



INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES

## **C2 Agility: Related Hypotheses and Experimental Findings**

David S. Alberts

May 2015

Approved for public release;  
distribution is unlimited.

IDA Document NS D-5520  
Log: H 15-000584

INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES  
4850 Mark Center Drive  
Alexandria, Virginia 22311-1882



*The Institute for Defense Analyses is a non-profit corporation that operates three federally funded research and development centers to provide objective analyses of national security issues, particularly those requiring scientific and technical expertise, and conduct related research on other national challenges.*

**About This Publication**

The views, opinions, and findings should not be construed as representing the official position of either the Department of Defense or the sponsoring organization.

**Copyright Notice**

© 2015 Institute for Defense Analyses  
4850 Mark Center Drive, Alexandria, Virginia 22311-1882 • (703) 845-2000

This material may be reproduced by or for the U.S. Government pursuant to the copyright license under the clause at DFARS 252.227-7013 (a)(16) [June 2013].

INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES

IDA Document NS D-5520

**C2 Agility: Related Hypotheses and Experimental Findings**

David S. Alberts



# **C2 Agility: Related Hypotheses and Experimental Findings**

a tutorial presented at  
**83<sup>rd</sup> Military Operations Research Society (MORS) Symposium**  
**June 2015**

**Dr. David S. Alberts**  
[dalberts@ida.org](mailto:dalberts@ida.org)

# Agenda

- C2 Agility
- Hypotheses
- Experiments and Results
- Next Steps



- C2 Approach Space

Understanding Command and Control (2006)



- C2 Maturity Levels

NATO NEC C2 Maturity Model (2010)

- Agile C2

The Agility Advantage (2011)



- C2 Agility Experimentation


NATO SAS-085 (2013)



# C2 Approach Space

- There are a great many possible approaches to accomplishing the functions that we associate with Command and Control.
- Developing the “option space” for Command and Control requires that major differences between possible approaches are identified.
  - Centralized v. Decentralized
  - Fixed Vertical Stovepipes v. Dynamic Task Organized
  - Limited information dissemination (need to know) v. broad dissemination (need to share)
- These difference are reflected in the dimensions of the C2 Approach Space (options available)
  - Allocation of Decision Rights (within an entity or to the collective)
  - Patterns of Interaction
  - Distribution of Information


# C2 Approach Space



# C2 Approach → NNEC Maturity

C2 Approaches

NNEC Capability Levels




# NATO NEC C2 Approaches


(context is a collection of civil-military entities)

C2 Approach	Allocation of Decision Rights to the Collective	Patterns of Interaction Among Participating Entities	Distribution of Information
<b>Edge C2</b>	Not Explicit, Self-Allocated (Emergent, Tailored, and Dynamic)	Unlimited As Required	All Available and Relevant Information Accessible
<b>Collaborative C2</b>  <b>Coordinated C2</b>  <b>De-Conflicted C2</b>	Collaborative Process and Shared Plan <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Coordination Process and Linked Plans <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Establish Constraints	Significant Broad <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Limited and Focused <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Very Limited Sharply Focused	Additional Information Across Collaborative Areas/Functions <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Additional Information About Coordinated Areas/Functions <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Additional Information About Constraints and Seams
<b>Conflicted C2</b>	None	None	Organic Information


Entity Cluster




Entity Cluster





Entity Cluster



Entity Cluster




Entity Cluster



Entity Cluster

Task Cluster

Entity Cluster



Entity Cluster


Entity Cluster

- individual
- interaction
- ..... cluster

Entity Cluster



# NATO NEC C2 Approaches



# What is Agility?

Agility is the capability  
to successfully effect, cope with and/or exploit  
changes in circumstances


# What is Agility?

Agility is the capability  
to successfully effect, cope with and/or exploit  
changes in circumstances

- the concept of Agility does not apply to a stable situation
- external changes (e.g. regime change, permissive to hostile)
- changes to self (e.g. a new coalition partner, loss of capability)

# What is Agility?

Agility is the capability to **successfully** effect, cope with and/or exploit changes in circumstances



within acceptable bounds of performance  
(e.g. effectiveness, efficiency, risk)

