

Distribution A



CLEARED
For Open Publication

May 05, 2022

Department of Defense
OFFICE OF PREPUBLICATION AND SECURITY REVIEW



Operational Energy Capability Improvement Fund (OECIF) and Operational Energy Prototyping Fund (OEPF) Fiscal Year 2023 Call for Proposals and Project Selection Evaluation Plan

APPROVED: 29 April 2022

RuthAnne Darling
Director of Operational Energy - Innovation (OE-I)

Distribution Statement A: Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited.

Distribution A

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction 3
- II. Background..... 3
- III. Roles and Responsibilities..... 3
- IV. Call for Proposals 5
- V. Proposal Process 6
- VI. Proposal Scoring 7
- VII. Future Guidance 9
- Appendix 1 FY2023 Operational Energy Capability Improvement Fund (OECIF) and Operational Energy Prototyping Fund (OEPF) Proposal Formats 10
- Appendix 2 FY2023 OECIF and OEPF Quad Chart Format 12

I. Introduction

A. This plan establishes and assigns roles/responsibilities, timelines, and procedures for executing the Operational Energy Capability Improvement Fund (OECIF) and the Operational Energy Prototyping Fund (OEPF) call, proposal evaluations, and selections for FY2023.

B. These are Program Elements 0604055D8Z and 0604555D8Z respectively.

II. Background

A. OECIF and OEPF serve to fund energy innovation and improve military force operational effectiveness through targeted investments. These investments focus on improving the operational energy (OE) performance of our military forces in two primary ways:

1. Developing, demonstrating, and rapidly transitioning operational energy technologies, processes, or standards within the force for improving military OE capabilities, reducing costs, and decreasing carbon emissions.
2. Establishing sustainable institutional capacities that will continue researching, developing, training, educating, and adopting OE innovations.

B. The OECIF and OEPF programs provide “seed money” for consolidating or initiating promising OE projects for transitioning by the Joint Forces, Combatant Commands (CCMDs), Department of Defense (DOD) Agencies, and/or the Services. Congress funded OECIF in FY2012 in the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) and mandated OEPF in the FY2021 NDAA.

C. The OE-I staff studied OE policy requirements, identified OE gaps, and aggregated warfighter requirements. OE-I coordinated with the Services and CCMDs, through the POM 23 issue paper process to establish technical directions. Using this data, the annual themes, requirements, processes, direction, reporting, policy, and guidance for the solicitation call were developed.

III. Roles and Responsibilities

A. The OECIF and OEPF programs include four stakeholder groups representing the OE users and technology community.

1. Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment (OUSD A&S), Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Environment & Energy Resilience (DASD(E&ER)).
2. Director, Operational Energy-Innovation (OE-I) and team.
3. Community Leaders including Service Energy Offices, CCMDs, DLA-Energy, E&P COI leaders, R&E organizations, and DIU.

4. Proposal Evaluation Board (PEB) and subject matter/advisory experts.
- B. Collectively these groups ensure that projects recommended and selected for funding are justified by valid DOD requirements, and are scientifically and technologically sound.
1. DASD(E&ER). The DASD(E&ER) or appointee shall:
 - a) Provide policy and/or guidance for administering the OECIF and OEPF programs.
 - b) Approve the annual requests for proposals to be distributed to the Service Deputy Assistant Secretaries for Operational Energy (or the Service's equivalent), the Defense Logistics Agency-Energy, and the CCMDs.
 - c) Review annual 1-N ranking of proposals ahead of initial and final announcement.
 - d) Provide Congressional accountability for PE 0604055D8Z Operational Energy Capability Improvement Fund and for PE 0604555D8Z Operational Energy Prototyping Fund.
 2. Director, (OE-I). The Director, OE-I shall serve as the selection official with responsibility to:
 - a) Ensure that proper procedures and safeguards are in place to protect the integrity of the selection process including the proper and efficient conduct of pre-proposal evaluation.
 - b) Manage the full proposal evaluation including peer review and award selection.
 - c) Oversee the distribution of funding for government labs, federally funded research and development centers (FFRDCs), and contracts or cooperative agreements with industry and academia.
 - d) Seek guidance from the Office of the DASD(E&ER) on the proposed priorities.
 - e) Approve the solicitation, selection, and evaluation plan.
 - f) Nominate members of the annual proposal evaluation board (PEB).
 - g) Chair the PEB.
 - h) Review the PEB's evaluation of the proposals including recommendations for priorities, down-selection, and selection decisions.
 - i) Review proposed and final 1-N rankings with the DASD(E&ER) and those members of the CCMD Science and Technology (S&T) Advisors, DLA-Energy, and Service Operational Energy Offices that optionally choose to attend.
 - j) Approve a funding priority list based on feedback from the PEB, Services, and CCMDs.
 3. CCMD Science and Technology (S&T) Advisors, DLA-Energy, and Service Operational Energy Offices. The CCMD advisors, DLA-Energy, and Service OE directors are proposal selection process owners and participants. They shall:

- a) Provide feedback and recommendations for the annual OECIF & OEPF theme and call for proposals.
 - b) Recommend and provide guidance for capturing the OE requirements and integrated priority lists into the solicitation process.
 - c) Manage their internal process for reviewing and submitting prioritized proposals in response to the OECIF & OEPF call for proposals. This includes prioritization of proposals and recommendations / advocacy for funding.
 - (1) Services: Provide a “1-N” ranking of all proposals nominated from that Service to the PEB. Optional: Advocate for other’s proposals with “yes/no” for funding. Yes/No support goes towards Jointness evaluation.
 - (2) CCMDs and DLA-Energy: Provide a “1-N” ranking and / or advocate “yes/no” for funding any or all projects.
 - (3) Provide a 1-5 assessment for each assigned proposal. 5- exceptional support; 4-outstanding support; 3-supported; 2 – minimal support; and 1 – no support.
 - d) Participate as non-voting members in the PEB sessions and support requests for OECIF & OEPF related information. Optionally, provide a 30-minute strategic briefing to the PEB ahead of their organization’s proposal review.
 - e) Optionally, attend presentation of PEB recommendations from the Director OE-I to the DASD E&ER or their representative as defined in III.B.1.c above.
 - f) Optionally, review and provide comments/reclamas on final project ranking and funding to the selection official.
 - g) Other community leaders such as the E&P COI and DIU may help to shape the calls, make recommendations to the Director, OE-I and PEB, serve on the PEB if nominated, and execute projects if awarded.
4. OECIF & OEPF PEB. The PEB shall:
- a) Serve as the official proposal review body for collecting, sorting, evaluating, and ranking proposals for final rankings/recommendations.
 - b) Be nominated by the Director, OE-I who ensures the PEB has the required expertise to evaluate proposals.
 - c) Be composed of at least seven (7) members. Four (4) members will be from the Office of the DASD(E&ER) including the Director, OE-I (Chairperson). Three (3) or more members will be subject matter experts (SMEs) with specific project technical knowledge, OE experience, and/or understanding of OECIF and/or OEPF themes (OEPF will not have an annual theme). The SMEs may be from the government, academia, or “not-for profit” organizations including FFRDCs.

IV. Call for Proposals

A. FY2023 proposals for OECIF and OEPF shall be relevant to the following DOD S&T operational energy strategy areas:

1. *Powering the Force*: Projects that best provide OE to combat forces with an emphasis on 1) the deployment of more mobile and distributed operations systems, 2) reduced and more agile logistics, and 3) reduced risk especially within contested environments.
2. *Electrifying the Battlespace*: Projects that 1) enable the electrification of weapons, platforms, unmanned systems, and soldiers to field new weapons, sensing, active defense, and other technologies, 2) advance power and thermal management technologies to meet the growing demands of high-power systems, and 3) pursue potential game-changing technology that may drastically reduce energy resupply risks, costs, and signatures to enable persistent unmanned system and unattended sensors.
3. *Commanding Energy*: Projects that 1) enhance OE command and control, 2) better capture and understand energy usage profiles, and 3) support OE education to transform Joint Force energy management and control from reactive to predictive.

