

IARPA

BROAD AGENCY ANNOUNCEMENT

IARPA-BAA-10-05



I A R P A
BE THE FUTURE

AGGREGATIVE CONTINGENT ESTIMATION (ACE)
PROGRAM

Incisive Analysis Office

IARPA-BAA-10-05

Release Date: June 30, 2010

IARPA

BROAD AGENCY ANNOUNCEMENT: IARPA-BAA-10-05

AGGREGATIVE CONTINGENT ESTIMATION (ACE) PROGRAM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part One: OVERVIEW INFORMATION.....	3
Part Two: FULL TEXT OF ANNOUNCEMENT.....	4
Section 1: Funding Opportunity Description.....	4
A: Program Overview.....	4
B: Program Milestones and Metrics.....	10
Section 2: Award Information.....	13
Section 3: Eligibility Information.....	14
A: Eligible Applicants.....	14
B: U.S. Academic Institutions.....	15
C: Cost Sharing / Matching.....	16
D: Other Eligibility Criteria.....	16
Section 4: Application and Submission Information.....	16
A: Content and Format of Application Submission.....	16
B: Proposal Content Specifics.....	18
C: Submission Details.....	24
Section 5: Application Review Information.....	25
A: Evaluation Criteria.....	25
B: Review and Selection Process.....	26
C: Proposal Retention.....	27
Section 6: Award Administration Information.....	27
A: Award Notices.....	27
B: Administrative and National Policy Requirements.....	27
Section 7: Agency Contacts.....	34
Appendix A: Academic Institution Acknowledgment Letter Template.....	35
Appendix B: Sample Cover Sheet for Volume 1 (Technical/Management Details).....	37
Appendix C: Sample Cover Sheet for Volume 2 (Cost Proposal).....	39
Appendix D: Organizational Conflicts of Interest Certification Letter Template.....	41

PART ONE: OVERVIEW INFORMATION

This publication constitutes a Broad Agency Announcement (BAA) and sets forth research areas of interest in forecasting and expert judgment. Awards based on responses to this BAA are considered to be the result of full and open competition.

- **Federal Agency Name** – Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity (IARPA), Office of Incisive Analysis
- **Funding Opportunity Title** – Aggregative Contingent Estimation (ACE) Program
- **Announcement Type** – Initial
- **Funding Opportunity Number** – IARPA-BAA-10-05
- **Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Numbers (CFDA)** – Not applicable
- **Dates**
 - Proposal Due Date: August 18, 2010
- **Anticipated individual awards** – Multiple awards are anticipated.
- **Types of instruments that may be awarded** – Procurement contract
- **Agency Points of contact**
 - Jason Matheny
 - IARPA, Office of Incisive Analysis
 - ATTN: IARPA-BAA-10-05
 - Office of the Director of National Intelligence
 - Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity
 - Washington, DC 20511
 - Fax: 301-851-7673
 - Electronic mail: dni-iarpa-baa-10-05@ugov.gov
- **Program website:** http://www.iarpa.gov/solicitations_ace.html
- **BAA Summary:** The ACE Program seeks to develop and test methods for generating accurate and timely probabilistic forecasts, leading indicators, and early warning for events, by aggregating the judgments of many widely-dispersed analysts. The Program will develop and test methods for eliciting, aggregating, and representing forecasts for conditional and unconditional events, by using data about forecasters and their patterns of judgment that are predictive of accuracy.
- **Questions:** IARPA will accept questions about the BAA until August 4, 2010. A consolidated Question and Answer response will be publicly posted every few days on the IARPA website http://www.iarpa.gov/solicitations_ace.html; no answers will go directly to the submitter. Questions about administrative, technical or contractual issues must be submitted to the BAA e-mail address at dni-iarpa-baa-10-05@ugov.gov. If e-mail is not available, fax questions to 301-851-7673, Attention: IARPA-BAA-10-05. All requests must include the name, e-mail address (if available) and phone number of a point of contact for the requested information. Do not send questions with proprietary content.

PART TWO: FULL TEXT OF ANNOUNCEMENT

Section 1: FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

The Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity (IARPA) often selects its research efforts through the Broad Agency Announcement (BAA) process. The BAA will appear first on the FedBizOpps website, <http://www.fedbizopps.gov>, then the IARPA website at <http://www.iarpa.gov>. The following information is for those wishing to respond to this Program BAA.

IARPA is seeking innovative solutions for the Aggregative Contingent Estimation (ACE) Program. The use of a BAA solicitation allows a wide range of innovative ideas and concepts. The ACE Program is envisioned to begin in 2010 and end in 2014.

The goal of the ACE Program is to develop and test methods for generating accurate and timely probabilistic forecasts, leading indicators, and early warning for events, by aggregating the judgments of many widely-dispersed analysts. The Program will develop and test methods that elicit forecasts from analysts, aggregate these forecasts using existing and emerging data about the analysts and their judgments that are predictive of accuracy, and communicate these forecasts to a wide variety of users. ACE methods will serve to improve forecasting and decision making in organizations where knowledge is widely distributed.

1.A. Program Overview

The intelligence community (IC) is frequently tasked to forecast global events and the consequences of possible U.S. actions. Within the IC, unconditional forecasts are often called “estimates,” while conditional forecasts are often called “contingent estimates.”¹

The ACE Program aims to develop methods that provide more accurate, precise, and timely forecasts by eliciting, aggregating, and communicating the judgments of many widely-dispersed analysts. Such methods will help the IC to:

- Aggregate relevant knowledge from analysts across the IC
- Generate probabilistic forecasts for a range of events
- Quantify disagreement and identify where additional analysis and collection may be required
- Monitor changes in forecasts that provide early warning and leading indicators of events
- Provide reach-back to analysts possessing outlying judgments
- Assess the accuracy of analysis

The ACE Program is anticipated to result in well-tested methods embodied in software prototypes that support:

- Generation of conditional probabilistic forecasts for a broad range of events
- Asynchronous elicitation of judgments and rationale from >1000 geographically-dispersed analysts

¹ Examples of National Intelligence Estimates can be found at http://www.dni.gov/nic/NIC_specialproducts.html. Strictly, all estimates are contingent estimates, even if they are contingent upon no action influencing the outcome.

- Continuous updating of judgments and rationale
- Aggregation method(s), robust across diverse analysts and problems, that outperform(s) the unweighted linear opinion pool and conventional prediction markets
- Technical approaches that continuously improve system forecasts on the basis of observed analyst performance
- Tools for users to analyze and visualize the distributions of forecast data
- Non-monetary incentives for performance

The Program is anticipated to be divided into a 12-month Base Period and three 12-month Option Periods (Table 1).

