



# TRANSITIONS

WINTER EDITION · VOLUME 4 · ISSUE 2 · 2007-08



## SBIR Reauthorization Status: An Outline of Congressional-level work to move Reauthorization forward

With SBIR's enabling legislation set to expire on Sept. 30, 2008, many in the SBIR community are looking at 2008 reauthorization scenarios in light of the past 30 months' work from mid-2005 to late 2007. Although the reauthorization path remains uncertain, Congress has heard many pro-SBIR voices during this period, including the prestigious National Research Council of the National Academies. (NRC and RAND Corp. both published strongly supportive studies of SBIR in 2007.)

SBIR debuted in 1982 through PL 97-219, with 1992 and 2000 reauthorizations. Over 25 years, it has enjoyed continuous support from ranking Democrats and Republicans, but 2005-2007 activities on The Hill suggested that many newly-seated members are less familiar with SBIR. During these 30 months, key points on SBIR reauthorization strategy emerged from hearings, interviews and roundtable discussions conducted by Congressional committees and staff:

- The Senate Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee, which originated PL 97-219, bases SBIR reauthorization work on Sec. XIV of the failed S.3778, a 2006 Small Business Administration bill that proposed significant SBIR increases in set-aside and award size, a unique "Phase III" fund to mature SBIR technologies to increase SBIR commercialization, and other program improvements. (Text from S.3778 can be found by visiting [www.google/ig/usgov](http://www.google/ig/usgov) and entering "S.3778".)
- The House Committee on Science and Technology-Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation is interested in the same issues mentioned above, plus small business eligibility rules. However, in the April and June 2007 hearings, the committee expressed concern over the lack of comprehensive SBIR program data and emphasized the importance of more SBIR administrative backbone to support the program. They also support increased SBIR commercialization.
- The House Committee on Small Business held no formal SBIR events during the 30-month target period, but members and staffers have signaled that a key issue for them is small business eligibility restrictions on VC control of SBIR participants.



*View of the U.S. Capitol Rotunda*

- Both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees' members and staffers have shown increasing interest in commercialization-focused SBIR issues during the 30-month target period. This is evidenced by passage of the landmark Commercialization Pilot Program in Sec. 252 of the 2006 National Defense Authorization Act. In 2007, HASC and SASC collaborated on proposed SBIR and CPP improvements in 2008 defense legislation, but candidate language was removed from the final bill text that would have extended SBIR until 2010.

Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.), keynote speaker at the 2007 Navy Opportunity Forum, said in October 2007, "The SBIR program is critical to our national security and our country's competitiveness in a global economy. Technologies developed through the program are helping to keep our troops safe on the battleground, improving our health care and expanding our ability to combat global warming. We need to keep this program strong, avoid any contracting delays or shut-downs and provide more resources to rapidly transition the most promising technologies into weapons systems or on the market quickly."

Yet key small business advocacy groups who work The Hill on SBIR issues—including the Small Business Technology Council, National Defense Industry Association and



*Sen. John Kerry during his speech at the '07 Navy Opportunity Forum*

Defense Technology Small Business Advisors—have pointed in internal publications to the need for more SBIR awardees to discuss the SBIR program in detail with their representatives so that 2008 SBIR reauthorization is a well-informed Congressional discussion.

As the New Year opened, SBIR reauthorization work commenced with two hearings held by the House Small Business Committee, focused on Department of Defense and National Institutes of Health SBIR programs. Issues included, size of awards, increased commercialization, enhanced program administration, and less restrictive eligibility. Committee Chair Nydia Velasquez (D-NY) said a reauthorization bill should be voted on by April 2008.



To locate contact info for individual congressional representatives, visit: [www.usa.gov](http://www.usa.gov)

**TRANSITIONING TECHNOLOGY TO THE FLEET**  
 JUNE 2-4, 2008 // HYATT REGENCY // CRYSTAL CITY, VA

TO REGISTER, CALL MIKE MORGAN AT 985.617.9460  
 OR GO TO [WWW.NAVYOPPORTUNITYFORUM.COM](http://WWW.NAVYOPPORTUNITYFORUM.COM)

The Forum provides an effective way for acquisition officers, R&D managers, prime contractors, 1st and 2nd tier suppliers, and defense personnel to:

- >> Identify technologies that address current and future platform requirements.
- >> Review the status of funded R&D at various TRLs.
- >> Identify new investment opportunities.
- >> Network with well-prepared, savvy small businesses.

SBIR

## CPP

# The Commercialization Pilot Program and the Navy

The Commercialization Pilot Program (CPP) initiative is intended to accelerate and incentivize the transition of SBIR projects into high priority Navy systems. It will accomplish this by providing needed assistance to SBIR firms and key technology stream participants. In some cases, additional SBIR project funds may be available to match original program funds, helping to advance the technology. Success occurs when the SBIR developed technology is inserted into a product or service that meets an identified Navy/DoD need.

This is the second in a series of articles that are designed to acquaint readers with CPP and discuss how it is being implemented within the Navy. The following is a brief recap of what the CPP is and how it was developed, followed by a run-down of CPP-2007.

### What is CPP?

As a part of Section 252 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2006, the Commercialization Pilot Program was authorized and created with the primary purpose to:

- Create a program (the CPP) to improve SBIR transitions from Phase II to Phase III
- Authorize expanded test and evaluation (T&E) activities during SBIR Phase II
- Mandate broad SBIR transition reporting
- Provide administrative support funding for CPP execution

### CPP-2007

Building upon the authorization's core purposes, the Navy's 2006 CPP initiatives, executed in fiscal year FY2007, included the SBIR Accelerated Transition (SAT) program, a "Best Practices" Study and the introduction of SBIR Firm Risk Management/Productibility Assessments. These initiatives, along with the establishment of formal CPP processes and responsibilities within each of the major SYSCOMs, established the Navy as the CPP leader within the DoD in FY2007.

