	36	47
Operations (\$M)	2.6	8.1	2.5
Total Cost (\$M)	24.6	44.1	49.5

* Requires radio & antenna integration and air worthiness testing

** Requires radio & antenna integration and testing



TRADING AIRSHIP VOLUME FOR DAYS ALOFT




OSD REQUIREMENTS


- **OSD technical objectives for airships:** (Long Endurance RFI)
 - ◆ 20,000 ft altitude
 - ◆ 2,500 lb sensor payload
 - ◆ 16 kW payload power
 - ◆ 3 week flight endurance (504 hrs)
 - ◆ Station keeping
- **Sizing envelope to meet technical objectives at standard temperature and pressure:**
 - ◆ **Fuel estimate:**
 - 30,240 lb fuel wt ((10 gal / hr X 6 lbs / gal) X 504 hrs = 30,240 lbs)
 - ◆ **Dry weight of airship structure:**
 - 5,000 lb total wt of Unmanned Airship platform (best case estimate)
 - ◆ **Payload weight:**
 - 2,500 lb
 - ◆ **Total lift requirement:**
 - $Lift = 30,240 + 5,000 + 2,500 = 37,740 \text{ lbs (estimate)}$
 - ◆ **Envelope volume needed to support this task:**
 - $37,740 \text{ lbs} / 2.329 \text{ lbs / cu meter at STP} = 16,204 \text{ cu meters or } 572,228 \text{ cu ft}$
 - At 20,000 ft AGL, you need approximately 50% ballonet or 572,228 cu ft for a total volume of the airship envelope of 1,144,456 cu ft



WIND SPEED vs ALTITUDE (AGL) – Bagram AFB



Planning for E-IBCT



What can be done to mitigate these gaps?



TPE Equipment per BCT

 Specialty 4 x Global Rapid Response Information Packages (GRRIP) 45 x OSVRT		~\$35 Million + FSR support + 50 Mb bandwidth
 Transport 21 x CBVSAT 32 x HCLOS 8 x GBS 1 x DVB-RCS Production and User Suite	 Automation 24 x servers (X2) 1,000 laptops (X3) 28 x CPOF 2 x Core switches (X2) 78 x 24-port switches (X2) 4 x Call Managers 32 x TACLANES 1 x TLA stack	
 Radios 270 x Blue Force Tracker 46 x BFT TOC Kits 148 x S/C TACSAT (PRC-117) 38 x HF (PRC-150) 1,200 MBITR (PRC-148) 1,200 LMR/ICOM/EF Johnson	 Phones 35 x Iridium 32 x Thuraya 525 x IP phones 64 x cell phones	 Audio/Visual 3 x Tandberg 6000 VTC 12 x Tandberg 1000 VTC 32 x LCD projectors (X2) 32 x GPS Digital cameras 32 x Plasma screens (X3)



BCT Modernization Overview


- Numerous activities have been initiated to develop the requirements, technical architecture, and acquisition strategy to modernize the BCT
 - Task Force 120 (Purpose: Primary TRADOC Activity)
 - Network Integrated Capabilities Team (Purpose: GOSC Review for TF 120)
 - PM FCS Program Planning (Purpose: FCS acquisition strategy with Boeing)
 - Network Tiger Team (Purpose: Develop ASA(ALT) BCT Modernization Strategy)
 - TRADOC FCS Red Team (Purpose: Independent assessment of FCS)
- Culminates by end of ~Aug-Sept with recommendations to CSA and CG TRADOC

How will the Army integrate all of these ideas?



Company Capabilities

- New -- CPs and ISR
- Companies are required to conduct secret level collaboration while maintaining forward command posts in IW airmpoint
 - Co CP is in addition to BCOTM requirement
 - BLOS capability required in complicated terrain
 - SNAP terminal is in CDRT – Recommended for transition to acquisition program
 - High Capacity LOS (HCLOS) is superior when terrain and distance supports
 - Harris Networking Radio (HNR) – WIN-T INC 2 Solution
 - Harris 7800 radio is in CDRT – Recommended for transition to acquisition program.



Large volume at low echelons makes affordability even more critical



Near-term Enhancement of LWN for Afghanistan

Background

- Maneuver forces (BCTs) and dedicated Combined Security and Training Command teams operating in widely distributed, remote locations have inadequate BLOS communications
 - Compartmented terrain in Afghanistan severely limits LOS systems' radio coverage
 - There is no near term <5 years POR which will eliminate this shortfall
 - Current needs must be satisfied by Mobile SATCOM Services (MSS): a combination of UHF MILSATCOM, Iridium, and L-band commercial (e.g., Inmarsat).
 - MSS capacity is limited by both availability of upgraded ground terminals and satellite capacity
 - Terrain also affects MSS coverage in some geostationary orbit "shadow" areas

Solutions

- Radically accelerate the fielding of airborne relay!
 - Configure "Sky Warrior" for "DEDICATED" comms relay
 - Move OIF Sky Warriors to Afghanistan and adapt HNR with antennas
 - Move HNR (101st Div assets) to Afghanistan
 - How does terrain "help" the relay performance
 - Add a common radio – SINCGARS, EPLRS, or UHF SATCOM

Recommend – TASK PEO AVIATION, WITH SUPPORT FROM WIN-T TO FIELD TWO ORBITS BY COB 2010

- Aggressively pursue deployment of upgraded multi-waveform MSS ground terminals: UHF, MUOS, Iridium, Inmarsat, etc.

