

PUBLIC RELEASE

***United States Air Force
Scientific Advisory Board***



Report on

***Technology for Machine-to-Machine Intelligence,
Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Integration***

Volume 1: Executive Summary and Brief (PR)

SAB-TR-03-03

July, 2003

DISTRIBUTION AUTHORIZED

In accordance with AFI 61-204 and DODD 5230.24, distribution statement A, this document is approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

PUBLIC RELEASE

PUBLIC RELEASE

This report is a product of the United States Air Force Scientific Advisory Board Study Committee on *Technology for Machine-to-Machine Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Integration*. Statements, opinions, findings, recommendations, and conclusions contained in this report are those of the Study Committee and do not necessarily represent the official position of the United States Air Force or the United States Department of Defense.

PUBLIC RELEASE

PUBLIC RELEASE

***United States Air Force
Scientific Advisory Board***



Report on

***Technology for Machine-to-Machine Intelligence,
Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Integration***

Volume 1: Executive Summary and Brief (PR)

SAB-TR-03-03

July, 2003

DISTRIBUTION AUTHORIZED

In accordance with AFI 61-204 and DODD 5230.24, distribution statement A, this document is approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

PUBLIC RELEASE

PUBLIC RELEASE

(This Page Intentionally Left Blank.)

PUBLIC RELEASE

ii

PUBLIC RELEASE

Executive Summary

As modern warfare evolves, the value of pervasive awareness and rapid response on the battlefield increases. Current Air Force systems are highly capable, and within individual domains, are highly automated. If the real-time machine-to-machine interactions that facilitate the presentation of actionable, decision-quality information to the warfighter in an intuitive form is assured, then many manual steps can be eliminated.

The focus of this study was to understand the underlying reasons for the current lack of broad-based machine-to-machine intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance integration (MTMISRI), discover available actions to remove technology as an obstacle, and construct specific suggestions on how the Air Force might move toward more pervasive MTMISRI.

In the process of the study, ten hypotheses on the origins of the problem were posed:

1. Requirements: Needs were not identified when systems were acquired.
2. Acquisition – Either the wrong technology was purchased or the needed technology could not be purchased.
3. Technology – Key technologies were not available.
4. Resources – The solution is known but unfunded.
5. Training – The capability exists in current systems but is unused.
6. Communications – The data cannot get to where it is needed.
7. Security Policy – Security policy barriers prevent success.
8. “Tribal” Issues – Cultural and/or political barriers impede success.
9. Organization – Organizational barriers impede success.
10. ROE – Manual action and/or decision is a required process step.

While evidence to support each of these hypotheses as elements of the problem was found, consensus was reached on an eleventh hypothesis – that the lack of an overarching architecture for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) severely inhibits integration and is the major obstacle to widespread MTMISRI.

Many disparate efforts are successfully integrating ISR systems to realize high priority machine-to-machine connectivity. For the most part, these efforts should not stop! However, these activities, while useful individually, will make it harder to achieve the vision of quickly integrating new and pre-existing systems to take advantage of shared information.

There are three major findings of the study:

1. The Air Force has no commonly accepted architectural framework to achieve MTMISRI.
2. The Air Force must revise security policy to achieve a better balance between “protection” and “usability.”
3. The Air Force should make sensor data from unconventional sources readily available as part of the ISR-data stream.

PUBLIC RELEASE

PUBLIC RELEASE

Making machines “talk” to each other is difficult, especially since competing companies designed them independently, to divergent requirements, with less-than-crisp interface specifications, and in different eras. Each domain (“stove-pipe”) is currently doing its best to integrate its systems by identifying deficiencies, prioritizing them, and funding fixes to as many deficiencies as it can locally afford. This has produced collections of high value, locally (pair-wise) connected systems that are globally disconnected and difficult to integrate.

The end result is that there is no single ISR architecture, but rather many architectures that evolved to meet specific requirements and remain largely incompatible.

The Study Committee believes there are four basic architecture options to correct the MTMISRI deficiencies. In all cases, the cost to retrofit and integrate existing systems into a new architecture drives the total ownership cost.

