

BAA 07-25
Proposer Information Pamphlet (PIP)

for

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency
(DARPA)
Defense Sciences Office (DSO)

Cognitive Technology Threat Warning
Systems (CT2WS)

Technical POCs: Dr. Doug Kirkpatrick, DARPA/STO,
Dr. Amy Kruse, DARPA/DSO

This BAA will be open for **one (1) year** from the date of its publication in www.fbo.gov and/or www.grants.gov.

NOTE: Although this BAA will be open for one (1) year from the date of its publication on www.fbo.gov and/or www.grants.gov, the Government anticipates that the majority of initial funding for this program will be committed during First Selections. To be considered for funding during First Selections, full proposals must be received no later than 3:00PM ET on June 21, 2007. (NOTE: University submissions may be made via www.grants.gov by using the “Apply for Grants” function.)

A Questions and Answers list from the Proposers’ Day Conference held on March 13, 2007, will be posted to <http://www.sainc.com/CT2WSTeaming/> for proposer review. It is not mandatory to have attended the Proposers’ Day Conference to respond to this BAA.

BAA 07-25, Cognitive Technologies Threat Warning Systems (CT2WS)

1. INTRODUCTION.....	2
1.1. APPROACH	2
1.2. PROPOSERS	2
1.3. PROGRAM SCOPE AND FUNDING.....	2
1.4. PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE	3
1.5. TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT	3
1.6. INSTRUCTIONS AND POINTS OF CONTACT	3
2. OVERVIEW OF CT2WS.....	3
2.1. PROGRAM OVERVIEW	3
2.1.1. Phase 1 (Base).....	4
2.1.2. Phase 2 (Option 1)	4
2.1.3. Phase 3 (Option 2)	4
2.1.4. Progression Between Phases.....	4
2.2. PROGRAM METRICS	5
3. GENERAL INFORMATION	6
3.1. ELIGIBILITY	6
3.2. LIMITATIONS ON OTHER TRANSACTIONS FOR PROTOTYPE PROJECTS	6
3.3. PROCUREMENT INTEGRITY, STANDARDS OF CONDUCT, ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS, AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (OCIs).....	7
3.4. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY	8
3.4.1. Procurement Contract Proposers.....	8
3.4.2. Non-Procurement Contract Proposers	9
3.4.3. All Proposers--Intellectual Property & Patents.....	9
3.5. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	10
3.6. REQUIRED REVIEW AND INTERCHANGE MEETINGS	10
3.7. SUBCONTRACTING	10
3.8. EXPORT LICENSES	10
3.9. PUBLIC RELEASE OR DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.....	11
3.10. AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION.....	11
3.11. HUMAN USE IN RESEARCH.....	11
4. PROPOSAL PREPARATION	12
4.1. GENERAL GUIDANCE.....	12
4.1.1. Restrictive Markings on Proposals	12
4.1.2. Confidentiality	13
4.1.3. Submission Timelines.....	13
4.2. FORMATTING CHARACTERISTICS.....	13
4.2.1. Proposal Format.....	14
5. PROPOSAL EVALUATION.....	18
5.1. TECHNICAL APPROACH	18
5.2. MANAGEMENT APPROACH	18
5.3. RELEVANT EXPERIENCE.....	19
5.4. POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION AND RELEVANCE TO THE DARPA MISSION	19
5.5. COST AND SCHEDULE REASONABLENESS AND REALISM	19
6. SECURITY INFORMATION	20
6.1. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INFORMATION.....	20
ATTACHMENT A: Sample R&D and Financial Status Report.....	22

1. INTRODUCTION

The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency's (DARPA) Defense Sciences Office (DSO) is soliciting proposals under this BAA for the performance of research, development, design, and testing to support the DARPA CT2WS program.

1.1. APPROACH

This BAA affords proposers the choice of submitting proposals for the award of a Grant, Cooperative Agreement, Procurement Contract, Technology Investment Agreement, Other Transaction for Prototype Agreement, or other such appropriate award instrument. The Government reserves the right to negotiate the type of award instrument determined appropriate under the circumstances.

1.2. PROPOSERS

The Government encourages proposals from non-traditional Defense contractors, nonprofit organizations, educational institutions, small businesses, small disadvantaged business concerns, Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU), Minority Institutions (MI), large businesses and Government laboratories. Teaming arrangements between and among these groups are encouraged. However, no portion of this BAA will be set aside for HBCU/MI, small or small disadvantaged business participation due to the impracticality of preserving discrete or severable areas of research in the technologies sought. Government/National laboratory proposals may be subject to applicable direct competition limitations, though certain Federally Funded Research and Development Centers are excepted per P.L. 103-337 § 217 and P.L. 105-261 § 3136. Any responsible and otherwise qualified proposer is encouraged to respond.

Proposers may include foreign personnel as part of their proposed resources as long as these personnel qualify technically, export control laws are complied with, the proposed effort is unclassified, and such foreign personnel sign any and all appropriate non-disclosure agreements prior to participating in the research effort.

1.3. PROGRAM SCOPE AND FUNDING

The Government intends to issue awards based on the optimum combination of proposals that offers the best overall value to the Government. The Government reserves the right to award without discussions. The Government reserves the right to select for award all, some, or none of the proposals received in response to this BAA. The Government also reserves the right to select for award some portion(s) of the proposals received; in that event, the Government may select for negotiation all, or portions, of a given proposal. The Government may incrementally fund any award issued under this BAA.

DARPA requests proposals for the full scope of development (e.g., an end-to-end system designed by a team of multidisciplinary research organizations, plus an integrator for coordination and implementation support). Proposals addressing only individual component-level technologies may be considered non-compliant with the requirements of this BAA.

It is anticipated that the total schedule for this effort will continue through **April 2011**. Proposers should propose a complete end-to-end solution for the entire program (Base effort and Options.)

While the earliest anticipated award is planned to occur in October 2007, the Government may select for funding any full proposal or portions of a proposal at any time during this year.

1.4. PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

The period of performance will be evaluated for consistency with the effort and deliverables. The Government does not specify the period of performance or required funding. The Proposer should propose the period of performance and funding necessary to implement their proposed program. The Proposer should delineate their effort as a Base effort plus two Option Efforts, approximately corresponding to Program Start through Preliminary / Breadboard Design Review (PDR), PDR through Critical / Brassboard Design Review (CDR), and CDR through Test Readiness Review and up to 6 months of Contractor Supported Government Testing.

