

1. Scoring equitability

- a. Program Facilitators work to ensure all Services are equitably represented in project scoring. Each focus area may accomplish this requirement differently.
 - For example, within the Energy and Environmental focus groups, each headquarters element may score projects. Unique organizations, laboratories, or Commands may submit one scorecard each. Focus area members are encouraged to determine how they will score projects, when there is more than one member per organization (i.e., select a member to score projects on their behalf or each member contributes to a composite vote for the organization).
- b. The NDCEE Program Management Office (PMO) members remain neutral and do not score projects. However, a non-NDCEE PMO designated USAEC representative may submit a scorecard on behalf of the organization.

2. NDCEE Program Facilitator role

Program Facilitators distribute scorecards to organizations and compile scores and comments in a consolidated spreadsheet. Program Facilitators may advise and share pertinent information with the Technical Advisory Group (TAG); however, they only advise and are not project proponents.

3. Scoring

- a. Scores for each criterion are based on a 1-10 score; 10 is highest.
- b. The Project Selection Committee may weigh scoring criteria, depending on current DoD priorities.

4. Process:

- a. Submissions are due as stated in the Call for Proposals. The selection period is compressed to ensure MIPRs are distributed as soon as program funds are received.
- b. Candidates may submit draft quad charts earlier than the due date and request feedback from the PMO or focus area community prior to their official submission.
- c. The PMO screens submissions for basic eligibility. Additional pre-screening methods may be used, depending on the number and nature of the proposals received, and those methods cannot be determined prior to the initial proposal review phase. These methods help narrow the pool of candidates to those that are the most competitive. Refer to the “How to do Business with NDCEE” guide for more information.
- d. Candidates present their quad charts (virtually) to the focus group, for scoring. To address concerns that proprietary information may be included in quad charts and white papers, these documents are provided to only the focus area’s government members and the presentation calls are government only. The NDCEE PMO provides focus area scoring results, including individual criteria scores and comments received, to the government focus area members. Scoring member identities will not be shared outside of the PMO.
- e. Advancing candidates have an opportunity to modify their quad charts, based on focus area feedback, prior to the TAG presentations. Candidates must also submit an NDCEE format white paper and MIPR instructions. Incomplete packages will not be accepted.
- f. The NDCEE PMO provides focus area scoring information to the TAG, which includes the Project Selection Committee members. The scoring information includes individual criteria scores and comments received. Scoring member identities will not be shared outside of the PMO.
- g. Project Candidates provide a final quad chart presentation (virtually) to the TAG.



- h. The PMO provides the 1-N list rankings and the projects' raw and consolidated scores, to the Project Selection Committee.
- i. The Project Selection Committee convenes to develop a consensus on the final recommended projects, ranked 1-N, based on anticipated funding for the upcoming year.
- j. The NDCEE Lead Agent approves the projects.

NDCEE uses a streamlined scoring system, which allows each scorer the latitude to interpret criteria, based on their unique perspectives. However, the following information is provided for consideration.

1. Mission/Readiness

- How does the transition product impact or enable the readiness of the Services?
- Does it impact or influence the readiness of Soldiers/Sailors/Airmen/Marines?
- Is there a positive impact to Installations?

Score	1	5	10
Description	Does not impact readiness or enhance mission	Has minor impact on mission and readiness	Has significant positive impacts to mission and readiness
Example	Project dem/vals a new plastic recycling process in which there is no military application	Project dem/vals a recyclable firing range backstop material, which improves longevity and reduces adverse impacts to training	Project dem/vals a wastewater reuse process that reduces freshwater transportation needs in a contingency environment – decreases convoy exposure to targeting

2. Technical Quality / Technically Feasible

- Does a valid user need exist? Note that a regulatory requirement alone does not indicate a valid user requirement exists.
- Does the intended transition product address an existing or foreseeable multi-Service or DoD problem?
- If the product is Commercial-off-the-Shelf, is the demonstration/validation unique to DoD needs?
- Is the technical approach sound?
- Are the project’s costs reflective of the work to be done?

Score	1	5	10
Description	There is no valid user requirement that indicates a systemic need, and the technical approach lacks a clear path to a successful outcome	Has a valid user requirement, but there is no evidence of a systemic need for the technology. The technical approach is sound but has a substantial risk of success.	Has strong support from authoritative sources across the DoD community. The technical approach is sound and there is a high potential for successful outcome and transition.
Example	Project references only the Clean Air Act (CAA) as the user requirement	Project references the CAA as the underlying requirement but addresses the need for only one installation. Prior tests were unsuccessful, but the new approach is vastly different from anything previously done.	Project improves the way that the Services monitor and report CAA requirements and has substantial written support from authoritative sources at the Headquarters level. Prior tests show significant promise, and the proposed approach builds on that information.

3. Transition Potential / End User Adoption

- Is there a valid Transition Partner? A transition partner signature is required at the two-star General Officer (or equivalent) level (per Army policy, dated 27 July 2021).
- Does the technology minimize user error potential or implementation difficulties?

Score	1	5	10
Description	There is no transition partner.	There is support for the project, but there is no evidence of a systemic need for the technology. Transition partner is not at the level required for systemic implementation following successful transition, or they are not able to commit to transition support.	The transition partner(s) is able to take the dem/val results and integrate them into broad-reaching programs and processes.
Example	Project states a user need, but there is no stated transition partner and there is no supporting evidence that there is one.	Project states 3 installation-level POCs as the transition partners. None of the POCs are able to implement systemic changes to current programs and processes across their Service.	Project provides strong endorsement from a Program Executive Office, Product Manager, or other authoritative source. The transition partner is able to integrate the technology into systemic programs or processes that have broad impact across a Service.

4. Modernization / Innovation

- Is the project proactive and forward looking to meet mission needs on the horizon?
- Does the project replace a current process/product with an innovative solution that is more effective, efficient, and/or resilient?

Score	1	5	10
Description	The project is not innovative and is not a significant improvement over the current state.	The project provides an improvement over short term needs but fails to provide long term results.	Has strong support from authoritative sources across the DoD community. The technical approach is sound and there is a high potential for successful outcome and transition.
Example	The project offers a soil erosion control material that is similar to those currently in use.	Project offers a soil erosion control material that is similar to those in use, but the application is unique, and it provides additional benefits not currently available in existing products.	Project offers a soil erosion control material that is not currently used in commercial or military applications. The approach anticipates additional resiliency needed for military applications anticipated in the future.