Nick Clark · Published July 30, 2026 · PDF

When the Interference Is Real and Nobody Logged It

At 6:40 on an ordinary Tuesday, the autonomy operations lead at a regional inland port watched three yard tractors stall at the same corner of Berth 3 and could not say why. By 7:15 the radio-frequency field there had returned to nominal and the optical returns were clean. She had a stopped fleet, a service window she could not reopen, and no way to separate an adversarial emitter from a newly parked refrigeration unit from a failing antenna on her own vehicle. This article describes subject matter disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/049,409, which describes detection, classification, attribution, and graduated response to disruptions in sensed environmental fields as an architectural primitive of a governed spatial mesh.

6:40 a.m. at the Berth 3 Turn

The autonomy operations lead at a regional inland port runs eleven driverless yard tractors across a container apron that has not changed shape in four years. She knows the route timings the way a dispatcher knows a rail schedule. On the Tuesday in question, the first tractor slowed at the northeast turn near Berth 3 and stopped. The second, nine minutes later, stopped at the same place. The third stopped short of it and would not proceed.

There was nothing on the apron. The camera feed she pulled up showed wet pavement, a row of stacked forty-foot boxes, and a refrigeration unit that had been set down overnight where nothing was usually set down. Her tractors reported low confidence and held position, which is what she asked them to do. What they did not report, in the form she needed, was why.

By 7:15 she had walked the corner herself, found nothing, cleared the hold manually, and watched all three units run the turn without complaint. The morning's first vessel discharge was already forty minutes into a ninety-minute berth window that she could not extend.

What she could not do, that day or afterward, was name the cause. Three hypotheses fit everything she had. A radio emitter somewhere off the fence line could have been sitting on the band her units use for their local links. The refrigeration unit, powered and running, could have been throwing both a thermal signature and a compressor whine into a corner her tractors had learned as quiet. Or one tractor's antenna could have been failing, with the second and third stopping for entirely unrelated reasons at a place she was already primed to suspect. In her setup, all three hypotheses produce the same visible outcome: a stop, a low-confidence flag, and a field that reads clean by the time anyone looks.

The Window That Does Not Reopen

She lost the berth window. That is the smaller loss, and it is measurable: forty minutes of a ninety-minute discharge, a downstream truck queue, a demurrage conversation she will have with a customer who does not care about radio-frequency baselines.

The larger loss is that the event itself is gone. The field condition at the Berth 3 turn existed for roughly thirty-five minutes on one morning, in one corner, under one set of weather and stacking conditions. It ended. Nothing in her setup was recording the field while it was departing, and by the time she was in a position to look, the condition she would have needed to sample was no longer at that corner to sample. She can inspect the antenna. She can photograph the refrigeration unit. She cannot go back and sample that morning's field.

That is what makes it a stake rather than an inconvenience. Every option in front of her now is a permanent commitment made on missing evidence. If she reroutes and sends her tractors the long way around the apron, she pays that cost every shift, forever, for a cause she never identified. If she pulls the tractor for antenna service, she takes a unit out of an eleven-unit fleet on a hunch. If she reports a suspected emitter to anyone, she is reporting a suspicion with nothing attached to it, and she knows how that reads.

And she will face it again. Whatever happened at Berth 3 was, on the evidence available to her, capable of recurring. The next time it does, her deployment as configured today will hand her the same three tractors, the same clean field, and the same empty question. The cost is not the one morning. The cost is that her fleet's confidence behavior at that corner is now unexplained in a way that compounds, because each new stop is evidence of nothing in particular.

Why the Question Stays Open in Her Deployment

The structural shape of her problem is that the evidence she needs is distributed across sensors that, in her setup, do not testify together.

Her tractors each carry their own perception stack, and each one made its own call. The stop at 6:40 and the stop at 6:49 are, as her system records them, two independent low-confidence events that happen to share coordinates. Nothing in her deployment treats the coincidence itself as evidence. Were her units able to pool departure detections against a shared characterization of what that corner normally looks like, the coincidence would be the finding. As it stands, the coincidence is something she noticed, on a whiteboard, after the fact.

The field classes are also separated for her. Her radio link quality, her lidar returns, and her thermal camera live in three different subsystems with three different owners. A radio amplitude departure and an optical return anomaly occurring in the same volume at the same minute would mean something specific to her if they arrived correlated. In her deployment they arrive, if at all, as three unrelated logs with unaligned timestamps, and she is the correlation engine.

Then there is the part she finds hardest to accept. Her fleet is entirely passive at that corner. When the tractors stopped, they waited. Nothing in her configuration lets a unit ask the field a question whose answer would separate her three hypotheses, and nothing tells it whether asking would be permitted if it could. She has no way to distinguish, in the moment, an absorptive obstruction from an active emitter, because distinguishing them would require emitting something characterized and watching what comes back, under rules she does not currently have.