Table 1: ACE Program Structure

Period	Length (years)	Goals
Base	1	Develop elicitation, aggregation, and communication methods; unclassified testing begins on unconditional forecasts; identify correlates of forecasting accuracy; build tools v1
Option 1	1	Refine and test technical approaches; unclassified testing continues on unconditional forecasts, begins on conditional forecasts; build tools v2
Option 2	1	Refine and test technical approaches; unclassified testing continues; build tools v3
Option 3	1	Refine and test technical approaches on IC systems and problems; build tools v4

Program Research Focus

For many events relevant to national security, there are insufficient quantitative data to generate statistical forecasts, so estimates must rely upon human judgment. Research on judgment-based forecasting shows that forecasts generated by individual experts and deliberating groups of experts are consistently less accurate than forecasts generated by methods that mathematically aggregate many independent judgments. The accuracy of two such methods, unweighted linear opinion pools and conventional prediction markets, has proven difficult to beat across a variety of domains.² However, recent research suggests that it is possible to outperform these methods by using data about forecasters to weight their judgments.

Some methods that have shown promise include weighting forecasters' judgments by their level of risk aversion, cognitive style, variance in judgment, past performance, and

² See, e.g., Tetlock PE, *Expert Political Judgment* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005), 164-88; Armstrong JS, "Combining Forecasts," in JS Armstrong, ed., *Principles of Forecasting* (Norwell, MA: Kluwer, 2001), 417-39; Arrow KJ, et al., "The Promise of Prediction Markets," *Science* 2008; 320: 877-8; Chen Y, et al., "Information Markets Vs. Opinion Pools: An Empirical Comparison," *Proceedings of the 6th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, Vancouver BC, Canada, 2005.

predictions of other forecasters' knowledge.³ Other data about forecasters may be predictive of aggregate accuracy, such as their education, experience, and cognitive diversity. To date, however, no research has optimized aggregation methods using detailed data about large numbers of forecasters and their judgments. In addition, little research has tested methods for generating conditional forecasts.

The goal of the ACE Program is to develop and demonstrate methods that a) elicit forecasts from a widely-distributed population of forecasters, b) aggregate these forecasts using approaches that maximize the accuracy of the aggregate forecast, and c) communicate forecasts so that they are easily understood by a variety of users. Proposals will be expected to address all three components, which are described in detail below.

ACE methods should be applicable to a wide range of forecasting problems, including forecasts of political, military, economic, science and technology, and social events, on month-to-year time horizons. We anticipate that the resulting methods will be prototyped in web-based software.

Elicitation – Advances Sought

The ACE Program seeks methods to elicit judgments from individual forecasters on:

- Whether an event will or will not occur
- When an event will occur
- The magnitude of an event
- All of the above, conditioned on another set of events or actions
- The confidence or likelihood a forecaster assigns to his or her judgment
- The forecaster's rationale for his or her judgment, as well as links to background information or evidence, expressed in no more than a couple of lines of text
- The forecaster's updated judgments and rationale

The elicitation methods should allow prioritization of elicitations, continuous updating of forecaster judgments and rationales, and asynchronous elicitation of judgments from more than 1,000 geographically-dispersed forecasters. While aggregation methods, detailed below, should be capable of generating probabilities, the judgments elicited from forecasters can but need not include probabilities.

Challenges include:

- Some forecasters will be unaccustomed to providing probabilistic judgments
- There has been virtually no research on methods to elicit conditional forecasts
- Elicitation should require a minimum of time and effort from forecasters; elicitation should require no more than a few minutes per elicitation per forecaster
- Training time for forecasters will be limited, and all training must be delivered within the software
- Rewards for participation, accuracy, and reasoning must be non-monetary and of negligible face value (e.g., certificates, medals, pins)

³ See, e.g., Dani V, et al., "An empirical comparison of algorithms for aggregating expert predictions," Proc. 22nd Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, UAI, 2006; Cooke RM, ElSaadany S, Huang X, "On the performance of social network and likelihood-based expert weighting schemes," Reliability Engineering and System Safety 2008; 93:745-756; Ranjan R, Gneiting T, "Combining probability forecasts," Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology) 2010; 72(1): 71-91.

Aggregation – Advances Sought

The ACE Program seeks aggregation methods that:

- Combine forecasts from multiple forecasters into a single forecast
- Generate forecasts that are substantially more accurate than both the unweighted linear opinion pool and conventional prediction market forecasts
- Are robust across diverse populations of forecasters and forecasting problems
- Use data about forecasters that are predictive of aggregate forecasting accuracy; if such data are to be obtained from the forecasters, the process should take no more than 30 minutes of their time and should be self-administered online
- Continuously improve accuracy over time

Challenges:

- Forecasters will be highly diverse in academic and professional education, experience, and other characteristics
- Forecasting problems will be highly diverse in topic area, probability, conditionality, and verifiability
- All information about forecasters and their accuracy must be generated through use of the ACE system
- Use of the ACE system will be voluntary, so the characteristics of participating forecasters on any given problem may be difficult to predict

Communication – Advances Sought

The ACE Program seeks methods for accurately and effectively communicating to a variety of potential users the forecasting results, including but not limited to:

- The aggregate forecast
- The distribution of individual judgments
- Trends in forecasts over time
- Measures of disagreement among forecasters
- Segmentation and cluster analysis of judgments
- Analysis linking rationale text to clusters and to outliers
- Advanced visualization methods that are intuitively clear to users with a limited background in statistics.

Challenges:

- Most users will be unaccustomed to forecasts and analyses of the types listed above
- It cannot be assumed that users will have quantitative training
- Only minimal training time is permitted; the methods must stand alone
- Users' understanding of probabilities can vary depending on the manner in which the probabilities are communicated, the context in which the probabilities are presented, and users' background and experience in statistics

Out of scope

The following activities fall outside the scope of this BAA:

- Approaches that rely on monetary incentives for performance
- Approaches encouraging strategic misreporting of judgments
- Unweighted linear opinion pools and conventional prediction markets.

Study population

For all but a portion of Option Period 3, performers will recruit the study population used in developing and testing elicitation and aggregation methods (Table 2). It is anticipated that performers will recruit hundreds to thousands of participants, most of whom will participate over multiple years.