The Government may incrementally fund any awards under this BAA.

1.5. TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

It is the intent of this office to use contractor support personnel in the administration of all submittals to this BAA. The Government intends to use non-government employees and subcontractors to assist in administration and, if needed, provide technical expertise on portions of the proposals. These personnel will have signed and be subject to the terms and conditions of non-disclosure agreements. By submission of its proposal, a proposer agrees that its proposal information may be disclosed to employees of these organizations for the limited purpose stated above. If you do not send notice of objection to this arrangement, the Government will assume you consent to use the subject personnel in review of your submittal(s) under this BAA. Only Government/Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) personnel will make technical evaluations and award recommendations or decisions under this BAA.

1.6. INSTRUCTIONS AND POINTS OF CONTACT

All questions pertaining to this BAA may be submitted to DARPA at the following e-mail address: BAA07-25@darpa.mil. DARPA may post updates to questions or comments periodically to the solicitation website: <http://www.sainc.com/dsobaa/>.

2. OVERVIEW OF CT2WS

2.1. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The CT2WS program will drive a breakthrough in soldier-portable visual threat warning devices. Recent developments and discoveries in the disparate technology areas of flat-field, wide-angle optics, large pixel-count digital imagers, cognitive visual processing algorithms, neurally-based target detection signatures and ultra-low power analog-digital hybrid signal processing electronics have led DARPA to believe that focused technology development, system design, and system integration efforts may produce revolutionary capabilities for the warfighter. The final objective of the DARPA CT2WS program is the development of prototype soldier-portable digital imaging threat queuing systems capable of effective detection ranges of 1-10 km against dismounts and vehicles while simultaneously surveying a 120-degree or greater field of view (FOV). The system is envisioned to queue the operator to potential threats in the FOV; target identification is presumed to be a subsequent action taken by the user/operator and is not a required function of the CT2WS system. DARPA is not aware of any single company or institution capable of spanning the requisite technical breadth and anticipates that a highly interdisciplinary team will be required to perform the effort and deliver several prototype soldier-

portable units. A teaming website, <http://www.sainc.com/CT2WSTeaming/>, will facilitate the formation of teams with the necessary expertise.

2.1.1. Phase 1 (Base)

Phase 1 (Base) will develop the prototype device system level design and demonstrate the key technology components separately at the breadboard level. Of critical interest in this phase is the development and demonstration of a composite software/human-in-the-loop system capable of high fidelity detection with extremely low false alarm rates. Such a system may include, for example, an array of neuro-mimetic or classical image processing algorithms in series with operator neural signature detection processing and operator feedback learning systems to maximize P_d and minimize PFA rates. Performers should develop a system-level preliminary design capable of achieving the program metrics detailed below in Section 2.2 including system-level design and essential tradeoffs for the optical subsystem, digital imager element(s), processing hardware architecture, software system inclusive of operator neural signature detection processing, packaging concept, and operator interface. The exit criterion for this Phase is a Preliminary Design Review inclusive of breadboard component subsystem evaluations that demonstrate the plausibility of the subject design to meet the objective system program metrics (listed in Table 1). Completion of the Preliminary Design Review does not guarantee down-selection to Phase 2.

2.1.2. Phase 2 (Option 1)

Phase 2 (Option 1) will finalize the prototype device system level design and validate each subsystem separately at the brassboard level. Of critical interest in this phase is the subsequent demonstration of the bench-top integration of these brassboard subsystems, and the demonstration of the P_d / PFA efficacy of this bench-integrated brassboard system in real field environments. The exit criterion for this Phase is a Critical Design Review inclusive of brassboard component subsystem evaluations and bench-integrated brassboard system evaluations that demonstrate the capability of the subject design to meet the objective system program metrics in Table 1. In particular, performers' packaging approach should take full consideration of the ruggedization and robustness required for soldier-portable tactical electronic devices. Completion of the Critical Design Review does not guarantee down-selection to Phase 3.

2.1.3. Phase 3 (Option 2)

Phase 3 (Option 2) will apply a final optimization, as necessary, to the brassboard components and subsystems and subsequently integrate and package three or more fully functional prototype systems for subsequent extended field testing in a range of real environments including desert, tropical, and arctic conditions. A mid-phase Test Readiness Review (TRR) should validate both the maintenance of the P_d PFA efficacy demonstrated in Phase 2 and suitable device ruggedization to support extended field testing. A successful TRR shall be followed by extended field testing over a 6-month period. This field testing shall include at least six 1-week periods of contractor-supported in-the-field testing by Government personnel. The in-the-field performance of the devices shall be analyzed for efficacy and potential improvements.

2.1.4. Progression Between Phases

Proposers should note that meeting the exit criterion for either the Base or Option 1 phases does not guarantee award of the subsequent Option 1 or Option 2 phases, respectively.

2.2. PROGRAM METRICS

In order for the Government to evaluate the effectiveness of a proposed solution in achieving the stated program objectives, proposers should note that the Government hereby promulgates the following program metrics that may serve as the basis for determining whether satisfactory progress is being made to warrant continued funding of the program. Although the following program metrics are specified, proposers should note that the Government has identified these goals with the intention of bounding the scope of effort, while affording the maximum flexibility, creativity, and innovation in proposing solutions to the stated problem. The Government will provide suitable test data sets at least 3 months prior to the completion of Phases 1 and 2, and a final data set(s) for the demonstration of these metrics shall be provided at the PDR and CDR for Phases 1 and 2, respectively.

Proposals should cite the quantitative and qualitative success criteria that the proposed effort will achieve by the time of each phase’s program metric measurement.