Finally, her stops leave a record that is terminal rather than reconstructable. Her logs say a unit dropped below confidence and held. They do not carry what the baseline was, what departed from it, by how much, what else was seen at the same time, or what the system considered and ruled out. When she opens the incident three weeks later because it happened again, she is reading an outcome, not a derivation.

How the Disclosed Architecture Treats a Departure

U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/049,409 discloses environmental disruption sensing as an architectural primitive of the governed spatial mesh, directed to detection, classification, attribution, and graduated response to disruptions in sensed environmental fields, independently of the specific field type. In the disclosure, a disruption is any departure of a sensed field from its governance-characterized baseline attributable to a source, the source being adversarial, accidental, environmental, instrumental, or of any governance-policy-defined classification. Chapter 13 describes the primitive as operating across radio-frequency, optical, acoustic, thermal-infrared, magnetic, electric, seismic, barometric, chemical, radiological, and gravitational field classes, and as admitting extension to further field classes through governance-policy-defined detector registration.

In an embodiment, the primitive comprises a baseline-characterization mechanism that establishes a governance-characterized baseline of each sensed field class across governance-policy-defined spatial, temporal, and operational conditions; a departure detector identifying sensed-field departures from that baseline that satisfy governance-policy-defined departure thresholds; and a disruption classifier mapping each detected departure to a governance-policy-defined disruption class. A multi-source corroboration evaluator aggregates departure detections across a plurality of sensing agents to produce corroboration scores per Chapter 4. A source-attribution mechanism localizes or identifies the source through multi-sensor triangulation, signature matching, or another governance-policy-defined attribution technique.

Two further elements bear directly on the kind of ambiguity described above. Section 13.6 discloses a cross-medium composite disruption detection mechanism, in which disruption observations from a plurality of field classes are combined to produce composite disruption determinations that the disclosure describes as not obtainable from an isolated field-class detection alone. The described embodiments include a radio-frequency-and-optical composite signature, in which a coordinated jamming event produces concurrent radio-frequency amplitude departures and optical-lidar return anomalies; a thermal-and-chemical composite signature associated with a combustion event; and other governance-policy-defined composite signatures. The disclosure states that cross-medium composite detection produces elevated confidence relative to isolated single-medium detection through independent corroboration across orthogonal physical channels, each field class being governed by a physically distinct sensing apparatus with distinct failure modes.

Section 13.7 discloses a governed active-probe mechanism, in which a sensing agent emits governance-credentialed probe signals into a sensed field to distinguish between competing cause hypotheses for an observed departure. In an embodiment it comprises a hypothesis-formulation engine, a probe-selection engine that selects a probe signal whose expected responses differ maximally across the candidate hypotheses, a response-collection interface, and a hypothesis-discrimination engine that updates hypothesis probabilities from the observed responses. Probing is conditioned: a probe-admissibility evaluator applies governance-policy-defined rules covering spectrum-licensing compliance, mission-interference evaluation, adversarial-awareness evaluation, power-budget evaluation, consent-governance evaluation, and regulatory compliance. The disclosure states that probes failing admissibility are suppressed and that the suppression is recorded in the probe-lineage record.

Across these elements, a graduated-response generator produces a graduated execution response per Chapter 6 proportional to the classified disruption and its authority, and a disruption-lineage recorder records each detection, classification, attribution, probe, response, and downstream consequence in the governance chain lineage field. Chapter 13 further describes composition with the capability envelope of Chapter 7 through disruption-induced capability derating, and with the training governance primitive of Chapter 12 through disruption-experience skill extraction.

Where the Disclosed Architecture Stops for Her

The disclosure conditions its outcomes, and the conditions matter for a deployment like hers.

Baseline characterization is governance-policy-defined across spatial, temporal, and operational conditions. Her Berth 3 corner would need a characterized baseline covering wet mornings with a powered refrigeration unit in an unusual position before a departure there could be scored against it. Departure thresholds are likewise governance-policy-defined, so what counts as a departure at her apron is a matter she or her governing authority would have to set, not something the architecture settles for her.

Corroboration in the described embodiments depends on there being a plurality of sensing agents to corroborate with, and cross-medium composite determination depends on two or more field classes actually reporting. Were her thermal and optical subsystems not emitting governed observations into the mesh, the composite signature that would separate her hypotheses would have nothing to compose from.

Active probing, in the disclosed embodiments, is not available on demand. If probing that corner would fall outside her spectrum authorization, would interfere with another credentialed operation in the probed volume, or would tell an adversary more than the discrimination is worth, the described admissibility evaluation is what suppresses it, and what she would have afterward is a recorded suppression rather than an answer.

