Cursor On Target

Dr. Christopher Niessen The MITRE Corporation





hard to be accurate and timely.

Complexity of Standards Hampers Improvement

5 JVMF (non-compatible) versions & growing



Never Fully Built & Subsets Are Different!

MITRE

A Way Out – Loose Couplers Focus on Intersection not Union



Look at What's Used, not Spec'd -TADIL-J Message Usage





Why Is This "Common Format" Different?

Makes extensive use of information encapsulation and XML for simple, extensible, hierarchical, machine-readable schemas



Top level schema contains very little, but offers a lot:

- <what> { observation | capability | tasking | reservation }
- <where> actually a "volume" of space
- <when> actually an "interval" of time
- <details> embeds the next level of detail

Example: UAV Domain



Summary-CoT Approach:

Doesn't Try to Do Everything—Just the most important

- Minimum set of key information common to all systems (What, Where, When and explicit quality)
- Provide "hooks" for arbitrary extension
- Use Simple Standard (XML)—Backward compatible
 - Adaptable by nearly all systems with only modest efforts (from \$2 processors to \$200,000 terminals)
- Network-centric—Cost and Value Scalability
 - Cost grows as N users, not N squared
 - Value grows as N squared, not N
 - Entirely open (no licensing fees, no "secrets")
- Readily Reconfigurable—Approach handles unforeseen needs
 - Using publish and subscribe, new 'finders', 'deciders', 'shooters', and mission threads can be created rapidly without large-scale coordination
- Gaining wide spread acceptance and usage
 - 90+ US DoD from proof of concept prototype to fielded systems of record using CoT

One Approach: Numerous Complex Translators



This is a long-term interoperability and maintenance nightmare...

(E.g., When MIL-STD-6016C comes out, how many systems must change?)

(E.g., How many systems implement "the full" standard?)

(E.g., How do you "synchronize" rollout of standards versions?)

(E.g., Will I need to carry another radio to talk to a new link?)

MITRE

Key Observation: Most Tactical Data Needs are Very Similar

- Similar exchange of time-sensitive position info is crucial for
 - Blue-force tracking
 - Spot reports
 - Air space deconfliction
 - Unattended sensor monitoring
 - Sensor queuing
 - Real-time targeting
 - Materiel management



- Network power increases rapidly with the number of users
 - Want all users to have potential access
- Create a common neutral XML format (Cursor on Target) for just the key items that participants translate to for extensible machine-to-machine meta-data tagging (scales as N vs N²)

But What's the XML *Really* Look Like?

The key information (What, Where, When) is contained in the root schema, "dumb" apps need nothing more.

Additional "details" are added (and removed) as needed by individual producer/consumer *communities*

```
<?xml version='1.0' standalone='yes'?>
  <event version='2.0' uid='H#File12#16' time='2003-08-04T18:41:09.00Z' start='2003-08-04T18:41:09.00Z'
stale='2003-08-05T18:41:09.00Z' type='a-h-G-E-W-A-L' how='m-i' >
  <point lat='30.632015000' lon='-86.736893333' le='3.300000' hae='11.439421' ce='3.000000' />
  <detail>
      <_flow-tags_ debug="2005-10-12T11:28:04.00Z" />
      <track course="120.1" speed="23.9"/>
      <mensuration . . . />
</detail>
</
```



Deployed UAVs Using Cursor on Target for SA



UAV SA JFCOM Cmdr. James M. Joyner, called the cursor-on-target scheme "a de facto standard for tactical system integration." (1/06/05)

Scan Eagle

"we are using the C2PC COT adapter for our Scan Eagle UAV's. ..working extremely well...we want more!" S/F, Maj Rob Buzby IMEF Info Management Officer Camp Fallujah Iraq (11/12/04)

Pioneer

DEPSECDEF initiative recommending CoT for sharing UAV SA