Table 1

<p>Phase 1 Breadboard</p>	<p>120° FOV components</p>	<p>PDR 9-12 months</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate threat queuing via neural detection signature/algorithm composite system performance in relevant environment with a $P_d \geq .98$ per 5 minute time interval (maximum time, including all processing, signal classification and learning) with a False Alarm* Rate < 10 per 120° FOV. Threat categories of interest include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Walking dismounts at 1 km – Vehicles at 5 km – Moving vehicles at 10 km • Demonstrate 120° FOV optical system • Deliver preliminary design consistent with objective performance and package size, weight and power. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Volume: 0.5 ft³ – Weight: 5 lbs – Power: 20 W
----------------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------	---

Phase 2 Brassboard	120° FOV system (verify scalability of solution)	CDR 12 months	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate integrated brassboard proof of concept system with threat queuing $P_d \geq .98$ with a False Alarm* Rate < 10 per 120° FOV in a less than 5 min time interval in spatiotemporally variegated environments. Threat categories of interest include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Dismounts at 1 km – Vehicles at 5 km – Moving vehicles at 10 km • Deliver detailed design consistent with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Volume < 0.5 ft³ – Weight < 5 lbs – Power < 20 W • Demonstrate brassboard component performance consistent with detailed design performance flow-down requirements.
Phase 3 Prototype Build/test	Proof-of-Concept testing	TRR 6-9 months + 6-9 months testing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate fully integrated prototype system $P_d \geq .98$ with a False Alarm* Rate < 10 per 120° FOV in less than 5 min time interval in spatiotemporally variegated environments. Threat categories of interest include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Dismounts at 1 km – Vehicles at 5 km – Moving vehicles at 10 km • Deliver three (3) prototype systems for extended field testing.

*Note: False alarms are defined as objects and features in the specified environment(s) that the human visual system would NOT attend to or find surprising.

3. GENERAL INFORMATION

3.1. ELIGIBILITY

This BAA solicits proposals from all interested and qualified sources. Proposers may include foreign personnel as part of their proposed resources as long as these personnel qualify technically, export control laws are complied with, the proposed effort is unclassified, and such foreign personnel sign any and all appropriate non-disclosure agreements prior to participating in the research effort.

3.2. LIMITATIONS ON OTHER TRANSACTIONS FOR PROTOTYPE PROJECTS

Proposers are advised that an Other Transaction for Prototype Agreement will only be awarded if there is:

1. At least one nontraditional Defense contractor participating to a significant extent in the prototype project, or
2. No nontraditional Defense contractor is participating to a significant extent in the prototype project, but at least one of the following circumstances exists:

- a. At least one third of the total cost of the prototype project is to be paid out of funds provided by the parties to the transaction other than the Federal Government. The cost share should generally consist of labor, materials, equipment, and facilities costs (including allocable indirect costs).
- b. Exceptional circumstances justify the use of a transaction that provides for innovative business arrangements or structures that would not be feasible or appropriate under a procurement contract.

Although use of one of these options is required to use an Other Transaction for Prototype Agreement as the procurement vehicle, no single option is encouraged or desired over the others. However, DARPA has not used the exceptional circumstances justification for the BAA process, and is unlikely to use this justification for this program.

NOTE: For purposes of determining whether or not a participant may be classified as a nontraditional Defense contractor and whether or not such participation is determined to be participating to a significant extent in the prototype project, the following definitions are applicable:

“Nontraditional Defense contractor” means a business unit that has not, for a period of at least one year prior to the date of the OT agreement, entered into or performed on:

1. Any contract that is subject to full coverage under the cost accounting standards prescribed pursuant to section 26 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 422) and the regulations implementing such section; or
2. Any other contract in excess of \$500,000 to carry out prototype projects or to perform basic, applied, or advanced research projects for a Federal agency that is subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

“Participating to a significant extent in the prototype project” means that the nontraditional Defense contractor is supplying a new key technology or product, is accomplishing a significant amount of the effort wherein the role played is more than a nominal or token role in the research effort, or in some other way plays a significant part in causing a material reduction in the cost or schedule of the effort or an increase in performance of the prototype in question.

NOTE: Proposers are cautioned that if they are classified as a traditional Defense contractor, and propose the use of an OT for Prototype Agreement, the Government will require submittal of both a cost proposal under the guidelines of the FAR/DFARS, and a cost proposal under the proposed OT for Prototype Agreement, so that an evaluation may be made with respect to the cost tradeoffs applicable under both situations. The Government reserves the right to negotiate either a FAR based procurement contract, or Other Transaction for Prototype Agreement as it deems is warranted under the circumstances.

3.3. PROCUREMENT INTEGRITY, STANDARDS OF CONDUCT, ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS, AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (OCIs)

Certain post-employment restrictions on former federal officers and employees may exist, including special Government employees (including but not limited to Section 207 and 208 of Title 18, United States Code, the Procurement Integrity Act, 41 U.S.C. 423, and FAR 3.104).

Program Managers are required to review and evaluate all proposals received under this BAA and be able to manage all selected efforts. If a conflict of interest exists with a proposer, the proposer must show how they plan to mitigate the conflict in the proposal. It should be raised to the DARPA Contracting Officer before time and effort are expended in preparing a proposal. All proposers and proposed sub-contractors must therefore affirm whether they are providing scientific, engineering, and technical assistance (SETA) or similar support to any DARPA technical office(s) through an active contract or subcontract. All affirmations must state which office(s) the proposer supports and identify the prime contract numbers. Affirmations shall be furnished at the time of proposal submission. All facts relevant to the existence or potential existence of organizational conflicts of interest (FAR 9.5.) must be disclosed. The disclosure shall include a description of the action the proposer has taken or proposes to take to avoid, neutralize, or mitigate such conflict. If the situation cannot be mitigated by the contractor, the proposal may be returned without technical evaluation and withdrawn from consideration for award under this BAA.

3.4. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

3.4.1. Procurement Contract Proposers

3.4.1.1. Noncommercial Items (Technical Data and Computer Software):

Proposers responding to this BAA requesting a procurement contract to be issued under the FAR/DFARS shall identify all noncommercial technical data and noncommercial computer software that it plans to generate, develop, and/or deliver under any proposed award instrument in which the Government will acquire less than unlimited rights, and to assert specific restrictions on those deliverables. Proposers shall follow the format under DFARS 252.227-7017 for this stated purpose. In the event that proposers do not submit the list, the Government will assume that it automatically has “unlimited rights” to all noncommercial technical data and noncommercial computer software generated, developed, and/or delivered under any award instrument, unless it is substantiated that development of the noncommercial technical data and noncommercial computer software occurred with mixed funding. If mixed funding is anticipated in the development of noncommercial technical data, and noncommercial computer software generated, developed, and/or delivered under any award instrument, then proposers should identify the data and software in question, as subject to Government Purpose Rights (GPR). In accordance with DFARS 252.227-7013 Rights in Technical Data - Noncommercial Items, and DFARS 252.227-7014 Rights in Noncommercial Computer Software and Noncommercial Computer Software Documentation, the Government will automatically assume that any such GPR restriction is limited to a period of five (5) years in accordance with the applicable DFARS clauses, at which time the Government will acquire “unlimited rights” unless the parties agree otherwise. Proposers are admonished that the Government may use the list during the source selection evaluation process to evaluate the impact of any identified restrictions, and may request additional information from the proposer, as may be necessary, to evaluate the proposer’s assertions. If no restrictions are intended, then the proposer should state “NONE.”

