



OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3400 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3400



7 June 2023

CLEARED
For Open Publication

Jun 08, 2023

ENERGY, INSTALLATIONS,
AND ENVIRONMENT

Department of Defense
OFFICE OF PREPUBLICATION AND SECURITY REVIEW

FY24 OE-I Proposal Scoring Criteria

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%).

Factor 1: Sponsor (CCMD Science and Technology (S&T) Advisors, DLA-Energy, and Service Operational Energy Offices) Assessment

The level of support from the proposal sponsoring organization. Proposal sponsor should note their support to their aligned proposals as follows (other Proposal Evaluation Board members do NOT score for this element): 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 other factors.

- 5 points – Exceptional alignment with sponsor priorities.
- 4 points – Outstanding alignment with sponsor priorities.
- 3 points – Proposal is supported, aligns with sponsor priorities.
- 2 points – Minimal support, some alignment with sponsor priorities.
- 1 point – No support, does not align with sponsor priorities.

Factor 2: Improved Operational Energy Effectiveness / Climate Impact

The military benefit of the proposed project. The extent to which the proposed project improves military Operational Energy (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 analyses will score better, as will alignment with published OE needs/gaps.

- 5 points – Technology meets multiple OE needs/gaps, compellingly improved OE capability/effectiveness, fully developed climate analysis and sustainability analytics.
- 4 points – Technology aligns to a few OE needs/gaps, significantly improved OE capability/effectiveness, climate analysis presented and sustainability analytics proposed.
- 3 points – Technology expressly aligns to an OE need/gap, improved OE capability/effectiveness, climate analysis attempted and sustainability analytics proposed.

- 2 points – Technology potentially aligns to an OE need/gap, somewhat improved OE capability/effectiveness, climate analysis not attempted and/or sustainability analytics not proposed.
- 1 point – Technology does not align to an OE need/gap, or OE capability/effectiveness not valued, or climate analysis not attempted and/or sustainability analytics not proposed.

Factor 3: Project Plan/Joint-ness

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 (see Factor 5).

- 5 points – Comprehensive, logical project goals, milestones, and a clear end state vision; meaningful / OE-relevant technology development; substantive participation from a least four Services/Combatant Commands (CCMDs).
- 4 points – In-depth, logical project goals, milestones, and a communicated end state vision; unique OE-relevant technology development; substantive participation from at least three Services/CCMDs.
- 3 points – Satisfactory project goals, milestones, or an end state vision; novel OE-relevant technology development; participation from multiple Services or CCMDs.
- 2 points – Weak project goal or end state vision, missing milestones; potentially OE-relevant technology development; participation from at least one Service or CCMD.
- 1 point – Unacceptable project plan, no milestones, no Service or CCMD participation.

Factor 4: Personnel/Team

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 points – Team has extremely qualified and well-matched skills/experience for project goals and includes experienced modeling/sim staff and interns.
- 4 points – Team has appropriately qualified and well-matched skills/experience for project goals and includes modeling/sim staff and interns.
- 3 points – Team has some qualified staff with skills/experience for project goals and includes some modeling/sim staff and interns.
- 2 points – Team composition is missing fundamental skill sets, modeling/sim staff, or interns.

- 1 point – Lacks discernable discussion of team structure/skill sets needed to be successful or proposed team is otherwise not viable.

Factor 5: Commitment to Analysis, Demonstration and Warfighter feedback, Wargames and Transition

Team conducts testing, 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 OEPPF). 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.

- 5 points – Exceptional description of transition path, including key milestones and demonstrations, with active transition partner participation and commitment clearly conveyed for fielding and a clear funding path beyond OECIF and OEPPF. Project aligns to transition partner's timeline. Modeling tool and analytics / testing tasks are superior yielding significant input to requirements, acquisition strategies, and war-gaming input. Project conducts multiple warfighter demonstrations annually and plans to incorporate warfighter feedback.
- 4 points – Reasonably well-identified transition path, including key milestones and demonstrations, with desired transition partner participation and commitment conveyed for fielding and a funding path beyond OECIF and OEPPF. Project seeks to align to transition partner's timeline. Modeling tool and analytics / testing tasks are outstanding yielding input to requirements, acquisition strategies, and war-gaming input. Project conducts warfighter demonstrations annually and plans to incorporate warfighter feedback.
- 3 points – Minimal satisfactory description of transition path, with plan to engage desired transition partner beyond OECIF and OEPPF. Modeling tool and analytics / testing tasks yield some input to requirements, acquisition strategies, and war-gaming. Project could conduct warfighter demonstrations annually and plans to incorporate warfighter feedback.
- 2 points – Weak description of transition path. Modeling tool and analytics / testing tasks don't yield some input to requirements, acquisition strategies, and war-gaming. Project could conduct warfighter demonstrations annually or incorporate warfighter feedback.
- 1 point – Unsatisfactory or no demonstration/transition discussion, or unacceptable demonstration approach.

Factor 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.

- 5 points – Cost estimates are transparent, justified, and clearly appropriate for 6.3 funds (OECIF) or 6.4 funds (OEPF); knowledgeable cost management/execution considerations are demonstrated throughout the proposal; greater than 100% matching funding during each execution year.
- 4 points – Cost estimates are understandable, justified, and appropriate for funding type; cost management/execution considerations are proposed; at least matching funding across complete project execution (does not have to show year-for-year excess...matching funding could be all in a single year).
- 3 points – Cost estimates are somewhat reasonable/justified, some cost management/execution considerations are proposed; some matching funding.
- 2 points – Cost estimates are poorly communicated/justified (e.g., just asks for maximum funding); little to no cost management proposed; potential for matching funds.
- 1 point – Cost estimates are absent/unjustified; cost management not described; no matching funds or these claims prove false upon verification.