Working Paper

A-Series Information:
WP-A develops foundational concepts and diagnostic frameworks for AI governance, autonomous systems, and emerging-technology strategy. The series examines how power, risk, control, and institutional capacity are reorganized as AI systems become embedded in security, economic, and governance infrastructures.

Recommended Citation:
Wu, Shaoyuan. (2026). *Low-Observable Deployable Modular Surface Platform (LODMSP): From Fixed Decks to Deployable Mission Interfaces in Autonomous Maritime Systems* (EPINOVA Working Paper No. EPINOVA–WP–A–2026–04). Global AI Governance and Policy Research Center, EPINOVA LLC. https://doi.org/10.67037/epinova.wp.a.2026.004

Low-Observable Deployable Modular Surface Platform (LODMSP):

From Fixed Decks to Deployable Mission Interfaces in Autonomous Maritime Systems

Author: Shaoyuan Wu
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0660-8232
Affiliation: Global AI Governance and Policy Research Center, EPINOVA LLC
Date: June 12, 2026

Executive Summary

The rapid development of unmanned surface vessels, containerized payloads, distributed maritime operations, and autonomous mission systems is changing the logic of naval platform design. Current innovation increasingly separates payloads from platforms and treats vessels as configurable nodes rather than fixed-purpose combatants. The U.S. Navy's Containerized Capability Campaign, for example, frames containerization as a way to decouple payloads from platforms, rapidly reconfigure forces, tailor capability to mission, and scale effects across the fleet. The Modular Attack Surface Craft (MASC) program points in the same direction by seeking industry input for cost-effective unmanned surface vessels shaped by modular design principles and rapid fielding requirements.

This working paper introduces the Low-Observable Deployable Modular Surface Platform (LODMSP) as a conceptual maritime morphology for the next phase of autonomous surface systems. LODMSP is not presented as a specific ship design, weapons architecture, or acquisition recommendation. Rather, it is an analytical model for asking how platform architecture may evolve when low-observable transit, modular payload reconfiguration, expanded mission surfaces, and autonomous orchestration become simultaneous design priorities.

The core claim is simple: fixed-deck modularity may be a transitional stage. Existing public concepts generally place modular payloads on conventional or semi-conventional hulls. LODMSP instead treats the platform itself as a deployable mission interface. In transit mode, the platform compresses into a compact, low-profile form optimized for movement, exposure reduction, and module protection. In mission mode, it expands radially, laterally, or segmentally to increase functional surface area, separate mission modules, enlarge sensor baselines, support unmanned-system handling, and distribute communication or logistics functions.

This concept extends the author's prior framework on morphological convergence and structural dominance: as autonomous platforms converge around stable physical forms, long-term advantage shifts from individual body optimization toward orchestration architectures, modularity, infrastructure control, and system-level scalability. LODMSP is a maritime expression of that broader shift.

Keywords: Low-observable maritime platforms; deployable mission interfaces; unmanned surface vessels; modular payloads; containerized naval capability; distributed maritime operations; autonomous maritime systems; mission-surface expansion; platform-payload decoupling; maritime systems architecture.

GLOBAL AI
GOVERNANCE
RESEARCH CENTER

EPINOVA

Key Findings

- Fixed-deck modularity is likely transitional. Containerized payloads and mission modules are becoming central to naval experimentation, but most current concepts still rely on fixed decks, fixed mission bays, and conventional seaframe assumptions. That geometry constrains mission-surface area, payload separation, sensor baseline expansion, and transit-state signature control.
- Deployable geometry may become a maritime design frontier. Future autonomous surface systems may compete not only on displacement, endurance, speed, payload, or cost, but on the ratio between compact transit form and expanded mission form. The relevant metric is not only how much payload a vessel carries, but how much usable mission interface it can generate when deployed.
- LODMSP reframes the vessel from carrier to interface. Conventional modular vessels carry payloads. LODMSP turns the vessel itself into a reconfigurable physical interface for sensing, communication, unmanned-system operations, payload spacing, logistics, maintenance access, and distributed coordination.
- The concept aligns with public trends but remains distinct from known public designs. DARPA's NOMARS and USX-1 Defiant show the design freedom created by removing onboard human accommodation requirements. The Navy's containerization campaign and MASC direction show movement toward modular, non-exquisite, scalable unmanned vessels. Publicly available concepts, however, still appear closer to fixed-hull modular vessels than to low-observable, variable-geometry deployable mission platforms.
- The strategic value of LODMSP would depend less on single-platform lethality than on orchestration. Its primary significance lies in how it could serve as a node within a distributed maritime ecosystem: carrying modular payloads, deploying unmanned systems, expanding sensing and communication surfaces, and connecting to a wider autonomy, logistics, and command architecture.

