



NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

**EVALUATION OF JSAF EM PROPAGATION PREDICTION
METHODS FOR NAVY CONTINUOUS TRAINING
ENVIRONMENT / FLEET SYNTHETIC TRAINING,
RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:
PART IV– JSAF POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS
COST/BENEFIT ANALYSIS**

by

Peter S. Guest, Paul A. Frederickson, Tom Murphree and Arlene A. Guest

December, 2012

Approved for public release, distribution is unlimited

Prepared for: Naval Warfare Development Command (NWDC)
1528 Piersey Street, BLDG O-27
Norfolk, VA 23511

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				<i>Form Approved</i> OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this 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 this 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 Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 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 any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 10-12-2012		2. REPORT TYPE Technical Report		3. DATES COVERED (From-To) 9-1-2011 to 9-30-2012	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Evaluation of JSAF EM Propagation Prediction Methods for Navy Continuous Training Environment / Fleet Synthetic Training Results and Recommendations: Part IV – JSAF Potential Improvements Cost/Benefits Analysis				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER N0001411WX30382	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Peter S. Guest, Paul A. Frederickson, Tom Murphree and Arlene A. Guest				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey California				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER NPS-MR-12-003	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Warfare Development Command (NWDC) 1528 Piersey Street, BLDG O-27 Norfolk, VA 23511				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) NWDC	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution is unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT In previous reports, the authors suggested several potential changes that would improve the realism and accuracy of JSAF range predictions for radar, communications and jamming systems. This report analyzes the estimated benefits and costs of implementing these and other potential changes to JSAF. This information is intended to be used a guide to help JSAF developers and managers prioritize which potential changes would provide the most benefits to JSAF users given limited budgets.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Electromagnetic propagation, electronic warfare, radar range, war gaming, synthetic training					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 14	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Peter S. Guest
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code) 831-595-8253

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39.18

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
Monterey, California 93943-5000**

RDML Jan E. Tighe
Interim President

O. Douglas Moses
Acting Provost

The report entitled "JSAF Potential Improvements Cost/Benefit Analysis" was prepared for and funded by Naval Warfare Development Command (NWDC), 1528 Piersey Street, Norfolk, VA 23511.

Further distribution of all or part of this report is authorized.

This report was prepared by:

Peter S. Guest
Research Professor

Paul A. Frederickson
Research Associate

Tom Murphree
Research Associate Professor

Arlene A. Guest
Senior Lecturer

Reviewed by:

Wendell Nuss, Chairman
Meteorology

Peter Chu, Chairman
Oceanography

Released by:

Jeffrey D. Paduan
Vice President and
Dean of Research

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

In previous reports, the authors suggested several potential changes that would improve the realism and accuracy of JSAF range predictions for radar, communications and jamming systems. This report analyzes the estimated benefits and costs of implementing these and other potential changes to JSAF. This information is intended to be used a guide to help JSAF developers and managers prioritize which potential changes would provide the most benefits to JSAF users given limited budgets.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Potential Improvements Cost/Benefit Analysis

A. Introduction

In previous reports, the authors suggested several potential changes that would improve the realism and accuracy of JSAF range predictions for radar, communications and jamming systems. This report analyzes the estimated benefits and costs of implementing these and other potential changes to JSAF. The analysis is summarized in Table 1.

B Analysis

Table 1. contains columns of text showing on the potential change, the expected benefits and a qualitative assessment of the costs. Costs are color-coded as indicated in the first row using the following categories.

1. Development costs – These are the one-time costs to create the model, data set or input method that would replace or augment the current JSAF method. In most cases this would be labor costs for personnel outside NWDC; in some cases it may represent purchase cost of commercial products.
2. Implementation cost – These are the one-time costs incurred during the design, coding, testing and documentation of incorporating the change into JSAF. This would primarily the cost of labor for personnel within NWDC or closely-affiliated contractors.
3. Added Maintenance – These are the extra ongoing costs incurred by NWDC that would be associated with maintaining the change. This includes installing model updates, refreshing data sets and fixing bugs.
4. Execution Time – This represents the increase or decrease in JSAF execution computation time associated with the change.
5. Data Storage – This represents the additional computer storage space incurred by the changes that would be needed.
6. User Interface Complexity – This is the human user “cost” associated with any changes that would need to be made to the JSAF user interface. Added complexity makes JSAF more difficult to understand and run.