B. Within the DOD S&T operational energy strategy areas, OE-I solicits FY2023 proposals for OECIF under the following topics:

1. *6.3, Advanced Technology Development Relevant, Aviation and Space Efficiencies*
 - a) Aviation efficiencies could include but are not limited to manned and or unmanned: aviation powerplants (i.e., electrification, hybridization, etc.), aerodynamics, flight software planning tools, inflight algorithms, and capabilities that improve efficiency, lower energy consumption and/or reduce harm to the environment. Analytic, Modeling& Simulation, War Gaming, and Training and Education opportunities are also on-topic.
 - b) Developing space
 - (1) Space access (platform launch and orbital transfer).
 - (2) Platform maneuver and station keeping/resupply.
 - (3) Platform operation capabilities that improve energy efficiency, lower energy consumption, and/or reduce harm to the environment.
2. *Contested Logistics*.
 - a) A Contested Logistics Environment is defined in the FY22 NDAA. It “means an environment in which the armed forces engage in conflict with an adversary that presents challenges in all domains and directly targets logistics operations, facilities, and activities in the United States, abroad, or in transit from one location to the other.”
 - b) The contested logistics topic includes but is not limited to:
 - (1) Mitigating contested logistics challenges through the reduction of OE demand within each military Service.

- (2) Developing innovative delivery systems, distributed storage, flexible contracting, and improved automation.
- (3) Burn-pit elimination and Arctic solutions.
- (4) Conducting studies to increase lethality, extend range and extend time-on-station for tactical assets.

3. *Vehicle Electrification and Hybridization.*

- a) For hybrid vehicles, industry trends highlight transitioning from the production of internal combustion engines to the development and production of alternative propulsion systems to improve climate impacts, energy use/costs, and sustainability.
 - b) Relevant technology includes but is not limited to:
 - (1) Charging / Re-charging technologies.
 - (2) Vehicle-to-vehicle and vehicle-to-grid solutions.
 - (3) electric, hydrogen, or other sustainable fuel technology to reduce OE-demand in the near- and/or long-term or provide another asymmetric warfighting advantage.
4. OECIF will accept three types of proposals: 1) multi-year traditional project proposals, 2) one-year surge project proposals, and 3) one-year studies. The details of the proposal types and funding amounts are outlined later in this call-for-proposals.

C. Within the DOD S&T operational energy strategy areas, OE-I solicits FY2023 proposals for demonstration and prototyping under the OEPF program. The OEPF call is open to any “first-of-a-kind system” with OE-impact that is ready to transition, but is either not yet a Service/CCMD program of record or does not have bridge funding to its program of record. OEPF proposals must have a transition partner who states they have or are attempting to submit for FY24 or FY25 POM funding. OEPF projects no longer need to come from OECIF successes. OEPF will accept surge project proposals only needing one-year of funding. The details of the proposal types and funding amounts are outlined later in this call-for-proposals.

D. The Services, CCMDs, or other DOD components shall manage all proposed projects with oversight by OE-I and the OECIF & OEPF portfolio leads (PLs).

E. Proposals must originate from the Services, CCMDs, or DOD components, however, collaboration with industry and academia is encouraged.

F. Proposals are to be uploaded electronically to the Operational Energy Management System (OEMS) web site: <https://www.oecif.org> by the Principal Investigator (PI).

V. Proposal Process. The proposal process includes the following schedule:

A. *Round 1—Aviation and Space Efficiencies.*

1. Proposers submit a maximum 6-page (Times Roman 12-point font) whitepaper describing the project candidate using the template format provided (Appendix 1, FY 2023 OECIF Proposal Format).
2. Proposers submit an accompanying quad-chart describing the proposed candidate project using the template format provided (Appendix 2, FY 2023 OECIF Quad Charts).
3. Proposals (V.A.1 and V.A.2 above) are due to Services, CCMDs, and/or DLA-Energy by 1700 Eastern on 1 August 2022.
4. Each of these components will run their internal review process and submit their 1-N ranking and 1-5 Proposal Assessment input into OEMS by 1700 Eastern on 1 September 2022.
5. The PEB reviewers will evaluate proposals using OE improvement and scoring criteria.

