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An advanced technology research and development firm, specializing in Information, Computer, & Physical Sciences

Known for technical excellence and challenging conventions to provide new and fundamentally better solutions to complex technical problems

Providing effective, real-world solutions and satisfying our customers and have been key to our success for over 50 years

Our staff consists of ~ 700 professionals
  • 2/3 with advanced degrees and security clearances

We maintain principal offices in Cambridge, MA and the Washington, DC area

All of our offices can support classified work
History of Innovation

1950s
- Acoustic Design for UN General Assembly Hall
- AI Program for Pattern Recognition

1960s
- Demonstration of Time Sharing
- LOGO Programming Language
- ARPANET-First Multi-node Packet Switched Network

1970s
- 1st Person-to-Person Network Email
- @ Sign for Email Addresses
- Acoustic analysis of JFK Assassination Tapes
- Analysis of Nixon Watergate Tapes
- First ARPANET Distributed Operating System
- First Symmetric Multi-processor
- First TCP for UNIX

1980s
- First Electronic Mail
- Defense Data Network
- National Science Foundation Network (NSFNET)
- Natural Language Computer Interface
- CRONUS Distributed Object Computing Environment
- Distributed Interactive Simulation (SimNet)
- Collaboration Planning Technology

1990s
- Secure email for DoD Multi-Gigabit Router
- Information Assurance
- Broadband Wireless Technology
- Genetic Algorithm Scheduling Tools
- Collaborative Planning for Desert Storm
- ATM Switch
- 40K Word Speech Recognition System
- Quality of Service for Objects Middleware
- Safekeyper Certificate Management

2000s
- Call Director
- Natural Language Routing
- DARPA Agent Markup Language
- Microthunder Urban Environment Surveillance System
- Quantum Cryptographic Network
- Quantum Cryptographic Network
...
http://www2.computer.org/portal/web/csdI/doi/10.1109/MAHC.2005.23

http://www2.computer.org/portal/web/csdI/doi/10.1109/MAHC.2006.6
Historical Context: Software Infrastructure Enables Application Capabilities

1950s 1960s 1970s 1980s 1990s 2000s

- Application
- Operating System
- Middleware
- Database Systems
- System Development Environments
- Information Management Systems

1950s 2008+ Fifty Years of Distributed Systems Software Architecture Evolution
Distributed Real-time Embedded (DRE) Systems Context

- Applications are distributed and network centric
- Stringent QoS requirements, including predictable and efficient data transfer and control
- Resources are constrained and shared
- Operate in dynamic environments

Applications:
- Avionics Mission Planning
- Industrial Production
- Military Systems of Systems
- Signal Analysis And Geolocation
- Shipboard Systems
- Disaster Response Systems
- FEMA
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Background: Underlying Forces at Work

- Everything is a computer
- Everything is a networked computer
- Everything is potentially interdependent
- Things connect to the real physical world
- Increasing heterogeneity, distance and mobility

Leading to Current Trends and Directions

- Need for Integrated/Managed End-to-End Behavior
  - Multi-dimensional QoS
- Multi-Layered Architectures, Network-centric Services Oriented & Systems of Systems
  - Coordinated and provided thru advanced Middleware solutions
- Evolutionary Designs Over Varying and Changing Configurations
  - Static $\rightarrow$ Dynamic; Adaptive
- (More) Advanced Software Engineering and Open Standards
  - (trying to keep pace)
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Need for QoS Adaptive Systems, Applications, Middleware & Networks

Static QoS provisioning is the rule in embedded systems, but dynamic QoS is the need.

Real End-to-end QoS is important

- QoS provisioning at a location/component (e.g., node, network) is necessary, but not sufficient.
- Ultimate consumer of information determines the QoS requirements, even if source is remote.
- End-to-end QoS is only as good as what can be provided thru each bottleneck at every particular point in time (over-provisioning often wears out with time).

Necessary to specify, measure, control, adapt & mediate QoS (at design time, (re)configuration time, & run time)

- The QoS desires of multiple applications might not be able to be satisfied with available resources.
- QoS policies will often conflict, e.g., security and real-time performance.
- Conditions, mission modes, and objectives will change.