In its proposal, the offeror must describe the selection criteria for its study population, how the population will be recruited, and how it can be considered generally representative of IC analysts. The IC employs many thousands of analysts across 16 agencies. Common attributes of analysts are U.S. citizenship, which is required to hold a security clearance, and interest in national security. Otherwise, analysts are highly diverse. They vary widely in age, education, and training. Analysts range in experience from less than a year to more than 30 years on the job, and their educational levels range from bachelor's degrees to PhDs, with degrees in a wide range of disciplines including history, linguistics, law, international policy, science, mathematics, and engineering. Performers must therefore be able to recruit a study population from communities with similar diversity.

Methods whose success depends critically on the study population recruited for initial testing are unlikely to be sufficiently robust to perform well in the IC, where the analyst population will be diverse and may vary unpredictably over time. Offerors are encouraged to propose research that will lead to generalizable methods that perform well across different populations.

In order to accurately distinguish the performance of different performers, it is assumed that all performers will use separate study populations. Performers will thus need to ensure that their study participants agree not to participate in any other studies in the ACE Program. If two or more performers plan to share a single study population, they should explain how feedback and other testing effects across performers will not invalidate results.

Study participants may be reimbursed for their time, in accordance with the performer's Institutional Review Board (IRB) guidance. Such reimbursement should be minimal, uniform across participants, and consistent with compensation provided in other research on human judgment. (See also Section 6.B.5.)

In its proposal, the offeror should also describe non-monetary incentives of negligible face value that will be used to motivate participants' level of participation, accuracy, and reasoning.

Assessment

At months 1, 9, 21, and 33, each performer will nominate 50 real-world, unclassified forecasting problems and the references for verification, to be used in IARPA's assessment of all performers. Forecasting problems should include a variety of global political, military, economic, science and technology, and social events, on one-to-12+ month time horizons. Most forecasts will be discrete (the event will occur or not occur) but some forecasts will be continuous (the event will have a specific magnitude or will occur by a specific date). Conditions will be discrete, and the number of conditions will not require combinatorial methods. Potential examples include:

- Will the incumbent party win the next presidential election in Country X?

- When will Country X hold its next parliamentary elections?
- How many cell phones will be in use globally by 12/31/11?
- By how much will the GDP of Country X increase from 1/1/11 to 12/31/11?
- Will Country X default on its sovereign debt in 2011?
- If Country X defaults on its sovereign debt in 2011, what will be the growth rate in the Eurozone in 2012?

Beginning at month 3, identical forecasting problems will be continuously assigned to all performers by the ACE Program Manager. These may include forecasting problems nominated by performers. It is anticipated that approximately 100 problems will be assigned per year. From months 3 to 11, problem sets will include only unconditional events. From month 13 on, problem sets will include both unconditional and conditional events.

Access to problems and forecasts will be password-protected and accessible only to the performers, recruited participants, the ACE Program Manager, and others only as approved by the ACE Program Manager.

Performers will be evaluated on the accuracy of their aggregate forecasts for all of the assigned problems against observed events. Since the performers' methods must allow forecasters to continuously update their forecasts, the mean forecast accuracy will be calculated per event, from the time the test problem is delivered to performers, until the time the forecast expires.

The Government test and evaluation team must have continuous access to the aggregate forecasts from each performer's system. Results on the accuracy of aggregate forecasts will be provided to all performers by the ACE Program Manager, after the forecasts expire.

Each performer will choose how judgments are elicited, how judgments are aggregated, which scoring rules are applied to individual judgments, the amount and type of feedback given to forecasters, and the non-monetary incentives that are used. In its proposal, the offeror should justify initial approaches, alternatives to be explored, and measures to prevent or mitigate intentional and unintentional misreporting of judgments.

During Option Period 3, in addition to continued testing by the performer, the performer's methods will be tested by IARPA using a study population of IC analysts. The study population and the forecasting problems will be determined by the ACE Program Manager. At month 37, the performer's software will be delivered to IARPA for these tests. The software should be structured to allow adjustment of the parameters of the aggregation algorithm(s) after delivery to IARPA.

Performers will also be evaluated on the communication of forecasting results generated by their elicitation and aggregation tools. By month 13, IARPA will provide performers a set of protocols with which their communications methods will later be assessed. At months 23 and 35, the performers' methods will be tested by a Government test and evaluation team using those protocols and a set of representative users recruited by the Government test and evaluation team. Communication research will complete by month 36.

1.B. Program Metrics and Milestones

The Government will use the following Program Metrics and Milestones to evaluate the effectiveness of proposed solutions in achieving the stated program objectives, and to determine whether satisfactory progress is being made to warrant continued funding of the program. These metrics are intended to bound the scope of effort, while affording maximum flexibility, creativity, and innovation in proposing solutions to the stated problem.

Elicitation and Aggregation:

Each performer will be assessed on the accuracy of its aggregate forecasts:

- The mean quadratic score (MQS)⁴ against observed discrete events
- The mean square percentage error (MSPE)⁵ against observed continuous events

Performers will be assessed against program milestones at months 11, 23, 35, and 47. Milestones will be based on the percent difference of the methods' MQS and MSPE over those of an unweighted linear opinion pool (ULinOP) among a separate study population recruited by the Government test and evaluation team (Table 2).

Table 2: ACE Metrics and Milestones: Elicitation and Aggregation

Year:	1	2	3	4
Study population	Recruited by performer			
Forecasting problems	Unclassified, unconditional, chosen by IARPA	Unclassified, unconditional & conditional, chosen by IARPA		
Metrics	MQS, MSPE			
Year-end milestone (% improvement over Government's ULinOP)	20	35	50	50+

Communication:

Each performer will be assessed by the Government test and evaluation team on the effectiveness of its communication of forecasting results from its elicitation and aggregation tool to a set of representative users. Testing criteria will include:

- Users' accurate interpretation of tool outputs
- Users' correct performance of tasks involving the tool
- Users' assessments of the tool's utility and usability

Performers will be assessed against program milestones at months 23 and 35 (Table 3). For instance, at month 23, users should achieve an average score of at least 85% on a

⁴ See, e.g., Selten R. "Axiomatic Characterization of the Quadratic Scoring Rule." *Experimental Economics*, 1:43–62 (1998).

⁵ See, e.g., Armstrong JS, Fildes R. "On the selection of error measures for comparisons among forecasting methods." *Journal of Forecasting* 14:67-71 (1994).

multiple-choice test assessing their interpretation of tool results, such as aggregate probabilities. At month 23, users should also achieve an average score of at least 85% on a test assessing their performance of tasks involving the tool, such as segmentation analysis and cluster analysis.

