UNSYS digital

The Journal of Instrumentation, Automation, and System

Multi-Objective Optimization for Aerial Surveillance Missions

Agus Budiyono[†], Vishnu Kumar Kaliappan[✓]

[†]CAP Solutions, Jakarta, Indonesia.

[✓]Computer Science and Engineering, KPR Institute of Engineering and Technology, Coimbatore, India.

Abstract—This technical note explores the application of multi-objective optimization principles to aerial surveillance mission planning, presenting a conceptual framework for addressing the complex trade-offs inherent in such operations. Modern surveillance missions must balance multiple competing objectives including maximizing area coverage, minimizing mission time and fuel consumption, maintaining adequate sensor resolution, and reducing exposure to threats. This note discusses how multi-objective optimization approaches, particularly Pareto-based methods, can provide mission planners with a spectrum of viable solutions rather than a single optimal point, thereby accommodating diverse operational priorities and constraints. Key considerations such as aircraft performance limitations, sensor capabilities, airspace restrictions, and mission-specific requirements are examined in the context of the optimization framework. The conceptual formulation presented here identifies the principal objective functions and constraints relevant to surveillance operations, while acknowledging the practical challenges of implementation. This work serves as a foundation for future rigorous mathematical development and algorithmic implementation, highlighting the potential benefits of systematic multi-objective approaches over traditional single-objective or heuristic planning methods. The framework is broadly applicable to various surveillance platforms and mission types, offering a structured methodology for improving operational efficiency and decision-making in aerial surveillance contexts.

Keywords— multi-objective optimization, aerial surveillance, mission planning, Pareto optimality.

Copyright© 2025. Published by UNSYSdigital. All rights reserved.
DOI: 10.21535/x2pcd172

I. Introduction

Aerial surveillance missions have become increasingly complex, requiring careful consideration of multiple, often conflicting, operational objectives. Modern surveillance platforms—whether manned aircraft or unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs)—must operate within stringent constraints while attempting to maximize mission effectiveness across several dimensions. Traditional mission planning approaches typically optimize a single objective, such as minimizing flight time or maximizing coverage area, potentially overlooking critical trade-offs that could significantly impact overall mission success [1, 2].

Corresponding author: Agus Budiyono (e-mail: budiyono@alum.mit.edu)
This paper was submitted on December 2nd, 2025, and accepted on December 25th, 2025.

The challenge facing mission planners is fundamentally one of resource allocation under uncertainty and constraint. A surveillance platform possesses finite resources: limited fuel or battery capacity, restricted flight time, bounded sensor capabilities, and constrained operational envelopes. Simultaneously, mission requirements demand comprehensive area coverage, adequate image resolution, timely intelligence gathering, and acceptable risk exposure. These competing demands cannot all be maximized simultaneously; improving performance in one dimension typically degrades performance in others [3].

Multi-objective optimization provides a systematic framework for addressing these inherent trade-offs [4, 5]. Unlike single-objective approaches that collapse multiple considerations into a single weighted metric—often obscuring the underlying compromises—multi-objective methods explicitly recognize the competing nature of mission objectives. The Pareto optimization paradigm, in particular, generates a set of non-dominated solutions where no objective can be improved without degrading at least one other objective [6]. This Pareto frontier provides mission planners with a spectrum of viable options, each representing a different balance among competing priorities.

The application of multi-objective optimization to aerial surveillance is particularly timely given the proliferation of UAV platforms with diverse capabilities and mission profiles [7, 8]. Small battery-powered UAVs face acute energy-coverage trade-offs, while larger platforms must balance fuel efficiency against payload capacity and loiter time. Military surveillance missions introduce additional objectives related to threat avoidance and survivability, while civilian applications may prioritize cost minimization or regulatory compliance [9].

This technical note presents a conceptual framework for applying multi-objective optimization principles to aerial surveillance mission planning. Rather than providing rigorous mathematical proofs or detailed algorithmic implementations, we focus on articulating the fundamental problem structure, identifying key objective functions and constraints, and illustrating the approach through representative examples. The framework is intentionally general, applicable to various platform types and mission scenarios, and serves as a foundation for subsequent rigorous development. Through this

conceptual exploration, we aim to demonstrate the potential value of systematic multi-objective approaches in enhancing surveillance mission effectiveness and supporting more informed operational decision-making.

II. Illustrative Example: Battery Life vs Coverage Trade-off

To demonstrate the multi-objective optimization approach in a practical context, we consider a representative surveillance mission scenario involving an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) with limited battery capacity. This example illustrates the fundamental tension between maximizing surveillance coverage and conserving energy resources.

A. Problem Formulation

The optimization problem seeks to determine the optimal flight trajectory and operational parameters that balance two competing objectives: maximizing the surveilled area while minimizing energy consumption. This can be expressed through the following formulation:

Maximize objective function $J = \alpha \cdot C(t) - \beta \cdot E(t)$, where

- $C(t)$ is cumulative coverage area over time (km^2),
- $E(t)$ is instantaneous energy consumption rate (W),
- α, β are non-dimensional weighting coefficients reflecting mission priority.

Subject to constraints:

- Energy budget: $E_{\text{total}} \leq \text{battery_capacity}$
- Velocity limits: $v_{\min} \leq v(t) \leq v_{\max}$
- Altitude bounds: $h_{\min} \leq h(t) \leq h_{\max}$
- Mission duration: $t \leq t_{\max}$

B. Physical Interpretation

The coverage function $C(t)$ depends on the sensor footprint, which is directly influenced by altitude and sensor field-of-view angle. Higher altitudes increase the coverage area but may reduce image resolution and require greater energy for climb. The energy consumption $E(t)$ is a function of velocity, altitude, and maneuver intensity, with higher speeds and aggressive turns demanding more power.