Policy Relevance

For policymakers, the LODMSP concept is useful less because it predicts a single future vessel than because it identifies a design question that procurement debates often miss: when modular payloads become central to naval architecture, should the vessel remain a fixed deck, or should the vessel itself become an adjustable interface?

This distinction matters because it shifts evaluation from platform capacity alone toward interface architecture, deployment geometry, sustainment burden, lawful signaling, and system-level resilience.

Scope and Limitations

This paper is a conceptual working paper, not a technical design specification, acquisition proposal, or operational doctrine. It evaluates LODMSP as a maritime systems architecture and policy-relevant design morphology: a way of thinking about how autonomous surface platforms might evolve when low-observable transit, modular payload reconfiguration, deployable geometry, and distributed orchestration are treated as simultaneous requirements.

The analysis intentionally avoids engineering prescriptions such as propulsion design, structural dimensions, materials selection, stealth-shaping formulas, launch mechanisms, weapons integration pathways, or tactical employment instructions. Those questions would require classified threat models, naval architecture validation, sea-state testing, safety analysis, command-and-control assessment, and legal review beyond the scope of a public working paper.

The claims are therefore bounded. LODMSP should be read as an analytical model for comparing future platform architectures, not as evidence that a particular configuration is technically mature, cost-effective, survivable, or operationally superior. Its policy value lies in identifying design variables—deployment ratio, functional interface ratio, modular separation, external-node support, and infrastructure dependence—that may deserve earlier attention in autonomous maritime experimentation.

1. Introduction

Naval platform design has historically centered on the ship as a fixed, integrated combat system. Hull form, propulsion, sensors, weapons, command systems, crew accommodation, survivability features, and mission spaces are designed into a single platform intended to perform defined roles across a long service life. Even modular naval vessels generally retain this fixed-platform logic: the ship remains a stable seaframe, while mission modules or payloads are exchanged within predetermined spaces.

That model is increasingly under pressure. The rise of unmanned systems, containerized payloads, distributed maritime operations, and autonomous coordination architectures is pushing naval design away from platform permanence and toward payload flexibility. The U.S. Navy's recent public statements emphasize common interface standards, modularity, open architecture, digital twins, and sustainment before steel is bent (U.S. Navy, 2026). The same remarks describe containerization as a practical way to decouple payloads from platforms and turn more platforms into potential combat nodes.

Unmanned vessels reinforce this transition. DARPA's No Manning Required Ship (NOMARS) program removes onboard human requirements from the design problem, opening design space for different reliability, maintenance, hydrodynamic, cost, and seaframe tradeoffs (DARPA, n.d.). USX-1 Defiant is presented by DARPA as a medium unmanned surface vessel intended for long-duration autonomous at-sea demonstration (DARPA, 2025). The broader implication is that unmanned design is not merely crewed design with the crew removed; it changes the underlying architectural problem.

Yet current modularity remains incomplete. Most public concepts still assume a relatively conventional hull carrying modular payloads on a fixed deck or within fixed mission bays. LODMSP asks whether the next phase of autonomous maritime design may move beyond fixed decks entirely. Instead of treating modular payloads as cargo placed on a ship, the platform itself may become a deployable mission surface: compact and low-observable in transit, expanded and functionally distributed in operation.