Table 3: ACE Metrics and Milestones: Communication

Year:	2	3
Study population and protocol	Chosen by IARPA	
Year-end milestones -- Average score on a test assessing: Users' interpretation of outputs		
Users' interpretation of outputs	85%	95%
Users' performance of tasks	85%	95%

Offerors must also identify waypoints that will provide the Government with insight into the development of the key aspects of the research beyond the annual Program evaluations. These waypoints are to consist of self-evaluations of key research and development activities, and progress in the empirical work. Waypoints are to be reviewed during site visits (Table 4). Proposals must include rationale, definition, metrics, performance goals and an evaluation plan for each waypoint. Waypoints must provide a clear measure of progress toward meeting the Program milestones.

1.C. Program Timeline

The Government will use the following timeline with programmatic gates to help the Program maintain its four-year schedule:

Table 4: ACE Program Timeline

Date	Event	Description/Purpose
Month 1	Kickoff Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting in Washington DC to communicate ACE vision and expectations • Performers provide Problem Set 1 nominations
Month 3	Start Problem Set 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IARPA starts to deliver Problem Set 1
Month 4	Site Visit 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Research Results and waypoints • Provide access to tools, data
Month 9	Site Visit 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Research Results and waypoints • Performers provide Problem Set 2 nominations
Month 11	Deliver research and evaluation reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of Year 1 research • Assessment against Program Milestones (See Tables 2 and 3)

Date	Event	Description/Purpose
Month 12	Principal Investigators Meeting 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting in Washington, DC to review Year 1 research results
Month 12	Notification of Option Year Award	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performers are notified of Option Year selection
Option Year 1		
Month 13	Start Problem Set 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IARPA starts to deliver Problem Set 2 • IARPA delivers communication test protocols
Month 15	Site Visit 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Research Results and waypoints
Month 21	Site Visit 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Research Results and waypoints • Performers provide Problem Set 3 nominations • Deliver software to IARPA for communication tests
Month 23	Deliver research and evaluation reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of Year 2 research • Assessment against Program Milestones (See Tables 2 and 3)
Month 24	Principal Investigators Meeting 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting in Washington, DC to review Year 2 research results
Month 24	Notification of Option Year Award	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performers are notified of Option Year selection
Option Year 2		
Month 25	Start Problem Set 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IARPA starts to deliver Problem Set 3
Month 27	Site Visit 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Research Results and waypoints
Month 33	Site Visit 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Research Results and waypoints • Performers provide Problem Set 4 nominations • Deliver software to IARPA for communication tests
Month 35	Deliver research and evaluation reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of Year 3 research • Assessment against Program Milestones (See Tables 2 and 3)
Month 36	Principal Investigators Meeting 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting in Washington, DC to review Year 3 research results
Month 36	Notification of Option Year Award	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performers are notified of Option Year selection
Option Year 3		
Month 37	Start Problem Set 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IARPA starts to deliver Problem Set 4
Month 37	Software delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete system delivery to IARPA, to include software, data, documentation

Date	Event	Description/Purpose
Month 39	Site Visit 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Research Results and waypoints
Month 45	Site Visit 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Research Results and waypoints
Month 47	Deliver research and evaluation reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of Year 4 research results Assessment against Program Milestones (See Table 2)
Month 48	Principal Investigators Meeting 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting in Washington, DC to review final research results
Month 48	Complete Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical and programmatic closeout

SECTION 2: AWARD INFORMATION

The ACE Program is envisioned as a four-year effort that is intended to begin in the fall of 2010. The Base Period is 12 months with three possible Option Periods of 12 months each. Costs associated with the commercialization of technology are not covered under this solicitation. It is expected that external investment or company funds will be leveraged to accomplish final commercialization of technology.

This BAA will result in awards for the entire program. Funding for Option Period(s) will depend upon performance during the Base Period, and succeeding Option Periods, as well as program priorities, the availability of funding, and IARPA priorities. Funding of Option Periods is at the sole discretion of the Government. Participants considered for funding in the Option Periods will be those teams that have made significant progress in the Base Period (and succeeding Option periods) and have correctly understood and contributed to the overarching goals of the Program. Teams that offer only minor enhancements to the current state of the art will not be invited to continue with the Program.

Multiple awards are anticipated. The amount of resources made available under this BAA will depend on the quality of the proposals received and the availability of funds.

The Government reserves the right to select for negotiation all, some, one or none of the proposals received in response to this solicitation and to make awards without discussions with offerors. The Government also reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Source Selection Authority determines them to be necessary. If the proposed effort is inherently divisible and nothing is gained from the aggregation, offerors should consider submitting it as multiple independent efforts. Additionally, IARPA reserves the right to accept proposals in their entirety or to select only portions of proposals for negotiations for award. In the event that IARPA desires to award only portions of a proposal, negotiations may be opened with that offeror.

Awards under this BAA will be made to offerors on the basis of the evaluation criteria listed in 5.A, program balance, and availability of funds. Proposals identified for negotiation may result in a procurement contract. However, the Government reserves the right to negotiate the type of award instrument it determines appropriate under the circumstances.

Offerors whose proposals are accepted for funding will be contacted before award to obtain additional information required for award. The Government may establish a deadline for the close of fact-finding and negotiations that allows a reasonable time for the award of a contract. Offerors that are not responsive to government deadlines established and communicated with the request may be removed from award consideration. Offerors may also be removed from award consideration should the parties fail to reach agreement on contract terms, conditions, and cost/price within a reasonable time.

SECTION 3: ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

3.A. Eligible Applicants

All responsible sources capable of satisfying the Government's needs **may** submit a proposal. Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Small Businesses, Small Disadvantaged Businesses and Minority Institutions (MIs) are encouraged to submit proposals and join others in submitting proposals; however, no portion of this announcement will be set aside for these organizations' participation due to the impracticality of reserving discrete or severable areas for exclusive competition among these entities. Other Government Agencies, Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs), University Affiliated Research Centers (UARCs), and any other similar type of organization that has a special relationship with the Government, that gives them access to privileged and/or proprietary information or access to Government equipment or real property, are not eligible to submit proposals under this BAA or participate as team members under proposals submitted by eligible entities.

Only U.S. organizations or institutions⁶ may prime and submit proposals to the ACE BAA. Additionally, at least twenty percent (20%) of the principals of the team (as measured by FTEs) must be from U.S. organization(s) or institution(s). Foreign participants and/or individuals may participate to the extent that such participants comply with any necessary Non-Disclosure Agreements, Security Regulations, Export Control Laws and other governing statutes applicable under the circumstances. Proposers are expected to ensure that the efforts of foreign participants do not either directly or indirectly compromise the laws of the United States, nor its security interests.