# What is Agility?

Agility is the capability to successfully effect, **cope** with and/or exploit changes in circumstances

respond to an event that would otherwise have adverse consequences


# What is Agility?

Agility is the capability to successfully effect, cope with and/or **exploit** changes in circumstances

take advantage of an opportunity to improve effectiveness and/or efficiency or reduce risk

# What is Agility?

take actions to effect change or to prevent changes that might otherwise occur



Agility is the capability to successfully **effect** cope with and/or exploit changes in circumstances

# Components of Agility

- Responsiveness
- Versatility
- Flexibility
- Resilience
- Adaptiveness
- Innovativeness

*The contributions of these components to agility are not additive*

- Responsiveness is an essential enabler of Active Agility.
- Responsiveness is a reflection of the timeliness of the intervention(s).
- The efficacy of the intervention is a function of all six of the enablers of agility.



# Versatility

- Versatility is the passive capability that enables an entity to maintain an acceptable level of performance without having to take action or change oneself.

Versatility of screws



Screw is able to successfully function under multiple circumstances (different screw drivers)

# Flexibility

- *Flexibility* is having more than one way to achieve a desired result.
- Having options becomes important if the preferred way cannot be exercised, does not work given the circumstances, or becomes prohibitively costly.
- In theory, the more options one has, the more likely it is that one will have a good option available whatever the circumstances.
- As the number of options in one's tool kit increases, the marginal contribution of each additional option gets smaller (the law of diminishing returns).



# Flexible Tool Kit




- *Resilience* pertains to changes in circumstances that limit, damage or degrade entity performance.
- Being resilient involves an ability to maintain performance within acceptable bounds despite suffering damage.
- Resilience can be either passive or active or both
  - Being resilient may require that some action being taken (e.g. bring some offline capability on-line) or it may require no action be taken (e.g. existing redundancies provide the protection needed).
  - For example, an appropriately designed network can still provide acceptable services in the event a number of links goes down.

- *Adaptability* refers to making changes to self
- In this case, it is not what one does (choose an alternative course of action) that needs to change, but what one is and how one operates.
- Thus, *adaptability* involves changes to organization, policies, and/or processes.

- *Innovativeness* involves creating something new
  - e.g. a new way of accomplishing something when current practice does not provide options with adequate performance.
- While *flexibility* refers to having more than one choice, innovativeness adds new ways and means to the toolkit.
- Hence, *Innovativeness* enhances *Flexibility*

# Interdependencies


Requisite Flexibility as a function of Resilience



## C2 Agility

- There are many ways to accomplish the functions associated with Command and Control
- No one approach to accomplishing the functions associated with command and control fits all missions or situations whether for a single entity or a collection of independent entities (a collective)
- The most appropriate approach will be a function of the endeavor and the prevailing circumstances
- Therefore, Entities (and Collectives) will need to be able to employ more than one approach
- C2 Agility is the ability to appropriately move around in the C2 Approach Space in response to changing missions and circumstances
- Agile C2 systems and processes are required for C2 Agility and to make specific approaches to C2 more agile


# C2 Agility



*This is a most appropriate C2 Approach for this particular set of circumstances*

# C2 Agility

When circumstances change, a different approach might be more appropriate




*C2 Agility involves recognizing the significant of a change in circumstances, understanding the most appropriate C2 Approach for the circumstance and being able to transition to this approach.*

## Measuring C2 Agility


- The degree of agility possessed by an entity is a function of its ability to successfully operate over an appropriate set of circumstances (Endeavor Space)
- A scalar measure of agility is defined as the area of the **region in the Endeavor Space where an entity can successfully operate**

$$\text{Agility} = \frac{\text{Area of } \bullet}{\text{Area of } \circ}$$



# C2 Agility

- C2 Agility =  $f$ (C2 Approach Agility, C2 Maneuver Agility)