B. *Round 2—Contested Logistics.*


1. Proposers submit a maximum 6-page (Times Roman 12-point font) whitepaper describing the project candidate using the template format provided (Appendix 1, FY 2023 OECIF/OEPF Proposal Format).
2. Proposers submit an accompanying quad-chart describing the proposed candidate project using the template format provided (Appendix 2, FY 2023 OECIF/OEPF Quad Charts).
3. Proposals (V.A.1 and V.A.2 above) are due to Services, CCMDs, and/or DLA-Energy by 1700 Eastern on 4 November 2022.
4. Each of these components will run their internal review process and submit their 1-N ranking and 1-5 Proposal Assessment input into OEMS by 1700 Eastern on 1 December 2022.
5. The PEB reviewers will evaluate proposals using OE improvement and scoring criteria.

C. *Round 3—Ground Vehicle Electrification and Hybridization.*

1. Proposers submit a maximum 6-page (Times Roman 12-point font) whitepaper describing the project candidate using the template format provided (Appendix 1, FY 2023 OECIF Proposal Format).
2. Proposers submit an accompanying quad-chart describing the proposed candidate project using the template format provided (Appendix 2, FY 2023 OECIF Quad Charts).
3. Proposals (V.A.1 and V.A.2 above) are due to either the Services, combatant commands, or DLA-Energy **and Defense Innovation Unit** on 6 February 2023

4. Each of these components **and DIU** will run their internal review process and submit their 1-N ranking and 1-5 Proposal Assessment input into OEMS by 1700 Eastern on 9 March 2023.
5. The PEB reviewers will evaluate proposals using OE improvement and scoring criteria.

D. Project proposals that have applicability in 1 or more OECIF calls may be submitted / resubmitted to each applicable call.



Figure—Round 1 OECIF Project Assessment (Aviation Efficiencies)




Figure 1—Round 2 OECIF Project Assessment (Contested Logistics) & OEPF (all topics)




Figure 2—Round 3 OECIF Project Assessment (Ground Vehicle Electrification and Hybridization with DIU)

VI. Proposal Scoring

- A. The proposals are evaluated against six factors with different weightings for OECIF/OEPF: sponsor assessment (10%); improved operational energy effectiveness / climate

impact (30%/20%); project plan/joint-ness (15%); personnel/team caliber (15%); commitment to analysis, demonstration and warfighter feedback, war-games, and transition (15%/25%); and cost (15%).

1. Sponsor (CCMD Science and Technology (S&T) Advisors, DLA-Energy, and Service Operational Energy Offices) Assessment. The proposal sponsor should note their support to their aligned proposals as follows: 5 – exceptional; 4 – outstanding; 3 – supported; 2 – minimal support; 1 – no support. Sponsors not providing a 1-5 rating will result in proposals being solely evaluated on factors 2-6 below. The additional 10% will be accounted for in improved operational energy effectiveness / climate impact (40%) for OECIF proposals and commitment to analysis, demonstration and warfighter feedback, war-games, and transition (35%) for OEPF proposals.
2. Improve Operational Energy Effectiveness / Climate Impact. *The military benefit of the proposed project.* The extent to which the proposed project improves military OE capabilities and/or reduces the burdens and risks from DOD’s energy supply lines. Efforts shall consider DOD’s impact on climate change and strategic sustainability for the developed technology. Well-supported, quantified operational and climate analysis will score better.
3. Project Plan / Jointness. *The quality and “joint-ness” of the proposed technical and managerial approach.* The goals, approaches, schedules, and processes of the proposed project should be clearly identified, logical, and demonstrate a clear understanding of the path forward. There should be a clear connection between the improved performance/capabilities sought, the technical goals, and project approach. joint / multi-service projects will score better. Test data to support acquisition, requirements, and war-gaming shall be collected.
4. Personnel / Team Caliber. *The quality of the project team.* This includes qualifications, expertise, and demonstrated accomplishments in work relevant to the proposed project. Each team shall include a data analytics/modeling and simulation expert. Teams with student/intern contributions will score better.
5. Commitment to Analysis, Demonstration and Warfighter feedback, Wargames and Transition. *Team conducts analysis, plans for demonstrations and war-games (as appropriate) and transitions.* Non-study proposals should have at least one demonstration annually. At least one transition partner must be active throughout the life of the proposal. A memorandum of understanding or other formal partnerships between research and acquisition/in-service/fielding organizations are beneficial (required for OEPF). Proposed projects that incorporate warfighter feedback and provide data for requirements, acquisition, war-games, and other transition data/analytics will score better. Study proposals that directly link results to strategy, policy, and/or requirements/acquisition strategies will score better.
6. Cost. *The reasonableness of the cost for the proposed program/study.* Communicating project fiscal discipline, realistic resource requirements, and sound financial planning will improve scores. Projects that provide equal or greater matching