Need an adaptive middleware framework at the seams you can grow with to support QoS enabled solutions for DRE systems

- Separate QoS concerns from functional concerns.
- Avoid the programming of point solutions and further entangled applications.
- Avoid premature tradeoff binding, promoting change and assembly.
- Anticipate evolution and more expansive integration and change.
- Scalability anticipating success.
Example DRE Application 1
Avionics Dynamic Mission Planning

A Net-meeting like mission replanning collaboration between C2 and fighter aircraft

QoS Techniques
- Tiling
- Compression
- Processor Resource Management
- Network Resource Management

Collaboration Task

Delegate

Expected Progress

Collaboration Client

get_image()

get_tile(n, q)

adjust_rates()

Soft Real-Time Tasks

Hard Real-Time Tasks

RMS or MUF scheduling of tasks

Processor Resource Manager

RT Scheduler

RT Event Channel

Network Monitor

TAO ORB

QuO Components

RT-ARM components

TAO components

Early
- Request higher Q level on next tile
- Finish early

On Time

Late
- Request more bandwidth on next tile
- Request higher priority
- Request lower Q level on next tile
- Notify application

% Image Processed

Time

Start
Deadline
Example DRE Application 2
Multi-UAV Surveillance and Target Tracking Requires Dynamic End-to-End QoS Management

Images from surveillance UAVs provide indications of a fleeting target
Imagery from the target area enables a commander to assign a weapon
A HIMARS missile is launched against the target
Before impact, terrorist leaders flee the target area
A weaponized UAV is dispatched to track and engage the fleeing targets

End-to-End Mission-Driven QoS Management

Surveillance
- Maximize surveillance area
- Sufficient resolution in delivered imagery to determine items of interest

Target Acquisition and Engagement
- UAV observing target provides high resolution imagery so that target or threat identification is possible

Battle Damage Assessment
- UCAV must provide high resolution imagery until a human operator has determined that it is sufficient
- UAV over target area must continue to provide target acquisition and engagement mission

The challenge is to program the dynamic control and adaptation to manage and enforce end-to-end QoS

Heterogeneous, shared, and constrained resources
Multi-layer points of view: System-view, mission-view, application-string view, local resource view
Mission-defined requirements and tradeoffs (e.g., rate, image size, fidelity)
Changing modes, participants, and environmental conditions
Demonstration Imagery Displays (C2 Receivers)

Name, role and COI of the asset

Color of the border reflects the role of the SimUAV

Image size and rate are a result of QoS information management
# QoS Policies

## Mission Relative Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relative Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISR_COI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TST_COI</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Qos Constraints and Tradeoffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Relative Priority</th>
<th>BW Needed (kbps) (Min-Max)</th>
<th>DiffServ Codepoint</th>
<th>CPU (Receiver) (%)</th>
<th>Rate (Timeliness) IO/Frame Rate</th>
<th>Scaling (Size)</th>
<th>Compression (Accuracy)</th>
<th>Cropping (Precision)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SURVEILLANCE (ISR)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50-200</td>
<td>Best Effort</td>
<td>0.1-2.0</td>
<td>0.1 – 0.4</td>
<td>Qtr-Qtr</td>
<td>JPG-JPG</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARGET TRACKING (TT)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>150-600</td>
<td>Expedited Forwarding</td>
<td>1.5-5.5</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td>Half-Half</td>
<td>None - JPG</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATTLE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT (BDA)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>300-400</td>
<td>Assured Forwarding</td>
<td>1.5-3.0</td>
<td>0.25-0.5</td>
<td>Full-Full</td>
<td>None-JPG</td>
<td>None-30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QoS Instrumentation: Policies and Sensors

Asset Identification Information

Resource Information: Allocation vs Usage

QoS Policy Information

Latencies in the IMS

Got Adaptation Event for: UAV_SENSOR_0
Multi-Layer QoS Management Architecture

- **System Resource Manager (SRM) near C2 node**
  - Knows mission goals and tradeoffs
  - Knows number and types of participants, roles and relative importance, and available shared resources
  - Produces policy defined for each participant

- **Local Resource Manager (LRM)**
  - Determines how to utilize allocated resources to meet mission goals
  - Configures and monitors QoS behaviors

- **QoS behaviors**
  - Control and monitor individual resources or mechanisms, or adapt application behavior

Mission goals, requirements, trade-offs
Model of Shared System Resources, Participants

System Resource Manager

System Participant

Local Resource Manager

Controller

QoS behavior

QoS mechanism/manager

Application component

Resource

QoS levels

Constraints

Feedback

Configure

Status

Control

Adapt

System Participant

Policy

Status

Policy

Status

Policy

Status
Robust, High speed and High bandwidth Networks

Changing Building Blocks: An Example

In the PHAROS project we are developing the global backbone network of the future

- Optical—guaranteed IP services with high data rate (up to 10Gb/s), low latency (125ms global one way), low jitter (25ms global one way)
  -- even more aggressive for non-IP (i.e., wavelength services)
- Agile—fast service set up: sub-second provisioning and re-provisioning (post-failure) instead of truck-roll
- Dependable—guaranteed bandwidth services are protected against up to 3 network failures
- Efficient—Resources allocated for protected paths are globally optimized

Robust and resilient against partitioning, DoS and other network attacks

- Separation of data and control plane, differentiated control channels, no interpretation of data, authentication of service requests, strict ingress monitoring
- Dynamic redundancy and cross-checking in control and management protocols
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Generations of Security Research

No system is perfectly secure—only adequately secured with respect to the perceived threat.