# Agility of C2 Maturity Levels

C2 Maturity Levels	Contents of C2 Toolkit	C2 Approach Decision Requirement	Transition Requirements	Region of the Endeavor Space where a collective is successful
Level 5	Edge C2 Collaborative C2 Coordinated C2 De-Conflicted C2	Emergent		
Level 4	Collaborative C2 Coordinated C2 De-Conflicted C2	Recognize 3 situations and match to appropriate C2 approach		
Level 3	Coordinated C2 De-Conflicted C2	Recognize 2 situations and match to appropriate C2 approach		
Level 2	De-Conflicted C2	N/A	None	
Level 1	Conflicted C2	N/A	None	

Adapted from the Alberts, D. S. (2011). *Agility Advantage*, CCRP


Conflicted
  De-Conflicted
  Coordinated
  Collaborative
  Edge

# Agenda


- C2 Agility
- Hypotheses
- Experiments and Results
- Next Steps

## C2 Agility Hypotheses

H1: Each C2 Approach is located in a distinct region of the C2 Approach Space




H2: No one approach is always the most appropriate




## C2 Agility Hypotheses

H3: More network-enabled approaches are more appropriate for Complex Endeavors; while less network-enabled approaches are more appropriate for less complex missions/circumstances




# C2 Agility Hypotheses

H4: More network-enabled approaches are more agile (have greater C2 Approach Agility)




# C2 Agility Hypotheses

H5: The dimensions of the C2 approach Space are positively correlated with agility



**Agility**



**Distance from Origin**

## C2 Agility Hypotheses

H6: More network-enabled approaches are better able to maintain their intended positions in the C2 Approach Space

H7: On-diagonal (balanced) approaches are more agile

H8: Increasing C2 Maneuver Agility increases agility

H9: More mature C2 capability is more agile than the C2 Approach Agility of the most network-enabled approach available

H10: Self monitoring is required for C2 Maneuver Agility

H11: The six enablers of agility are collectively exhaustive and thus all instances of observed agility can be traced to one or more of these enablers

H12: Each of these enablers is positively correlated with agility

# Agenda


- C2 Agility
- Hypotheses
- Experiments and Results
- Next Steps

- DoD CCRP ELICIT
- SAS-085 Campaign of Experimentation (CAMPX)
- ARL Network Science Research Laboratory

Experimental Laboratory for the Investigation of **C**ollaboration **I**nformation-sharing and **T**rust

- The U.S. DoD (OASD/NII) Command and Control Research Program (CCRP) sponsored the design and development of the ELICIT platform for experimentation and classroom activities focused on information, cognitive, and social domain phenomena
- The purpose of ELICIT-related experimentation, teaching, and analysis is to investigate the cognitive and social impacts of C2 approach and organizational structure (e.g. information sharing, trust, shared awareness, and task performance)
- ELICIT features:
  - An instrumented environment
  - Flexibly configurable C2 approaches
  - Supports both person-in-the-loop and software agents
  - Context provided by instructions/procedures/data files

# Controllable in ELICIT






# Hierarchy – Edge

Measures of Effectiveness and Efficiency  
Results of Human Trials


	Average Correctness	Average Timeliness	Average Efficiency	Average Error Rate
Hierarchy	.025	.013	.011	.549
Edge	.193	.080	.044	.426

\*Alberts, The Agility Advantage (2011) Results from 7 matched sets (14 human trials)

# Controllable in abELICIT




# Agility Map for Edge C2 (with an adaptive information sharing policy)



with varying Signal-Noise Conditions and Degrees of Network Damage


# Agility Map for Edge C2 (with an adaptive information sharing policy)

Source: The Agility Advantage CCRP Publications 2011



Endeavor Space  
with varying Signal-Noise Conditions and  
Degrees of Network Damage

# Comparative Agility Map




with varying conditions of signal to noise  
and with varying requirements  
for shared situation awareness and response time

- DoD CCRP ELICIT
- SAS-085 Campaign of Experimentation (CAMPX)
- ARL Network Science Research Laboratory

\

- The method followed is based on the prospective meta-analysis methodology in order to produce a more complete, robust and generalizable set of findings than summarizing multiple independent experiments