3.A.1. Procurement Integrity, Standards of Conduct, Ethical Considerations and Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI)

"Organizational conflict of interest" means that because of other activities or relationships with other persons, a person is unable or potentially unable to render impartial assistance or advice to the Government, or the person's objectivity in performing the contract work is or might be otherwise impaired, or a person has an unfair competitive advantage.

⁶ "U.S. organization or institution" means any corporation, business association, partnership, trust, academic institution, society or any other entity or group that is incorporated or organized to do business in the United States. It specifically excludes any foreign corporation, business association, partnership, trust, academic institution, society or any other entity or group that is not incorporated or organized to do business in the United States, as well as international organizations, foreign governments and any agency or subdivision of foreign governments.

If a prospective offeror, or any of its proposed subcontractor teammates, believes that a potential conflict of interest exists or may exist (whether organizational or otherwise), the offeror should promptly raise the issue with IARPA and submit a waiver request by e-mail to the mailbox address for this BAA at dni-iarpa-baa-10-05@ugov.gov. All waiver requests must be submitted through the offeror, regardless of whether the waiver request addresses a potential OCI for the offeror or one of its subcontractor teammates. A potential conflict of interest includes but is not limited to any instance where an offeror, or any of its proposed subcontractor teammates, is providing either scientific, engineering and technical assistance (SETA) or technical consultation to IARPA. In all cases, the offeror shall identify the contract under which the SETA or consultant support is being provided. Without a waiver from the IARPA Director, neither an offeror, nor its proposed subcontractor teammates, can simultaneously provide SETA support or technical consultation to IARPA and compete or perform as a Performer under this solicitation.

All facts relevant to the existence of the potential conflict of interest, real or perceived, should be disclosed in the waiver request. The request should also include a proposed plan to avoid, neutralize or mitigate such conflict. The offeror, or subcontractor teammate as appropriate, shall certify that all information provided is accurate and complete, and that all potential conflicts, real or perceived, have been disclosed. It is recommended that an offeror submit this request as soon as possible after release of the BAA before significant time and effort are expended in preparing a proposal. If, in the sole opinion of the Government, after full consideration of the circumstances, the conflict situation cannot be resolved, the request for waiver will be denied, and any proposal submitted by the offeror that includes the conflicted entity will be withdrawn from consideration for award.

As part of their proposal, offerors who have identified any potential conflicts of interest shall include either an approved waiver signed by the IARPA Director or a copy of their waiver request. Otherwise, offerors shall include in their proposal a written certification that neither they nor their subcontractor teammates have any potential conflicts of interest, real or perceived. A sample certification is provided in Appendix D.

If, at any time during the solicitation or award process, IARPA discovers that an offeror has a potential conflict of interest, and no waiver request has been submitted by the offeror, IARPA reserves the right to immediately withdraw the proposal from further consideration for award.

Offerors are strongly encouraged to read "Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity's (IARPA) Approach to Managing Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI)", found on IARPA's website at http://www.iarpa.gov/IARPA_OCI_081809.pdf.

3.B. US Academic Organizations

According to Executive Order 12333, as amended, paragraph 2.7, "Elements of the Intelligence Community are authorized to enter into contracts or arrangements for the provision of goods or services with private companies or institutions in the United States and need not reveal the sponsorship of such contracts or arrangements for authorized intelligence purposes. Contracts or arrangements with academic institutions may be undertaken only with the consent of appropriate officials of the institution."

It is highly recommended that offerors submit with their proposal a completed and signed Academic Institution Acknowledgement Letter for each U.S. academic organization that is a part of their team, whether the academic organization is serving in the role of prime, or a subcontractor or consultant at any tier of their team. A template of the Academic Institution Acknowledgement Letter is enclosed in this BAA at Appendix A. It should be noted that an appropriate senior official from the institution, typically the President, Chancellor, Provost, or other appropriately designated official must sign the completed form. Note that this paperwork **must** be completed before IARPA can enter into any negotiations with any offeror when a U.S. academic organization is a part of its team.

3.C. Cost Sharing/Matching

Cost sharing is not required and is not an evaluation criterion; however, cost sharing will be carefully considered and may be required where there is an applicable statutory or regulatory condition relating to the selected award instrument (e.g., for any other transactions under the authority of 10 U.S.C. § 2371). Cost sharing is encouraged where there is a reasonable probability of a potential commercial application related to the proposed research and development effort.

3.D. Other Eligibility Criteria

3.D.1. Collaboration Efforts

Collaborative efforts and teaming arrangements among potential performers are strongly encouraged. Specific content, communications, networking and team formations are the sole responsibility of the participants. However, each team must include all the expertise necessary to build a complete system. A team might include some combination of expertise in:

- Psychology, economics, decision science
- Statistics, econometrics
- Computer science, artificial intelligence
- Data visualization, information design
- Software rapid prototype development
- Education, training

SECTION 4: APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION

This notice constitutes the total BAA and contains all information required to submit a proposal. No additional forms, kits, or other materials are required.

4.A. Content and Form of Application Submission

4.A.1. Proposal Information

Interested offerors are required to submit full proposals in order to receive consideration for funding. Proposals must be received by the time and date specified in section 4.C.1. in order to be considered during the initial round of selections. IARPA may evaluate proposals received after this date for a period of up to one year from the date of initial posting on FedBizOpps. Selection remains contingent on availability of funds.

The typical proposal should express a consolidated effort in support of one or more related technical concepts or ideas. Disjointed efforts should not be included in a single proposal.

Offerors should submit proposals for a Base Period of 12 months plus three possible 12-month Option Periods.

The Government intends to use employees of Booz Allen Hamilton, as well as employees of the MITRE Corporation, to provide expert advice regarding portions of the proposals submitted to the Government. Booz Allen Hamilton will also provide logistical support in carrying out the evaluation process. These personnel will have signed and be subject to the terms and conditions of non-disclosure agreements. By submission of its proposal, an offeror agrees that its proposal information may be disclosed to employees of these organizations for the limited purpose stated above. If offerors do not send notice of objection to this arrangement, the Government will assume consent to the use of contractor support personnel in assisting the review of submittal(s) under this BAA.

Only Government personnel will make evaluation and award determinations under this BAA.

All administrative correspondence and questions regarding this solicitation should be directed by e-mail to dni-iarpa-baa-10-05@ugov.gov. Proposals must be mailed to the address provided in Section 4.C.2. Proposals may **not** be submitted by hand, e-mail or fax; any such proposals received in this manner will be disregarded. See below for proposal submission instructions.