1st Generation: Protection
- Trusted Computing Base
- Cryptography
- Access Control & Physical Security

2nd Generation: Detection
- Firewalls
- Boundary Controllers
- Intrusion Detection Systems
- VPNs
- PKI

3rd Generation: Survivability/Tolerance
- Big Board View of Attacks
- Real-Time Situation Awareness & Response
- Graceful Degradation
- Hardened Operating System

Prevent Intrusions
(Access Controls, Cryptography, Trusted Computing Base)

Detect Intrusions, Limit Damage
(Firewalls, Intrusion Detection Systems, Virtual Private Networks, PKI)

Tolerate Attacks
(Redundancy, Diversity, Deception, Wrappers, Proof-Carrying Code, Proactive Secret Sharing)
Premise
• The number & sophistication of cyber attacks is increasing – some of these attacks will succeed

Philosophy
• Operate through attacks by using a layered defense-in-depth concept
  • Accept some degradation
  • Protect most valuable assets
  • Move faster than the intruder

Approach
• “Defense Enabling” Distributed Applications
• Based on Adaptive Middleware Technology
Architecting Survivability into Large Systems With Realtime Response

Detection and correlation
Mix of IDS and Policy violation
Advanced, distributed correlation

Layers of protection
Both HW and SW
Design Principles, Architectural constrains

High barrier to intrusion

Embedded sensors

Adaptive middleware
Rapid and coordinated response
Isolation, recovery, Graceful degradation

Adaptive response

Reliability requires architecting in multiple dimensions
Even more so, when the goal is to be resilient not only against errors, but also against attacks....

General principles for survivability
• Protect as best as possible
• Improve chances of detection
• Adapt to manage gaps

Redundancy:
No single point of failure in critical functionality

Weak assumptions

Less susceptible to attacker’s manipulation of environment

Diversity: Avoid common mode vulnerabilities
Tolerance and Survivability:

- Assumes that attacks/bad things cannot be totally prevented—some attacks will even succeed, and may not even be detected on time.

- Focuses on desired qualities or attributes that need to be preserved and continued even if in a degraded manner—
  - availability: (of information and service)
  - integrity: (of information and service)
  - confidentiality: (of information)

- Exploring beyond degradation—regain, recoup, regroup and even improve

- Semi-automated: Survivability architecture captures a lot of low level (and sometimes uncertain and incomplete) information – utilizes advanced reasoning and machine learning
Applications that Participate in their Own Defense (A POD)

Circa: 1999
Observations:
• Distributed applications need distributed resources
• There are enablers (middleware, OS, Networks,) as well as defense mechanisms
• But not much coordination between applications and defenses
  • Challenge: develop technology to defense-enable applications

Lessons Learned:
• Application’s involvement in defense is an important attribute
• Possible to build more survivable application from less secure components running in a less secure environment
• Distributed middleware can be used to coordinate defenses from application’s point of view as long as corrupt application cannot control the defenses (self protection, sophisticated attacks, …)
DPASA

Circa: 2003-2005
Observations:
• Lots of point solutions (firewalls, access controls, IDSs, replication..), need an architecture to organize
• Time to loss of service under attack is in minutes for state of the art defended systems
• Challenge: Defense enable a military information system that can survive sophisticated attackers for 12 hrs

Lessons Learned:
• Survived 75% of attacks, even when the attacker was given insider access and privilege (red team would actually start the system, after placing attack code)
• A number survivability design principles that goes beyond “defense in depth”
  • SPOF elimination, redundancy and diversity, containment, hardware or cryptographic root of trust, Crumple zones (many of these show up in recently published SANS/MITRE/NSA Common Weakness Enumeration (CWE))
• Availability was the only attribute that was successfully compromised
• Flaws in COTS components still a/the major risk (and a fact of life)
• Limiting attacker probing and adding uncertainty helped enormously
• Information reported by defended system can cause information overload– needed experts to interpret
• What will happen if information system spans multiple domains?– need to explore cross domain issues

DPASA Approach: combine elements of protection, detection and adaptive reaction in the survivability architecture
Circa: 2006-2008
Observations:
- Possible to architect a highly survivable system, but the system provides a heavy stream of signals that only experts can interpret
- Involvement of human experts at this level is costly and often impractical
- **Challenge**: Develop automated mechanisms that would interpret the reports and help decide effective course of action