The weighting coefficients α and β represent the relative importance assigned to coverage versus energy conservation. In time-critical reconnaissance missions, α might be significantly larger than β, prioritizing rapid area coverage. Conversely, for persistent surveillance operations, β may dominate to extend mission endurance.

C. Pareto Optimization Approach

Rather than solving for a single optimal solution with fixed α and β values, the Pareto optimization approach generates a set of non-dominated solutions forming the Pareto frontier. Each point on this frontier represents a configuration where improving one objective (e.g., increasing coverage) necessarily degrades the other (e.g., increasing energy consumption).

Key characteristics of the Pareto frontier:

- No single "best" solution
  Different mission contexts favor different points along the frontier
- Trade-off visualization
  Mission planners can visualize the cost of prioritizing one objective over another
- Flexibility
  Allows real-time adaptation based on evolving mission requirements or environmental conditions

D. Practical Implications

Consider two extreme scenarios along the Pareto frontier:

1. Scenario A (Maximum Coverage)
   The UAV operates at optimal altitude for sensor footprint, maintains high velocity, and follows an aggressive search pattern. This maximizes $C(t)$ but depletes the battery rapidly, resulting in shorter mission duration.
2. Scenario B (Maximum Endurance)
   The UAV flies at lower speeds, minimizes altitude changes, and follows energy-efficient trajectories. This minimizes $E(t)$, extending flight time but covering less total area.

Most practical missions will select an intermediate solution that provides acceptable coverage while maintaining sufficient endurance to complete mission objectives. The Pareto frontier enables quantitative assessment of these trade-offs, supporting informed decision-making.

E. Extension to Multiple Objectives

While this example focuses on two objectives, the framework naturally extends to include additional factors such as:

- Threat exposure minimization
- Image quality/resolution requirements
- Temporal coverage (revisit rates)
- Communication link reliability

Each additional objective increases the dimensionality of the Pareto frontier but provides a more comprehensive representation of mission trade-offs. This conceptual foundation will be developed rigorously in subsequent work, including specific algorithmic implementations and validation through simulation and flight testing.

III. Conclusion

This technical note has presented a conceptual framework for applying multi-objective optimization to aerial surveillance mission planning. The fundamental challenge in surveillance operations lies in balancing competing objectives (such as maximizing coverage while minimizing energy consumption) within platform and operational constraints. Traditional single-objective approaches often obscure these inherent trade-offs, potentially leading to suboptimal outcomes when viewed holistically.

The Pareto optimization paradigm provides a systematic methodology for addressing competing demands by generating non-dominated solutions that explicitly reveal trade-off structures. Rather than prescribing a single "optimal" solution, this approach offers mission planners a spectrum of viable options, each representing different balances among objectives. This flexibility is particularly valuable in dynamic operational environments where priorities may shift based on evolving requirements, threat conditions, or resource availability.

The illustrative example of battery life versus coverage demonstrates how the framework applies to practical scenarios. By formulating objective functions and constraints that capture essential platform physics and operational realities, the multi-objective approach enables quantitative assessment of alternatives and supports informed decision-making.

While focusing on conceptual development rather than rigorous mathematical treatment, this note establishes a foundation for subsequent work. Future research will address detailed mathematical formulations, algorithm development and validation, uncertainty incorporation, dynamic replanning capabilities, and experimental validation through simulation and flight testing. The framework is intentionally general and extensible, applicable to diverse platforms from small UAVs to large manned aircraft, and adaptable to both military and civilian contexts.

As surveillance capabilities expand and mission requirements grow more complex, systematic optimization approaches become increasingly essential. Multi-objective optimization provides a principled methodology for navigating complexities and trade-offs, ultimately enhancing operational effectiveness in aerial surveillance operations.

REFERENCES

[1] Bellingham, J., Tillerson, M., Richards, A., and How, J. P., "Multi-Task Allocation and Path Planning for Cooperating UAVs," *Cooperative Control: Models, Applications and Algorithms*, Springer, 2003, pp. 23-41. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-3758-5_2

[2] Rasmussen, S. J., and Shima, T., "UAV Cooperative Decision and Control: Challenges and Practical Approaches," *SIAM*, Philadelphia, PA, 2009. https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9780898718584

[3] Nigam, N., Bieniawski, S., Kroo, I., and Vian, J., "Control of Multiple UAVs for Persistent Surveillance: Algorithm and Flight Test Results," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, Vol. 20, No. 5, 2011, pp. 1236-1251. https://doi.org/10.1109/TCST.2011.2167331

[4] Deb, K., "Multi-Objective Optimization Using Evolutionary Algorithms," *Wiley*, Chichester, UK, 2001. ISBN: 978-0-471-87339-6

[5] Coello Coello, C. A., Lamont, G. B., and Van Veldhuizen, D. A., "Evolutionary Algorithms for Solving Multi-Objective Problems," 2nd ed., *Springer*, New York, 2007. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-36797-2

[6] Miettinen, K., "Nonlinear Multiobjective Optimization," *Kluwer Academic Publishers*, Boston, MA, 1999. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-5563-6

[7] Valavanis, K. P., and Vachtsevanos, G. J., "Handbook of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles," *Springer*, Dordrecht, 2015. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9707-1

[8] Chao, H., Cao, Y., and Chen, Y., "Autopilots for Small Unmanned Aerial Vehicles: A Survey," *International Journal of Control, Automation and Systems*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 2010, pp. 36-44. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12555-010-0105-z

[9] Tisdale, J., Kim, Z., and Hedrick, J. K., "Autonomous UAV Path Planning and Estimation," *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, Vol. 16, No. 2, 2009, pp. 35-42. https://doi.org/10.1109/MRA.2009.932529