A sample list for complying with this request is as follows:

NONCOMMERCIAL			
Technical Data Computer Software To be Furnished	Basis for Assertion	Asserted Rights Category	Name of Person Asserting Restrictions

With Restrictions			
(LIST)	(LIST)	(LIST)	(LIST)

3.4.1.2 Commercial Items (Technical Data and Computer Software):

Proposers responding to this BAA requesting a procurement contract to be issued under the FAR/DFARS shall identify all commercial technical data and commercial computer software that may be embedded in any noncommercial deliverables contemplated under the research effort, along with any applicable restrictions on the Government’s use of such commercial technical data and/or commercial computer software. In the event that proposers do not submit the list, the Government will assume that there are no restrictions on the Government’s use of such commercial items. The Government may use the list during the source selection evaluation process to evaluate the impact of any identified restrictions, and may request additional information from the proposer, as may be necessary, to evaluate the proposer’s assertions. If no restrictions are intended, then the proposer should state “NONE.”

A sample list for complying with this request is as follows:

COMMERCIAL			
Technical Data Computer Software To be Furnished With Restrictions	Basis for Assertion	Asserted Rights Category	Name of Person Asserting Restrictions
(LIST)	(LIST)	(LIST)	(LIST)

3.4.2. Non-Procurement Contract Proposers

3.4.2.1. Noncommercial Items and Commercial Items (Technical Data and Computer Software):

Proposers responding to this BAA requesting a Grant, Cooperative Agreement, Technology Investment Agreement, or Other Transaction for Prototype shall follow the applicable rules and regulations governing these various award instruments, but in all cases should appropriately identify any potential restrictions on the Governments use of any Intellectual Property contemplated under those award instruments in question. This includes both Noncommercial Items and Commercial Items. Although not required, proposers may use a format similar to that described in Paragraphs 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 herein. The Government may use the list during the source selection evaluation process to evaluate the impact of any identified restrictions, and may request additional information from the proposer, as may be necessary, to evaluate the proposer’s assertions. If no restrictions are intended, then the proposer should state “NONE.”

3.4.3. All Proposers--Intellectual Property & Patents

Please include documentation proving your ownership of or possession of appropriate licensing rights to all patented inventions (or inventions for which a patent application has been filed) that will be utilized under your proposal for the DARPA program. If a patent application has been filed for an invention that your proposal utilizes, but the application has not yet been made publicly available and contains proprietary information, you may provide only the patent number, inventor name(s), assignee names (if any), filing date, filing date of any related provisional application, and a summary of the patent title, together with either: 1) a

representation that you own the invention, or 2) proof of possession of appropriate licensing rights in the invention. Please also provide a good faith representation that you either own or possess appropriate licensing rights to all other intellectual property that will be utilized under your proposal for the DARPA program.

3.5. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The number and types of reports will be specified in the award document, but will include as a minimum quarterly R&D and financial status reports (see sample at attachment A). The reports shall be prepared and submitted in accordance with the procedures contained in the award document and mutually agreed on before award. A Final Report that summarizes the project and tasks will be required at the conclusion of the performance period for the award, notwithstanding the fact that the research may be continued under a follow-on vehicle. Each performer will also be required to submit period reports on invention disclosure, election of title, and filing of patent applications. Patent application and invention disclosure reporting will be made through the Government's online reporting service, iEdison.

3.6. REQUIRED REVIEW AND INTERCHANGE MEETINGS

1) Attendance at quarterly review meetings (anticipated to be held at the performer's location) is mandatory.

2) Following a successful Test Readiness Review in Phase 3, contractor support is required for 6 weeks of field testing allocated as 2 weeks each at the following locations: Twenty Nine Palms, CA; Fort Drum, NY; and Eglin AFB, FL.

3) The contractor may propose additional (intermediate) field testing of the brassboard or prototype systems in Phases 2 and 3 as they believe may support cost-effective development of the key technology subsystems and integrated prototype system. Such testing, if proposed, should clearly detail the desired schedule, range type, conditions, and Government support required.

3.7. SUBCONTRACTING

Pursuant to Section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)), it is the policy of the Government to enable small business and small disadvantaged business concerns to be considered fairly as subcontractors to contractors performing work or rendering services as prime contractors or subcontractors under Government contracts, and to assure that prime contractors and subcontractors carry out this policy. Each proposer who submits a contract proposal and includes subcontractors is required to submit a subcontracting plan IAW FAR 19.702(a) (1) and (2) should do so with their proposal. The plan format is outlined in FAR 19.704.

3.8. EXPORT LICENSES

The following provision will be incorporated into any resultant contract:

(1) The contractor shall comply with all U.S. export control laws and regulations, including the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), 22 DFR Parts 120 through 130, and the Export Administration Regulations (EAR), 15 CFR Parts 730 through 799, in the performance of this contract. In the absence of available license exemptions/exceptions, the Contractor shall be responsible for obtaining the appropriate licenses or other approvals, if required, for exports of hardware, technical data, and software, or for the provision of technical assistance.

(2) The Contractor shall be responsible for obtaining export licenses, if required, before utilizing foreign persons in the performance of this contract, including instances where the work is to be performed on-site at any Government installation, including installations within the United States, where the foreign person will have access to export-controlled technical data or software.

(3) The Contractor shall be responsible for all regulatory record-keeping requirements associated with the use of licenses and license exemptions/exceptions.

(4) The Contractor shall be responsible for ensuring that the provisions of this clause apply to its subcontractors.

3.9. PUBLIC RELEASE OR DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

The following provision will be incorporated into any resultant contract:

(1) There shall be no dissemination or publication, except within and between the Contractor and any subcontractors, of information developed under this contract or contained in the reports to be furnished pursuant to this contract without prior written approval of the DARPA Technical Information Officer (DARPA/TIO). All technical reports will be given proper review by appropriate authority to determine which Distribution Statement is to be applied prior to the initial distribution of these reports by the Contractor.