### SAT

In general, the SAT program was a pilot effort designed to test possible implementation models for CPP. The funds for SAT came from a "sweep-up" of a significant amount of unexpended SBIR program funds—as the CPP legislation does not set aside any additional funding for SBIR research.

The process for the SAT was designed as a pilot, intended to determine the value that providing "Super-Sized" Phase II awards could have on transition success (i.e., What if we gated our Phase II contracts and provide significantly more than \$750,000 to those with the strongest transition potential?). Additionally, SAT served as a test of a potential process for selecting CPP candidates.

In 2007, the Navy used the SAT solicitation as a primary means of identifying CPP participants. This solicitation enabled SBIR Phase II firms to apply for additional funding to support transition using a centralized Navy process. The process rigorously screened candidates to establish clear transition milestones and commitments. In most cases, additional program support was secured by the presence of non-SBIR matching funds. In each case, a technology transition plan/agreement was developed to document the strategy for transitioning to acquisition and the associated risks in achieving identified cost, performance, and/or schedule requirements.

The SAT solicitation generated 113 proposals and 35 projects were selected—33 SBIR and 2 STTR. The total value of the approved SAT projects for 2007 is \$77 million, including over \$30 million in matching funds.

### Best Practices

The Best Practices study was completed in late 2007. The study included extensive surveys of SBIR firms, topic authors, Government technical PoCs, acquisition program managers, DoD Prime Contractors and others associated with the Navy's SBIR program. The study identified 112 distinct best practices to be performed at one or more activities which provided measurable program benefit. Contrarily, the study identified 59 roadblocks or barriers which prevented the program from either achieving desired results or doing so in an efficient manner. The study resulted in the following specific recommendations:

### SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY

1. Contracting personnel need to be increased in number, with training improvements and increased SBIR familiarity, to reduce contract action gaps
2. "Transition Impact Elements" (law, policy, management authority, decision-making, capability development, transition management) and "Transition Criteria" (topics, resources, processes, right technology, et al) should be the axis in a transition improvement policy-shaping matrix
3. Acquisition Program Offices need Transition Managers and need to use Technology Transition Agreements (TTA)
4. SBIR transition management needs new metrics and improved project gating
5. SBIR firms need earlier access to system designs re Capability Development
6. TAP (Transition Assistance Program) needs to provide stronger acquisition training

All of these recommendations are currently being worked. Look for new and improved processes that will turn these recommendations into reality.

### Risk Management/Producibility Assessments:

Utilizing the resources available through the Navy's Best Manufacturing Center of Excellence (which can be found at: [www.bmpcoe.org](http://www.bmpcoe.org)) and Dawnbreaker (contractor for the Transition Assistance Program), the Navy is now focusing on the "reliable supplier" argument raised by many DoD

Prime contractors and system integrators. The argument usually goes something like "I can't risk my multi-billion dollar program on the reliability of this small business. I am choosing a more established, less risky supplier."

Most SBIR firms cannot afford to become ISO 9000 certified and cannot become "established" if nobody will give them that first big contract; so, what are they to do? One answer may be in working with Best Manufacturing Practices and/or Dawnbreaker. The Navy, as part of CPP, is funding for risk management and producibility assessments to be performed for certain SBIR firms preparing for transition. These assessments can be used to help develop plans to mitigate business and technical risks, and establish or scale manufacturing lines. Initial results and follow-ups may be used to verify the reliability of a particular company or the risk associated with a particular project.

In the next issue of the Navy *Transitions* newsletter, the CPP-2008 and Navy's CPP website will be discussed.

## CPP POCs



Below is a list of Points of Contact for each participating SYSCOM's Program Manager for the Commercialization Pilot Program:

### Lee Ann Boyer

DON/ONR CPP Program Manager  
(703) 696-4841  
[leeann.boyer@navy.mil](mailto:leeann.boyer@navy.mil)

### Kim Berche

NAVAIR CPP Program Manager  
(301) 757-9538  
[kimberly.berche@navy.mil](mailto:kimberly.berche@navy.mil)

### Michelle Willis

NAVSEA CPP Program Manager  
(202) 781-4182  
[michelle.willis@navy.mil](mailto:michelle.willis@navy.mil)

### Elizabeth Rogers

SPAWAR CPP Program Manager  
(858) 537-0230  
[elizabeth.rogers@navy.mil](mailto:elizabeth.rogers@navy.mil)

### Paul Lambert

MARCOR CPP Program Manager  
(703) 432-3502  
[paul.a.lambert@usmc.mil](mailto:paul.a.lambert@usmc.mil)



## New Faces and Notable Changes in Navy SBIR

Over the past year, there have been several changes in the staffing for the Navy SBIR program. Several long-time members of the team have moved on to new, exciting opportunities and new team members have stepped up to the plate, bringing their skills and perspective to the job.

A big "THANK YOU" goes out to those who have served the Navy SBIR program so well and for so long. They will be missed. Another "THANK YOU" goes to those who have joined the program, keeping the SBIR mission moving forward.

### Navy SBIR Program

John Williams has added some new responsibilities to his schedule. He is now the Director of the Navy SBIR/STTR and Technology Transfer (T2) Programs. Willams can be reached via the following e-mail address: john.williams6@navy.mil.