- All experimental platforms are constructive agent-based simulations, each of which instantiates at least two C2 Approaches and simulates a variety of circumstances
- ELICIT: Scenario that finds the Who, What, Where and When of a terrorist attack. There are three variants:
  - ELICIT-IDA (U.S.A.)
  - abELICIT (Portugal)
  - ELICIT-TRUST (U.S.A.): agents are influenced by trust
- IMAGE (Canada): Multi-agency stabilization operation
- WISE (U.K.): Air and maritime support to land operation
- PANOPEA (Italy): Maritime counter-piracy operation

- C2 environments will exist in situations where entities do not trust or there is uncertainty with regard to the behavior of others in the Collective
- ELICIT-TRUST implements sharing behavior between nodes based on trust estimate of other agents
- Trust is a function of competence and willingness.
- Trust evolves according to Bayesian models and agents adapt their behaviors based on estimated trust of neighboring entities
- Communication network effects degrade the flow of information

# ELICIT Experiment Endeavor Spaces

	ELICIT- IDA	ELICIT-TRUST	abELICIT
<b>Self</b>	Network damage	Message/Drop rates	Infostructure degradation
		Trust	Agent performance
		Selfishness	Organisation disruption
<b>Environment</b>	Challenge		Key information available
	Noise in information		
	Cognitive complexity		

- IMAGE is a complexity comprehension tool augmented with software agents that deliberate and act according to rules that comply as much as possible with N2C2M2 theory
- The scenario involves multiple organizations that try to secure and stabilize the failing state by using a comprehensive approach

## Canadian


JTF: Joint Task Force  
AAFC: Agriculture Canada  
CIDA: Canadian International Dev. Agency  
DFAIT: Foreign Affairs and Int. Trade Canada  
RCMP: Royal Canadian Military Police

## International

DWB: Doctor Without Border  
WHO: World Health Organization  
WFP: World Food Program  
Red Cross  
USAID: US Agency Inter. Devel.

## Local


Armed forces  
Police




<b>C2 Approach</b>	<b>Allocation of Decision Rights to the Collective</b>	<b>Patterns of Interaction among Entities</b>	<b>Distribution of Information among entities</b>
<b>Conflicted</b>	Each organization decides of its unit locations and activities	Between units of the same organization	Between units of the same organization
<b>De-conflicted</b>	Each organization decides on its unit locations and non-conflicting activities	With organizations having collocated units for preventing conflicting activities	Variables shared instantly between organizations having collocated units
<b>Coordinated</b>	Like in De-Conflicted but interacting activities are considered first with collocated units	With organizations having collocated units for considering interacting activities	Like in De-Conflicted + variables shared with 5 non-collocated units (delay: 5 iter)
<b>Collaborative</b>	All activities and unit locations are decided collectively	With all organizations for deciding unit locations and activities.	Same as coordinated but with any number of units (delay 3 iter.)

- The Wargame Infrastructure and Simulation Environment (WISE) is a Land focused C2 model with representation of air and maritime support to Land operations at the system level
- The scenario simulates a failing state that is experiencing internal conflict. The central government has invited a NATO coalition to stabilize the country
- The UK operation represents a brigade size operation with the specific intent of clearing insurgents from a major urban area
- WISE represented degraded conditions within the brigade operational area by varying the quality of battlefield communication

## De-Conflicted C2 Approach



## Collaborative C2 Approach



Single Joint AoR



## *Piracy Asymmetric Naval Operation Patterns modeling for Education & Analysis*

- PANOPEA is a simulator for reproduction of anti-piracy operations and for evaluating the different approaches defined in NEC C2M2
- PANOPEA reproduces military frigates and helicopters, ground base, cargos, fisherman, yachts traffic and pirates
- Units are managed by intelligent software agents


The screenshot displays the PANOPEA simulation interface. On the right, a satellite-style map shows the Gulf of Aden region with numerous icons representing ships and aircraft. On the left, a text window displays simulation data, including coordinates and unit types. Below the map, a control panel allows for adjusting various parameters:

- Helicopter:** Average Setup Time (h) 0.1, Radar max (Nm) 45, Eye Max (Nm) 12, Speed (Knots) 135, Max Distance to Try (Nm) 240.
- Fisherman Boat/Pyrates:** Generate (boats) 700, Pirates (%) 3, Attack Threshold (Nm) 8, Attack Probability (%) 0.8, Fisher Speed (Knots) 10, Pyrate Speed (Knots) 35.
- Other Parameters:** Cargo Ship Flow (ship/day) [slider], Intelligence Detection Probability 0.1, and a Randomize checkbox.