• When one system does not work, the other often does

Recommend – TASK PEO-C3T TO FIELD UPGRADED MSS RADIOS ASAP



Leverage FCS Progress (2 of 2)

CONCLUSIONS


- Additional analysis and demonstration of LandWarNet additions must be considered for integration into legacy vehicles and into GCVs
 - Gaps/priorities, interoperability with legacy, cost, maturity, SWaP, and cooling
- Alternatives to FCS components and systems to enable Spin Out systems must be assessed
 - Examples: FBCB2 versus ICS/BCS BC; HMS versus GMR

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Task independent assessments for and task demonstration of:
 - Transition of FCS developments into LandWarNet
 - Alternatives applications, hardware and transport to enable Spin Outs




E-IBCT Network FY11 Baseline Capabilities





E-IBCT Network FY12 Enhanced Capabilities



JTRS / Serviceable Radios

- Robust Network Capability Enabling: Display/Share Relevant Information; Enable Collaboration; Create & Disseminate Orders
Company ↔ Platoon ↔ Squad
- JTRS is designed to provide terrestrial layer communications
 - Networked radio – supports legacy waveforms
 - Voice and data
- JTRS is available FY13; No final system design for Army formations
- Significant investment in radios through ONS/JUONS
 - Focus on Co and Below BLOS capability w/SATCOM and HF
 - SINGARS – purchase this year is last
- Capability trades
 - Limited networking w/proprietary waveforms
 - Inability to leverage MUOS available in FY 12

WAY AHEAD: Define JTRS system design for Army formations in 13-14 that affordable, achievable with the greatest operational effects.



Annex F

Abbreviations

Abbreviations

AHP	Analytic Hierarchy Process
AMCOM	Aviation and Missile Command
AMRDEC	Aviation and Missile Research, Development and Engineering Center
AoA	analysis of alternatives
ARSTRAT	Army Forces Strategic Command (SMDC)
ASA(ALT)	Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology
ASB	Army Science Board
BCT	brigade combat team
C ⁴ ISR	command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance
CDL	common data link
EO/IR	electro-optic/infrared
EPLRS	Enhanced Position Location Reporting System
G-3	Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations
GEO	geosynchronous Earth orbit (satellites)
GiG	Global Information Grid
HAFW	high-altitude fixed wing
HALTA	high-altitude lighter than air
HDRS	high data rate satellite
HMS	handheld, manpack, small form fit (JTRS type)
HNW	highband networking waveform
HQDA	Headquarters, Department of the Army
IPT	integrated product team
JEFX	Joint Expeditionary Force Experiment
JFEX	Joint Forces Exercise
JTRS	Joint Tactical Radio System
LDRS	Low Data Rate Satellites
LEO	low Earth orbit (satellites)
LTA	lighter than air
MAFW	medium-altitude fixed wing
MALTAHL	medium-altitude lighter-than-air heavy lift
MALTAML	medium-altitude lighter-than-air medium lift
MARW	medium-altitude rotary wing
MR TCDL	Multirole Tactical Command Data Link
MUOS	Mobile User Objective System

OSD	Office of the Secretary of Defense
PCSR	Persistent Communications, Surveillance and Reconnaissance
PEO	program executive office
PEO/C ³ T	Program Executive Office for Command, Control and Communications – Tactical
PEO/IEWS	Program Executive Office for Intelligence, Electronic Warfare and Sensors
POR	program of record
SATCOM	satellite communications
SIGINT	signals intelligence
SINCGARS	Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio System
SMDC	Space and Missile Defense Command
SR	surveillance and reconnaissance
SRW	soldier radio waveform
SWAP	size, weight and power
TACSAT	tactical satellite communications
TCDL	Tactical Common Data Link
TOR	terms of reference
TRADOC	Training and Doctrine Command
UAV	unmanned aerial vehicle
UHF	ultra high frequency
USA	United States Army; Under Secretary of the Army
USD	Under Secretary of Defense
USMA	United States Military Academy
WGS	Wideband Global SATCOM
WIN-T	Warfighter Information Network – Tactical
WNW	wideband network waveform