The Study Committee makes five recommendations:

1. Fund a program to achieve ISR/Operations integration. Include as part of the program:
 - a. Building a modern technical architecture and the associated enterprise services infrastructure;
 - b. Validating the architecture and associated infrastructure through experiments;
 - c. Authority over other programs to enforce compliance with the architecture;
 - d. Central funding for infrastructure and retrofit/integration of existing systems;
 - e. Development of a test and certification capability to support the compliance mandate;
 - f. Support for revisions of concepts of operations (CONOPS) and doctrine that result from program successes;
 - g. Development of a program schedule that supports an initial operating capability (IOC) no later than that of the Air Force Distributed Common Ground System (AF DCGS) Block 10.2 Program and demonstrates an interim reference architecture at the Joint Expeditionary Force Experiment 2006(JEFX-06); and
 - h. A definition of an IOC that will assure the ability to seamlessly exchange information among a specific set of domains.
2. Establish a policy that mandates compliance with the architecture. Use experimentation as the route to confidence-building demonstrations prior to enforcing the policy.
3. Engage the Intelligence Community (IC) to:
 - a. Focus on CONOPS, doctrine, and policy for strategic and operational information sharing and collection management;
 - b. Review and revise classification and releaseability guidelines while striving to achieve a balance between “protection” and “usability”; and

PUBLIC RELEASE

PUBLIC RELEASE

- c. Integrate Air Force MTMISRI activities with the Horizontal Integration Initiative proposed by the Transformational Space and Air Program (TSAP).
4. Institute enterprise data management in each of the Air Force's major domains (the Air Mobility Command provides a good example), to focus on:
 - a. Semantic agreement;
 - b. Metadata registry;
 - c. Data ownership/sharing; and
 - d. Data management across domains.
5. Incorporate responsive access to non-traditional sources as part of ISR/Operations integration.

The Study Committee found that while some technological challenges exist to MTMISRI, they are not insurmountable. Significant changes in program management of MTMISRI will make it a reality for the Air Force.

PUBLIC RELEASE



PUBLIC RELEASE

Air Force Scientific Advisory Board

Integrity - Service - Excellence

Technology for Machine-to-Machine ISR Integration (MTMISRI)

Study Outbriefing

Dr. Llewellyn S. “Doc” Dougherty – Chair

LSDougherty@raytheon.com | 310-647-3993

Mr. Thomas F. “Skip” Saunders – Vice Chair

tfs@mitre.org | 781-271-3194

DISTRIBUTION AUTHORIZED

In accordance with AFI 61-204 and DODD 5230.24, distribution statement A, this document is approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.
--

<p>DISCLAIMER: This report is a product of the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board (SAB). The SAB is an independent, objective advisory group that gives advice to the Secretary and Chief of Staff of the Air Force. Statements, opinions, recommendations, and conclusions contained in this briefing are those of the preparing committee, and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the U.S. Air Force or the Department of Defense.</p>

PUBLIC RELEASE



U.S. AIR FORCE

PUBLIC RELEASE



PUBLIC RELEASE

Integrity - Service - Excellence



Study Charter



U.S. AIR FORCE

- **Understand** the evolution, current state, and capabilities of existing and planned ISR systems and their interfaces and integration with Command and Control (C2) systems that are relevant to the real-time combat environment.
- **Provide insight into technology and process steps that the Air Force should take** to achieve real-time information integration into a single real-time product across system, geographic, and cultural boundaries.
- **Identify new opportunities** to take traditionally unrelated information sources and integrate them in ways that exploit the power of the machine at the digital level while requiring little or no human intervention.
- **Propose a near term experiment** using existing Air Force systems that can demonstrate MTM integration and serve as a beginning to a longer term process.



PUBLIC RELEASE



Study Members

U.S. AIR FORCE

SAB Members

- Wanda Austin
- Doc Dougherty (Chair)
- Tom Garvey
- Dan Held
- Lou Metzger
- LtGen (R) George Muellner
- MGen (R) Eric Nelson
- Howard Schue

Ad Hoc Advisors

- LtGen (R) Linc Faurer
- Bill Grimes
- MGen (R) George Harrison
- Skip Saunders (Vice Chair)

- Space Systems
- C4ISR and Systems Technology
- C2 and Information Systems
- ISR Systems Development
- C4ISR and Systems Technology
- AF Ops and Acquisition
- BMC4ISR Acquisition
- Intel Systems

- Intel Systems and Operations
- Big Safari
- Combat Operations
- C4ISR and Systems Technology