At the bottom of the control panel, there is a 'Close' button.




## De-Conflicted



## Collaborative



## Edge



- Ship decision-making capability
- Intelligence DM capability
- Number of pirates
- Weather condition
- Misleading information



Endeavor  
Space


The differences among the experimental instantiations of the C2 approaches was investigated and these were found to be insignificant for the purposes of the CoE

	ELICIT-IDA (USA)	ELICIT-TRUST (USA)	abELICIT (Portugal)	IMAGE (Canada)	WISE (UK)	PANOPEA (Italy)
Conflicted		X		X		
De-Conflicted	X	X		X	X	X
Coordinated	X	X	X	X		
Collaborative	X	X	X	X	X	X
Edge	X	X	X			X

*Not all of the experiments implemented all of the C2 Approaches*

## Creating an Endeavour Space



- The Endeavor Spaces were populated by combining all possible values of multiple variables, each one corresponding to an aspect of the situation
- Heat maps show the progressive degree of challenge of the Endeavour Spaces
  - Darker shades of orange represent most challenging circumstances
  - Values were normalized across the experiments



# SAS-085 CAMPX Endeavour Spaces

ELICIT-IDA


IMAGE



ELICIT-TRUST

WISE


PANOPEA




# Approaches in the C2 Approach Space

H1: Each of the NATO C2 Maturity Model approaches is located in a distinct region of the C2 Approach Space


## Theoretical Locations




## Observed Locations (IMAGE)



## Conceptual Model



## Experimental Results




*Combined results show that C2 approaches are located in distinct regions of the C2 Approach Space*

# No 'One Size' Fits All



H2: No one approach to C2 is always the most appropriate

H3: More network-enabled approaches to C2 are more appropriate for more challenging circumstances; however, less network-enabled C2 approaches to C2 are more appropriate for some circumstances




H4: More network-enabled approaches to C2 are more agile

ELICIT-IDA



Same circumstance tested un different C2 Approaches

ELICIT-TRUST





- Darker shades of teal correspond to higher levels of mission success (1), lighter ones to failure (0)
- Blank squares represent non-simulated cases


# More Network-Enabled = More Agility

De-Conflicted was successful in 27 out of 54 circumstances  
 Agility Score (IMAGE, De-Conflicted) = 27/54 = 0.50


IMAGE



WISE




PANOPEA



- Darker shades of teal correspond to higher levels of mission success (1.0), lighter ones to failure (0.0)
- Blank squares represent non-simulated cases


# More Network-Enabled = More Agility

- Results suggest that Agility accelerates as C2 approaches become more network-enabled
- The relation between C2 Approach and Agility Score is quadratic ( $R^2 = 0.99$ )




# C2 Approach Space → Agility

H5: The dimensions of the C2 Approach Space are positively correlated with agility




- Individually: Agility Score is strongly correlated to each dimension of the C2 Approach Space
- Collectively (multiple regression):

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Agility Score} = & 0.030 + 0.460 \times \text{Allocation of decision rights} \\
 & - 0.269 \times \text{Patterns of interaction} \\
 & + 0.274 \times \text{Distribution of information}
 \end{aligned}$$




H6: More network-enabled C2 approaches are better able to maintain their position in the C2 Approach Space

- Only patterns of interaction and distribution of information were affected by circumstances
- The deviation was measured by the spreading, calculated from the area occupied by all circumstances




H6: More network-enabled C2 approaches are better able to maintain their position in the C2 Approach Space



# On vs. Off Diagonal

H7: On-diagonal (balanced) approaches to C2 are more agile



C2 Approach	On-Diagonal Group	Off-Diagonal Group
Average % Maximum Effectiveness	82%	36%
Average Distance from Diagonal	0.02	0.09