Offerors must submit two hard copies and one soft copy of their proposals: one original hard copy with original signatures; one hard copy with original or copied signatures; and 1 electronic copy with Volume 1, Volume 2 and any permitted, additional information (.pdf format preferred) on a CD-ROM. Both hard copies and the CD must be clearly labeled with the following information: IARPA-BAA-10-05, the offeror's organization, the proposal title (short title recommended), and copy # of #.

Please note that reviewers receive the electronic copy submitted by CD. Hard copies are primarily for archival purposes. In case of inconsistencies between the hard copy and the electronic copy, the electronic copy takes precedence.

4.A.3. Proposal Format

All proposals must be in the format given below. Nonconforming proposals may be rejected without review. Proposals shall consist of two volumes: "Volume 1 - Technical and Management Proposal" and "Volume 2 - Cost Proposal." All pages shall be printed on 8-1/2 by 11 inch paper with type not smaller than 12 point. Smaller font may be used for figures, tables and charts. The page limitation for full proposals includes all figures, tables, and charts. All pages must be numbered. Unnecessarily elaborate brochures or presentations beyond what is sufficient to present a complete and effective proposal are not acceptable and will be discarded without review.

4.A.4. Proposal Classification

The Government anticipates that proposals submitted under this BAA will be unclassified. In the event that an offeror chooses to submit a classified proposal or

submit any documentation that may be classified, the submissions must be appropriately marked and submitted in accordance with section 6.B.1, below.

4.B. Proposal Content Specifics

Each proposal submitted in response to this BAA shall consist of the following:

Volume 1 – Technical & Management Proposal

- Section 1 - Cover Sheet & Transmittal Letter
- Section 2 – Summary of Proposal
- Section 3 – Detailed Proposal
- Section 4 – Additional Information

Volume 2 – Cost Proposal

- Section 1– Cover Sheet
- Section 2 – Detailed Estimated Cost Breakdown

4.B.1. Volume 1, Technical and Management Proposal {Limit of 30 pages}

Volume 1, 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 on which the proposal is based. Copies of not more than three relevant papers can be included with the submission. The submission of other supporting materials along with the proposal is strongly discouraged and will not be considered for review. Except for the cover sheet, transmittal letter, signed Academic Institution Acknowledgement Letter(s) if required, OCI waiver/certification, table of contents, bibliography, and relevant papers, Volume 1 shall not exceed 30 pages. Any pages exceeding this limit will be removed and not considered during the evaluation process. Full proposals must be accompanied by an official transmittal letter. All full proposals must be written in English.

Section 1: Cover Sheet & Transmittal Letter

A. Cover sheet:

- (1) BAA number
- (2) Lead organization submitting proposal
- (3) Type of business, selected among the following categories: “LARGE BUSINESS”, “SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS”, “OTHER SMALL BUSINESS”, “HBCU”, “MI”, “OTHER EDUCATIONAL”, OR “OTHER NONPROFIT”
- (4) Contractor’s reference number (if any)
- (5) Other team members (if applicable) and type of business for each
- (6) Proposal title
- (7) Technical point of contact to include: title, first name, last name, street address, city, state, zip code, telephone, fax (if available), electronic mail (if available)
- (8) Administrative point of contact to include: title, first name, last name, street address, city, state, zip code, telephone, fax (if available), electronic mail (if available)
- (9) OCI waiver or waiver request [see Section 3.A.1.] included? Yes/No
- (9a) If no OCI, a written certification must be included (see Appendix D letter template).
- (10) Are one or more U.S. Academic Organizations part of your team? Yes/No

- (10a) If Yes, are you including an Academic Institution Acknowledgement Statement with your proposal for each Academic Organization that is part of your team? Yes/No
(11) Total funds requested from IARPA and the amount of cost share (if any)
(12) Date proposal was submitted.

B. Official Transmittal Letter.

Section 2: Summary of Proposal

Section 2 shall provide an overview of the proposed work as well as introduce associated technical and management issues. This section shall contain a technical description of and technical approach to the research as well as a succinct portrayal of the uniqueness and benefits of the proposed work. It shall make the technical objectives clear and quantifiable and shall provide a project schedule with definite decision points and endpoints. Offerors must address:

- A. Innovative claims for the proposed research. This section is the centerpiece of the proposal and should succinctly describe the uniqueness and benefits of the proposed approach relative to the state-of-the-art and alternate technologies and approaches.
- B. Summary of the products, transferable technology and deliverables associated with the proposed research results. Measurable deliverables should be defined that show progress toward achieving the stated Program Milestones. Include in this section all proprietary claims to the results, prototypes, intellectual property, or systems supporting and/or necessary for the use of the research, results, and/or prototype. If there are no proprietary claims, this should be stated. Should no proprietary claims be made, Government rights will be unlimited
- C. Schedule and milestones for the proposed research, including overall estimates of cost for each task. Summarize, in table form, the cost, schedule and milestones for the proposed research, including estimates of cost for each deliverable, total cost and company cost share, if applicable. Do not include proprietary information with the milestones.
- D. Overview of the technical approach and plan. Technical rationale, technical approach and constructive plan for accomplishing the technical goals that realize the innovative claims and deliverables. (This section will be supplemented with a more detailed plan in Volume 1, Section 3 of the proposal.)
- E. Related research. General discussion of other research in this area and its relation to the proposed research approach.
- F. Project contributors. Offerors must include a clearly defined organizational chart of all anticipated project participants, their countries of citizenship and their roles in the project. Accompanying the organization chart, offerors will provide brief biographical sketches of key personnel and significant contributors and a detailed description of the roles that contributors (including Principal Investigator(s)) will play based on their qualifications and on their level of effort in each year of the Program. Discussion of the teaming strategy among team members shall be included. If the team intends to use consultants, they must be included in the organizational chart as well. Indicate if the person will be an "individual" or "organizational" consultant (that is, will the consultant represent himself/herself or his/her organization). In both cases, the organizational affiliation should be identified. The consultant should make a written commitment to be available to the team; the commitment should be attached to the Cost Volume. (Interested parties are encouraged to leverage personnel that are dedicated to BAA

requirements no less than 10% of their time. If any participant is scheduled for less than 10% of his/her time, the proposer will provide a clear and compelling justification as to how benefit can be gained from that person's participation at the specified level of effort.)

A chart, such as the following, is suggested.