PUBLIC RELEASE

Integrity - Service - Excellence



PUBLIC RELEASE

Study Members



U.S. AIR FORCE

Government Participants

- LtGen Tom Hobbins 12th AF/CC, Gen Officer Participant
- Dr. Alex Levis (AF Chief Scientist) AF/ST, Senior Civilian Participant
- Mr. Steve Callicutt AF Ops, C2 & Battle Management
- Mr. Dean Daigle 12th AF Representative
- Mr. Zane Faught CIA Representative
- Mr. Thurman R. Haas NRO Representative
- Dr Andrew W. Palowitch CIA Representative
- Mr. Ed Mornston NIMA Representative

- Maj John Grenier Study Executive Officer
- Maj Carol Welsch Study Technical Advisor
- Maj Ki Ho Kang SAB Study Executive Officer
- Capt Kent Broome SAB Study Executive Officer

PUBLIC RELEASE

Integrity - Service - Excellence



PUBLIC RELEASE

Visits/Briefings



U.S. AIR FORCE

- CIA
- NIMA
- NSA
- L3Com (Rockwall TX)
- L3Com (Greenville TX)
- Raytheon (Garland TX)
- ESC
- AlphaTech (Burlington MA)
- NRO
- Northrop Grumman (Baltimore)
- 7th Air Force
- 12th Air Force
- PACAF
- Boeing
- Lockheed
- DARPA
- SIAP
- Dep NSSI
- AMC
- Army CIO – LGen(S) Boutelle
- Navy ForceNet
- AF/XI –
LtGen Kenne
BGen Goodrich
SES David Tillotson
- AF CIO – SES John Gilligan
- AF/XOQ – SES Snake Clark

PUBLIC RELEASE

Integrity - Service - Excellence



U.S. AIR FORCE

PUBLIC RELEASE

The Problem



- We can do much to eliminate manual steps by assuring that real-time MTM interactions facilitate:
 - ✓ Presentation of actionable decision quality information
 - ✓ to the warfighter
 - ✓ in an intuitive form
 - ✓ as it is needed
- We have sought:
 - ✓ The underlying reasons for the current lack of MTMISRI
 - ✓ Available actions to remove technology as an obstacle
 - ✓ Specific suggestions on how to move toward MTMISRI

PUBLIC RELEASE

Integrity - Service - Excellence



PUBLIC RELEASE

10 Hypotheses Why We Don't Currently Have MTMISRI



U.S. AIR FORCE

1. **Requirements – needs not identified when systems were acquired**
2. **Acquisition – bought the wrong stuff; couldn't buy the right stuff**
3. **Technology – key technologies are not available**
4. **Resources – the solution is known but unfunded**
5. **Training – capability exists (unused) in current systems**
6. **Communications – can't get the data to where it is needed**
7. **Security Policy – security policy barriers prevent success**
8. **“Tribal” Issues – cultural/political barriers impede success**
9. **Organization – organizational barriers impede success**
10. **ROE – manual action/decision is a required process step**

What is the relative importance of each hypothesis?

PUBLIC RELEASE

Integrity - Service - Excellence



Things We Didn't Address



U.S. AIR FORCE

- Joint / Coalition issues
- Acquisition system
- Adequacy of communications
- Adequacy of collection assets



U.S. AIR FORCE

The Bottom Line at the Top



- There is no commonly accepted architectural framework on which to hang machine-to-machine ISR integration
- If you want to fix this problem, treat it as a program!



One Preliminary



Domain-Specific Architectures



U.S. AIR FORCE

- The MTM problem exists across many domains, e.g.:

- ✓ Defense suppression, ISR,
- ✓ Air Defense, Combat Ops,
- ✓ Mobility, Logistics, ...

Domains: Collaborative groups of users who must exchange information in pursuit of their shared goals, interests, missions, or business processes, and who therefore must have shared definitions for the information they exchange

- Within each of the ISR domains, we found people:

- ✓ Identifying deficiencies
- ✓ Prioritizing them
- ✓ Funding as many as they can locally afford

- The result is collections of high value, locally (pair-wise) connected systems that are globally disconnected and increasingly difficult to integrate



U.S. AIR FORCE

PUBLIC RELEASE



The Core of The Problem

PUBLIC RELEASE

Integrity - Service - Excellence



The Architecture Is Missing



U.S. AIR FORCE

- There is no overarching ISR architecture, but rather *many architectures*
 - ✓ Evolved to meet specific requirements
 - ✓ Remain largely incompatible
 - ✓ Will not converge on their own