(2) When submitting material for written approval for open publication as described in subparagraph (1) above, the Contractor must submit a request for public release request to the DARPA TIO and include the following information: a) Document Information: document title, document author, short plain-language description of technology discussed in the material (approx 30 words), number of pages (or minutes of video) and document type (briefing, report, abstract, article, or paper); b) Event Information: event type (conference, article, or paper), event date, desired date for DARPA's approval; c) DARPA Sponsor: DARPA Program Manager, DARPA office, and contract number; and d) Contractor's Information: POC name, e-mail and phone. Allow four weeks for processing; due dates under four weeks require a justification. Unusual electronic file formats may require additional processing time. Requests can be sent either via e-mail to tio@darpa.mil or via 3701 North Fairfax Drive, Arlington VA 22203-1714, telephone (571) 218-4235. Refer to www.darpa.mil/tio for information about DARPA's public release process.

3.10. AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

(1) Central Contractor Registration. Selected offerors not already registered in the Central Contractor Registry (CCR) will be required to register in CCR prior to any award under this BAA. Information on CCR registration is available at <http://www.ccr.gov>.

(2) Representations and Certifications. In accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation 4.1201, prospective proposers shall complete electronic annual representations and certifications at <http://orca.bpn.gov>.

3.11. HUMAN USE IN RESEARCH

Proposals selected for funding are required to comply with provisions of the Common Rule (32 CFR 219) on the protection of human subjects in research

(<http://www.dtic.mil/biosys/downloads/32cfr219.pdf>) and the Department of Defense Directive 3216.2 (<http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/html2/d32162x.htm>). All proposals that involve the use of human subjects are required to include documentation of their ability to follow Federal guidelines for the protection of human subjects. This includes, but is not limited to, protocol approval mechanisms, approved Institutional Review Boards, and Federal Wide Assurances. These requirements are based on expected human use issues sometime during the entire length of the proposed effort.

For proposals involving "greater than minimal risk" to human subjects within the first year of the project, performers must provide evidence of protocol submission to a federally approved IRB at the time of final proposal submission to DARPA. For proposals that are forecasted to involve "greater than minimal risk" after the first year, a discussion on how and when the proposer will comply with submission to a federally approved IRB needs to be provided in the submission. More information on applicable Federal regulations can be found at the Department of Health and Human Services - Office of Human Research Protections website (<http://www.dhhs.gov/ohrp>).

4. PROPOSAL PREPARATION

4.1. GENERAL GUIDANCE

All proposals submitted must follow the instructions in this Proposer Information Pamphlet (PIP) and include only the information requested to avoid delays in evaluation or disqualification. It is anticipated that within 30 days of completing the evaluation, proposers will be notified that: 1) its proposal has been selected for negotiation, or 2) its proposal has not been selected. Proposals not selected will be destroyed; however, a copy of non-selected proposals may be retained and filed.

4.1.1. Restrictive Markings on Proposals

All proposals should clearly indicate limitations on the disclosure of their contents. Proposers who include in their proposals data that they do not want disclosed to the public for any purpose, or used by the Government except for evaluation purposes, shall-

(1) Mark the title page with the following legend:

This proposal includes data that shall not be disclosed outside the Government and shall not be duplicated, used, or disclosed-in whole or in part-for any purpose other than to evaluate this proposal. If, however, a contract is awarded to this proposer as a result of, or in connection with, the submission of this data, the Government shall have the right to duplicate, use, or disclose the data to the extent provided in the resulting contract. This restriction does not limit the Government's right to use information contained in this data if it is obtained from another source without restriction. The data subject to this restriction are contained in sheets [*insert numbers or other identification of sheets*]; and

(2) Mark each sheet of data it wishes to restrict with the following legend:

Use or disclosure of data contained on this sheet is subject to the restriction on the title page of this proposal.

Markings like "Company Confidential" or other phrases that may be confused with national security classifications shall be avoided. The proposer may be required to remove such markings before the proposal will be accepted. "Proprietary" or "Company Proprietary" are acceptable notations. See Section 6., for additional information.

4.1.2. Confidentiality

It is the policy of DARPA to treat all proposals as competitive information and to disclose their contents only for the purpose of evaluation. No proposals will be returned. The original of each proposal received will be retained at DARPA and all other copies of non-selected proposals destroyed. Documentation related to the source selection process will be marked SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104.

4.1.3. Submission Timelines

This BAA shall remain open for one (1) year from the date of publication on www.fbo.gov and/or www.grants.gov. Although the Government may select proposals for award at any time during this period, it is anticipated that the majority of funding for this program will be committed during the initial selection period as stipulated on the first page of this Proposer Information Pamphlet (PIP). Proposers may submit a full proposal in accordance with the instruction provided herein at any time up to the proposal due date.

All submitted proposals will be reviewed. In order to be considered during the initial round of funding, full proposals must be submitted to DARPA **on or before 3:00PM ET, June 21, 2007.**

Proposals submitted under this BAA may be either mailed, hand-delivered or submitted via the website <http://www.sainc.com/dsobaa/>.

Mailing address: DARPA/DSO
 ATTN: BAA 07-25, Dr. Amy Kruse
 3701 North Fairfax Drive
 Arlington, VA 22203-1714

For hand deliveries, the courier shall deliver the package to the DARPA Visitor Control Center at the address specified above. The outer package, as well as the cover page of the proposal, must be marked “CT2WS BAA 07-25.” (NOTE: University submissions may be made via www.grants.gov by using the “Apply for Grants” function.)

4.2. FORMATTING CHARACTERISTICS

All submissions must be in the following format—nonconforming proposals may be rejected without further review. Proposals must be on single-sided pages, written in English, and with 1-inch margins (left, right, top, and bottom) in each page. A page is defined as being no larger than 8.5” by 11.0”. (Accordion-style foldouts will be counted as multiple pages equivalent to the expanded size.) Paper copies of proposals should be stapled or submitted in loose-leaf binder, not bound. The Technical Proposal shall contain no smaller than 12-point font type. The Cost Proposal shall contain no smaller than 8 point font type. Larger font type for the Cost Proposal, up to 12-point font type, is desired, where appropriate.