funding will score better. Projects that provide a detailed and realistic cost analysis will score better.

B. Proposal Evaluation.

1. CCMD Science and Technology (S&T) Advisors, DLA-Energy, and Service Operational Energy Offices (and DIU) Review. For Each OECIF topic and OEPF Round of Project Assessments:

- a) The Service (and DIU for the Ground Vehicle Electrification and Hybridization topic) will conduct their own evaluation and provide a “1-N” ranking of all proposals nominated to them for the PEB.
- b) The Service Operational Energy Offices may optionally rank any or all other Services/CCMD/DLA-Energy/DIU projects
 - (1) Integrated in their “1-N” in ranking (no Sponsor Assessment) or
 - (2) With “yes/no” advocacy for funding.
- c) CCMDs and DLA-Energy may optionally provide a more limited ranking. This includes any portion of a “1-N” ranking, the 1-5 Project Assessment for projects assigned to them, and/or “yes/no” for funding any or all projects.
- d) If the lead sponsor does not provide a Project Assessment, then no Project Assessment rating will not be considered. The project will get rated solely on the PEB assessment (as outlined in VI.A.2-6 criteria above).

2. PEB Review.

- a) All proposals are reviewed by the PEB within the Operational Energy Management System (OEMS).
- b) The PEB will meet in person at a designated conference room in the Mark Center or Pentagon. Services, CCMDs, DLA-Energy, and the E&P COI Leadership may participate as non-voting members in the PEB (in-person or VTC) and support PEB requests for related information. The selection official may approve PEB individuals with extenuating circumstances to attend via VTC. In the event of increased COVID restrictions, the selection official may move the entire board to VTC.
- c) The PEB reviews and ranks all the proposals based on the six criteria outlined in *Section VI.A*. Each PEB member will additionally assess whether the proposal responds to an OE requirement and if the proposal should be considered for funding.

3. The PEB will review the proposals based on a six (6) page single-sided maximum proposal technical paper (if required) and a briefing.

4. **Invited proposers will brief the PEB and answer questions at the PEB conference either in-person or via VTC/phone/TEAMS.**

5. PEB reviewer comments and scores will be entered in the OEMS for criteria VI.A.2-6 based on the expanded proposal. Proposal reviews will be grouped by type (multi-year – not to exceed \$2M/year for not more than 3 years, surge – not to exceed \$4M for 1 year, or study – not to exceed \$1M for 1 year) and program (OECIF or OEPF).

The selection official, based on the PEB scores and discussion, will create a consolidated 1-to-N priority list of proposals for each program.

6. The CCMD Science and Technology (S&T) Advisors, DLA-Energy, Service Operational Energy Offices, and DIU (or their delegate) will have an opportunity to brief strategic context and priorities to the PEB before the board deliberates, if desired.

C. DASD(E&ER) Awareness Briefing.

1. The selection official shall post the date, send invitations, and brief the DASD(E&ER) (or DASD appointed official) on the review, the selection process, and results of the FY2023 call for proposals.

2. Per DASD(E&ER) direction, different options may be presented.

3. The DASD may expand the Awareness Brief audience to include leadership from CCMD Science and Technology (S&T) Advisors, DLA-Energy, Service Operational Energy Offices, and DIU so everyone is briefed simultaneously. The reclama clock will start after this brief.

4. If not invited or not able to make the awareness briefing, the CCMD Science and Technology (S&T) Advisors, DLA-Energy, and Service Operational Energy Offices and DIU may request a brief from the Selection Official.

