


Systems Research Series — Vol. 1

Michael J. DiMario

System of Systems Collaborative Formation



Systems Research Series — Vol. 1

System of Systems Collaborative Formation



Michael J. DiMario

Stevens Institute of Technology, USA

 **World Scientific**

NEW JERSEY • LONDON • SINGAPORE • BEIJING • SHANGHAI • HONG KONG • TAIPEI • CHENNAI

Published by

World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd.

5 Toh Tuck Link, Singapore 596224

USA office: 27 Warren Street, Suite 401-402, Hackensack, NJ 07601

UK office: 57 Shelton Street, Covent Garden, London WC2H 9HE

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

SYSTEM OF SYSTEMS COLLABORATIVE FORMATION

Systems Research Series — Vol. 1

Copyright © 2010 by World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd.

All rights reserved. This book, or parts thereof, may not be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any information storage and retrieval system now known or to be invented, without written permission from the Publisher.

For photocopying of material in this volume, please pay a copying fee through the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. In this case permission to photocopy is not required from the publisher.

ISBN-13 978-981-4313-88-9

ISBN-10 981-4313-88-2

Typeset by Stallion Press

Email: enquiries@stallionpress.com

Printed in Singapore by B & Jo Enterprise Pte Ltd

System of Systems Collaborative Formation

LIST OF SYMBOLS

u_i	Constituent System Utility
U	System of Systems Utility
Σ	Summation
$f(\cdot)$	Social Function
\in	Element of
$>$	Greater than
λ_{\max}	Largest Eigen Value
\succ	Preferred
E^3	System of Systems Environmental Cube (Systems, Capabilities, Time)
EU	Expected Utility

CONTENTS

List of Tables	ix
List of Figures	xi
List of Symbols	xv
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Introduction and Overview	1
1.2 Problem Statement and Research Hypothesis	3
1.3 Research Objectives	3
1.4 Uniqueness of this Research	3
1.5 Dissertation Organization and Structure	4
2. Literature Review and Research Boundary	5
2.1 Systems Thinking	7
2.2 System of Systems	9
2.3 Systems Cooperation	12
2.3.1 Connectivity and Interoperability	12
2.3.2 Belonging and Collaboration	15
2.3.3 System of Systems Interoperability and Satisficing	16
2.3.4 The Collaborative Formation of System of Systems	18
2.4 Mechanism	19
2.5 Decision Theory	20

3.	Research Approach	23
3.1	System of Systems Interoperability	23
3.2	Systems of Systems Design-Time	24
3.3	System of Systems Run-Time	25
4.	System of Systems Formation	29
4.1	System of Systems Design-time and Run-time Overview	29
4.2	SoS Characteristics and Evolution	31
4.2.1	Emergence	32
4.2.2	Autonomy	38
4.2.3	Diversity	38
4.2.4	Connectivity and Interoperability	39
4.2.5	Belonging and Collaboration	39
4.2.6	Evolution	40
4.3	Design-Time SoS Formation	43
4.3.1	Enterprise Architecture	43
4.3.2	Composeable SoSE	43
4.3.3	Composeable Design-Time SoS Case Study	45
4.3.4	SoS Design-Time Compositional Process	47
4.4	Run-Time SoS Formation	48
4.4.1	Soft Systems Methodology SoS Guideline	48
4.4.2	SoS Mechanism	48
4.4.3	Satisficing SoS Mechanism Design Social Function	51
4.4.4	Multicriteria Decision Making	53
4.4.5	Analytical Network and Analytical Hierarchy Process	55
4.4.6	Auto Battle Management Aids SoS Mechanism	58
4.4.7	Mechanism Scenario MCDA Model	60
4.4.8	MCDA SoS ABMA Simulation	62
5.	Research Validation	65
5.1	Validation Overview	65
5.2	SoS Design-Time	66
5.3	SoS Run-Time	67
5.4	Validation Summary	71

6. Conclusions and Future Research	73
6.1 SoS Collaborative Formation	73
6.2 Future Research	73
6.2.1 SoS Social Function	73
6.2.2 SoS Health Care Future Research Application . . .	76
Appendix A: Design-Time Compositional Systems of Systems Engineering	79
Appendix B: Soft Systems Methodology SoS Guideline	89
Appendix C: A Case for an International Consortium on System-of-Systems Engineering — IEEE Systems Journal, September 2007	97
References	105
Appendix D: System of Systems Interoperability Types and Characteristics in Joint Command and Control, IEEE Conference on System of Systems Engineering, April 2006	113
References	125
Appendix E: Applying Frameworks to Manage SoS Architecture — Engineering Management Journal, December 2008	127
References	138
Appendix F: “Satisficing” System of Systems (SoS) using Dynamic and Static Doctrines — Submitted for Publication	141
References	164
Appendix G: System of Systems Collaborative Formation — Submitted for Publication	167
References	188
Appendix H: System of Systems Multicriteria Decision Aid Auto Battle Management Simulation Architecture	191
References	193

