STANDARDS & PROFILES
FOR COALITION
INTEROPERABILITY

El Wells
Chairman NOSWG
wellsex@state.gov
15OCT08

Outline

• Information Exchange Gateways (IEGs)
• NATO Interoperability Standards & Profiles (NISP)
• NRF Profiles
• Architectures & NISP
• Summary
“Effective NATO operations require the exchange of a wide variety of data within and between NATO and National Consultation, Command and Control (C3) systems. This information exchange shall be achieved via the establishment of specified gateways in NATO and National systems, the boundary conditions of which shall be defined by NATO Interface Profiles identifying the common data exchange protocols and standards which shall be used.”
IEG Scenarios

Principal architecture for interconnection of IEGs and RIEGs
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Purpose of NISP

• Serve as the principal source of technical guidance for management of NATO CIS project implementations and transition to NNEC
• Track technology developments in order to optimise application development
• Compile all applicable CIS standards as baseline for optimising programmes and project selection and adherence
• Support architecture-based CIS programme development and evolution
• Provision of technical reference and rationale to promote and optimise NATO CIS systems interoperability
• Promote NATO internal, Nation to NATO and Nation to Nation interoperability
• Provide guidance on transformation to NNEC
  – Near term platform centric
  – Mid term Service centric
NISP V2 Structure

- 4 Volumes
  - Volume 1
    - Overview of re-structured NC3TA
    - Rational for new structure
    - Description of new structure
    - Request For Change Proposals
  - Volumes 2 through 4
    - Time dependent
    - Similar structures

- Supporting Rationale Document
- Supporting Annex
  - Service & Interoperability Points
  - NATO, National & Industry NNEC Approaches
  - Reference Models

NISP V2 Structure (Con’t)

- Contents of Volumes 2, 3, 4
  - Similar structure
    - Introduction, Technology, Standards, Profiles, Transition, References
  - Different timeframes
    - Volume 2
      - Near term (legacy systems)
      - 0 to 2 years
    - Volume 3
      - Mid term
      - 2 to 6 years
    - Volume 4
      - Long term
      - 6 + years
Categories of Standards

- **Emerging long term** - A standard is considered emerging long term if it deals with technology that is expected to be useful in the long term to NATO.
- **Emerging mid term** - A standard is considered Emerging mid term if it is sufficiently mature to be used within the current or next planned systems.
- **Emerging near term** – A standard is considered Emerging near term if it is mature enough to be used within 0-2 years.
- **Mandatory** - A standard is considered mandatory if it is mature to be used immediately. This means that it may both be applied within existing systems and in within future mid term planned systems.
- **Fading** - A standard is considered fading if the standard is still applicable for existing systems. The standard however is becoming obsolete or will be replaced by a newer version or another standard. Except for legacy systems or interoperability with legacy systems, the standard may not be used any more.
- **Retired** - A standard is considered retired if the standard, that has been used in the past, but is not applicable any more for existing systems.
- **Rejected** - A standard is considered rejected if, while it was still emerging, it is considered unsuitable for use within NATO.

Use Of NISP

- On 2 May 2008 the NC3B approved the mandatory standards & profiles in NISP Version 2, Volum2 for NCFS
- Nations indicate use of mandatory standards & profiles by ratifying STANAG 5524 (AdatP 34)
- CCEB Nations commitment to mandatory standards & profiles
NISP Updates

Request For Change Proposal (RFCP)

- Subject Matter Experts submit RFCP to NOSWG
  - Standard, Profile, Technology
  - Near, mid or far term
  - Category (e.g. mandated)
  - Rational for category
- NOSWG Handling of RFCP
  - Normal: Scheduled NOSWG meeting
  - Urgent: Collaboration tool, within 2 weeks
- Example RFCPs
  - The Netherlands for NRF 10 LCC (4 RFCPs)
  - ACT for NFFI
  - ISSC for STANAG 4406 Ed2
- NISP update
  - Database immediately after RFCP approval
  - Paper & electronic version annually

NISP Structure

http://nhqc3s.nato.int/c3ccsc-noswg
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NRF Profile Guidance

NRF Generic Interface Profile Guidance Document

• AC/322(SC/1)N(2008)0008, 12 June 08
• Linked to NISP
  – Use of profiles & standards
  – Submittal of RFCPs
• Contains Interface Profile Template
• Used to develop profiles for the following:
  – LCC 11 (Netherlands)
  – LCC 11 (France)
  – LCC 12 (Spain)
  – LCC 13 (UK)
• Being updated to be broader than NRF
NISP has been developed to support coalition interoperability today and for NNEC

- Standards and Profiles in NISP
  - Used by Netherlands (NRF 10) & France (NRF 11)
  - Planed to be used by Spain (NRF 12) & UK (NRF 13)
- Reference Models, Technologies and Guidance support transition to NNEC
- Requires RFCPS from SMEs
- Future online registry will provide access to standards and profiles
NOSWG
Enabling NNEC by NISP
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