Table 1. JSAF Change Cost/Benefit Matrix

Change	Benefits	NWDC Costs (number and color coded)	
		<u>Monetary (mostly labor)</u> 1. Development Costs 2. Implementation Costs 3. Added Maintenance Costs	<u>Non-Monetary (user effects)</u> 4. Execution time 5. Data Storage 6. User Interface Complexity
		7. Other Costs?	
<u>Propagation Models and Sub-Models</u>			
<u>Main Model</u> Replace EREPS (FFACTOR) with APM Propagation Model	Greatly improved accuracy and realism. Currently AREPS (with APM) is the main Navy Operational EM model	1. Minor. APM is in FORTRAN and has been compiled for the LINUX platforms that JSAF uses. JSAF uses mostly C /C++ but should be able to accommodate a compiled FORTRAN module 2. Moderate – may be able to use same “sockets” as current EREPS in JSAF 3. Should be light if APM updates don’t require translation. 4. < 1 sec per run for near surface propagation, can be minutes for high frequency, high elevation transmissions. 5. < 1 Mb for executable (output maybe more) 6. Could initially use existing interface, but will need changes as more accurate environmental data are used.	
<u>APM Sub-model</u> Surface Clutter from Ocean Waves	Accounts for increased radar clutter and decreased ranges during rough sea conditions	1. Already in SPAWAR developed APM 2. Moderate – Requires wave info (or winds as proxy) 3. Light 4. Doubles APM execution time 5. None (already in APM) 6. No changes to interface required (but may be beneficial)	
<u>APM Sub-Model</u> Gaseous Absorption	Already included in APM. Generally a relatively small effect.	1. Already in SPAWAR-developed APM 2. No extra since already in APM 3. Light 4. Negligible extra time 5. None (already in APM) 6. May want to include option for doing calculation	
<u>APM Sub-Model</u> Troposcatter	Models troposcatter (scattering off of tropopause) for over-the-horizon VHF and UHF comms.	1. Already in SPAWAR-developed APM 2. In APM for ocean surface cases, not land cases. 3. Light 4. Negligible extra time 5. None (already in APM) 6. Some – need option button	

<u>APM Sub-Model</u> Precipitation Effects	Has significant effect on ranges. Easy to see on radar displays so not as “tricky” as some other effects.	1. SPAWARS SSC developing model , ready in 12-18 months 2. Quite high – would need spatial precip. specification 3. Light 4. Negligible extra time? 5. Would require space for precip. description 6. Some – need option button
<u>Main Model Upgrade</u> Atmospheric Horizontal Variability	Important in coastal regions, atmospheric fronts, over land topography and other high spatial variability situations	1. Already in SPAWAR-developed APM 2. High – Considerable complexity added to JSAF, but should be able to use some of the current assets currently used in JSAF for acoustic modeling, which includes horizontal variations. 3. Light 4. Same execution time as homogeneous cases 5. A little more storage, but probably not significant 6. Significant interface changes required
<u>Main Model Upgrade</u> Land Terrain and Diffraction	Essential for over land predictions. Diffraction allows signals behind topography	1. Already in SPAWAR-developed APM 2. Light - JSAF already has topography 3. Light (unless more data sets added) 4. No significant increase in execution time 5. Depends on resolution needed, could be > 500 Mb for high-resolution data sets 6. No more than above box changes
<u>Terrain Model Upgrade</u> Soil and Vegetation Effects	Improves over land predictions, especially surface wave mode of propagation (lower frequencies)	1. AREPS uses soil type info – fairly crude data base. Difficult to model. No Vegetation in current model 2. Moderate – Need to populate data base 3. Light (unless more data sets added) 4. No significant increase in execution time 5. High - depending on resolution 50 – 500 Mb? 6. Would require option
<u>Main Model</u> HF Propagation	Allows prediction of HF skywave and surface wave propagation for comms and HF over-the-horizon radar	1. AREPS has limited HF model 2. High – needs new module 3. Light 4. Significant increase in execution time 5. Several Mb for ionosphere data base 6. High 7. Would require new JSAF interface