4.2.1. Proposal Format

Proposals shall consist of two volumes. Volume I, Technical and Management Proposal, may include an attached bibliography of relevant technical papers or research notes (published and unpublished), which document the technical ideas and approach upon which the proposal is based. Copies of not more than three (3) relevant papers can be included with the submission. The bibliography and attached papers (in Section III of Volume I) are not included in the page counts given below. The submission of other supporting materials along with the proposal is strongly discouraged and will not be considered for review. Sections I and II of Volume I shall not exceed 50 pages. The page limitation for proposals includes all figures, tables (except the table of contents), and charts. Recommendations on the page length of any specific section are shown in braces { } below. All pages that exceed the maximum page limit specified may be removed and not be reviewed or considered in evaluation.

Technical and cost proposals should conform to the guidance provided in Paragraphs 1.3. (Program Scope and Funding) and 1.4. (Period of Performance) of this BAA. Proposers should refer to those sections for information on how to scope and segment their technical and costs proposals.

When submitting electronically, proposers should follow the instructions found at <http://www.sainc.com/dsobaa/>.

When submitting via hardcopy proposers must submit:

- one (1) printed original of the full proposal and
- four (4) printed copies of the full proposal and
- one (1) electronic copy of the full proposal
 - Electronic copies must be on a CD-ROM.
 - Each disk must be clearly labeled with **BAA 07-25**, proposer organization, and proposal title (short title recommended).
 - Electronic copies of the proposal must be in MS-Word readable application. Cost proposal spreadsheets should be submitted in an MS Excel-readable format.
 - Exceptions: the three relevant papers included in Volume I, Section III may be in .pdf format. No other items may be submitted in .pdf format.

4.2.1.1. Volume I, Technical and Management Proposal

Section I. Administrative

1. {1} Cover sheet to include:
 - a. BAA number (**BAA 07-25**)
 - b. Lead Organization Submitting proposal
 - c. Type of business, selected among the following categories: “LARGE BUSINESS,” “SMALL BUSINESS,” “SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS,” “8A,” “OTHER SMALL BUSINESS,” “EMERGING SMALL BUSINESS,” “VETERAN-OWNED SMALL BUSINESS,” “SERVICE-DISABLED VETERAN OWNED,” “OTHER VETERAN,” “WOMAN-OWNED BUSINESS,” “HUBZONE,” “JWOD PARTICIPATING NONPROFIT AGENCY,” “OTHER NONPROFIT,” “HOSPITAL,” “FOREIGN CONCERN OR ENTITY,” “DOMESTIC FIRM PERFORMING OUTSIDE U.S.,” “HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY (HBCU),” “MINORITY INSTITUTION (MI),” “OTHER EDUCATIONAL,”

- “FFRDC (INCLUDING DOE LABORATORIES),” “DOD COMPONENT,”
 “OTHER GOVERNMENT,” “OTHER”
- d. Contractor’s reference number (if any)
 - e. Other team members (if applicable) and type of business for each
 - f. Proposal title
 - g. Technical point of contact to include: salutation, last name, first name, street address, city, state, zip code, telephone, fax (if available), electronic mail
 - h. Administrative point of contact to include: salutation, last name, first name, street address, city, state, zip code, telephone, fax (if available), electronic mail (if available)
 - i. Funds requested from DARPA for the Base Effort, each option and the total proposed cost; and the amount of cost share (if any)
 - j. Date proposal was prepared.
2. {1} Official transmittal letter.
 3. {Not included in page count} Table of Contents. The Table of Contents should be keyed to the page numbers of the proposal sections.
 4. {1} A one slide summary of the proposal in PowerPoint that quickly and succinctly indicates the main objective, key innovations, expected impact, and other unique aspects of the proposal.

Section II. Detailed Proposal Information:

This section provides the detailed discussion of the proposed work necessary to enable an in-depth review of the specific technical and managerial issues. Specific attention must be given to addressing both risk and payoff of the proposed work that make it desirable to DARPA.

1. {3} Executive Summary of the Proposal. This section should succinctly describe the uniqueness and benefits of the proposed approach relative to the current state-of-art and alternate approaches. Define the problem/challenge that this innovative claim will address and the effort’s technical goals. Explain how this proposal addresses this problem differently than current approaches and the significant gains due to its uniqueness.
2. {20} Technical Approach. This section is the centerpiece of the proposal. It should fully describe the uniqueness and benefits of the proposed approach relative to current state-of-the-art and alternate approaches. It should fully describe the detailed technical rationale, technical approach, and constructive plan for accomplishment of technical goals in support of program objectives, intermediate milestones, and deliverable production. This section should clearly explain: What you are proposing (and how it works); why you are proposing this approach; why you believe it can be done now; and the importance or affect if successful (who will care and why).
3. {10} Management Approach. This section should establish that the proposing organization is appropriately organized, is staffed by highly qualified key personnel (include brief bios), and features the necessary interactions to ensure an effective integrated technology development effort (an organization chart is recommended). Proposers are strongly encouraged to include a detailed description of their risk management approach including, where appropriate, a discussion of the proposer’s risk buy-down strategy, risk retirement plan, and risk retirement schedule. Finally, this section should indicate how the proposed management approach supports effective transition of the technology to the operational military communities in such a way as to enhance U.S. defense.

4. {5} Relevant Capabilities. This section should describe the relevant experience of the key personnel and the proposing organization, as well as the relevant facility and business capabilities of the proposing organization. This section should include a discussion of proposer's previous accomplishments in this or closely related development areas, including a discussion of similar work funded by other Government organizations.
5. {3} Statement of Work (SOW). SOW should be written in plain English, outlining the scope of the effort and citing specific tasks to be performed and specific contractor requirements.
6. {3} Deliverables. Deliverables associated with the proposed research and the plans and capability to accomplish technology transition and commercialization will clearly address how the proposed effort will meet the goals of the program. Include in this section all proprietary claims to results, prototypes, intellectual property, or systems supporting and/or necessary for the use of the research, results, and/or prototype. (SEE SECTION 3.4, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.) If there are no proprietary claims, this should be stated. NOTE: For purposes of completing Section 3.4, Intellectual Property, this information will NOT be counted in the proposers page count.
7. {3} Cost, schedule and milestones. Detail cost, schedule, and milestones for the proposed research, including estimates of cost for each task in each year of the effort, for each phase, and total cost and company cost share, if applicable. Please note: cost-sharing is neither required nor encouraged.

Section III. Additional Information

A brief bibliography of relevant technical papers and research notes (published and unpublished) that document the technical ideas upon which the proposal is based. Copies of not more than three (3) relevant papers can be included in the submission. These papers are not included in the fifty (50) page limit.

