

7. Enhancing the Clarity of Low Level Decisions on the Goals of Large Complex Projects

Robert Dow, Lyn Dow, LCDR Kim Baddams and David Kershaw
Maritime Operations Division, DSTO

Abstract

The aim of the work is to examine the possibility of developing a tool to track, monitor and predict large complex system development by enhancing the clarity of how decisions at lower levels impact on the goals of the project. The approach uses Maritime Operations Division's (MOD) established ability in combat system performance modelling using MBSE and attempts to connect that level to Operational Capabilities and hence Strategy.

The paper leverages off MBSE tool capabilities, developments such as the Whole of System Architecture Framework (WSAF) and research approaches such as the Aligned Process Model (APM). The large complex project examined in this experiment is the Future Submarine project due to the authors' experience with the project, however any other large complex project would have been equally viable for the experiment.

Presenter Biography

Robert Dow graduated from James Cook University of North Queensland with Bachelor of Engineering and Master of Engineering Science Degrees in 1974. His professional engineering and scientific research career includes designing Army man-pack radios at Army Design Establishment, Maribyrnong, Victoria (1974-77); scientific instrumentation and CNC machines (1977-84) in the Engineering Division of Materials Research Laboratory (MRL); then research into sea mine target detection logic in Explosives Division of MRL (1984-1989). From the early 1990's within Maritime Operations Division he looked after a team supporting the Mine Warfare Systems Centre Project, RAN Mine Warfare Exercises and research into artificial neural networks for ordnance. He moved to MOD, DSTO-E, Adelaide in 1998 where he has worked on MBSE in support of combat systems for surface combatants and submarines. Robert Dow currently works on MBSE for Combat Systems within the Submarine Combat System Group of the Submarine Systems Branch, Maritime Operations Division, DSTO-E.

Lyn Dow has Higher Technician's Certificates from Footscray Institute of Technology in mechanical and electrical engineering. She worked in Dimensional Metrology in Materials Research Laboratory (MRL) (1970-1972), Electrical Metrology (1972-1974, 1976-1978), Camouflage (1974-1976), and Electronics (1978-1983). Returning to work in 1989, Lyn provided LAN network, computer and executive support in Maritime Operations Division. She moved to MOD, DSTO-E, Adelaide in 1998 where she has worked on MBSE in support of combat systems for surface combatants. Lyn Dow currently works on MBSE for Maritime Warfare Operations Group of the Surface Ship Operations Branch, Maritime Operations Division, DSTO-E.

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE FEB 2013		2. REPORT TYPE N/A		3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Enhancing the Clarity of Low Level Decisions on the Goals of Large Complex Projects				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Maritime Operations Division, DSTO				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES See also ADA585222. Proceedings of the 2012 Model-Based Systems Engineering Symposium, 27 - 28 November 2012, DSTO Edinburgh, South Australia., The original document contains color images.					
14. ABSTRACT The aim of the work is to examine the possibility of developing a tool to track, monitor and predict large complex system development by enhancing the clarity of how decisions at lower levels impact on the goals of the project. The approach uses Maritime Operations Division's (MOD) established ability in combat system performance modelling using MBSE and attempts to connect that level to Operational Capabilities and hence Strategy. The paper leverages off MBSE tool capabilities, developments such as the Whole of System Architecture Framework (WSAF) and research approaches such as the Aligned Process Model (APM). The large complex project examined in this experiment is the Future Submarine project due to the authors's experience with the project, however any other large complex project would have been equally viable for the experiment.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 13	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Kim Baddams served in the Royal Australian Navy from 1973 to 1998, qualifying as a fighter pilot, Air Warfare Instructor, and Principal Warfare Officer specialising in anti-submarine warfare. He held staff positions in the Naval Warfare Branch of Navy Office, where he was the inaugural Director Above and Underwater Warfare, and in the Maritime Development branch of Defence Capability Development. Since leaving full time service he has worked as a Naval Reserve in support of Navy tasks at the Defence Science and Technology Organisation, including considerable involvement with Model Based System Engineering. His qualifications include a Diploma of Maritime Studies and a Graduate Diploma of Applied Science.

David Kershaw started in Defence as a Cadet Engineer with Navy Material in 1987 and transferred to DSTO in 1989. He holds a B.Sc(Hons) in Physics, a B.E in Electrical and Computer Systems Engineering and a PhD in Tracking Systems. Positions held within DSTO have included Head of Torpedoes & Torpedo Defence Group (1999 through to 2002), Navy Scientific Adviser (2003-04), Air Warfare Destroyer S&T Adviser (2005-06), Acting Research Leader in Surface Ship Operations (Sept 2006-March 07), Head Torpedo Systems Group (2007-2010), and Head Submarine Combat Systems Group (2010-2012). David was appointed as the Research Leader Submarine Systems and SEA 1000 (Future Submarine) S&T Adviser in early 2012.