<u>Environmental Models</u>		
<u>Main Model</u> <u>NAVSLaM</u> Evaporation Duct Model	Greatly improved accuracy and realism. Very important for low level propagation over ocean for > 2 GHz signals	1. Already in AREPS 2. Moderate – need to transfer code into JSAF 3. Light (unless more data sets added) 4. Small increase in execution time 5. Negligible 6. Could use existing JSAF interface initially, but should be updated to allow more accurate inputs
<u>Main- Model</u> Refractivity Profile Blending Algorithm	Allows smooth transition from modeled surface layer to upper level obs or predictions. Prevents artifacts associated with “kinks” in M-profile	1. Will be in AREPS in 12-18 months 2. Moderate/High – will need to transfer code 3. Light (unless more data sets added) 4. Small increase in execution time 5. Negligible 6. Could use existing JSAF interface
<u>Environmental Data Sets and Inputs</u>		
Global Evaporation. Duct Climatology	Greatly improved realism for >2 GHz low level signals. Predictions can be keyed to different locations, different large scale patterns (e.g. El Niño) different months and different times of day	1. Development of data base underway 2. Light/Moderate – need input module 3. Light (unless more data sets added) 4. Negligible increase in execution. time 5. Several Mb, depending on areal coverage and resolution 6. Would require new JSAF interface
Global Surface Duct and Surface-Based Duct Climatology	Greatly improved accuracy and realism for all UHF and higher frequencies. Can be keyed to same variability described above	Similar to previous
Global Upper-Level Duct Climatology	Not in current JSAF, important for some air-to-air radar, jamming and comms.	Similar to previous

Real-Time or Short to Medium (1-10 days) forecast Weather Inputs	Would allow simulations of current of near future simulations or realistic “canned” scenarios	1. Significant – would need to access operational data bases 2. Significant – need input modules 3. Depends on operational changes 4. Negligible increase in execution time 5. Not much more storage needed 6. Would require new JSAF interface
<u>System Parameters</u> (analysis not in FY 12 work plan but included for completeness)		
Improved Transmitter Representations	Essential for accurate predictions	1. Data hard to obtain, SPAWARS has a CLASSIFIED data set, but there may be accuracy problems because systems can change and new systems added to Fleet. 2. Significant – need input module 3. Significant – need to update and import new systems data 4. Negligible increase in execution time 5. Not much more storage needed 6. Should be able to use existing JSAF interfaces
Improved Receiver Representations (Communications)	Essential for accurate predictions	Similar to previous
Improved Radar Target Representations	Essential for accurate predictions	Similar to previous

C. Conclusions

This information is intended to be used a guide to help JSAF developers and managers prioritize which potential changes would provide the most benefits to JSAF users given limited budgets. Since the time that this analysis was initially performed in February, 2012, it was decided that the APM model would be incorporated into JSAF. APM and some of the sub-models with it have already passed the development stage and are currently being implemented into JSAF.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia
2. Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
3. Research Sponsored Programs Office, Code 41
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93943
4. Todd Morgan
NWDC, ACOS Modeling, Simulation and Experimentation
5. Darrel Morben, CIV NWDC
Modeling & Simulation Director
NCTE Program Manager
6. Gary R. Brown
Contractor Support
NWDC M&S Software Engineering
7. David Hamby
Contractor Support
NWDC Modeling and Simulation
8. Andy Ceranowicz
Contractor Support
Navy Warfare Development Command (NWDC)