2. The Limits of Fixed-Deck Modularity

Fixed-deck modularity offers important advantages. It allows navies to reuse hulls across mission types, install containerized sensors or mission systems, simplify logistics, and reduce the need for every platform to be purpose-built. The Mk 70 Payload Delivery System illustrates the direction of travel: a high-capability naval payload can be packaged in a standard 40-foot containerized format derived from existing launch-system technology (Lockheed Martin, 2023).

The MASC program extends this logic by emphasizing unmanned surface vessels, cost-effective acquisition, commercial off-the-shelf technology, modular design philosophy, and rapid deployment (Naval Sea Systems Command, 2025). Public reporting and congressional analysis describe the broader Navy effort as moving toward large USVs equipped with containerized sensors, electronic payloads, or other mission packages that support distributed maritime operations (O'Rourke, 2026).

The fixed-deck approach, however, has structural limits. First, the deck remains a finite two-dimensional surface. Once containers, sensors, communications, unmanned-system handling equipment, cooling, power conversion, and maintenance access compete for the same area, reconfiguration becomes constrained by geometry rather than strategy.

Second, module proximity can create interference and operational conflict. Sensors, communication systems, electronic payloads, launch or recovery equipment, power systems, cooling systems, and support modules may not perform optimally when concentrated on a fixed deck. Some mission functions benefit from spacing, separation, and sectorization.

Third, fixed-deck modularity does not fully solve the transit-versus-mission tradeoff. A vessel optimized for carrying exposed modules may not be hydrodynamically or signature optimized for cross-sea movement. Conversely, a hull optimized for low-profile transit may not provide enough accessible mission surface during operations.

Fourth, fixed-deck modularity can preserve platform-centric thinking. Even when payloads are modular, the ship may remain the primary design unit. The deeper shift is not from fixed payload to modular payload, but from fixed platform to reconfigurable system interface.

Fifth, earlier modular vessel experience shows that modularity is not automatically successful. The Littoral Combat Ship experience demonstrates that mission-module concepts can encounter serious operational, integration, reliability, cost, sustainment, and testing challenges. GAO found that the LCS fleet had not demonstrated the operational capabilities needed for its intended missions and that mission-module development and sustainment problems remained significant (GAO, 2022). The lesson is not that modularity should be rejected. The lesson is that modularity must be designed as a system architecture, not marketed as a procurement slogan.

3. Concept Definition: Low-Observable Deployable Modular Surface Platform

LODMSP is a low-observable, variable-geometry maritime platform that compresses into a streamlined transit configuration and expands into a deployable mission interface for modular sensing, communication, unmanned-system operations, payload separation, logistics support, and distributed maritime coordination.

Three terms are central. Low-observable refers to a design priority of reducing avoidable signature exposure, protrusions, discontinuities, and mission-equipment visibility during transit. It does not imply invisibility. Deployable refers to a physical transition from a compact transit state to an expanded mission state. Modular refers not only to payload exchangeability, but to standardized power, data, cooling, mechanical, software, and certification interfaces across mission segments.

The concept has two primary configurations: a folded/transit configuration and a deployed/mission configuration. These are not merely different operational postures. They represent two different architectural states of the same platform.

3.1 Folded / Transit Configuration

In folded mode, LODMSP minimizes protrusions, exposed mission equipment, radar-reflective discontinuities, windage, and module exposure. Its external form would approximate a compact, continuous, low-profile shell rather than a conventional open deck. The purpose is not to make the platform undetectable, but to reduce exposure while moving between operating areas.

Analytically, the folded state prioritizes reduced signature exposure through fewer exposed edges and mission components; lower windage and improved transit efficiency; protection of modular payloads during cross-sea movement; compact geometry for endurance, survivability, and logistics; and simplified remote or autonomous navigation. This is consistent with the broader unmanned-vessel design logic opened by removing human accommodation requirements, but it applies that logic specifically to a variable-geometry platform.

3.2 Deployed / Mission Configuration

In deployed mode, the platform expands outward through radial, lateral, or segmented mission surfaces. These surfaces are not decorative appendages. They function as mission interfaces. Their role is to increase effective working area, distribute modules, separate incompatible payloads, enlarge sensor baselines, support unmanned aerial, surface, or undersea system operations, and create multiple functional sectors around a central command, power, or data core.