Steve Sullivan is now the Program Manager for the Navy Transition Assistance Program (TAP) and the STTR Program. He can be reached via the following contact information:

Office of Naval Research  
One Liberty Center  
875 North Randolph Street  
Code 03TSB, Room 261  
Arlington, VA 22203-1995  
(703) 696-7830  
steven.sullivan@navy.mil

### ONR

Tracy Frost is now the Program Manager for the Office of Naval Research, replacing Cathy Nodgaard. Mrs. Frost can be reached via the following contact information:

Office of Naval Research  
One Liberty Center  
875 North Randolph Street  
Code 03TSB, Room W262D  
Arlington, VA 22203-1995  
(703) 696-3196  
tracy.frost@navy.mil

### NAVSEA

Dean Putnam is now the NAVSEA Program Manager, replacing Janet Jaensch. Putnam can be reached via the following contact information:

Naval Sea Systems Command  
Attn: Code 05DR  
1333 Isaac Hull Avenue SE  
Washington Navy Yard, D.C. 20376-2030  
(202) 781-3261  
dean.r.putnam@navy.mil

### SPAWAR

Steve Stewart is the acting SPAWAR Program Manager, replacing Linda Whittington. Mr. Stewart can be reached via the following contact information:

Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command  
Attn: Code 05SBIR  
Building OT-3  
4301 Pacific Hwy  
San Diego, CA 92110-3127  
(619) 553-2546  
steve.stewart@navy.mil

### PEO SUBS

Victor Gavin is now the PEO Submarine Technical Director, replacing Richard McNamara. Mr. Gavin can be reached via the following contact information:

Naval Sea Systems Command  
614 Sicard Street SE  
Washington Navy Yard, DC 20376  
victor.gavin@navy.mil

# Geneva Aerospace Finds Success as L-3 Acquisition

Geneva Aerospace, founded in 1997 by experienced aerospace engineers, missile guidance experts and senior-level executives, has developed a portfolio of industry-leading unmanned vehicle command, control and communication (C3) technology, which was partially funded through the Navy SBIR program.

Geneva Aerospace's acquisition by L-3 Communications was finalized on Jan. 31, 2007 and it is now known as L-3 Geneva Aerospace. *Transitions* recently had the opportunity to sit down with Vince Longhi, co-founder of Geneva Aerospace and vice president of sales and marketing for L-3 Geneva Aerospace, to discuss the preparations Geneva's management made in advance of their acquisition, lessons the company learned along the way and words of advice for other firms looking towards the possibility of acquisition.

**"Geneva is a pioneer in UAV flight operations, with strong engineering talent and a number of successful products that will add substantial technology to our existing capabilities."**

**—Michael T. Strianese, President and Chief Executive Officer of L-3 Communications.**

### The Path to Acquisition

After approximately eight years in business, Geneva Aerospace started discussing what it would take to reach the "next level" in their business. The company had experienced success with their core products and had created name recognition in the defense industry. The reputation they had built provided Geneva with a window of opportunity to accelerate their position in the industry and increase the company's rate of growth, but doing so would require an infusion of capital.

"We put together a strategy and then estimated the amount of capital that it would take to reach the next level," said Longhi. "Initially, we had discussed investment options, and investigated pursuing venture capital funding, "going public" with an IPO (Initial Public Offering) or finding an industry partner that would be willing to finance some of our efforts."

The Geneva team discussed the pros and cons of each option available to them and along the way it was decided they were looking for more than just capital. "We desired not only the capital to get started, which is of course important, but we also wanted to find a good, strong relationship with a larger defense prime. We were looking for a partnership that could be synergistic, that would create a two-way street of information flow that would be advantageous to both parties and leverage us into some bigger opportunities," Longhi explained.

Geneva then laid out a set of target companies and the team hit the road to meet with them and discuss their

plans. They quickly discovered through those meetings that, for the most part, the larger firms were less interested in investing in the company and more interested in the possibility of acquiring the company. The Geneva team regrouped to discuss the possibilities of acquisition and whether or not it was right for the business. "We decided that for the right price and the right arrangement we would probably be interested in acquisition. So, our focus started to shift more towards taking the plan that we had and looking for the right partner to be acquired. We were still open to the idea of a larger company just investing in us, but acquisition seemed more likely. Ultimately, the reason behind the acquisition was finding the capital necessary to elevate and grow the company as we wanted," said Longhi.

### The Planning Process for Acquisition

To get to this point, Geneva management spent a good deal of time and effort to prepare. The company hired an experienced consultant, with expertise in both investments and acquisitions, to guide the development of the business plan that would be used when approaching potential investors and acquiring companies. The consultant evaluated the plan and provided the Geneva team with insight into the investor mind-set. "Together, we created an extensive business plan that included financials, market descriptions and market research, etc... This provided a strong foundation for our meetings with potential investors and acquiring companies," said Longhi.

It was helpful that Geneva was already running their business like a large firm. "We were good about doing yearly forecasts and monitoring our status relative to that forecast throughout the year—adjusting it accordingly as things changed," Longhi explained. By focusing on their business at this detailed level, Geneva's team had all of the necessary information for presentations and reports for investors, at their finger-tips. This made the process less complicated. "We did not cut corners when it came to information," Longhi said. "We felt there was a value



Geneva Aerospace technology "linkTEK"

to doing the things that larger businesses do, so we had everything there, ready to go.”

### Speaking from Experience

Now, a year after the acquisition was finalized, the L-3 Geneva Aerospace team is really settling into their place in the L-3 business. From this perspective, Longhi offered some words of advice to other small businesses considering the option of acquisition.

“First off,” Longhi began, “I would say, that they shouldn’t get in a hurry. Any small business in that position needs to recognize that this is a time-consuming process.” The excitement of change can be powerful, but this process can take months and even years to bring to fruition.