Attribution is also not the same as identification. Localizing a source through triangulation or signature matching, as described, would tell her a good deal more than she has today. It would not by itself tell her who owns the emitter, and nothing in the disclosure represents that it would.

Disclosure Scope

This article is a technical description of subject matter disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/049,409, and specifically of the environmental disruption sensing primitive described in Chapter 13 of that filing, including the baseline-characterization, departure-detection, classification, corroboration, attribution, cross-medium composite detection, governed active-probe, graduated-response, and disruption-lineage elements recited there.

The scenario, the party, the port, and the operational details above are illustrative and are not drawn from the filing. Nothing in this article characterizes the scope of any claim, present or future, in the cited application or in any related application. Nothing here is an admission regarding the state of the art, and no statement about any described embodiment should be read as a limitation on what is claimed.

Environmental Disruption (/environmental-disruption)

All 49 steps → (/inventive-steps)

Cross-medium signatures. Governed active probing. Adversarial-aware sensing.

Provisional application

PRIMARY TECHNICAL DISCLOSURE

SECONDARY TECHNICAL

APPLICATIONS · GENERAL

- Critical Infrastructure Protection: Cross-Medium Environmental Disruption Detection for the Power, Water, and Communications Grid (/articles/environmental-disruption/critical-infrastructure-protection)
- Multi-INT Fusion for Contested Defense ISR: A Multi-Medium Sensing Architecture (/articles/environmental-disruption/defense-isr-environmental)
- Multi-Medium Disaster Monitoring: Cross-Hazard Sensor Fusion for Earthquake, Wildfire, and Flood Early Warning (/articles/environmental-disruption/disaster-monitoring-multi-medium)
- Multi-Source Earthquake Detection and Early Warning Without Trusting Any Single Sensor (/articles/environmental-disruption/earthquake-multi-source-detection)
- Maritime Domain Awareness: Multi-Medium Sensor Fusion With Verifiable Evidence Lineage for Dark-Vessel and IUU-Fishing Enforcement (/articles/environmental-disruption/maritime-domain-awareness)
- Multi-Medium Wildfire Detection: Cross-Modality Sensor Fusion for Early Ignition Alerts (/articles/environmental-disruption/wildfire-detection-multi-medium)
- CISA Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity Compliance: Cross-Modality Detection and CIRCIA Incident Reporting (/articles/environmental-disruption/cisa-eo-13800)
- GNSS Jamming and Spoofing Detection: Architecting FCC and EO 13905 PNT Resilience (/articles/environmental-disruption/fcc-gnss-protection)
- FCC Part 15 Unlicensed RF Compliance: Adversarial-Resistant Sensing for DFS and 6 GHz AFC (/articles/environmental-disruption/fcc-part-15-unlicensed)
- **When the Interference Is Real and Nobody Logged It (/articles/environmental-disruption/environmental-disruption-stakes)**

APPLICATIONS · SPECIFIC

- Anduril Sentry Tower vs Multi-Medium Credentialed Disruption Sensing (/articles/environmental-disruption/anduril-sentry-tower)
- Dedrone Alternative: Governed Multi-Medium Counter-UAS Detection Beyond Single-Vendor Fusion (/articles/environmental-disruption/dedrone-counter-uas)
- HawkEye 360 Alternative: Multi-Medium Credentialed Sensing Beyond RF-Only Geolocation (/articles/environmental-disruption/hawkeye-360-rf)
- Capella Space SAR vs governed multi-medium fusion (/articles/environmental-disruption/capella-sar)
- Maxar Imagery vs Governed Multi-Medium Disruption Sensing (/articles/environmental-disruption/maxar-imagery)
- Planet Labs Imagery vs Multi-Medium Governed Sensing (/articles/environmental-disruption/planet-labs-imaging)

- Slingshot Aerospace vs Governed Multi-Medium Space Sensing (/articles/environmental-disruption/slingshot-aerospace)
- Spire Global vs Governed Multi-Medium Environmental Disruption Sensing (/articles/environmental-disruption/spire-rf-monitoring)
- Cognex Machine Vision vs Governed Multi-Medium Sensing (/articles/environmental-disruption/cognex-machine-vision)
- Keyence Vision Sensors vs Governed Multi-Medium Sensing (/articles/environmental-disruption/keyence-vision-sensors)

HOW-TO GUIDES

- How to Build Wildfire or Earthquake Early Detection From Multiple Sensors (/articles/guides/wildfire-and-earthquake-multi-sensor-detection)
- How to Detect Environmental Threats Using Multiple Sensing Mediums (/articles/guides/detect-threats-with-multi-medium-sensing)
- How to Detect GPS Jamming or Spoofing (/articles/guides/detect-gps-jamming-and-spoofing)

Environmental Disruption overview → (/environmental-disruption)