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Attribute Differentiation of a System and System of Systems	13
Table 2:	System Characteristics of Integration vs. Interoperation	15
Table 3:	Systems Cooperation Characteristics	16
Table 4:	SoS Formation Boardman Conceptagon	31
Table 5:	Neumann-Morgenstern and SoS Satisficing Social Function Characterization	52
Table 6:	ANP/AHP Scale of Pairwise Comparisons Modified From (Belton & Stewart, 2002)	56
Table 7:	AHP ABMA SoS Characteristics Criteria	61
Table 8:	SoS ABMA Sub Criteria Priorities and Alternatives . . .	62
Table 9:	Testable Attribute Results	72
Table 10:	SoS Formation Conceptagon	74

Appendix E

Table 1:	Differentiating a System from a System of Systems (Boardman and Sauser 2006)	130
Table 2:	Zachman Framework TM for Enterprise Architecture (Zachman 1987)	132

Appendix F

Table 1:	SoS Characteristics Contrast	158
----------	--	-----

Appendix G

Table 1:	SoS Interoperability Spectrum	171
Table 2:	AHP Scale of Pairwise Comparisons	178
Table 3:	Conceptagon of Platform vs. Force-wide Centricity	181
Table 4:	Contrast of SoS Characteristics of Control vs. Forms of Decentralized Control	182
Table 5:	AHP Pseudo Simulated Preferences and Priorities	184

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1:	Research Approach	24
Figure 2:	SoS Janus Effect	25
Figure 3:	SoS Compositional Hierarchy Circular Process	26
Figure 4:	SoS Social Function Value Thinking (Keeney, 1992)	27
Figure 5:	SoS Network Centric Operations	30
Figure 6:	SoS Epoch Composeable Engineering	44
Figure 7:	Systems of Systems Environmental Cube (E^3)	45
Figure 8:	SoS Environmental Sub- E^3 Decomposition	46
Figure 9:	SoSE Compositional Process of CAS C2	47
Figure 10:	Structural Difference between a Hierarchy-AHP and a Network-ANP: (a) Hierarchy; (b) Network	57
Figure 11:	Value Focused Thinking Hierarchy	59
Figure 12:	Alternative Focused Thinking Hierarchy	59
Figure 13:	VFT Battle Group AHP Hierarchy	60
Figure 14:	Battle Group Cooperation Models	63
Figure 15:	MCDA SoS ABMA Simulation	67
Figure 16:	Relative Comparison of Battle Group Enemy Strikes	68
Figure 17:	Relative Comparison of Battle Group Weapons Expend	69
Figure 18:	Relative Comparison of Battle Group Decision Engagement Time	70
Figure 19:	Relative Comparison of Battle Group Threat Engagement Range	71
Figure 20:	SoS Collaborative Machinery	75
Figure 21:	U.S. Health Care SoS Constituent Systems (Reid, Compton, Grossman, & Fanjiang, 2005)	77
Figure 22:	CAS Decomposition	80
Figure 23:	CAS Composition Mini Thread Evaluation	81

Figure 24:	Consolidated Mission Threads Per Epoch and Governance View	82
Figure 25:	CAS Common Mini Thread Patterns	83
Figure 26:	CAS Common Mission Tread Evaluation and Patterns	84
Figure 27:	Common Patterns Define Mission Thread	85
Figure 28:	Consolidated Mission Threads Interoperability	86
Figure 29:	Soft Systems Methodology SoS Guideline	90
Figure 30:	Soft Systems Methodology Generic SoS Model	91
Figure 31:	Soft Systems Methodology SoS Health Care Guideline	93
Figure 32:	Soft Systems Methodology Health Care SoS Model	94
Figure 33:	Soft Systems Methodology SoS ABMA Guideline	95
Figure 34:	Soft Systems Methodology ABMA SoS Model	96
Figure 35:	SoS ABMA Simulation Environment Architecture	192

Appendix C

Figure 1:	Structure of International Consortium on System of systems — ICSOS	104
-----------	---	-----

Appendix D

Figure 1:	System of Systems Interoperability Types	115
Figure 2:	Global Information Grid Components	119
Figure 3:	JDEP Interaction Hierarchy Federation Object Model	121