The deployed state prioritizes expanded functional surface area, mission-zone separation, modular payload access, unmanned-system launch and recovery support, sensor and communications spacing, distributed damage tolerance, and integration into a wider autonomous maritime network. This distinguishes LODMSP from a modular vessel that simply carries containers. LODMSP physically transforms to expose, separate, and operationalize modular mission surfaces.

4. Analytical Metrics: From Displacement to Deployment Ratio

Traditional naval comparison emphasizes displacement, speed, endurance, range, payload capacity, seakeeping, cost, and survivability. These metrics remain essential, but they do not fully capture the design logic of deployable modular platforms, whose operational value depends on the difference between compact transit morphology and expanded mission morphology. Public U.S. Navy statements on containerized capability emphasize the need to decouple payloads from platforms, standardize interfaces, and scale modular effects across the fleet (U.S. Navy, 2026).

The MASC program similarly points toward cost-effective unmanned surface vessels shaped by modular design principles and rapid fielding requirements, while the LCS experience shows that modularity can fail when interfaces, sustainment, testing, and doctrine remain immature (GAO, 2022; Naval Sea Systems Command, 2025). Building on those lessons and on the author's prior framework on morphological convergence and infrastructure-centered autonomous power, Table 1 proposes a set of analytical metrics for assessing deployable modular surface platforms (Wu, 2026).

Table 1. Core Metrics for Deployable Modular Platforms

Metric	Definition	Policy Use
Deployment ratio	Mission-state functional area relative to transit-state footprint.	Tests whether compact transit form can generate meaningful operational surface after deployment.
Functional interface ratio	Usable sensing, communication, handling, maintenance, or module interface relative to platform volume or displacement.	Shifts evaluation from vessel size to usable external interaction per unit of hull.
Modular separation index	Ability to separate modules that interfere electronically, physically, thermally, or operationally.	Clarifies whether modularity reduces or simply relocates integration risk.
Distributed expansion coefficient	Degree to which the platform can extend its operational footprint through UAVs, USVs, UUVs, floating sensors, relays, or logistics nodes.	Links platform design to distributed maritime operations and autonomous force orchestration.
Interface maturity level	Reliability and standardization of power, data, cooling, mechanical locking, autonomy, and software-update pathways.	Prevents modularity from becoming a promise unsupported by integration and sustainment architecture.

Source: Author's synthesis based on public U.S. Navy materials on containerized capability and unmanned surface vessels, NAVSEA's Modular Attack Surface Craft program description, GAO's assessment of Littoral Combat Ship modularity challenges, and the author's prior framework on morphological convergence and infrastructure power in autonomous systems (GAO, 2022; Naval Sea Systems Command, 2025; U.S. Navy, 2025, 2026; Wu, 2026).

5. Architectural Logic

LODMSP can be understood through five architectural layers: a central core, deployable mission segments, a data and power ring, a low-observable transit shell, and an external node layer. This layered view keeps the concept grounded. The value of the platform is not in the shell alone, nor in any single module. It lies in the relationship among structure, interfaces, autonomy, sustainment, and distributed operations.

5.1 Central Core

The central core provides power management, data processing, navigation, autonomy support, communications, health monitoring, and structural anchoring. It should be understood as the platform's protected system nucleus rather than a traditional bridge or crew-centered command space. In a minimally manned variant, the core could include limited human support space. In a fully unmanned variant, it would prioritize redundancy, remote command integration, autonomous fault management, and secure update pathways.

5.2 Deployable Mission Segments

The deployable segments form the platform's mission interface. They may host sensors, communication packages, unmanned-system handling areas, logistics modules, electronic payloads, maintenance access points, or other mission packages. Their value lies in transforming mission geometry. Unlike a fixed deck, these segments are designed to change the platform's functional surface configuration between transit and operation.