5. Subsequent to this briefing, the final 1-to-N ranking of proposals will be disseminated to CCMD Science and Technology (S&T) Advisors, DLA-Energy, and Service Operational Energy Offices, and DIU offices.

D. CCMD Science and Technology (S&T) Advisors, DLA-Energy, Service Operational Energy Offices, and DIU Review Reclama.

1. Organizational leads (or their delegate) may submit a reclama by the dates highlighted in Figure 1, 2, and 3 documenting their concerns with the 1-to-N list and recommending specific changes. A justification must be provided for all suggested changes.

2. The selection official will present any reclama to the DASD (E&ER) (or DASD appointed official) for consideration and propose a recommended path forward.

E. Final Selection.

1. The selection official shall announce the final ranking with consideration for expected/actual funding and the Service/CCMD reclama input.

2. Once funding is appropriated, the selection official will announce final project funding to the Services, CCMDs, DLA-Energy, DIU, and Project Investigators.

3. If there is a change to funding, or ability to accept or execute funding, then the next project(s) on the 1-N list will receive the non-usable funding. Exceptions will be made for Congressional Add(s)/Direction.

VII. Future Guidance

- A. Call for Proposal guidance will be updated and reviewed annually to ensure the most effective partnerships and collaboration opportunities to develop and field technologies for the future.
- B. Beginning in February 2022, Service energy offices, CCMDs, DLA-Energy, DIU, and the E&P COI had the opportunity to review and provide comment on this annual guidance prior to its publication.
- C. This guidance was reviewed and adjudicated in April 2022.

Appendix 1



FY 2023 OEICIF Proposal



Project Title (& Acronym if applicable)

Type of Request (Surge, Study, or Multi-year proposal)

POC(s): include PI and Alternative PI with email and phone

MILITARY PROBLEM: Describe the military problem, gap, and/or modernization priority that the project will address and its relevance to the topic call.

TECHNICAL OPPORTUNITY: Describe the emerging technology that the project will mature and its operational impact.

TECHNICAL APPROACH: Describe the technical approach to advance the technology, including key milestones, go/no-go criteria, and demonstrations.

ANALYTICAL APPROACH: Describe warfighter input, data collection, and analytical products to be generated and those already available. Climate impact must be estimated. Focus on Requirements, Acquisition, Demonstration and Warfighter feedback, War-game, and Transition information to be provided across the Operational Energy community.

GOAL AND END STATE: Describe the improved capabilities the project will deliver (include quantitative comparisons to existing technology used today).

PARTICIPANTS: Include lead Service/Combatant Command and partners (government, industry, academic) as well as expected transition partners. Describe use of students / interns.

FUNDING REQUESTED: FY23: \$XXM; FY24: \$XXM; FY25: \$XXM PI should be prepared to submit detailed bottoms up costing.

Instructions:

- *Limit information to 6 pages (single-sided, Times Roman 12 Font).*
- *In the header, only color in the one strategy area box that the proposal primarily addresses (with the understanding that more than one focus area might be addressed). Include the appropriate Distribution level in the header.*
- *Use the correct template for OEICIF or OEPF.*
- *Transition letters must be signed by GS-15/ O-6 or above.*
- *If not proposing an industry solution/partnership, then contact DIU ahead of proposal submission to confirm that there is not an available commercial solution*



FY 2023 OEPP Proposal



Project Title (& Acronym if applicable)

POC(s): include PI and Alternative PI with email and phone

MILITARY PROBLEM: Describe the military problem, gap, and/or modernization priority that the project will address.

TECHNICAL OPPORTUNITY: Describe the emerging technology that the project will mature and its operational impact.

TECHNICAL APPROACH: Describe the technical approach to advance the technology, including key milestones, go/no-go criteria, and demonstrations.

ANALYTICAL APPROACH: Describe warfighter input, data collection, and analytical products to be generated and those already available. Climate impact must be estimated. Focus on Requirements, Acquisition, Demonstration and Warfighter feedback, War-game, and Transition information to be provided across the Operational Energy community. **OEPP projects are test, demonstration and prototyping efforts, not technology development. This should be the strongest section of the proposal.**

GOAL AND END STATE: Describe the improved capabilities the project will deliver (include quantitative comparisons to existing technology used today).