Appendix E

Figure 1:	Three Dimensional Architectural Framework (Morganwalp and Sage 2002/ 2003)	133
Figure 2:	SoS Connectivity Attribute Information Architecture Using Zachman Framework	136

Appendix F

Figure 1:	Two Stopping Rules of Satisficing and Optimality Contrasted (Schmidt, 1996)	146
Figure 2:	Systems characterization, adopted from (Gorod, Gandhi <i>et al.</i> , 2008)	148
Figure 3:	SoSE Management Conceptual Areas (Gorod, Gove <i>et al.</i> , 2007)	150

Figure 4:	Framework for “Satisficing” SoS using Dynamic and Static Doctrine	151
Figure 5:	SoSE Management Framework (Gorod, Sauser <i>et al.</i> , 2008)	152
Figure 6:	SoS Characteristics Contrast	160
Figure 7:	Relationship between Dynamic and Static Doctrines of Auto Battle Manage- ment Aids	163

Appendix G

Figure 1:	SoS Social Function Mechanism	173
Figure 2:	Influence of SoS Characteristics in Social Function Mechanism	173
Figure 3:	System State Transition Concept	177
Figure 4:	SoS Characteristics Ideal Criterion AHP Structure	177
Figure 5:	ABMA Pseudo Simulated Preferences	183
Figure 6:	SoS ABMA MCDA Function	185
Figure 7:	Battle Group Simulation Results Summary	186

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

There is notably a growing interest in System of Systems (SoS) concepts and strategies. The performance optimization among groups of heterogeneous systems to realize a common goal has become the focus of various application areas including military, security, aerospace, and disaster management. There is particular interest in achieving synergy between these independent systems to enable the desired overall system performance. In the literature, researchers have begun to address the issue of coordination and interoperability in a SoS pointing to the emergence of the concept of system of systems engineering (SoSE). SoSE presents new challenges that are related to, but distinct from, systems engineering (SE) challenges. By understanding these differences, appropriate methods, tools, and standards, a SoSE approach may be crafted in an intelligent manner to architect and control seemingly amorphous systems.

1.1 Introduction and Overview

The engineering and control of emergent capabilities of large complex systems comprised of numerous seemingly unplanned contributing systems has been an unattainable goal of technologists and social infrastructure planners. Similarly described as an “invisible hand” in the published work of the Scottish philosopher Adam Smith in Book IV of the “Wealth of Nations” whereby economic processes, acting as individual agents to maximize their own well being, affect other processes without due intent (Smith, 1776). The invisible hand metaphor is intended to explain that actions have unintended consequences, are not controlled by a central command authority, and have an observable and patterned effect on the process and systems. The cooperative systems’ architecture, design, and control are characterized by a set of interconnected systems with a common

goal. The real-time cooperative control is not well understood let alone intentionally designed (Cloutier, DiMario, & Polzer, 2009; Tien, 2009). To possess the methodology to direct and control similar examples such as the U.S. health care system, world political systems, the effects of an economic recession, and a global shipping system is a study of complex systems.

Many complex systems are a SoS that comprise numerous constituent interdependent systems and have been described as an integration of complex metasystems — defined as a group of systems that have an interrelationship (Keating *et al.*, 2003). This system description supposes that the systems are autonomous and heterogeneous forming partnerships whereby their interoperability relationship produces capabilities or unintended consequences because of emergent behavior. The emergent behavior does not originate from any single individual constituent system nor deduced by properties of the collective constituent systems. The interoperability relationships of the constituent systems create new behaviors of the holistic system.

General Systems Theory (GST) introduces the holistic concept of systems as a science of wholeness whereby there are general systems laws, which apply to any system of a certain type independent of its properties, classified as summative and constitutive. The summative system owes its capabilities to the summation of the characteristics and sub capabilities of its elements. The properties of the elements are universally the same in all environments and have no relationships. The constitutive system has capabilities that are greater than the summation of its elements because the effects are dependent upon the context of their properties and their relationships (Bertalanffy, 1969). Kenneth Boulding a general systems theorist, described this concept as a SoS which may perform the function of a *gestalt*, which is a pattern so unified as a whole that its properties cannot be derived from its parts (Boulding, 1956).