Presentation



The Challenge

To support the Decision Maker, we want to look at the possibility of **developing a tool to monitor large complex system development** by enhancing the **clarity of how decisions at lower levels** impact on the **goals of the project**.



The V-model of the Systems Engineering Process








Image extracted from [Clarus Concept of Operations](#), Publication No. FHWA-JPO-05-072, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), 2005







Capability Development Life Cycle - Responsibilities



Figure 1-2: Capability Systems Life Cycle - Responsibilities

Defence Capability Development Handbook, Commonwealth of Australia, 2011



The Challenge

Three reasons why this could get difficult

1. Developing a tool
2. Applied to large complex system development
3. Attempts to enhance the clarity of how decisions at lower levels impact on the goals of the project.

**Risk
Increasing**



Rationale for the Proposed Tool

Requirement: Quantify how low level decisions impact on the goals of the Project.

When: During acquisition phase of Capability Development Lifecycle.

Why Not Done Now: complexity, cost and delay.

DSTO advice needs to be timely, accurate and independent



Tool Requirements

1. Fast and automated, 1 week turnaround for advice,
2. Run with a minimum of manual effort,
3. Works across the entire MBSE Project database
4. Deliver results in formats readily understood by decision makers
5. Staffing limited for tool development and application



Approach to Enhancing the Clarity of Low Level Decisions on the Goals of Large Complex Projects

1. Project Goals measured by submarine's ability to meet Top Level Requirements.
2. Achievement of Top Level Requirements tested by submarine behaviour within agreed defined scenarios and vignettes.
3. Submarine behaviour captured by executable functional chains containing probability distributions and analytical expressions.
4. Therefore measuring whether Project Goals are being met can be tested by executing submarine functional chains within scenarios and vignettes defined by the Top Level Requirements.



Approach Informed by Work in Other Types of Warfare

1. Mine Warfare Command Tactical Decision Aides
Calculated effect of low level changes on MCM Task Group Operations. Used Monte Carlo simulations, analytical expressions, and probability theory.
Must be calculated every task cycle.
2. Maritime Air Defence Combat System Performance
Prediction using MBSE.
Calculation time twelve hours once models built.



White Paper Strategic Roles of FSM

DEFENCE WHITE PAPER 2009:
Chapter 9 p70

The Future Submarine will be capable of a range of tasks such as;

1. Anti-ship warfare;
2. Anti-submarine warfare;
3. Strategic strike;
4. Mine detection and mine-laying operations;
5. Intelligence collection;
6. Supporting special forces (including infiltration and exfiltration missions);
7. Getting battlespace data in support of operations.



Impact of High Level Function Failure on Project Goals

Tasks	ASuW	ASW	SS	MW	Intel	BD
Sonar Passive	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sonar Active		X				
Sonar HF Active				X		
ESM	X		X		X	X
Periscope	X		X		X	X
Bathometer				X		
Radio					X	
Mk 48 ADCAP	X	X				
Harpoon	X					
Land Attack			X			

Sub. Tasks - Defence White Paper 2009

ASuW Anti-Ship Warfare
ASW Anti-Submarine Warfare
SS Strategic Strike
MW Mine Warfare
Intel Intelligence Collection
BD Battlespace Data




Tool Implementation – a possible approach

1. One complete high level function failure is not likely
2. Reality is marginal performance changes in some functions
3. Approach for tool construction: functional chains executing scenarios and vignettes with MBSE
4. Functions incorporate external information: analytic expressions, tables, graphs, probability distributions etc.
5. MBSE Model execution tightly connected to Operational Requirements, Architecture and System Engineering database.
 - Removes translation errors between models
 - Enables cross referencing within MBSE database



Illustration of Designed, Marginal and Failed Functional Behaviour





Designed functional performance

Marginal functional performance

Failed functional performance

— Required parameter values





Layout of the Modelling Layers Contained within 'Clarity' Tool & How it Can Support Timely Decisions

1. Detailed models from:
 - The Integrated Platform System Model (MPD, DSTO) for whole of submarine margins
 - Physics and engineering for sensors and weapons
 - With Prior modelling calculation time - weeks
2. Executable models in MBSE (CORE).
 - Use 'distilled' information from above within MBSE Functions
 - Submarine functional chain execution in scenarios & vignettes
 - Informed by Operations Research
 - Parametric analysis (minimal) - changes in few low level functions
 - Computation time - days
3. Final layout of results in formats for decision makers
 - May require information display tools outside MBSE (CORE)



Challenges for Tool Development


1. Inputting the FSM Project into MBSE
 - 1.1 Helpful:
 - Capability Development using WSAF (MBSE CORE)
 - Should have two – five years
 - 1.2 Difficult:
 - Low level changes to functions need detailed implementation
 - may be difficult within Project response times
2. Moving between operations and engineering understanding of parameter values during Project?



Engineering vs Operations Understanding of Parameter Values

1. Operational performance measured from operational/exercise analysis vs.

2. Engineering Performance calculated from physics and engineering signal processing



Is it worth doing?

How else might it be done?