5.3 Data and Power Ring

A modular deployable platform requires standardized power, data, cooling, and mechanical interfaces. The key design question is not only how modules attach, but how the platform preserves reliable connectivity across moving structural segments. This is where the concept connects to autonomous-system infrastructure theory: long-term advantage depends on interfaces, data buses, power distribution, update pathways, and system integration rather than hull form alone (Wu, 2026).

5.4 Low-Observable Transit Shell

The folded shell is not merely a protective cover. It is a transit morphology. Its purpose is to reduce signature exposure, protect mission modules, lower drag, and allow the platform to move as a compact object across wider maritime spaces before expanding into a mission state. This distinguishes LODMSP from modular barges or floating work platforms, which can expand working area but do not generally combine compact low-observable transit form with autonomous mission deployment.

5.5 External Node Layer

The outermost layer is not the hull. It is the network of systems the platform can deploy or support: UAVs, USVs, UUVs, floating sensors, communications relays, decoys, logistics packages, or temporary mission nodes. In this layer, LODMSP becomes an ecosystem node rather than a single asset. Sea Hunter, Seahawk, Ranger, Mariner, and related experimentation show that the Navy is exploring how unmanned vessels can integrate into fleet operations; LODMSP extends the question from fleet integration to physical transformation into a distributed mission interface (O'Rourke, 2026; U.S. Navy, 2025).

6. Relationship to Existing Public Concepts

LODMSP does not emerge in isolation. It is best understood as a synthesis of several visible trends: unmanned seaframe design, containerized payloads, distributed maritime operations, open architecture, and the growing emphasis on interface standards. Its novelty is not that it combines modularity and autonomy; those are already central to public naval experimentation. Its novelty is the proposition that the platform's physical geometry should be treated as part of the interface system.

6.1 NOMARS and USX-1 Defiant

NOMARS demonstrates that removing humans from vessels can unlock new design tradeoffs in reliability, endurance, maintenance, hydrodynamic performance, cost, and seaframe architecture (DARPA, n.d.). LODMSP shares NOMARS' unmanned-design logic but adds deployable mission geometry. NOMARS asks how to design a ship without human constraints. LODMSP asks how such a ship might change physical form between transit and mission states.

6.2 MASC and Containerized Payloads

The Navy's MASC direction and Containerized Capability Campaign show that modular payloads are moving from experiment to strategic concept. NAVSEA describes MASC as using a modular design philosophy, commercial off-the-shelf technology, and incremental development to field cost-effective unmanned surface vessels (Naval Sea Systems Command, 2025). The Navy's Sea-Air-Space remarks frame containerization as a way to decouple payloads from platforms and scale effects across the fleet (U.S. Navy, 2026). LODMSP shares this payload-over-platform logic, but challenges the fixed-deck assumption.

6.3 Mk 70 and the Containerized Payload Baseline

Mk 70 demonstrates that high-capability naval payloads can be containerized in a standard 40-foot format (Lockheed Martin, 2023). LODMSP does not depend on that system or on any specific payload. Its broader significance is that containerized or modular payloads become more useful if the platform can separate, expose, power, network, maintain, and operate modules through a deployable interface rather than simply carry them on a fixed deck.

6.4 LCS as Cautionary Precedent

The LCS experience offers a cautionary case. Modularity can fail when mission packages, testing, sustainment, interfaces, training, and doctrine are immature. GAO found significant operational and mission-module challenges in the LCS program and emphasized the need for comprehensive plans, adequate testing, and better cost and sustainment data (GAO, 2022). LODMSP should therefore not be evaluated as a promise that modularity automatically creates flexibility. Its viability would depend on mature interfaces, sustainment architecture, module certification, maintenance concepts, and operational doctrine.

6.5 Civilian Transformable USV Research

Public research on transformable unmanned surface vehicles also suggests that variable geometry is technically meaningful outside military contexts. For example, the TransBoat concept uses an expandable body structure to shift from a mono-hull to a multi-hull configuration for overwater construction and stability under wave disturbance (Zhang et al., 2022). That research is not a direct analogue to LODMSP, but it demonstrates the broader relevance of shape-changing USVs. LODMSP differs by linking variable geometry to low-observable transit, modular mission interfaces, and distributed maritime coordination.

