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What's The Subject?

- Model Driven Development
  - using executable UML modeling
  - building the core of collaborative FoS for NCW
  - applies to end item and the building process
- of Command and Control Capabilities
  - applications for information and cognitive functions
  - Single Integrated Air Picture (SIAP) is not just about an air picture, but is a prototype for all BM/C2
  - peers build and use distributed, replicated data for BM/C2 ops
- for Joint and Coalition Warfare
  - ad hoc dynamic groupings of networked peers
  - heterogeneous systems
  - varied peer data-access privileges
Bottom Line

• *Tactical Real-Time* Net Centric Operations and Warfare (e.g., shared awareness) call for collaborative Federations of Systems (FoS)
  • Therefore, DoD acquisition system processes must lead to collaborative FoS
• Assertions
  • Existing DoD NCW transformation initiatives for interoperability are not strong enough for FoS solutions
  • OMG™ Model Driven Architecture (MDA™) approach meets the need
  • Complexity of the interoperability problem requires executable architecture
• Joint SIAP System Engineering Organization (JSSEO) is prototyping the technical and management path for collaborative FoS
OUTLINE

• JSSEO Background
• MDA™
• JSSEO Technical and Management Approach
• Implications and Recommendations
SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE

User viewpoint: common, correct, complete, continuous, timely

System: state of data consistency among distributed replicated data stores, for objects of peer interest
GENERALIZED SIAP CONTEXT

PEER TO PEER (IP) NETWORK
(mobile, ad hoc)

- Tactical Sensors
- Theater Sensors
- Battle Managers/C2
- Theater Joint Intel Center
- Combat ID Coordinator
- Combat ID Fusion Center
- Track Data Coordinator
- Other Aviation Authorities
- Effecting Resources (e.g., shooters)
- Planning Cells
- Collaborative Operational Node

LEGEND
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* Alberts, Understanding Information Age Warfare
FEDERATION OF SYSTEMS

Derived (as rqd) Operational Framework & Concepts

Derived Distributed-System Concepts

Derived PEER Concepts (PEER black box view)
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NCW BEHAVIOR REQUIREMENTS

• Post before process
• Smart pull
• Collaborate for sense-making
• Only handle info once
• Communicate with reliability & assurance
OMG™ Model Driven Architecture™

• OMG™ learned with CORBA™ that middleware was not enough
• MDA™ is a standards framework, mainly
  • Unified Modeling Language (UML)
  • Meta-Object Facility (MOF)
• Precept: separate the implementation technology from business concerns
• Depends on modeling
  • Platform-Independent Model (PIM)
  • Platform-Specific Model (PSM)
  • Platform = host computing machine (could be distributed)
MDATM CONCEPTS

Platform Independent Model

Platform A Specific Model

Platform B Specific Model

"Translate" to account for technology particulars

Compile from model to computer program

A Implementation

B Implementation

Implementing Technology Platform A

Implementing Technology Platform B

A fielded system

A system of systems
# MOF META-LEVELS
(Adapted from Frankel)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meta-Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M3</strong></td>
<td>MOF, i.e. the set of constructs used to define metamodels</td>
<td>MOF Class, MOF Attribute, MOF Association, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M2</strong></td>
<td>Metamodels, consisting of instances of MOF constructs</td>
<td>UML Class, UML Association, UML Attribute, UML State, UML Activity, (&amp; other-modeling-language elements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M1</strong></td>
<td>Models, consisting of instances of M2 metamodel constructs</td>
<td>Class &quot;Customer,&quot; Attribute &quot;Account#&quot; (&amp; types modeled in other languages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M0</strong></td>
<td>Objects and data, i.e., instances of M1 model constructs</td>
<td>Customer &quot;Joe Doaks,&quot; Account# &quot;6543&quot; (&amp; other instances of types)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTABLE UML AND MDA

• Executable UML is a profile of UML
  • Classes
  • State machines
  • Action Specification
• Executable models run in simulation
• Tools to support MDA are available*
• Assertions: Tactical BM/C2 interoperability is so complex, that
  • understanding requires an executable model of the business (*DoD static approaches won't do it!*)
    • for understanding requirements, &
    • understanding the distributed system under development
  • technical detail of the platform should be in the model compiler so translation is automated

*JSSEO is using Kennedy-Carter iUML
COMPONENTS OF A PEER

- The IABM is a Platform Independent Model
- The IABM Implementation is a computer program hosted on one or more processors of the peer systems
- IABM initial configuration is due to complete in Sep 2005
IABM Distributed Replicated Data

• Replicated data stores at peers are built by sharing source data (e.g., sensor measurements)

• Replication is on an object basis per peer need

• SIAP = a state of data consistency among peers
The JSSEO ARCHITECTURE SOLUTION FOR FoS COMPLEXITY

Unpredictable Heterogeneous Set of Systems

Predictable, Logically Homogeneous FoS

IABM: INTEGRATED ARCHITECTURE BEHAVIOR MODEL
IABM NOTIONAL CONFIGURATION

SENSORS (PRODUCERS)
- Radar System
- IFF System
- NAV System
- Electronic Surveillance

IABM USERS (CONSUMERS)
- Operator Displays
- BM/C2 Systems
- Weapons
- Electronic Attack

