



**PEO-M-U: Battery Bottle Assessment Event
Q&A Telecon Transcript
04 September 2026**

1. **Is PEO open to appreciable design changes, including joint and assembly solutions?**
Yes. Jointed designs are not excluded; however, they may add weight and create additional challenges related to corrosion prevention and other design considerations. Respondents proposing a jointed design should address those challenges in the white paper.
2. **Is PSU open to material tolerance and finish modifications, subject to engineering review, to improve manufacturability?**
Yes. This effort is intended primarily as a build-to-print effort to support research and development; however, the Government is looking to industry for its manufacturing expertise. If a proposed change would significantly improve manufacturability, it may be considered. Respondents are highly encouraged to provide a quote that meets the provided design and separately identify any proposed deviations.
3. **Can the Government provide additional clarification identifying the different bottle designs, including the K3 design?**
Yes. The Government acknowledged that additional guidance is needed. The designs generally include a replication of the SWRI design, a unique internally stiffened Penn State University aluminum design, a unique smooth-bore externally stiffened Penn State University design, and a DCS design. The Government also acknowledged that an end-cap design is missing and will provide clarification.
4. **Can the bottle design be split into multiple pieces or use a joined structure?**
Yes. A joined structure may be considered, provided the submission addresses the associated challenges, including increased weight, design complexity, and corrosion at the interfaces. Respondents should also describe what the complete assembled design would look like.
5. **Are you able to disclose limits for weight, dimensions, and cost?**
No additional limits will be provided. The dimensions are contained in the drawings because this is intended as a build-to-print effort. For joined designs, particularly the DCS variant, the thickened mounting areas shown on the drawings cannot be infringed upon.
6. **Is SOFWERX interested in teaming with entities that can perform only one or more portions of the effort?**
Yes. If a company can support one bottle design but not another, the Government is willing to consider teaming or grouped capabilities.
7. **Will PEO provide CAD/STEP files?**
Yes. CAD/STEP files will be provided. The PDFs are available for OQE and dimensional information. During the call, the Government acknowledged that the STEP files were not currently posted and stated that this would be corrected.





8. **Are second sheets available for drawings showing interior features such as inside radii?**

The Government believed the drawings were complete but acknowledged that some information appeared to be missing. The Government will verify that the internal design information, including the internals for drawings 1171976 and 1170706, is available.

9. **Given the meeting delay, will the submission deadline change?**

No. The submission deadline will remain unchanged. Extending the deadline would require another ecosystem blast and an update to SAM.gov.

10. **Are the indicated design pressures exclusive of potential CS&S requirements?**

The Government stated that the required load profile has already been built into the design and could not provide additional detail at this time.

11. **Will the 'hanger queen' bottles be used for actual at-depth or pressure efforts?**

Most likely not. Although the SWRI aluminum version could potentially be used at depth, the current intent is to use the mock bottles for activities such as fit checking. They are currently intended as in-air hanger queens. If that use changes, the requirements would be modified accordingly.

12. **The table in the white paper template does not appear to match the drawings. How should respondents complete it?**

Follow the intent of the table. The Government wants an apples-to-apples comparison that correlates each drawing with items such as cost, weight, and other applicable criteria. If the wording does not align exactly, respondents should still provide the requested information in a tabular format.

13. **Can you clarify which drawing numbers correlate to the ALI-02 and SWRI designs?**

The Government did not have the correlation immediately available during the call and took an action to correct and clarify it.

14. **Is the requested quantity eight or fourteen?**

Both quantities are requested for evaluation. Eight represents a ship set, while fourteen includes additional units for spares and testing. These quantities do not represent the total anticipated production requirement; they are for the evaluation portion of the effort.

15. **Are you able to disclose the list of teaming partners for this initiative?**

No.

16. **Can respondents collaborate with partners such as SWRI?**

Yes, subject to the other organization's willingness to participate. It is the respondent's responsibility to initiate partnering, teaming, and related discussions with those organizations.

17. **Can the correct drawing/part-number information be added to the white paper template?**

Yes. The Government stated that it would work to correct the template. However, a submission will not be rejected solely because it is not fully compliant with the exact template





content, as long as the Government can correlate the drawings, costs, and other required information and the intent is met.

18. Given the Tuesday due date, can industry expect the identified updates to be published before submissions are due?

The Government stated that it planned to update the table that afternoon. The primary concern was the missing SWRI double-end-cap design. If the Government could not provide the drawing in enough time for industry to evaluate it, respondents could note that the drawing was not provided, and the Government would take that into account during evaluation.

19. There does not appear to be a SWRI drawing representing the R9M3 design in the drawing set. Which drawing should be used?

The drawing marked SWRI should be the SWRI bottle drawing. The Government indicated that the file should contain both a PDF and a STEP file.

20. Should respondents perform additional design work or propose design changes as part of this effort?

Generally, no. This is a build-to-print effort focused on obtaining bottles quickly. Additional design work would generally not be useful unless it is directly driven by the respondent's manufacturing technique. Other avenues may be available for proposing alternative design solutions.

21. What data-rights position does the Government expect for work performed under this program?

The intent is that anything done under this program will have full Government rights. The Government indicated that a statement to that effect should be included in the assessment criteria.

22. Will the missing files and drawings discussed during the Q&A be uploaded to the website?

Yes. The Government stated that it would work to upload them immediately after the call, assuming there are no file-size or other website-related issues.

