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Baghdad, we have a problem…
Situation

• ROE for Urban Environment
  – Minimize Collateral Damage
  – Protect Cultural and Religious Areas
  – Maximize Safety
  – Use Precision Guided Munitions
  – Avoid Dud Producing Munitions

• Target
  – Small and Mobile Requires Quick Response
  – Not Armored
Assets

• Air – Response Time too slow
• Artillery
  – Rocket/Missile (MLRS)
    • Dud Producing
    • Large Minimum Safe Distance
  – Cannon
    • Not Considered Precision Guided
Copperhead Overlooked

Capabilities…

– Laser Guided
– Unitary Warhead
– Quick Response
– Small Minimum Safe Distance

Overlooked by the Automated System

– System had hard-coded relationships
– Selected based on target type rather than capability
– Anti-tank role
Policy Model – Primary Classes

Policy Rule

Defines how the Policy Rule is used and specifies the behavior that dictates how applicable entities will interact.

Policy Condition

Defines the necessary state and/or prerequisites that define whether or not the associated Policy Actions should be performed.

Policy Action

Represents the necessary action that should be performed if the Policy Condition is met.
Domain Knowledge

• Representation of Problem Space
  – Formalized
    • e.g. APICM and DPICM are both ICM munitions
  – Machine Interpretable
• Used to…
  – Constrain rules definition in Policy Console
  – Determine Applicable Rules in Policy Broker
  – Aid Decision-Making in Policy Consumer
• Flexible
  – Adapt to Changing Problem Space
  – Ability to Represent Newly Discovered Relationships
Policy Console

- User Interface – Graphical or Textual
- Defines Rules
- Captures Commander’s Intent / Guidance – e.g. Use precision guided munitions in an urban environment
- Constrained by Complexity of the Domain Knowledge
Policy Broker

• Stores Policy Rules
  – “Targets in an Urban Environment **MUST** use munitions that have a Precision Guided System”
  – “ICM is preferred for an FS Target”

• Brokers Requests from Policy Consumers

• Uses Domain Knowledge to Relate Rules to the Request Criteria
Key Technologies

• Ontology
  – Formal Representation of Domain Knowledge
    • Formal Language
    • Captures Semantics and Vocabulary of the Domain
      – Describes relationships and attributes
      – Enables inference
  – Machine Interpretable
    • Enables Machine Learning
Key Technologies

- **Expert System**
  - Declarative programming, not procedural programming
  - Describes “what” rather than “how”
  - Composed of an inference engine, a rule base and a fact base
  - Uses rules to reach conclusions from a set of premises
High-Level Design

Policy System
- Policy Console (User Interface)
- Domain Knowledge (Ontology)

Expert System
- Rule Base
- Inference Engine
- Policy Consumer

Connections:
- Input Rules to Domain Knowledge (Ontology)
- Specifies Domain
- Define Relationships
- Requests Rules
Ontology Example

Artillery Munitions
- ICM
  - APICM
  - DPICM
  - ATACMS
    - MSD ~ 1km

Unitary
- Shaped Charge
  - HE
  - CPHD
    - MSD <50m

Precise Guidance Systems
- GPS
- Laser
- Radar
- Optic
  - Missile
    - MSD <100m

Target
  - Fire Support
  - Mortar Team

Armor

Terrain
- Urban
- Rural
Rule Base

• Policy Rules
  – Preferred munitions for FS targets is ICM
  – Targets in an urban environment must use precision guided munitions
  – Targets in an urban environment must use munitions with a unitary charge

• Policy Result
  – Use Air Missiles
Same Rule Base – New Result

• Copperhead is now recommended based on capability
  – Unitary
  – Small Minimum Safe Distance
  – Precision Guided
  – Quick Response
Net Centric Operations

• DOD Trend toward Net Centric Operations
  – Future Combat Systems (FCS)
  – DDX
  – Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS)
  – Persistent Surveillance Dissemination System of Systems (PSDS2)

• Recognize Need for Sophisticated Policy Applications

• Dynamic Policy Environment

• Growing Implications of Legal and Geopolitical Factors
Cognitive Extensions

• Ontologies and Expert Systems Enable Cognition
  – Learn from Decision Patterns
  – Recognize Uncertainty
  – Identify Conflicts in Policy
  – Recommend New Policy
Next Steps

• Additional Research is Needed
  – Policy Conflict Identification and Resolution
  – Knowledge Elicitation
  – Performance and Trust
  – Guaranteed Service
  – Supportability, Training and Testing
Summary

• Current Force applications can’t keep up
• Policy environment is dynamic
• Ontologies and Expert Systems are key technologies
• Proposed a new approach
Questions?
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