COMMUNICATIONS
- PEER to PEER Communications
- LINK 16
- LINK 11

PEER to PEER Communications
IABM: SET OF INTERACTING DOMAINS
DOMAINS, A KEY CONCEPT

• Domains are:
  • "Autonomous world inhabited by conceptual entities" [Mellor]
  • Subject matter encapsulations
    • Used "as is" in every implementation, if applicable to mission
    • Domains are coupled via bridges
      • loose coupling: cross-domain "pollution" is in the bridges
  • The System Engineering primitive component
    • Elemental configuration item; test item
    • Foundation of modeling teams
    • Reusable, maintainable
Interoperability of BM/C2 FoS requires engineering of all levels concurrently!
JSSEO DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (1)

- JSSEO is using *AGILE* development
  - Delivering a running end item every 4 weeks (final PIM due Sep 05)
  - Model testing is in-phase (lagging) with deliveries
    - local testbeds for domain and project integration testing
    - HLA interface for distributed simulation test bed (JDEP)
  - Regular reflection and feedback
  - Working code is the primary progress metric
  - Changing/new requirements are expected
    - each build cycle timebox has a dedicated requirements/architecture phase; refactoring is constant
      - higher level requirements/architecture cycle more slowly
  - SMEs (operational, technical) and developers work closely on domain teams
JSSEO DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (2)

• JSSEO leads a joint/allied distributed SE task force
  • Central development site for PIM
  • Partner involvement/ownership in PIM development (esp. adaptation domains)
  • Partner/Service integration sites for PSMs, model compilers

• The IABM is the collaboration mechanism integrating the team
  • Unambiguous specification
    • functions
    • interfaces
  • Measurable performance and progress
  • Generic domains for tailoring to adaptation domains

JSSEO is not just experimenting and prototyping, but is directly engineering FoS interoperability
MODEL-DRIVEN DEVELOPMENT
RECOMMENDATION #1

• Design FoS interoperability using federated object models
  • NCW battlefield requires *ad hoc* federations of systems (FoS)
  • JSSEO building aerospace object model, but...
    • Resources (e.g., sensors, networks) and Cognitive Domain activities cross mission areas
    • Multiple "pictures" in development without peer-to-peer interoperability
  • Federated executable business models using JSSEO MDA™ approach permits design of FoS capabilities

DoD should scale up JSSEO MDA™ processes to federate executable architecture models covering mission-area partitions
MODEL-DRIVEN DEVELOPMENT
RECOMMENDATION #2

• Leverage MDA™ by preparing hosts for PIM/PSM
  • PIM handling (e.g., code manipulation) during implementation increases risk to interoperability
    • PIM interoperability testing voided if PIM altered
    • Model translation and compiling safest if by machine
    • Risk extends to life cycle maintenance and upgrade
    • Technology aspects become embedded in PIM
  • Open up system architectures, build platform-specific tools and system object models
    • Let tools embed the platform technology
    • Enables closely coordinated release of PIM upgrades
    • Readies partner participation on SE task forces

DoD acquisition leaders plan for and incentivize programs' transition to MDA as part of NCW transformation
MODEL-DRIVEN DEVELOPMENT
RECOMMENDATION #3

• Pursue executable Operational Architectures
  • NCW Operational Concepts for Joint/Coalition BM/C2 are scarce, imprecise, and poorly articulated
  • NCW developers need definition of the "business" of Joint/Coalition BM/C2, i.e. the operational...
    • structures
    • behaviors
    • data
  • Executable Operational Architectures permit Warfighter specification of NCW
    • Technology independent
    • Mission Capability Package (MCP) alignment

Empower warfighters with tools and cadre of systems engineers to generate executable operational architectures
MODEL-DRIVEN DEVELOPMENT
RECOMMENDATION #4

• Common-processing in GIG edge devices has special DoD enterprise-level implications
  • Streamlining of system operational testing and certifications is needed to avoid redundancies
    • model-based testing has a different meaning with MDA; the model is a component, not an abstraction
  • Can push smart enterprise-common design solutions into GIG edge devices using PIMs or reference implementations
    • information assurance and security processes
    • Net-Centric Enterprise Service interfaces
    • network C2, transport QoS, COI management
    • data characterization

DoD policy-makers must appreciate and leverage the implications of large-scope common processing architectures
MODEL-DRIVEN DEVELOPMENT

RECOMMENDATION #5

• DoD enterprise-level interoperability should be achieved using a model-driven development environment
  • Current/planned environment is tech-dependent and unsuited for real-time, weakly connected, battlefield ops
  • Needed: a development-phase system for designing FoS and federating object models
  • Analogous to OMG, environment should support model-based specification, model interoperability, tool interoperability, model-driven testing
  • Build a general-purpose GIG testbed for edge-device federation testing

DoD acquisition leaders should establish a model-driven engineering environment analogous to OMG MDA environment
CONCLUSIONS

- JSSEO is successfully performing NCW transformation of Joint/Coalition tactical aerospace BM/C2
- MDA™ methods using executable architectures have the technical power to engineer complex FoS
  - Current DoD NCW transformation initiatives do not go far enough for real-time tactical BM/C2 FoS
  - JSSEO should be considered an acquisition process pathfinder or prototype for mission areas outside aerospace BM/C2
- NCW transformation can be accelerated by leveraging MDA™ in DoD enterprise policies and processes