Participants	Citizenship	Org	Role	Unique, Relevant Capabilities	Specific Task(s) / Contributions	Time Commitment
John Doe	USA	ABC University	PI/Key Personnel	Astrophysicist	Orbit characteristics	25%
John Doe, Jr.	PRC	ABC University	Key Personnel	Computer Programmer	Automated guidance programming	25%
Jane Doe	USA	ABC University	Significant Contributor	And so forth...	And so forth...	50%
Jane Roe	Uzbekistan	ABC University	Contributor			25%
John Doe, III	ROK	XYZ Co.	Co-PI/Key Personnel			25%
Wayne Roe	USA	XYZ Co.	Significant Contributor			40%
John Doe, IV	USA	XYZ University	Consultant (Individual)			200 hours

Section 3: Detailed Proposal Information

This section of the proposal shall provide the detailed, in-depth discussion of the proposed research. Specific attention must be given to addressing both the risks and payoffs of the proposed research and why it is desirable for IARPA to pursue. This part shall provide:

- A. Statement of Work (SOW) - In plain English, clearly define the technical tasks and sub-tasks to be performed, their durations and the dependencies among them. For each task and sub-task, provide:
- A general description of the objective;
 - A detailed description of the approach to be taken, developed in an orderly progression and in enough detail to establish the feasibility of accomplishing the goals of the task;
 - Identification of the primary organization responsible for task execution (prime, sub-contractor, team member, etc.) by name, as well as the citizenship of each participant;
 - The exit criteria for each task/activity, i.e., a product, event or milestone that defines its completion;
 - Definition of all deliverables (e.g., data, reports, software, etc.) to be provided to the Government in support of the proposed research tasks/activities.

Note: Do not include any proprietary information in the SOW.

At the end of this section, provide a Gantt chart, showing all the tasks and sub-tasks on the left with the performance period (in years/quarters) on the right. All milestones should be clearly labeled on the chart.

- B. A detailed description of the objectives, scientific relevance, technical approach and expected significance of the work. The key elements of the proposed work

should be clearly identified and related to each other. Proposals should clearly detail the technical method(s) and/or approach(es) that will be used to meet or exceed each program milestone and should provide ample justification as to why the proposed method(s)/approach(es) is/are feasible. Any anticipated risks should be described and possible mitigations proposed. General discussion of the problem without specific detail about the technical implementation will result in an unacceptable rating.

- C. State-of-the-art. Comparison with other on-going research, highlighting the uniqueness of the proposed effort/approach and differences between the proposed effort and the current state-of-the-art clearly stated. Identify the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed work with respect to potential alternative approaches.
- D. Data sources: Identification and description of data sources to be utilized in pursuit of the project research goals. Explain clearly how the data selected will be an appropriate and adequate set for exploring the research topic being proposed. The Government reserves the right to reject a proposal if it does not appropriately address data issues. Include the documentation required in 6.B.5. (Human Use) and, in addition, provide written verification that all data were lawfully obtained and were either publicly available or collected with informed consent, and, where applicable, that the proposer has a license for use of the data that will cover the proposed activity. Documentation must be well written and logical; claims for exemptions from Federal regulations for human subject protection must be accompanied by a strong defense of the claims. The Human Use documentation and the written verification are not included in the total page count.
- E. Description of the deliverables associated with the proposed research results, enhancing that of Volume 1, Section 2: Summary of Proposal.

Deliverables should be defined that show progress toward achieving the stated Program Milestones. Deliverables should be specified for each of the Periods (Table 4). Year-end deliverables are to include all data, tool prototypes, evaluation analyses and documents (software documentation, methodology documentation, research reports, and publications). Other deliverables are to include problem set nominations, research status reports including waypoint results, and significant completed tool prototypes, publications, and data. For all deliverables describe the proposed approach to intellectual property rights, together with supporting rationale of why this approach offers the best value to the Government. This section should include a list of technical data, computer software or computer software documentation associated with this research effort in which the Government will acquire less than unlimited rights. For all software deliverables, the offeror shall include all as delivered version source code produced in the course of software development. These deliverables must include source code and the appropriate scripting, subordinate libraries, release notes, and other necessary components, data, and documentation. These and all other deliverables developed as part of the IARPA ACE Program shall be delivered prior to the end of the contract Period of Performance. The Government desires Government Purpose Rights for all deliverables, anything less will be considered a significant weakness in the proposal. (See also Section 6.B.3 (Intellectual Property)).
- F. Cost, schedule, milestones. Cost, schedule, and milestones for the proposed research, including estimates of cost for each deliverable delineated by the primes and major sub-contractors, total cost, and company cost share, if any. Where the effort consists of multiple portions that could reasonably be partitioned

- for purposes of funding, these should be identified as options with separate cost estimates for each. The milestones must not include proprietary information.
- G. Offeror's previous accomplishments. Discuss previous accomplishments and work in this or closely related research areas and how these will contribute to and influence the current work.
 - H. Facilities. Describe the facilities that will be used for the proposed effort, including computational and experimental resources.
 - I. Detailed Management Plan. The Management Plan should identify both the organizations and the individuals within those organizations that make up the team and delineate the expected duties, relevant capabilities and task responsibilities of team members and expected relationships among team members. Expected levels of effort (percentage time or fraction of an FTE) for all key personnel and significant contributors should be clearly noted. A description of the technical, administrative and business structure of the team and the internal communications plan should be included. Project/function/sub-contractor relationships (including formal teaming agreements), Government research interfaces, and planning, scheduling, and control practices should be described. The team leadership structure should be clearly defined. Provide a brief biography of the key personnel (including alternates, if desired) who will be involved in the research along with the amount of effort to be expended by each person during the year. Participation by key personnel and significant contributors is expected to exceed 10% of their time. A compelling explanation of any variation from this figure is required.
 - J. Resource Share. Include the type of support, if any, the offeror might request from the Government, such as facilities, equipment or materials, or any such resources the offeror is willing to provide at no additional cost to the Government to support the research effort. Cost sharing is not required from offerors and is not an evaluation criterion, but is encouraged where there is a reasonable probability of a potential commercial application related to the proposed research and development effort.
 - K. The names of other federal, state or local agencies or other parties receiving the proposal and/or funding the proposed effort. If none, so state.

Section 4: Additional Information

A brief bibliography of relevant technical papers and research notes (published and unpublished) which document the technical ideas on which the proposal is based. Copies of not more than three (3) relevant papers may be included in the submission. This information does not contribute to the page count of Volume 1.