7. Strategic Implications

LODMSP's policy significance lies in what it implies about future maritime power. The concept points away from the vessel as an isolated object and toward the vessel as a configurable interface embedded in a larger autonomous ecosystem.

7.1 From Shipbuilding to Interface-Building

Future maritime competition may not be defined only by who builds better ships, but by who builds better maritime interfaces. The decisive question becomes: how effectively can a platform expose, connect, separate, power, update, maintain, and coordinate mission modules? This aligns with the broader shift from platform competition to structural competition, in which advantage migrates from individual platform performance toward orchestration systems and infrastructure control (Wu, 2026).

7.2 Low-Cost Mass and Mission Reconfiguration

A deployable modular surface platform could support a logic of quantity with adaptability. Its role would not be to replace high-end combatants. It would create lower-cost configurable nodes that can perform sensing, communication, logistics, unmanned-system support, and other missions within a distributed maritime system. The strategic effect would come from reconfiguration, aggregation, and persistence rather than from a single platform's performance.

7.3 Cross-Sea Mobility and Mission Expansion

The folded configuration addresses a problem common to deployable systems: expanded mission geometry is useful during operations but inefficient during transit. LODMSP separates these states. It moves as a compact low-profile body, then expands when it reaches an operating area. This distinction may become important for autonomous platforms that must travel long distances but operate as distributed nodes once deployed.

7.4 Gray-Zone Identification and Signaling

Variable-configuration maritime platforms would raise legal, operational, and escalation-management questions. Reconfigurable payloads and changing visible mission states can complicate identification, classification, and rules of engagement. This does not make such systems inherently unlawful or destabilizing. It means that governance, transparency, command responsibility, and operational signaling must be included early in design and doctrine.

7.5 Infrastructure Dependence

LODMSP would not be decisive as an isolated platform. Its value would depend on surrounding infrastructure: module production, shipyard maintenance, software updates, communications, energy supply, spare parts, autonomy stacks, training pipelines, and command networks. This is the central strategic point. LODMSP is less a future ship than a physical manifestation of infrastructure-centered autonomous power.

8. Risks and Limitations

The concept should be treated cautiously. Deployable geometry creates opportunities, but it also introduces risk. The most important limitation is that LODMSP remains an architectural hypothesis until validated through naval architecture modeling, sea-state trials, autonomy testing, interface certification, sustainment analysis, and legal-operational review. Six limitations are especially important.

Mechanical complexity. Moving maritime structures introduce hinge, locking, fatigue, corrosion, sealing, alignment, and sea-state challenges. The ocean is unforgiving, and moving parts are usually less robust than fixed structures.

Maintenance burden. A low-cost platform can become expensive if deployable mechanisms require frequent specialized maintenance, dry-dock access, proprietary parts, or complex inspection routines.

Survivability tradeoffs. Expanded mission surfaces may increase functionality but also increase exposure. LODMSP is therefore state-dependent: survivability in transit and functionality in mission mode may not peak simultaneously.

Integration risk. The LCS experience shows that modularity can fail if interfaces, support systems, testing, training, sustainment, and doctrine are immature (GAO, 2022). LODMSP would magnify this risk because it adds moving structural interfaces to modular payload interfaces.

Doctrine gap. Navies would need new concepts for tasking, deploying, protecting, recovering, maintaining, and legally signaling variable-geometry autonomous platforms.

Governance and accountability. If platforms can alter visible mission configuration, classification and escalation signaling become more complex. Command accountability, cyber resilience, auditability, and lawful-use constraints would need to be designed into the system from the beginning.

9. Policy and Research Agenda

Evaluate deployable mission surface as a design metric. Naval research should examine deployable functional area, modular separation, mission-interface capacity, and state-transition reliability alongside traditional metrics such as range, payload, speed, endurance, and cost.

Separate concept exploration from weapons integration. LODMSP should first be studied as an architecture for sensing, communication, unmanned-system handling, logistics, maintenance, and distributed coordination. Weaponization should not be treated as the primary or only use case.