4.2.1.2. Volume II, Cost Proposal – {No page limit}

1. A cover sheet to include:
 - a. Name and address of Proposer (include zip code);
 - b. Name, title, and telephone number of Proposer's point of contact;
 - c. Award instrument requested: cost-plus-fixed-fee (CPFF), cost-contract--no fee, cost sharing contract--no fee, or other type of procurement contract (specify), grant, agreement, or other award instrument;
 - d. Place(s) and period(s) of performance;
 - e. Funds requested from DARPA for the Base Effort, each option and the total proposed cost; and the amount of cost share (if any);
 - f. Name, mailing address, telephone number and Point of Contact of the Proposer's cognizant government administration office (i.e., Office of Naval Research/Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA)) (if known);
 - g. Name, mailing address, telephone number, and Point of Contact of the Proposer's cognizant Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) audit office (if known);
 - h. Any Forward Pricing Rate Agreement, other such Approved Rate Information, or such other documentation that may assist in expediting negotiations (if available);

- i. Contractor and Government Entity (CAGE) Code;
 - j. Dun and Bradstreet (DUN) Number;
 - k. North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) Number [NOTE: This was formerly the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Number];
 - l. Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN); and,
 - m. All subcontractor proposal backup documentation to include items a. through l. above, as is applicable and available).
2. Detailed cost breakdown to include:
- a. Total program cost broken down by month and Government fiscal year (GFY) [Note: Government Fiscal Year runs from October 1st to September 30th] and Base and Options; further broken down by major cost items as follows:
 - i. Direct Labor – Individual labor category or person, with associated labor hours and unburdened direct labor rates;
 - ii. Indirect Costs – Fringe Benefits, Overhead, General and Administrative Expense, Cost of Money, etc. (Must show base amount and rate);
 - iii. Travel – Number of trips, number of days per trip, departure and arrival destinations, number of people, etc.
 - iv. Subcontract – A cost proposal as detailed as the Proposer’s cost proposal will be required to be submitted by the subcontractor. The subcontractor’s cost proposal can be provided in a sealed envelope with the Proposer’s cost proposal or will be requested from the subcontractor at a later date;
 - v. Consultant – Provide consultant agreement or other document which verifies the proposed loaded daily/hourly rate;
 - vi. Materials – Should be specifically itemized with costs or estimated costs. An explanation of any estimating factors, including their derivation and application, shall be provided. Please include a brief description of the Proposer’s procurement method to be used;
 - vii. Other Direct Costs – Should be itemized with costs or estimated costs. Backup documentation should be submitted to support proposed costs.
 - b. Costs of major program tasks and major cost items by year and month;
 - c. An itemization of major subcontracts (labor, travel, materials and other direct costs) and equipment purchases;
 - d. A summary of projected funding requirements by month; and

- e. The source, nature, and amount of any industry cost sharing, if applicable. Where the effort consists of multiple phases that could reasonably be partitioned for purposes of funding, these should be identified as options with separate cost estimates for each.
3. Supporting cost and pricing information in sufficient detail to substantiate the summary cost estimates above. Include a description of the method used to estimate costs and supporting documentation. Provide the basis of estimate for all proposed labor rates, indirect costs, overhead costs, other direct costs and materials, as applicable.
 4. OCI Mitigation Plan (if applicable) to detail what steps the contractor is performing to mitigate an actual or perceived Organizational Conflict of Interest.

5. PROPOSAL EVALUATION

The criteria to be used to evaluate and select proposals for this project are described in the following paragraphs. Each proposal will be evaluated on the merit and relevance of the specific proposal as it relates to the program rather than against other proposals for research in the same general area, since no common work statement exists. In descending order of importance, the proposal Evaluation Criteria include: (a) Technical Approach; (b) Management Approach; (c) Relevant Experience; (d) Potential Contribution and Relevance to the DARPA Mission; and (e) Cost and Schedule Reasonableness and Realism. In accordance with FAR 35.016(e) the primary basis for selecting proposals for award shall be technical, importance to Agency programs, and funds availability. Cost and schedule reasonableness and realism shall also be considered to the extent appropriate as described herein. Proposals may be evaluated as they are received, or they may be collected and periodically reviewed. The following are descriptions of the above listed criteria:

5.1. TECHNICAL APPROACH

The proposer's Technical Approach will be evaluated to determine the extent that the proposed development plan enables the program vision and meets the program objectives and goals discussed in the BAA Proposers' Information Pamphlet (Sections 2.1-2.2), with particular emphasis on the following items:

- Overall scientific and technical merit of the proposal approach,
- Understanding of the problem including the demonstrated understanding of the performance objectives, fundamental subsystem characteristics tradeoffs, their implications in the overall system design, and the technical feasibility of subsystem development approaches,
- Realistic and justified feasibility of the proposed approach meeting the objective metrics described in Section 2.2,
- Probability of success and likelihood of achieving a robust integrated system meeting the desired detection and false alarm performance objectives within the size, weight, and power constraints.

5.2. MANAGEMENT APPROACH

The approach to the management of the project will be evaluated with particular emphasis on the following items:

- The appropriateness, effectiveness, and reliability of the management structure considering the diversity of technologies that needs to be integrated as well as their relative maturities,
- The qualifications of Principal Investigator and the key Task Leaders, and clauses for contract termination in event of unapproved key personnel changes,
- The range, depth, and mix of expertise of the proposer's key personnel will be evaluated to ensure that they are qualified in the theory and application of the technologies involved in the research, development, testing, and evaluation of the proposed system(s) and technology,
- The risk management approach, risk buy-down strategy, and risk retirement plan and schedule,
- The plans to transition the technology to the operational military communities in such a way as to enhance U.S. defense.

5.3. RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

The relevant experience of the proposer, team members, Principal Investigator, and other key personnel will be evaluated with particular emphasis on the following items:

- The prior experience of the proposer's team in similar efforts will most desirably clearly demonstrate an ability to deliver the key technology developments, system integration focused technology management, and innovative product development capable of meeting the proposed technical performance within the proposed budget and schedule,
- The experience of key personnel within their technical area(s) of responsibility,
- The demonstrated capability of the proposed team to manage technical development projects to the proposed cost and schedule,
- The documentation of similar efforts completed/ongoing by the offeror's team in this area, including identification of other Government sponsors.