**“Having a good team on the small business side, consultants, legal advisors, etc... ensures that you have what you need to negotiate the best deal for your company”**

According to Longhi, one of the most important things that Geneva Aerospace did after deciding that being acquired was the right path for the company, was writing down the key objectives for the acquisition. “That document kept us focused throughout the process. When opportunities showed up, we would go back to that understanding and compare the offer, with a critical eye, to what we had originally stated as our goal.”

Hiring an experienced consultant at the beginning of the planning stage was also a key element for Geneva Aerospace as they searched for the right partner. Having someone who was emotionally divorced from the process was extremely important to the team. “When we would counter an offer, we were desperate for a response—like kids waiting for the candy store to open. Good or bad, we wanted to know,” Longhi explained. “The consultant was helpful in keeping us grounded.”

Small businesses should also try to evaluate multiple opportunities and not just jump at the first sign of interest. “We learned a great deal by meeting with several companies and seeing for ourselves the opportunities that were out there,” Longhi said. “It should also be remembered that the people on the acquiring-side are experienced, they work on acquisitions day in and day out and they know how to get what they want. Having a good team on the small business side, consultants, legal advisors, etc... ensures that you have what you need to negotiate the best deal for your company.”

Finally, Longhi said, “Don’t forget that this can be a very distracting, multi-year effort for key people to the company. Make sure the business is ready to handle that deep of a commitment and that you don’t lose sight of running the business. A good deal of damage can be done to a small business in the intervening time if tasks fall by the wayside due to acquisition work. If you aren’t careful, you could end up with something you can’t sell.”



**For more information on L-3 Geneva Aerospace, Inc., visit their website at**  
[www.genaero.com](http://www.genaero.com)

---

## SBIR Program Manager Corner

---

### Janet McGovern- NAVAIR

---

Recently, *Transitions* had the opportunity to sit down with SBIR program manager, Ms. Janet McGovern to discuss the NAVAIR SBIR Program. With an annual budget of approximately \$150 million, the NAVAIR SBIR program is the largest Systems Command (SYSCOM) program in the Navy’s SBIR portfolio.

McGovern began her civilian career with the Navy in 1984 at the Naval Engineering Center in Lakehurst, N.J. Since that time, she has held various engineering and management positions at the Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, Pa. and at the Naval Air Systems Command, Patuxent River, Md. In 2000, she joined the NAVAIR SBIR Program as the Deputy Program Manager. McGovern was promoted to her current position as the SBIR Program Manager in 2006 and is responsible for the execution and management of the technology portfolio.

When asked about the most significant challenges facing the NAVAIR SBIR program, McGovern reflected back on her seven years on the program and highlighted the management changes that were required to accommodate the significant growth experienced by the program and the corresponding increase in the portfolio workload.

**“The bottom line to success for a SBIR Company is effective communication with the customer, understanding the customer’s requirements, and then delivering on time and within budget.”**

“Although the dramatic growth of the program in the past few years has presented us with several management challenges, it has also provided some unique opportunities to improve the program and to increase the transition of SBIR technologies into Naval Aviation Weapon Systems,” said McGovern.

In FY2000, NAVAIR awarded 50 new Phase II projects. In comparison for FY2007, the program statistics, as of Sept. 30, 2007, indicated that there were 184 active Phase I awards and 220 active Phase II awards. Although this growth has provided increased opportunities for SBIR companies, it has also presented the NAVAIR SBIR Program Team some unique challenges. According to McGovern, when there were only 50 Phase II projects she and her predecessor, Carol Van Wyk, were personally involved with each project, got to know the companies and worked closely with their executives. However, as a result of the dramatic program growth and the larger number of active Phase II projects to manage, she has had to change her management approach. The new approach places more emphasis on ensuring that the NAVAIR SBIR Team is better trained in the SBIR processes, improving communication between the companies and their NAVAIR points of contact and strengthening the involvement of the acquisition community in the SBIR program.



*Photo courtesy of NAVAIR photo gallery*

Though her tenure as PM has been short, she highlights the initiation of the Commercialization Pilot Program (CPP) as one of the most notable accomplishments made during her watch. She considers CPP as an opportunity to improve SBIR transitions and drive process improvement across the NAVAIR SBIR Program. (See the article on page 2 for more information on the CPP.)

McGovern has quickly capitalized on opportunities offered by the CPP. For example, during the latter half of FY07, the NAVAIR SBIR Team conducted a PMA-led Phase II project portfolio review of all current NAVAIR second-year, Phase II projects. This effort involved the review of over 138 projects by NAVAIR SBIR Technical Points of Contact (TPOCs) and PMA's. The result of the review was the identification of a number of Phase II projects with a high potential of transition to Phase III, a prioritization of projects requiring continued investment, the identification of technology gaps that needed to be addressed and the identification of areas of improvement for NAVAIR SBIR processes. As a result of comments and lessons learned from the PMA portfolio review, added emphasis was placed on the alignment of new topics with Naval Aviation Acquisition Program requirements, topic generation and TPOC training workshops have been planned and scheduled, and improvements have been made in the PEO Topic Selection Board process.

In addition to increasing the involvement of the PEOs and PMAs in various SBIR processes, McGovern has established a set of new incentives designed to increase technology transition by incentivizing PMAs to utilize SBIR technologies. The incentives include increasing the amount of SBIR matching funds under the Phase II Enhancement program; initiating a PEO/PMA driven process for identification and shared funding of follow-on development efforts for promising Phase II and CPP projects; and providing the NAVAIR Science and Technology (S&T) Directorates with SBIR funding for topics aligned with S&T requirements for new and emerging Naval Aviation programs.