Prioritize interface standards. The decisive layer is not the shell shape. It is the interface system: data, power, cooling, mechanical locking, autonomy integration, software update pathways, module certification, and sustainment documentation.

Learn from LCS without abandoning modularity. The LCS case shows that modularity must be supported by mature mission packages, sustainment planning, training, and operational testing. It does not prove that modularity is strategically wrong; it proves that modularity cannot compensate for immature systems engineering.

Connect LODMSP to distributed maritime operations. The platform should be analyzed as a node in a distributed force rather than as an independent ship replacement. Its value depends on how it contributes to sensing, communication, deception, logistics, autonomy, and operational resilience across a wider maritime network.

Include governance and identification in early design. Variable-configuration maritime platforms should be designed with signaling, classification, command accountability, cyber resilience, and lawful-use considerations from the outset.

Conclusion

The Low-Observable Deployable Modular Surface Platform is a conceptual response to a broader structural shift in maritime autonomy. Current trends already point toward unmanned vessels, non-exquisite platforms, containerized payloads, open architecture, and payload-platform decoupling. But most public concepts remain tied to fixed decks and conventional seaframe assumptions.

LODMSP extends the logic further. It proposes that the platform itself may become variable: compact, protected, and low-profile in transit; expanded, modular, and interface-rich during operations. Its significance is not simply that it could carry mission modules, but that it reframes the surface vessel as a deployable system interface.

This concept fits the broader evolution of autonomous systems from body-level competition toward orchestration and infrastructure-centered power. As platform morphologies converge and fixed-body optimization produces diminishing returns, strategic advantage may increasingly depend on the ability to coordinate, reconfigure, sustain, and scale distributed autonomous ecosystems.

The future of maritime autonomy may therefore not be defined by a single revolutionary ship type. It may be defined by platforms that can compress, transit, unfold, connect, and become part of a larger operational ecology. In that sense, LODMSP is not merely a vessel concept. It is a way of thinking about the next phase of autonomous maritime power: from fixed decks to deployable mission interfaces.

References

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. (n.d.). *NOMARS: No manning required ship*. https://www.darpa.mil/research/programs/no-manning-required-ship

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. (2025, August 11). *NOMARS at-sea demo*. https://www.darpa.mil/news/features/nomars

Lockheed Martin. (2023). *Mk 70 Mod 1 Payload Delivery System*. https://www.lockheedmartin.com/content/dam/lockheed-martin/rms/documents/naval-launchers-and-munitions/Mk70_Product_Card.pdf

Naval Sea Systems Command. (2025, July 31). *U.S. Navy seeks industry feedback for Modular Attack Surface Craft program*. https://www.navsea.navy.mil/Media/News/Article-View/Article/4261138/us-navy-seeks-industry-feedback-for-modular-attack-surface-craft-program/

O'Rourke, R. (2026, January 16). *Navy large unmanned surface vessels (USVs): Background and issues for Congress* (CRS Report No. R45757). Congressional Research Service. https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R45757

U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2022). *Littoral Combat Ship: Actions needed to address significant operational challenges and implement planned sustainment approach* (GAO-22-105387). https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-22-105387

U.S. Navy. (2025, August 27). *Medium unmanned surface vessel (MUSV)*. https://www.navy.mil/Resources/Fact-Files/Display-FactFiles/Article/4288073/medium-unmanned-surface-vessel-musv/

U.S. Navy. (2026, April 20). *CNO remarks at Sea-Air-Space*. https://www.navy.mil/Press-Office/Speeches/display-speech/Article/4464830/cno-remarks-at-sea-air-space/

Wu, S. (2026). *From control substitution to structural dominance: Morphological convergence and infrastructure power in autonomous systems* (EPINOVA Working Paper No. EPINOVA-WP-A-2026-03). Global AI Governance and Policy Research Center, EPINOVA LLC. https://doi.org/10.67037/epinova.wp.a.2026.003

Zhang, L., Ji, X., Jiao, Y., Qian, H., & Zhang, T. (2022). *Design and control of the TransBoat: A transformable unmanned surface vehicle for overwater construction* (arXiv:2212.03639). arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.03639