This thesis discusses a constitutive SoS framework in regard to new behaviors that emerge as a result of a mechanism of collaboration that is architected to affect a holistic capability. The management and design of SoS architectures are of great interest as individual systems become ever more interoperable with other systems (U.S. Department of Defense, 2008). The ability to design and control a SoS architecture to elicit capabilities not germane to any one individual system becomes paramount (DiMario, Cloutier, & Verma, 2008). SoS architecture management and development of such structures, as well as the discipline of SoS, is of great interest with many avenues to explore as well as its foundational engineering science discussed further in Appendix C (DeLaurentis *et al.*, 2007).

1.2 Problem Statement and Research Hypothesis

A description of an approach of a mechanism framework whereby the paradox of autonomous and yet cooperative systems may be architected to elicit SoS capabilities is lacking. A methodology and framework to architect systems that may influence other systems in collaboration is absent in the systems literature as well as literature in support of systems that naturally interoperate but were not presciently designed to do so. The research hypothesis is a system of systems (an SoS), as distinct from a system of parts, is a system comprised of pre-existing autonomous systems that choose to belong to the dynamically forming SoS, and interoperate together in spite of their evident diversity, is a result of changes in the autonomous systems' environment or their own utility resulting in capabilities of the SoS not presciently designed.

1.3 Research Objectives

The research objectives are to describe the influence of SoS characteristics that demarcate a class of systems defined as constituent — design-time SoS, and run-time SoS. This includes a description of how constituent systems may cooperate through the characteristic of belonging creating value of the SoS as a constitutive mechanism. This is done via design rules or a social function that balances the SoS characteristics of autonomy and belonging. SoS run-time and design-time are uniquely assembled by interoperability at various levels and define system's belonging.

1.4 Uniqueness of this Research

This research addresses the autonomy of systems, managed independently, to make independent choices of collaboration. However, the SoS cannot exist physically if not for constituent systems agreeing to be “integrated” and having a sense of belonging. For an SoS, the hypothesis of this thesis is a mechanism that allows systems to be integrated at a holistic level that are either designed, referred to as design-time, or occur naturally via self-organization and referred to as run-time. Examples are:

- Al-Qaeda: Run-time SoS;
- Health care: Run-time SoS;
- USN Battle Group: Design-time and run-time SoS;
- National Transportation: Run-time SoS;

- Coast Guard Deepwater Program: Design-time SoS at end of the program or T_0 ; Expected run-time at later epochs or T_1 .

The constitutive mechanism defines the levels of belonging as a design for influence approach defines the design rules or rules naturally evolve as an “invisible hand” or amorphous via self-organization.

1.5 Dissertation Organization and Structure

This chapter provides an introduction and context for this research. Chapter two highlights the relevant literature of SoS and an esemplastic, a union of ideas giving way to new concepts, approach to the problems presented. Chapter three discusses the research approach. Chapter four discusses the results of the research and findings. Chapter five discusses the validation of the research as a case study approach of low-constraint methods and the case study data. Chapter six highlights the research conclusions and next logical research steps. The remainder of the dissertation consists of appendices of published or to be published papers, additional research supporting material, and dissertation references.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH BOUNDARY

There is sparse literature concerning the formation of a SoS. The systems engineering discipline of SoS is in its formative phase (Gorod, Sauser, & Boardman, 2008). The approach in the literature review and in this research is an esemplastic approach that includes systems thinking, systems engineering concepts, social networks, mechanisms of economics, and decision theory:

- Systems Thinking — provide a foundation for SoS as it has provided the same for systems engineering (Arquilla & Ronfeldt, 2001; Bertalanffy, 1969; Boardman & Sauser, 2008; Boulding, 1956; Checkland, 1993, 2000; Holland, 1998; Herbert A. Simon, 1962);
- SoS — the literature is rich in SoS definitions, perspectives, abstractions, and general notions of what a SoS is or is not. Other than definitions, the literature is largely void concerning SoSE, SoS management, developing an SoS, or the understanding of naturally occurring (i.e. non-developed or unplanned) SoS structures. The uniform agreement in the literature is that a SoS is comprised of cooperative constituent systems (Alberts, Garstka, & Stein, 2000; Boardman, 1995; Krygiel, 1999; Maier, 1996; Morganwalp, 2002; Sage & Cuppan, 2001);
- Systems Cooperation — the literature does not address how constituent systems interoperate but assumes interoperation is by typical approaches of preplanned syntactic connectivity. This assumption accounts for man-made systems, but does not account for naturally occurring SoS that have evolved over long periods of time such as the National Transportation System, U.S. health care, and the Al-Qaeda terrorist organization. Systems cooperation may illicit itself in any manner by which systems may interoperate via direct communication through communication protocols or indirectly through forms of stigmergy. The reason why systems cooperate, especially in real-time is largely absent in the SoS