Improving and streamlining the SBIR process is a significant priority for McGovern. As part of a larger NAVAIR Business Processes Realignment, the SBIR program has been involved in several Six-Sigma Kaizen events to take a critical look at all aspects of the program and implement process improvements. As a result, the program is streamlining existing processes, evaluating automation of different aspects of the process and deploying web-based tools to facilitate these efforts. Specific efforts initiated thus

far include the hiring and deployment of PEO Transition Managers to assist the PMAs in managing SBIR topic generation and technology transitions; implementation of a streamlined contract preparation process to standardize and streamline the preparation of the documentation needed to support contract award; and the deployment of a web-based portfolio and project review tool to facilitate PMA evaluation and selection of CPP projects.


“One of the keys to transition of SBIR technologies is ensuring that our SBIR companies are successful and reliable suppliers.” The ultimate goal of the SBIR program is the commercialization and transition of technologies developed under Phases I and II to Phase III. A key element in achieving this goal is ensuring that the SBIR companies are successful and reliable suppliers.

McGovern is a strong champion of the Navy's Transition Assistance Program (TAP) where the SBIR companies receive Navy-provided assistance in preparing transition plans, business plans, marketing strategies and presenting their projects to the SYSCOM and acquisition communities. In addition to supporting TAP and encouraging NAVAIR SBIR company participation in the program, the NAVAIR SBIR Program, along with the Small Business Program Office, co-sponsors an annual NAVAIR Small Business Aviation Technology Conference to provide SBIR and other small businesses an opportunity to participate in a conference focused specifically on how to work with NAVAIR.

At this conference, the participating companies are provided pertinent information on Naval Aviation programs and are afforded an opportunity to meet one-on-one with NAVAIR, PEO, PMA and Prime Contractor personnel to discuss their technologies and businesses. Finally, as part of the CPP, all SBIR companies selected for CPP are provided focused business and technical assistance to mitigate the transition risks associated with their specific projects. The common thread in all these efforts is to provide information and assistance to SBIR companies in an effort to facilitate successful technology transition and to help companies become reliable NAVAIR suppliers.

“The bottom line to success for a SBIR company is effective communication with the customer, understanding the customer's requirements, and then delivering on time and within budget.”

When asked what advice she would give to SBIR companies looking to work with NAVAIR, she indicated the company should take advantage of all the assistance programs offered by the Navy, establish effective communications with their customer, fully understand their customer requirements and be able to clearly communicate the “value add” their technology brings to the customer's program. But after all is said and done, the bottom line for the SBIR company simply is that the Company must be prepared to be a reliable supplier - one that delivers a working product, on time and within budget.



**Learn more about the NAVAIR SBIR program  
by visiting their website at**

[www.navair.navy.mil/sbir/ov\\_main.htm](http://www.navair.navy.mil/sbir/ov_main.htm)

## The TPOC's Perspective of the EFV and the SBIR Program

---

Recently, *Transitions* sat down with Craig Harvey, Program Manager for Advanced Technology at PM AAA (Program Manager Advanced Amphibious Assault), to discuss his role as technical point of contact (TPOC) for the Marine Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle (EFV), its challenges and successes and offer some insight to those interested in SBIR solicitations concerning the EFV.

The EFV, developed by General Dynamics Amphibious Systems, is the next generation beyond the Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicle (AAV). By utilizing automatic transfer of power from high-speed water jets to the vehicle tracks, it will have a seamless transition from Naval ships located beyond the visual horizon to inland objectives. The armored vehicle will travel at 29 mph in the water and 45 mph on land, all while transporting 17 Marines with full combat equipment and a three-man crew.

Harvey, a 1976 U.S. Naval Academy graduate, has been working on the program for five years. His diverse background includes serving as a fleet systems engineer for Darlington, Inc., 13 years as a systems engineer/data base designer at TRW, and other distinguished positions. In his position as Program Manager for Advanced Technology, he wears many hats, with the duties of a TPOC most certainly falling under his purview. When we spoke, he was working with 25 SBIR contracts, some STTR contracts, as well as some ONR and FNC projects. These contracts ran the gamut from new high-strength alloys to bilge water purification systems. "The position certainly provides a good amount of variety. I have to be part-time contract administrator, part-time evaluator,

write statements of work and know enough about the technology to ask the right questions."

While one of the most enjoyable benefits of working with advanced technology in the SBIR program is, as Harvey says, "checking out the whiz-bang stuff," there is no doubt that it is a difficult task to "take a good idea from a concept to something that can be purchased and used by the Marine Corps—otherwise known as taking a technology through the Valley of Death."

One difference in the PM AAA, as compared to some other SBIR programs, is that they are more focused on the near term and are not focused on basic research, as some other Navy SBIR. He only does an SBIR solicitation when he has identified risk or a need that is not being currently met. "I focus our topics on what I believe are specific areas and things that can be done—with fair chance of coming up with a solution. Whether or not it eventually gets sold is another issue. I am not pushing the boundaries of science here," says Harvey.

Overall, approximately one-third of Harvey's SBIR projects make it through the Valley of Death. Some of these technologies end up on the EFV, other technologies are purchased by a third party. The remaining projects do not move forward for a variety of reasons, including lack of need and even newer innovations. Harvey is aiming for what he calls the "triple win" which he defines as "A SBIR project that, first of all, has a viable technology that we have helped to develop. Secondly, the SBIR company sells the technology to someone and thirdly, the SBIR company sells it to General Dynamics and it ends up on the EFV."

