



Interoperability Breakout Panel

- Examine current interoperability standards for unmanned systems and develop a path forward for achieving interoperability across all unmanned systems.



Panelists

- Robert Wade
 - Chair of SAE AS-4A (JAUS)
- Keith Wheeler
 - Custodian of STANAG 4586
- LTC (ret.) Kerry Pavek & MAJ Clarence White
 - FCS User Requirements



Session Framework

- Interoperability means different things to different people
 - Interfaces
 - Architectures
 - Software and hardware
- Group concentrated on the command and control (C2) standards impact on interoperability



Session Summary

- Identified key issues surrounding interoperability for unmanned systems
- Generated a list of recommended actions based on those issues identified during the session



Key Issues

- **Definition of “interoperability”**
 - **Joint Pubs update to include this new arena?**
 - **Current interoperability definitions concentrate on data exchange, not control of UMS**
 - **Related to other UMS vernacular issues**
 - **Difficult without a common way to dialog (language/definitions)**
 - **NIST ALFUS/AS-4D/ASTM F41/NATO/EDA-EDU/Joint Pubs/Service Pubs are just some of the places with definitions**



Key Issues

- **Better definition needed in the expression of “how interoperable we are/need to be”**
 - e.g. Levels of Interoperability (STANAG 4586) and Levels of Control (TCS and FCS ORDs)
 - How should the services decide what will be interoperable?

- **Need for Physical standards?**
 - Or is that too deep/too complex to address from OSD level
 - “plug and play” issue



Key Issues

- **Assured Compliance**
 - Is there a solid method of measuring compliance?
 - Do we need the “Underwriters Lab” of UMS control?
 - JFCOM, JITC for Joint interoperability certifications?
- **Multiplicity of Standards**
 - Multiple standards may or may not be an issue
 - Answer is bedded in the “vision”
 - How many “languages” will be allowed or will we neck down to ONE.
 - Costs are a key element of that decision
 - Can we afford to continue with multiple standards?
 - Need to ID what is the commonality/differences to support the decision



Key Issues

- **Security**
 - **Authorizations**
 - **Permissions**
 - **Training**
 - **Authentication**
 - **UMS only responds to authorized user**
 - **Impact of Open Architectures direction?**
 - **Classification guide implications?**
 - **COMSEC**
 - **Where is appropriate place for that security layer**
 - **Anti-Tamper and Layered Self-defense of UMS**



Key Issues

- **Safety**
 - Improvement in “Hand off” of control
 - TTP development support
 - Other Safety considerations
 - Control interface functionalities match the UMS functionalities
 - Software safety (safety critical code)
 - E-Stop guidelines
 - Interference
- **Lessons Learned library of UMS implementation?**
 - Documenting and sharing experiences



Key Issues

- **Policy Guidance Needed**
 - **Clear articulation of the intent and scope**
 - What is OSD's business model for acquiring UMS?
 - How deep should the policy apply – to payloads?
 - **Determination of the appropriate agency**
 - OSD is consensus
 - **Would provide industry motivation for “participation”**



Recommended Actions

- **Better define “Interoperability” in the Joint Publications and Service Publications**
- **Find consensus on levels of interoperability within the standards; understand the business model for acquisition of unmanned systems**
- **Determine viability of specifying physical standards**
- **Identify method of assuring compliance of C2 standards**
- **Identify commonalities/differences in existing standards**



Recommended Actions

- **Investigate implications of security issues related to C2 standards**
- **Validate software safety and other safety issues**
- **Document lessons learned from various UMS**
- **Generate guidance/policy to encourage standardization**
- **Determine if Government/industry is willing to incur the costs of supporting multiple standards**