Lessons Learned:
- Possible to minimize on-line involvement of human experts if appropriate knowledge about the system, its defenses, attacker objectives etc are encoded into the reasoning mechanism
- Event interpretation by reasoning about the evidentiary and accusatory information using theorem proving and coherence search is viable, but compute intensive— in red team experiments CSISM were able to decide correctly in 75% cases
- Integrating learned responses on line needs additional research, but off line use of machine learning was useful if good training data is available
Robust, High speed and High bandwidth Networks

Changing Building Blocks: An Example

In the PHAROS project we are developing the global backbone network of the future

- Optical—guaranteed IP services with high data rate (up to 10Gb/s), low latency (125ms global one way), low jitter (25ms global one way)
  -- even more aggressive for non-IP (i.e., wavelength services)
- Agile—fast service set up: sub-second provisioning and re-provisioning (post-failure) instead of truck-roll
- Dependable—guaranteed bandwidth services are protected against up to 3 network failures
- Efficient—Resources allocated for protected paths are globally optimized

Robust and resilient against partitioning, DoS and other network attacks

- Separation of data and control plane, differentiated control channels, no interpretation of data, authentication of service requests, strict ingress monitoring
- Dynamic redundancy and cross-checking in control and management protocols
Applying Middleware Concepts to the Total Ship Computing Environment

- Total ship computing concept
- Redundant distributed computing bays
- Multiple QoS properties and requirements
- Layers of middleware for software infrastructure
- Multi-layered policy and control

- Redundant, Distributed TSCE Data Center
  - Minimal delay in Sensor Data Delivery
  - Relative importance and quality of sensor input

- Distributed resource management
  - Allocation/reservations, caching, scheduling, monitoring, & load balancing

- Coordinated use of shared resources

- Distributed security

- Distributed fault tolerance
Increased Naval Warfighting Power through Shipboard Resource Management

Problem:

Manage ship computing resources to maximize warfighting capabilities, in response to both changes in the tactical situation and damage.

Solution:

Dynamic resource management:
- Monitor health of system components
- Monitor performance thresholds end-to-end
- Maintain copies of component states
- Respond to actual and anticipated limit violations by re-assigning functional threads

A resource pool is a set of resources or resource pools. Every resource consumer is allocated down the hierarchy.
Need a distributed computing environment that can rapidly respond to changing operating conditions. High speed, decentralized, scalable **Computing** Node Failure Detection

We have a hierarchical failure detection architecture
Challenge: adjust dynamically to changing failure detection performance

4 Dimensions of Dynamic High-Assurance Behavior:
- Low False Positive Rate
- Fast Worst-Case Detection Time
- Low Overhead
- Scalability to thousands of nodes
1. Identify “Good” and “Bad” Behavior: Utility Metric

Important considerations when defining a utility metric for configurations:

1. System Safety: Does the system satisfy safety constraints?
2. Fault Tolerance: Is the system flexible for unforeseen eventualities?
3. Computability: Can the metric be computed in real-time?

2. Component Interaction Control

We can more uniformly and certifiably control the resources provided through these interfaces if we provision the resource management functionality as a common middleware infrastructure.

Important considerations include the provisioning of communication, computation resources to operate middleware, scalability.

3. Restrict Operation to Certifiable Configurations

Through the use of common middleware infrastructure and utility metric, we want to permit “certifiable” behavior to occur and prevent the system from entering into an “unacceptable” configurations.

Important considerations:

1. Difficult to predict the effects of control operations in real-time.
2. May need to maintain a list of “fail-safe” default configurations.
Looking Forward: Some Interim Conclusions

1. Heterogeneity/diversity is your friend, but is still costly
   - On the one hand we often preach it; but in practice we avoid it
   - Extensible, open standards is key to avoid (premature) lockdown

2. We routinely build predictively behaving systems, and we routinely build interoperable systems, but we do not (yet) routinely build predictable interoperable systems
   - Interoperability $\rightarrow$ sharing
   - Predictability $\rightarrow$ isolation and dedicated resources

3. Many of the distributed, realtime, embedded environments we engage (will) have certifiability requirements
   - Current approach is completely static and exhaustive testing
   - Interconnection drives dynamic behavior which breaks current approaches

4. We’re in the midst of a long march forward, and the “middle” is where a lot of the important new action lies
   - Adopting an evolvable, common interconnection substrate is key and raises all boats
   - Technology provides the means for blurring common boundaries; systems provide the means (and challenges!) for orchestrating more cohesive and enduring operation
Thanks for Listening!
Comments/Questions to Rick Schantz
schantz@bbn.com