Harvey's advice to SBIR companies with an interest in the EFV program is to "First, read the solicitations. Then secondly, make certain that you know what criteria the client is looking for and thirdly, take advantage of the assistance available." He points out that companies who are successful working with PM AAA, and really with any SBIR program, come into Phase I with a good idea, they are then definitive about what they are going to do and they then go above and beyond.



EFV on the water



## NAVY PHASE III OBLIGATIONS DURING FY07

### TOTAL COMMAND DOLLARS OBLIGATED TO PHASE III PROJECTS IN FY07 AS REPORTED ON THE DD350

Topic Number	Company Name	Phase III Sponsor	Contract	OBLIG\$ in FY07
<b>MARCOR</b>				
N01-108	EUREKA AEROSPACE, LLC	MARCOR	M6785407C1122	\$970,845
<b>NAVAIR</b>				
N90-074	ATK MISSILE SYSTEMS COMPANY	NAVAIR	N0001903C0353	\$62,785,849
N02-151	ADAPTIVE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833505D0018	\$497,639
N02-173	ALION - MA&D CORPORATION	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833507C0209	\$248,853
N02-080	ALION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	NAWCTSD	N6133907D0001	\$773,995
N02-160	ALION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833507C0241	\$98,877
N02-160	ANACAPA SCIENCES, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833507D0004	\$102,504
AF97-043	ANDRO COMPUTATIONAL SOLUTIONS	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833505D0007	\$356,138
N00-013	APPLIED HYDRO-ACOUSTICS RESEARCH	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833502D0022	\$1,870,406
N05-005	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833507D0016	\$328,374
N03-183	EFFICIENT CHANNEL CODING, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833507C0042	\$299,184
N03-169	ESRD, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833507D0020	\$1,443,997
N98-043	ESSEX CORPORATION	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833502D0009	\$1,051,000
N00-078	FOSTER-MILLER, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833503D0101	\$856,631
N03-058	GENEVA AEROSPACE, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833505D0013	\$1,041,759
N03-017	HARMONIA, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833507D0002	\$99,999
N02-162	HONTEK CORPORATION	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833507D0008	\$1,166,000
A03-202	INNALABS, INC.	NAWCTSD	N6133907C0052	\$429,915
N98-160	ITCN, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833502D0021	\$581,205
N95-033	JENTEK SENSORS, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833500D0463	\$126,200
N90-085	LOGIS-TECH, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833506D0021	\$116,319
N01-024	MAGCANICA, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833506D0016	\$425,000
N01-015	MANAGEMENT SCIENCES, INC.	NAVAIR	N0001907D0105	\$309,386
N98-149	MATERIALS RESEARCH & DESIGN, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833502D0027	\$184,564
N94-178	NAVMAR APPLIED SCIENCES CORP.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833505D0020	\$7,898,613
N92-170	NAVMAR APPLIED SCIENCES CORP.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833507C0324	\$8,893,083
N01-158	NOESIS, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833506D0007	\$980,028
A98-149	OPTICAL SCIENCES CORPORATION	NAWCTSD	N6133905D0001	\$93,112
N04-003	OPTONET, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833507D0013	\$250,000
N04-044	OREGON IRON WORKS, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833506D0005	\$2,084,951
N98-057	ORGANIZATIONAL STRATEGIES, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833505D0010	\$14,619,094
N99-053	PHYSICAL SCIENCES, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833503D0099	\$199,621
N04-022	PLANNING SYSTEMS, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833506D0001	\$309,869
N04-011	PROGENY SYSTEMS CORPORATION	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833507D0025	\$1,485,062
N05-003	QUASAR FEDERAL SYSTEMS, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833507D0017	\$449,034
N02-142	QUINTESSENCE PHOTONICS CORP.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6893607C0037	\$499,850
N98-035	RDA, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833502D3109	\$1,612,133
AF99-185	REYNOLDS SYSTEMS, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6893605D0030	\$312,182
N96-061	REYNOLDS SYSTEMS, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833502D0025	\$1,081,503
N03-027	ROTORDYNAMICS-SEAL RESEARCH	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833507D0023	\$3,301,874
A01-209	SAN DIEGO RESEARCH CENTER, INC.	NAWCTSD	N6133904D0039	\$15,665,362
N03-025	SCIENTIFIC COMPANY, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833507C0389	\$50,000
N01-013, N01-188	SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH CORP.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833506D0006	\$8,417,775
N02-159	SENSING SYSTEMS, LLC	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833507D0001	\$473,900
N03-014, N04-007	SIGNAL SYSTEMS CORPORATION	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833507D0010	\$1,022,161
N05-071	SOLID STATE SCIENTIFIC CORP.	NAVAIR	N0042107D0006	\$4,578,791
N98-072, N98-077	SOLIPSYS CORPORATION	NAVAIR	N0042102D3065	\$5,077,986
N96-236	STOTTLER HENKE ASSOCIATES, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833502D0007	\$905,900
SOCOM03-004	TRIDENT SYSTEMS, INC.	NAWC Lakehurst	N6833505D0025	\$3,305,921
SB992-018	VOXTEC INTERNATIONAL, INC.	NAVAIR	N0042107D0018	\$1,357,208
			<b>NAVAIR Total</b>	<b>\$160,118,807</b>

## NAVFAC

N98-114	AEPTEC MICROSYSTEMS, INC.	FISC San Diego	N0024401D0036	\$600,739
N04-118	ICOSYSTEM CORPORATION	FISC Norfolk	N0018907CZ068	\$399,990
N03-159	MIOX CORPORATION	NAVFAC Eng. Comm.	N6871105C0065	\$25,032
N96-005	ROBOTEK ENGINEERING, INC.	NAVFAC Eng. Comm.	N6871105D0008	\$191,870
<b>NAVFAC Total</b>				<b>\$1,217,631</b>