➤ Control mechanisms are disparate and fragmented

➤ We believe there are four basic options:

Note: Retrofit and integration of existing systems into a new architecture drives total cost




U.S. AIR FORCE

PUBLIC RELEASE

Unifying the Tribes: Exploit the Existing Domains



**A Federated Network
Organized by Domain**




PUBLIC RELEASE

Integrity - Service - Excellence



Example of a Transaction: SOF Request Situational Awareness

Position and Time Comprise a
Common Frame of Reference





Recommendations



U.S. AIR FORCE

PUBLIC RELEASE

*Recommendation 1 (in two parts):
Commit*



*In order for MTM interaction to drive
ISR/Operations integration:*

- CSAF must commit to -
 - ✓ Fund a program to include implementing an architecture and the associated infrastructure
 - ✓ Establish a policy that mandates compliance with the architecture

PUBLIC RELEASE

Integrity - Service - Excellence



1A – Fund a Program



U.S. AIR FORCE

- Centrally fund
 - ✓ Enterprise services-based architecture and infrastructure
 - ✓ Retrofit and integration of existing systems
- Include authority over other programs to enforce compliance with the architecture
- Build a test and certification capability to support the compliance mandate
- Validate the architecture and associated infrastructure through experiments
- Support revision of CONOPS and doctrine that result from program successes
- Develop a program schedule that supports an IOC no later than DCGS 10.2 and demonstrate an interim reference architecture at JEFX-06
 - ✓ Define IOC as the ability to seamlessly exchange information among a specific set of domains



U.S. AIR FORCE

1B – Establish a Policy



- Publish a policy to provide advanced notice that architecture compliance will be required
- Validate the architecture before enforcing the policy:
 - ✓ Define the technical architecture
 - Leverage *popular* commercial standards
 - ✓ Get industry buy-in
 - ✓ Build the infrastructure needed to validate the architecture
 - ✓ Perform experiments which validate the architecture
 - ✓ Assure that a capability exists to perform certification testing of products that claim they conform to the architecture
- Enforce the policy



U.S. AIR FORCE

PUBLIC RELEASE

Recommendation 2: Engage



- CSAF & SecAF engage the Intelligence Community (IC) to:
 - ✓ Focus on CONOPS, policy, and doctrine for strategic and operational information sharing and collection management
 - ✓ Review and revise classification and releaseability guidelines
 - Strive to achieve balance between “protection” and “usability”
 - Educate the IC on warfighters' *modus operandi* – now and in the future
 - ✓ Integrate AF MTMISRI activities with the HI Initiative proposed by the Transformational Space and Air Program (TSAP)

PUBLIC RELEASE

Integrity - Service - Excellence



PUBLIC RELEASE

Recommendation 3: Manage



U.S. AIR FORCE

- Institute enterprise data management in each of the Air Force's major domains (AMC provides a good example)
 - ✓ Semantic agreement
 - ✓ Metadata registry
 - ✓ Data ownership/sharing
- Develop data management across domains
 - ✓ Hierarchical communities of interest
 - ✓ Data mediation

PUBLIC RELEASE

Integrity - Service - Excellence

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE**Form Approved
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 manipulating 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 the burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave Blank)		2. REPORT DATE July 2003	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final, January 2003 – July 2003	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Technology for Machine-to-Machine Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Integration, Volume 1: Executive Summary and Brief			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Llewellyn Dougherty, Wanda Austin, Tom Garvey, Dan Held, Lou Metzger, George Muellner, Eric Nelson, Howard Schue, Line Faurer, Bill Grimes, George Harrison, Skip Saunders, Steve Callicutt, Dean Daigle, Zane Faught, Maj John Grenier, Maj Carol Welsch, Maj Kiho Kang, Capt Kent Broome				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) HQ USAF/SB 1180 AF Pentagon, 5D982 Washington, DC 20330-1180			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER SAB-TR-03-03	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) SAF/OS AF/CC Pentagon Washington, DC 20330-1670			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Public Release			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE A	
ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 Words) As Modern warfare evolves, the value of pervasive awareness and rapid response on the battlefield increases. Current Air Force systems are highly capable, and within individual domains, are highly automated.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance, Multi-Level Security, Machine-to-Machine, ISR Architecture, Domain Integration.			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 30	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT None	