PARTICIPANTS: Include lead Service/Combatant Command and partners (government, industry, academic) as well as expected transition partners. Describe use of students / interns.

FUNDING REQUESTED: FY2023: \$XXM PI should be prepared to submit detailed bottoms up costing.

Instructions:


- *Limit information to 6 pages (single-sided, Times Roman 12 Font).*
- *Include the appropriate Distribution level in the header.*
- *Transition letters must be signed by GS-15/ O-6 or above.*
- *Use the correct template for OECIF or OEPP.*
- *If not proposing an industry solution/partnership, then contact DIU ahead of proposal submission to confirm that there is not an available commercial solution*

Appendix 2 OECIF and OEPF Quad Charts



CUI/CTI (when filled in)

OECIF Project Title (& Acronym if applicable)



Date: YYYY.M.DD

Acquisition and Sustainment

Insert picture here
of your technology
and how it will be
utilized

Technology / Product / Objective:

Technology:

- Component 1: Description
- Component 2: Description
- Integration information

Product:

- Description of final system/component/product

Objectives:

- Overall Goal

The So What:

Describe the impact your project will have on lethality, survivability, and readiness with an emphasis on enhanced capabilities and DoD modernization priorities
(Examples: Silent Mobility - ...
Extended Range - ...
Exportable Power - ...)

"Bumper Sticker" Takeaway Summarizing Benefits/Goals/Objectives of Technology

Key Participants:

- Project Lead Agency: Service office
- Govt Contributors: Other Service offices, DOE, NASA, etc.
- Transition Partners:
 - PMPEO
 - CCMD
- Commercial Partners: Company 1, Company 2
- Type of Project: Surge, Study, Multi-year

Key Deliverables:

- Deliverable #1
- Deliverable #2
- Deliverable #3
- Deliverable #4

■ Aviation Efficiencies
■ Contested Logistics
■ Ground Vehicle Electrification and Hybridization with DIU

Funding (\$M)	FY 23	FY 24	FY 25	Total
OECIF	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx
Army – Office 1	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx
Navy – Office 2	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx	x.xx

*Out year funding is contingent on the availability of funds within the year of execution; not available for surge or study projects


Milestones/Demonstrations Leading to Fielded Capability:

- Milestone #1: Q2 FY23
- Demonstration #1: Q3 FY23
- Milestone #2: Q3 FY24
- Demonstration #2: Q4 FY24

PL POC: Name, Email, Phone Number


← Select primary focus area and delete non-selected

CUI/CTI – Distribution Statement (when filled in)



CUI/CTI (when filled in)

OEPF Project Title (& Acronym if applicable)



Date: YYYY.M.DD

Acquisition and Sustainment

Insert picture here
of your technology
and how it will be
utilized

Technology / Product / Objective:

Technology:

- Component 1: Description
- Component 2: Description
- Integration information

Product:

- Description of final system/component/product

Objectives:

- Overall Goal

The So What:

Describe the impact your project will have on lethality, survivability, and readiness with an emphasis on enhanced capabilities and DoD modernization priorities
(Examples: Silent Mobility - ...
Extended Range - ...
Exportable Power - ...)

"Bumper Sticker" Takeaway Summarizing Benefits/Goals/Objectives of Technology

Key Participants:

- Project Lead Agency: Service office
- Govt Contributors: Other Service offices, DOE, NASA, etc.
- Transition Partners:
 - PMPEO
 - CCMD
- Commercial Partners: Company 1, Company 2
- Type of Project: Surge

Key Deliverables:

- Deliverable #1
- Deliverable #2
- Deliverable #3
- Deliverable #4

Funding (\$M)	FY 23	Total
OECIF	x.xx	x.xx
Army – Office 1	x.xx	x.xx
Navy – Office 2	x.xx	x.xx

Milestones/Demonstrations Leading to Fielded Capability:

- Milestone #1: Q2 FY23
- Demonstration #1: Q3 FY23
- Milestone #2: Q3 FY24
- Demonstration #2: Q4 FY24

PL POC: Name, Email, Phone Number

CUI/CTI – Distribution Statement (when filled in)