## NAVSEA

N04-138	3 PHOENIX, INC.	NAVSEA	N0002407C6274	\$2,384,000
N98-114	3E TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL	NSWC Panama	N6133106D0008	\$4,614,874
N01-127	ADAPTIVE METHODS, INC.	NAVSEA	N0002405C6305	\$1,295,000
N03-074	ADVANCED ACOUSTIC CONCEPTS, INC.	NAVSEA	N6660401D4218	\$920,307
N98-106	ADVANCED ACOUSTIC CONCEPTS, INC.	NAVSEA	N0002405C5486	\$8,821,835
N96-268	APPLIED ORDNANCE TECHNOLOGY, INC.	NSWC Dahlgren	N0017804D1025	\$564,055
tdb	APPLIED THIN FILMS, INC.	NSWC Crane	N0016407C6068	\$199,999
multiple	CHESAPEAKE SCIENCES CORP.	NAVSEA	N0002407C6207	\$16,933,411
N01-093	CYBERNET SYSTEMS CORP.	NSWC Crane	N0016406C6002	\$787,643
N96-103	DEFENSE HOLDINGS, INC.	NAVSEA	N0002407C4207	\$1,255,580
multiple	DIGITAL SYSTEM RESOURCES, INC.	NAVSEA	N0002403C6206	\$17,111,358
N05-163	INNOVATIVE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGIES	NSWC Dahlgren	N0017807D2006	\$650,105
N02-102	INTERACTIVE DATA VISUALIZATION	NSWC Dahlgren	N0017807C3023	\$299,566
N99-153	LAKOTA TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS, INC.	NSWC Dahlgren	N0017806D3004	\$24,994
N02-025	MIKEL, INC.	NAVSEA	N0002405C6236	\$1,017,500
N02-039	MIKROS SYSTEMS CORPORATION	Port Hueneme Div.	N6339407C1170	\$2,396,000
N04-201	NEKTON RESEARCH, LLC	NUWC	N6660407C0398	\$200,000
OSD99-008	OCEANA SENSOR TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	NSWC	N0016704D0058	\$1,074,930
N04-053	PHOENIX INTERNATIONAL, INC. (7593)	NUWC	N6660407C4578	\$745,882
N98-122	PROGENY SYSTEMS CORPORATION	NAVSEA	N0002403C6201	\$3,598,811
N00-049	PROGENY SYSTEMS CORPORATION	NAVSEA	N0002403C6219	\$22,810,911
N98-122	PROGENY SYSTEMS CORPORATION	NAVSEA	N0002404C6201	\$6,331,000
N03-215	RADIX TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	NSWC Dahlgren	N0017807C3045	\$2,615,000
N99-200	SARA, INC.	NSWC Dahlgren	N0017804C3043	\$459,895
SOCOM96-002	SEEMANN COMPOSITES, INC.	NSWC	N0016707D0007	\$3,223,020
N05-047	SIMULEX, INC.	NSWC Crane	N0016407C6062	\$758,134
N05-053	SIMVENTIONS, INC.	NSWC Dahlgren	N0017806D3028	\$659,660
tdb	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES	NUWC	N6660406D0100	\$1,591,258
tdb	TELEDYNE BENTHOS, INC.	NUWC	N0025306D0005	\$792,901
N92-095	TPL, INC.	NSWC Crane	N0016404C4713	\$690,000
N00-062, N00-067	TRIDENT SYSTEMS, INC.	NSWC Dahlgren	N0017806D3023	\$1,738,128
tdb	WILLIAMS-PYRO, INC.	NSWC Crane	N0016407C6063	\$3,477,925
<b>NAVSEA Total</b>				<b>\$110,043,682</b>

## ONR

N04-138	3 PHOENIX, INC.	ONR	N0001406C0461	\$468,578
N02-T015	ADVANCED CERAMICS RESEARCH, INC.	ONR	N0001403D0247	\$1,306,000
N99-188	AETC, INC.	ONR	N0001405C0263	\$328,481
N97-092	AITHER ENGINEERING, INC.	ONR	N0001407C0330	\$749,590
N99-037	ARETE ASSOCIATES	ONR	N0001404C0011	\$1,451,000
N99-037	ARETE ASSOCIATES	ONR	N0001405C0042	\$1,479,983
N04-177	CARACAL, INC.	ONR	N0001407C0423	\$838,577
N04-T030	CARACAL, INC.	ONR	N0001407C0469	\$1,246,764
SB02-029	CSS SOLUTIONS, INC.	ONR	N0001407C0518	\$250,003
N00-107	DYNAMICS TECHNOLOGY, INC.	ONR	N0001404C0612	\$504,000
SB031-005	H.C. MATERIALS CORPORATION	ONR	N0001406C0098	\$15,059
N04-123	KUHLMANN WILSDORF MOTORS, LLC	ONR	N0001407C0790	\$939,661
N02-207/3	NEKTON RESEARCH, LLC	ONR	N0001407C0197	\$145,257
N96-T004	NEKTON RESEARCH, LLC	ONR	N0001405C0277	\$49,397
N95-074	OCEAN POWER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	ONR	N0001402C0053	\$555,404
N95-074	OCEAN POWER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	ONR	N0001405C0384	\$1,321,495

