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Overview

- Model of Parallel Acquisition of Targets
  - Kill Rate Consequences
    - Taylor’s New General Methodology for Lanchester Attrition-Rate Coefficients
    - Analytical Expression for Kill Rate
      - Higher Kill Rate Than for Serial Acquisition
- Insights into Network-Centric Warfare
Effects of Parallel Acquisition

- More Efficient Target Acquisition
- Force Multiplier
  - Inflict More Casualties on Enemy
  - Sustain Fewer Casualties
- Example
  - X Force Can Effect Change from Serial to Parallel Acquisition of Targets
Basic Lanchester-Type Paradigm

\[ \frac{dx}{dt} = -a \ y \quad \text{with } x(0) = x_0 \]

\[ \frac{dy}{dt} = -b \ x \quad \text{with } y(0) = y_0 \]

Simplified Representation
Lanchester Attrition-Rate Coefficients

- $a$ and $b$ are Called **Lanchester Attrition-Rate Coefficients**

- $a = \text{Rate at Which an Individual Y Firer Kills X Targets (Single-Weapon-System-Type Kill Rate); Kill Rate of Single Typical Firer}$
Conceptual Combat Model

- Lanchester-Type Force-on-Force Attrition Model
  - Kill-Rate Model
    - Single Typical Firer
    - Set of Enemy Targets
    - LOS Process
  - Acquisition Capabilities
  - LOS Parameters

- Expected Course of Combat
- Aggregated-Force Model
  - Lanchester Attrition-Rate Coefficient
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Kill-Rate Model

- Considers Single Typical Firer against *Passive Target*
  - No Consideration of Duel

- Does Not Consider Effect on Target by Any Other Firer
  - Can Develop Correction Factor to Account for Such Effects
New General Methodology for Lanchester Attrition-Rate Coefficients

- Recently Developed by Taylor
- Greatly Expands Modeling Capabilities
  - Great Detail in Target-Engagement Cycle
    - Special Treatment of First Round(s)
    - Actual Distributions for Event (e.g. Interfiring) Times
  - Battle Damage Assessment
  - Command & Control at Platform Level
  - Insights into Network-Centric Warfare
Conditions Considered

- Heterogeneous-Target Environment
- Stochastic Line of Sight (LOS)
- Target-Acquisition Times Independent (But Otherwise Arbitrary)
- Interfiring Times Independent (But Otherwise Arbitrary)
New Methodology

Kill Rate Computed as Ratio of

- Expected Number of Kills in Target-Engagement Cycle to
- Expected Duration of Target-Engagement Cycle

\[
a_{ij} = \frac{\overline{n}_{kX_iY_j}^{\text{cycle}}}{\overline{t}_{\text{cycle}Y_j}}
\]
Can Now Model

- **In Tank Warfare**
  - First Round Chambered
  - Tank Commander Acquires Targets While Gunner Engages
  - Automatic Loader (in Russian Tanks)

- **Information Aspects**
  - Battle Damage Assessment
  - Time to Assess
  - False Targets
Conditions in Specific Cases

- Heterogeneous-Target Environment
- Stochastic Line of Sight (LOS)
- Target-Acquisition Times Exponential (and Independent)
- Interfiring Times Exponential (and Independent)

Can Be Extended to Log Normal/Erlang Times
Key Question

- Can New Targets Be Acquired While an Acquired Target Is Being Engaged?
- Simplest Model Considers Two Cases
  - No New Target Can Be Acquired
    - Serial Acquisition
  - New Target Can Be Acquired (At Same Rate)
    - Parallel Acquisition
Target-Engagement Cycle
(Parallel Acquisition of Targets)
Some Computations

- Y Always Uses Serial Acquisition
- X Can Change from Serial Acquisition of Enemy Targets to Parallel Acquisition

 Computations Done for These Two Cases

✓ Serial Acquisition by X
✓ Parallel Acquisition by X
Both Sides Serial
(Force-Level Decays)

(Rates in hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single-Target</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition Rate</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Kill Rate</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability LOS</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Losing LOS</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intermittent LOS
Combat Model
(Only X Force Uses Parallel Acquisition)

\[ \frac{dx}{dt} = - \frac{P_{K(LOS)_{XY}} y}{P_{LOS} \lambda_{XY} x + b + \mu} \]

\[ \frac{dy}{dt} = - \frac{P_{K(LOS)_{YX}} x}{P_{LOS} \lambda_{YX} y + b + \mu} \]

Intermittent LOS
Target Availability

- **Typical X Firer Keeps on Continuously Acquiring Targets from Beginning of Battle**
- **Target Availability Given by** (Assuming Steady State for LOS Process and No Targets Initially Acquired)

\[
B_{tg} = P_{LOS} \left( \frac{\lambda_{YX}}{\lambda_{YX} + \mu} \right) \left( 1 - e^{-b_{YX} + \mu t} \right)
\]

*Intermittent LOS*
Effects of Changing from Serial to Parallel Acquisition

Intermittent LOS
Benefits to X

- Inflicts 62% More Attrition
- Suffers 19% Less Attrition
- Turns Defeat into Victory
Final Comments

- Significant Benefits from Parallel Acquisition Demonstrated for Combat at Platform Level
- Ideas Can Be Adapted to Modeling Network-Centric Warfare
- Such Analytical Models Very Convenient for Showing Benefits from Network-Centric Warfare