

Figure 1. Sources connected to the hub connected to a conformal battery with constant watts connected to a rifleman radio.

Another assumption made was that the results are based on energy harvesting. Possible energy harvesting solutions are kinetic harvesters such as energy harvesting rucksacks and knee braces, or photovoltaic alternatives such as solar blankets. The results do not take into account generator or scavenging capabilities, as seen in Figure 2 below.




Figure 2. Operational view of how where the power comes from to charge the batteries (Aten et al).

Another tool used was a graph of the theoretical hours needed to provide 52Wh of charge at 12 volts DC, seen below in Figure 3. This study used the graph as a supplement to determine this capability gap.




Figure 3. Theoretical hours to provide 52Wh of charge at 12 volts DC.

By using the data above, the rate of charge was determined by finding the point of interest in the curve where there was a most significant change, which is 7.75 W/hr, represented by the yellow dot. This gap was determined by averaging out the points on the curve.

2.1 Power and Energy Characteristics for Dismounted Soldiers

Based on stakeholder analysis and soldier input, four mission profiles were created, including the timelines of the different missions a dismounted warfighter conducts. A typical mission for a soldier is 72 hours. However, depending on the type of mission, different amounts of energy are produced due to movement. The missions are broken down into three types of missions: sustainability, offensive, and defensive. Depending on the type of mission, kinetic and/or potential energy harvesters are possible. For example, on an offensive mission, the squad is moving the majority of the time, making it ideal for kinetic energy harvesters. The actual energy output is dependent on the terrain since a warfighter moves at different speeds when engaging various terrain. Weather also plays a factor since a soldier will move slower and take more rests in the heat than in cooler weather. However, 72 hour missions cannot be conducted in extreme heat due to the lack of water nor can they be conducted in extreme cold due to exposure. Additionally, the sunnier it is, the more solar availability, increasing photovoltaic energy harvesting. Therefore, different terrain and weather have a significant impact on the power usage and energy harvesting, which was taken into account.

Soldiers were interviewed on equipment usage to verify that the equipment load for a squad was correct. The equipment load included equipment necessary for each mission and mission-specific equipment. The usage of each type of device was then determined in hours, which was then used to determine the number of batteries for each device is required for a 72 hour mission. The weight and energy per battery was also recorded. Using this information, an average demand for energy was determined for a dismounted infantry platoon. The weight of the radios for a 72 hour mission was determined, which was used to determine the platoon power per hour and the platoon power per 72 hour mission. Once the platoon power per 72 hour mission was determined, the percentage of power for each of the devices were found. The table 1 below shows the power and percentage for each device. Since the Rifleman Radio and MBITR (Multiband Intra Team Radio) consumed the majority of the platoon's power (approximately 92 percent), the analysis is focused on these two devices.

Table 1. Platoon Power per Device

Device	Platoon Power / 72 Hour Mission (Watts)	Percentage of Platoon Power (%)
Rifleman Radio	22,680	74.896
MBITR	5292	17.476
ASIP	785.455	2.594
SATCOM	1524.71	5.035
TOTAL	30,282.2	

3. Results

3.1 Minimum Threshold for Energy Harvesting Technologies

Using the energy gap and comparing it to different technologies, a projected amount of power that will need to be supplied to a hub, regardless of the technology providing the power can be determined. This amount of power required to erase the calculated gap over the time available is how the minimum threshold was generated.

The amount of power generated has a non-linear relationship to the amount of time it takes to charge a battery. Using the standard of a conformal battery as the baseline, it would take significantly longer to charge a battery at 2 watts continuously that it would at 10 watts continuously. In fact, at 2 watts, the battery would never reach a usable charge in time for use before other power supplies were exhausted. At 7.75 watts however, you could self-sustain a Soldier’s Nett Warrior system by switching conformal batteries between charging and use, referring back to Figure 3. While there are many other considerations to determine if alternatives are feasible, identifying the power requirements by itself so it can be used to specify what benchmarks emerging technologies must achieve is useful.

Additionally, the demand was calculated based on the assumption that on a 72 hour mission, only 36 hours will be beneficial to energy harvesting due to daylight and soldiers’ movement. The demand was found by multiplying the required watts per hour by 72 hours since the usage of the radios is 72 hours on the mission. In order to find the demand, the energy per battery was subtracted from the overall demand since the mission will start with full batteries, 63WH (the energy per battery), is not included in the actual demand. The demand was then compared with the 72 hour supply needed for the mission, which was determined by the attained constant watts multiplied by the useful hours, 36 hours. The constant watts were then altered to see how many watts made the ratio equal to one. The results were plotted below in Figure 4.




Figure 4. Time to charge each radio based on watts provided.

The rifleman radio needs 14 constant watts from an energy source in order to conserve approximately 75 percent of the platoon’s power. The MBITR requires 8.75 constant watts. Finally, when both the rifleman radio and MBITR are charging together, they require 22.75 constant watts, shown in Figure 5 below.




Figure 5. The demand of power for the rifleman radio (75%), MBITR (17%), and both together (92%).

Furthermore, assuming each mission has the same 72 hour power supply, each type of mission produces different amounts of energy based on how much movement occurs. An offensive mission produces more energy since the warfighters are moving much more. Table 2 below shows the approximate hours of movement for each type of mission and how much energy is needed each hour of movement to achieve the supply.

Table 2. Approximate hours of movement for each type of mission (Aviles).

Type of Mission	Hours of Movement	72 Power Supply (WH)	Energy Needed Per Hour
Sustainment	39	819	21
Offensive	27	819	30.3
Defensive	20	819	41

4. Conclusion

By using a warfighter’s movement to produce a usable energy source that could power his/her equipment could greatly decrease the weight of a combat load. Knowing the minimum threshold for energy harvesting technologies for each of the radios will allow soldiers to adjust how many batteries are necessary for their mission. By carrying less batteries, the warfighter has less weight and/or more room for other mission-essential items. A recommendation of the minimum threshold that an alternative should produce is 15 watts. Since the demand of power shows how significant the rifleman radio is to the platoon at a constant 14 watts, it has a power drain of approximately 75 percent of the platoon’s power. Thus, with an alternative at 15 constant watts, the platoon weight of batteries would be slightly under 300 pounds. Moreover, depending on the mission, the platoon leader can adjust the battery and solar weight based on how much movement occurs on the mission.

5. References

- Aten, C., Evangelista, P., Michalowski, A., Stamm, C., Williams, C. (2015). *Soldier Power Operational Benefit Analysis*.
- Aviles, Steven, Program Manager Soldier Warrior. (2015). *OMS-MP Power Generator System Breakdown*.
- Meredith, S., & Bergmann, D. (2013). *Soldier Power: A Growing Operational Concern*.
- Riemer, R., & Shapiro, A. (2011). *Biomechanical Energy Harvesting from Human Motion: Theory, State of the Art, Design Guidelines, and Future Directions*.
- Shukla, Kailash, U.S. Army, RDECOM. (2014). *Soldier and Small Unit Operational Energy Comparative CONOPS for Dismount Soldier Equipment*.
- U.S. Army, Program Executive Office Soldier, Soldier System Integration. (2014). *Dismounted Baseline Version 1.0 for the Soldier System*.