N00-116	OCEAN POWER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	ONR	N0001407C0617	\$5,000
N96-032	OPTICAL AIR DATA SYSTEMS, LLC	ONR	N0001407C0062	\$4,207,904
N02-198	POLATOMIC, INC.	ONR	N0001403C0388	\$1,109,924
A03-238	PRECISION COMBUSTION, INC.	ONR	N0001406C0087	\$489,717
N03-103	RLW, INC.	ONR	N0001407C0096	\$4,430,433
N02-207/1	SCIENTIFIC SOLUTIONS, INC.	ONR	N0001406C0330	\$500,000
N03-226	SIGNAL SYSTEMS CORP.	ONR	N0001407C0697	\$398,377
N05-T026	TELEDYNE BENTHOS, INC.	ONR	N0001407C0313	\$287,003
SB031-005	TRS CERAMICS, INC.	ONR	N0001406C0539	\$123,068
			<b>ONR Total</b>	<b>\$23,200,675</b>

### SPAWAR

N01-137	21ST CENTURY SYSTEMS, INC.	SPAWAR	N0003907C0022	\$1,699,957
N03-146	ADAPTIVE METHODS, INC.	SPAWAR	N0003907C0014	\$775,000
multiple	CHESAPEAKE SCIENCES CORP.	SPAWAR	N6523606D8153	\$7,042,181
N99-110	DARLINGTON, INC.	SPAWAR	N6600103D7000	\$229,984
N99-111	MALIBU RESEARCH ASSOCIATES, INC.	SPAWAR	N6523606D5875	\$839,934
N05-074	OUT OF THE FOG RESEARCH, LLC	SPAWAR	N0003907C0131	\$375,997
multiple	PROGENY SYSTEMS CORP.	SPAWAR	N6523602D6822	\$5,908,458
N03-144	SENTEL CORPORATION	SPAWAR	N0003907C0138	\$346,077
N03-142	SFA, INC. SYSTEMS ENGINEERING DIV.	SPAWAR	N6523607D5889	\$6,866,973
SOCOM02-006	TECHNO-SCIENCES, INC.	SPAWAR	N6600107C0145	\$23,841,554
N03-224	TELEDYNE BENTHOS, INC.	SPAWAR	N6600107D0006	\$50,000
SOCOM01-006	TRIDENT SYSTEMS, INC.	SPAWAR	N6523606D7874	\$8,014,999
multiple	VIASAT, INC.	SPAWAR	N6600199D7000	\$534,294
AF01-216	WINDMILL INTERNATIONAL, INC.	SPAWAR	N6523607D5886	\$2,252,720
			<b>SPAWAR Total</b>	<b>\$58,778,128</b>

**Total Command Dollars Obligated to Phase III Projects in FY07 as reported in FPDS-NG**

\*\*\* as of February 5, 2008

**102 Firms & 126 Contracts**

**\$354,329,768**

## Navy Receives Prestigious FLC Awards for Excellence in Technology Transfer

This year, the Navy was honored with seven awards from the Federal Laboratory Consortium for Technology Transfer (FLC), a national network of federal laboratories linking laboratory technologies and expertise across federal agencies and the marketplace.

AWARDEE	AWARD PRESENTED
Mr. Edward Linsenmeyer, NSWC PC	Harold Metcalf Award for sustained significant service for the FLC
Dr. Stephen Lieberman, SSC-SD	FLC Representative of the Year
NUWCNPT Senior Leadership Team: Captain Michael Byman, Dr. Paul Lefebvre & Mr. Donald Aker	FLC Laboratory Director of the Year. Honored for support of technology transfer activities
Naval Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory	Excellence in Technology Transfer for work on composite acoustic attenuation and vibration damping materials
SPAWAR Systems Center – San Diego	Excellence in Technology Transfer for work on QwikLite, a field- deployable bioluminescent bioassay system to detect toxins
Naval Research Laboratory	Excellence in Technology Transfer for work on unique process to produce transparent spinel ceramic
Naval Research Laboratory	Excellence in Technology Transfer for collaborative effort with Sandia National Laboratories to develop coiling laser fibers to make high-power fiber lasers

# CONTENTS

---

## SBIR REAUTHORIZATION STATUS

Allen Baker, Vital Strategies

## THE COMMERCIALIZATION PILOT PROGRAM AND THE NAVY

Lee Ann Boyer, DON/ONR PM

## NEW FACES AND NOTABLE CHANGES IN NAVY SBIR

## SUCCESS STORY - GENEVA AEROSPACE

## SBIR PROGRAM MANAGER CORNER - NAVAIR

## '07 PHASE III OBLIGATIONS

## TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND STTR PROGRAM MANAGER

Steve Sullivan

## EXECUTIVE EDITOR

Jenny C. Servo

## MANAGING EDITOR

Julie A. Smith

## CREATIVE DIRECTOR / GRAPHIC DESIGNER

Adrienne Stiles

*Transitions* is brought to you by the Navy Transition Assistance Program  
Download this newsletter at [www.navysbir.com](http://www.navysbir.com)



The graphic features a dark blue background with white silhouettes of various naval vessels and aircraft. The text is primarily in white and orange. At the top, it says "'08 Navy" in a large, bold font. Below that, it reads "OPPORTUNITY FORUM®" in orange, followed by "TRANSITIONING TECHNOLOGY TO THE FLEET" in white. The dates and location are listed: "JUNE 2-4, 2008 // HYATT REGENCY // CRYSTAL CITY, VA". A call to action says "TO REGISTER CALL MIKE MORGAN AT 585.617.9460" and "OR GO TO WWW.NAVYOPPORTUNITYFORUM.COM". A vertical "SBIR" logo is on the right. At the bottom, it says "NEW THIS YEAR NASA SHOWCASE" with "NEW THIS YEAR" in small letters.

For comments/questions about this newsletter contact:

**STEVE SULLIVAN:** [steven.sullivan@navy.mil](mailto:steven.sullivan@navy.mil)  
Transition Assistance Program and  
STTR Program Manager