## C2 Maturity → C2 Agility

H9: More mature C2 capability is more agile than the most agile C2 Approach that can be adopted


C2 Maturity Levels	Contents of C2 Toolkit	C2 Approach Decision Requirement	Transition Requirements	Region of the Endeavor Space where a collective is successful
Level 5	Edge C2 Collaborative C2 Coordinated C2 De-Conflicted C2	Emergent		
Level 4	Collaborative C2 Coordinated C2 De-Conflicted C2	Recognize 3 situations and match to appropriate C2 approach		
Level 3	Coordinated C2 De-Conflicted C2	Recognize 2 situations and match to appropriate C2 approach		
Level 2	De-Conflicted C2	N/A	None	
Level 1	Conflicted C2	N/A	None	

Adapted from the Alberts, D.S. (2011). *Agility Advantage, CCRP*

Conflicted
  De-Conflicted
  Coordinated
  Collaborative
  Edge



# C2 Maturity → C2 Agility

H9: More mature C2 capability is more agile than the most agile C2 Approach that can be adopted



# C2 Maturity → C2 Agility

*Experimental results suggest more an imbricated model than a complementary one*



- DoD CCRP ELICIT
- SAS-085 Campaign of Experimentation (CAMPX)
- ARL Network Science Research Laboratory (NSRL)

\

- A specific C2 Approach is defined in three dimensions
  - allocation of decision rights
  - patterns of interactions
  - distribution of information
- The allocation of decision rights is a design parameter of a social network that is a function of organizational structure
- A patterns of interaction is an outcome of a social network and is a function of prescribed or emergent organizational processes
- The distribution of information is a function of policies, processes, and individual propensities
- All of the above are enabled or constrained by capabilities provided by information and communications networks

- A Composite Network is a collection of interdependent networks
- The values of each of the C2 Approach dimensions is the result of the outcomes associated with three interdependent networks (social, information, and communications), each with specific design parameters values, behaviors, and performance
- Thus, C2 experiments should be conceived of and instantiated as multi-genre composite network experiments

- Need to move beyond single genre experiments that represent the capabilities and performance of other networks by parameters
  - e.g. ELICIT will parameter determined communication delays
- ARL NSRL developed an ELICIT-EMANE\* integrated environment as a first step in a planned development of a composite network experimentation environment
  - All interactions between social network nodes go through an emulated mobile tactical communications network
- This IOC capability will be enhanced with the introduction of an information network and network monitoring to explore integrated design of composite networks and context-aware network behaviors

# Agenda

- C2 Agility
- Hypotheses
- Experiments and Results
- **Next Steps**

- C2 of Composite Networks
- Cyber Security as a component of integrated design
- Automation and autonomy as a C2 Approach

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188		
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. <b>PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.</b>					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YY) xx-05-2015		2. REPORT TYPE Final		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE  C2 Agility: Related Hypotheses and Experimental Findings			5a. CONTRACT NO.  HQ0034-14-0001		
			5b. GRANT NO.		
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NO(S).		
6. AUTHOR(S)  David S. Alberts			5d. PROJECT NO.		
			5e. TASK NO.  C6418		
			5f. WORK UNIT NO.		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Institute for Defense Analyses 4850 Mark Center Drive Alexandria, VA 22311-1882			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NO. IDA Document NS D-5520 IDA Log H 15-000584		
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Institute for Defense Analyses 4850 Mark Center Drive Alexandria, VA 22311-1882			10. SPONSOR'S / MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)  IDA		
			11. SPONSOR'S / MONITOR'S REPORT NO(S).		
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT  The objective of this tutorial is to acquaint attendees with the foundational concepts upon which C2 Agility is constructed, the metrics that are associated with C2 Agility, and C2 Agility-related experimentation and results to date.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS  C2, Agility, C2 Agility, Experimentation, Composite Networks					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT  UU	18. NO. OF PAGES  1	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON David S. Alberts
a. REPORT  U	b. ABSTRACT  U	c. THIS PAGE  U			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code) (703) 845-2411