5.4. POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION AND RELEVANCE TO THE DARPA MISSION

The potential contributions of the proposed effort with relevance to the national technology base will be evaluated. Specifically, DARPA's mission is to maintain the technological superiority of the U.S. military and prevent technological surprise from harming our national security by sponsoring revolutionary, high-payoff research that bridges the gap between fundamental discoveries and their military use.

5.5. COST AND SCHEDULE REASONABLENESS AND REALISM

The objective of this criterion is to establish that the proposed costs and schedules are reasonable and realistic for the technical and management approach offered, as well as to determine the proposer's practical understanding of the effort. This will be principally measured by cost per labor-hour and number of labor-hours proposed. The evaluation criterion recognize that undue emphasis on cost may motivate proposers to offer low-risk ideas with minimum uncertainty and to staff the effort with junior personnel in order to be in a more competitive posture. DARPA discourages such cost strategies. Cost reduction approaches that will be received favorably include innovative management concepts that maximize direct funding for technology and limit diversion of funds into overhead.

NOTE: PROPOSERS ARE CAUTIONED THAT EVALUATION SCORES MAY BE LOWERED AND/OR PROPOSALS REJECTED IF SUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS ARE NOT FOLLOWED.

6. SECURITY INFORMATION

6.1. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Proposals in response to this BAA are anticipated to be UNCLASSIFIED. However, in the event that a proposer chooses to submit a classified proposal or submit any documentation that may be classified, the following information is applicable.

If you choose to submit a classified proposal, you must first receive permission of the Original Classification Authority (OCA) to use their information in replying to this BAA and submit the applicable OCA classification guide(s) to ensure that the proposal is protected appropriately.

Classified submissions shall be in accordance with the following guidance:

Collateral Classified Data: Use classification and marking guidance provided by previously issued security classification guides, the Information Security Regulation (DoD 5200.1-R), and the National Industrial Security Program Operating Manual (DoD 5220.22-M) when marking and transmitting information previously classified by another original classification authority. Classified information at the Confidential and Secret level may only be mailed via U.S. Postal Service (USPS) Registered Mail or U.S. Postal Service Express Mail (USPS only; not DHL, UPS or FedEx). All classified information will be enclosed in opaque inner and outer covers and double wrapped. The inner envelope shall be sealed and plainly marked with the assigned classification and addresses of both sender and addressee. The inner envelope shall be addressed to:

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)
ATTN: **BAA 07-25**, DARPA/DSO, **Dr. Amy Kruse**
3701 North Fairfax Drive
Arlington, VA 22203-1714

The outer envelope shall be sealed with no identification as to the classification of its contents and addressed to:

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)
Security & Intelligence Directorate, Attn: CDR
3701 North Fairfax Drive, Suite 832
Arlington, VA 22203-1714

All Top Secret materials should be hand carried via an authorized, two-person courier team to the DARPA Classified Document Registry (CDR).

Special Access Program (SAP) Information: Contact the DARPA Program Security Support Center (PSSC) at 703-812-1962/1970 for further guidance and instructions prior to transmitting to DARPA. All Top Secret SAP must be transmitted via approved methods for such material. Consult the DoD Overprint to the National Industrial Security Program Operating Manual for further guidance. It is strongly recommended that you coordinate the transmission of SAP material and information with the DARPA PSSC prior to transmission.

Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) Data: Contact the DARPA Special Security Contact Office (SSCO) at 703-812-1993/1994 for the correct SCI courier address and instructions. All SCI should be transmitted through your servicing Special Security Officer (SSO) / Special Security Contact Officer (SSCO). All SCI data must be transmitted through your servicing Special Security Officer (SSO) / Special Security Contact Officer (SSCO). All SCI data must be transmitted through SCI channels only (i.e., approved SCI Facility to SCI facility via secure fax).

Proposers submitting proposals for classified efforts must have existing and in-place prior to execution of an award, approved capabilities (personnel and facilities) to perform research and development at the classification level they propose.

ATTACHMENT A: Sample R&D and Financial Status Report

(1) R&D STATUS REPORT

This brief narrative, not to exceed five pages in length, shall contain the following:

- (i) For first report only; the date work actually started.
- (ii) Description of progress during the reporting period, supported by reasons for any change in approach reported previously.
- (iii) Planned activities and milestones for the next reporting period.
- (iv) Description of any major items of experimental or special equipment purchased or constructed during the reporting period.
- (v) Notification of any changes in key personnel associated with the contract during the reporting period.
- (vi) Summary of substantive information derived from noteworthy trips, meetings, and special conferences held in connection with the contract during the reporting period.
- (vii) Summary of all problems or areas of concern.
- (viii) Related accomplishments since last report.
- (ix) Fiscal status, to include reporting of summary level financial data in the following format: (next page)

This report shall document the results of the complete effort and should be delivered at the completion of the contract. If the Government chooses to exercise the options under this contract, the due date for the final report is extended accordingly. Title pages shall include a disclaimer worded substantially as follows:

“The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the official policies, either expressly or implied, of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency or the U.S. Government.”

The Final Technical Report summary shall include:

Task Objectives
Technical Problems
General Methodology (i.e., literature review, laboratory experiments, surveys, etc.)
Technical Results
Important Findings and Conclusions
Significant Hardware Development
Special Comments
Implications for Further Research
Standard Form 298, September 1988

(b) Reports delivered by the Contractor in the performance of the contract shall be considered “Technical Data” as defined in Section I contract clauses entitled “Rights in Technical Data – Noncommercial Items” and “Rights in Noncommercial Computer Software and Noncommercial Computer Software Documentation.”

(c) Bulky Reports shall be mailed by other than first-class mail unless the urgency of submission requires use of first-class mail. In this situation, one copy shall be mailed first-class and the remaining copies forwarded by less than first-class.

(d) All papers and articles published as a result of DARPA sponsored research shall include a statement reflecting the sponsorship. In addition, a bibliography of the titles and authors of all such papers are to be included in the Final Technical Report

(1) The cover or title page of each of the above reports or publications prepared, will have the following citation:

Sponsored by
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency
DSO
Program:
ARPA Order No. XXX, Program Code: XXX
Issued by DARPA/CMO under Contract No.:

(2) The title page shall include a disclaimer worded substantially as follows:

“The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the official policies, either expressly or implied, of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency or the U.S. Government.”

(3) All technical reports must (i) be prepared in accordance with American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Standard Z39.18; (ii) include a Standard Form 298, August 1998; and (iii) be marked with an appropriate Distribution Statement.