4.B.2. Volume 2: Cost Proposal {No Page Limit}

Section 1: Cover Sheet

- (1) BAA number;
- (2) Lead organization submitting proposal
- (3) Type of business, selected among the following categories: "LARGE BUSINESS", "SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS", "OTHER SMALL BUSINESS", "HBCU", "MI", "OTHER EDUCATIONAL", OR "OTHER NONPROFIT"
- (4) Contractor's reference number (if any)
- (5) Other team members (if applicable) and type of business for each
- (6) Proposal title

- (7) Technical point of contact to include: title, first name, last name, street address, city, state, zip code, telephone, fax (if available), electronic mail (if available)
- (8) Administrative point of contact to include: title, first name, last name, street address, city, state, zip code, telephone, fax (if available), and electronic mail (if available)
- (9) Award instrument requested: cost-plus-fixed-fee (CPFF), cost-contract—no fee, cost sharing contract – no fee, or other type of procurement contract (specify)
- (10) Place(s) and period(s) of performance
- (11) Total proposed cost separated by basic award and option(s) (if any)
- (12) Name, address, telephone number of the offeror's Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) administration office or equivalent cognizant contract administration entity, if known
- (13) Name, address, telephone number of the offeror's Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) audit office or equivalent cognizant contract audit entity, if known
- (14) Date proposal was prepared
- (15) DUNS number
- (16) TIN number
- (17) Cage Code
- (18) Proposal validity period [minimum of 90 days]

[NOTE: See Appendix B for Cover Sheet Template]

Section 2: Detailed Estimated Cost Breakdown

- (1) Total cost broken down by major cost items (direct labor, including labor categories; sub-contracts; materials; other direct costs, overhead charges, etc.) and further broken down by major task and phase
- (2) Major program tasks by fiscal year
- (3) An itemization of major subcontracts and equipment purchases
- (4) An itemization of any information technology (IT⁷) purchase
- (5) A summary of projected funding requirements by month
- (6) The source, nature and amount of any industry cost-sharing
- (7) Identification of pricing assumptions of which may require incorporation into the resulting award instrument (e.g., use of Government Furnished Property/Facilities/Information, access to Government Subject Matter Expert/s, etc.).

The prime contractor is responsible for compiling and providing all subcontractor proposals for the Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO). All subcontractor proposals shall

⁷ IT is defined as “any equipment, or interconnected system(s) or subsystem(s) of equipment that is used in the automatic acquisition, storage, manipulation, management, movement, control, display, switching, interchange, transmission, or reception of data or information by the agency. (a) For purposes of this definition, equipment is used by an agency if the equipment is used by the agency directly or is used by a contractor under a contract with the agency which – (1) Requires the use of such equipment; or (2) Requires the use, to a significant extent, or such equipment in the performance of a service or the furnishing of a product. (b) The term “information technology” includes computers, ancillary, software, firmware and similar procedures, services (including support services), and related resources. (c) The term “information technology” does not include – (1) Any equipment that is acquired by a contractor incidental to a contract; or (2) Any equipment that contains imbedded information technology that is used as an integral part of the product, but the principal function of which is not the acquisition, storage, manipulation, management, movement, control, display, switching, interchange, transmission, or reception of data or information. For example, HVAC (heating, ventilation, and air conditioning) equipment, such as thermostats or temperature control devices, and medical equipment where information technology is integral to its operation, is not information technology.”

also include the above listed cost breakdown. If any subcontractor does not wish to provide their direct and/or indirect rates to the prime contractor, their proposal may contain burdened rates; however, a copy of the proposal showing their unburdened rates shall be contained in the offeror's proposal as a sealed package to the Government. Subcontractor proposals should include Interdivisional Work Transfer Agreements (ITWA) or similar arrangements. Where the effort consists of multiple portions which could reasonably be partitioned for purposes of funding, these should be identified as options with separate cost estimates for each. NOTE: For IT and equipment purchases, include a letter stating why the offeror cannot provide the requested resources from its own funding.

Supporting cost and pricing information must be provided in sufficient detail to substantiate the summary cost estimates in Volume 1 above. Include a description of the method used to estimate costs and supporting documentation. Note: "cost or pricing data" shall be required if the offeror is seeking a procurement contract award of \$650,000 or greater unless the offeror requests an exception from the requirement to submit cost or pricing data. All proprietary subcontractor proposal documentation, prepared at the same level of detail as that required of the prime, shall be made immediately available to the Government, upon request, under separate cover (i.e., mail, electronic/email, etc.), either by the offeror or by the subcontractor organization.

Consultant letter(s) of commitment should be attached to the Cost Volume and estimated costs should be included in the cost estimates.

4.C. Submission Details

4.C.1. Due Dates

Proposals must be received by or before 5:00 p.m. local time on August 18, 2010, in order to be considered during the initial round of selections.

4.C.2. Proposal Delivery

The proposal (one original hard copy with original signatures; one hard copy with original or copied signatures; and 1 electronic copy with Volume 1, Volume 2 and any permitted, additional information (.pdf format preferred) on a CD-ROM) must be delivered to:

ODNI/IARPA
Attention: Jason Matheny
Gate 5
1000 Colonial Farm Road
McLean, VA 22101

IMPORTANT: Deliveries must be made using one of the following commercial delivery services: UPS, FedEx or DHL; NOT United States Postal Service (USPS). Failure to use one of these methods may jeopardize or delay delivery of proposals. Note that under certain "same day delivery" options, UPS, FedEx and DHL may subcontract out their services to local delivery companies. These smaller local delivery companies will not be allowed access to this address to make deliveries. Offerors are cautioned that they assume the risk of untimely delivery of their proposal if they use one of these "same day delivery" options. Deliveries by hand, e-mail or fax will not be accepted.

Offerors must ensure the timely delivery of their proposals. The mail facility closes at 5 p.m. local time; delivery cannot take place after this time until the following day. IARPA will generally acknowledge receipt of complete submissions via e-mail within 24-48 hours and assign control numbers that should be used in all further correspondence regarding proposals. To be certain of delivery, however, it is suggested that a tracking number be obtained from the carrier.

Proposals must be received by the time and date specified in the BAA in order to be considered during the initial round of selections. IARPA may evaluate proposals received after this date for a period up to one year from the date of initial posting on FedBizOpps. Selection remains contingent on availability of funds. Failure to comply with the submission procedures may result in the submission not being evaluated.

SECTION 5: APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION

5.A. Evaluation Criteria

The criteria to be used to evaluate and select proposals for this Program BAA are described in the following paragraphs. Because there is no common statement of work, each proposal will be evaluated on its own merits and its relevance to the Program goals rather than against other proposals responding to this BAA. Specifics about the evaluation criteria are provided below, in descending order of importance.

5.A.1. Overall Scientific and Technical Merit

Overall scientific and technical merit of the proposal is substantiated, including unique and innovative methods, approaches, and/or concepts. The offeror clearly articulates an understanding of the problem to be solved. The technical approach is credible, and includes a clear assessment of primary risks and a means to address them. The offeror can expect the selection process to include an assessment of the proposal against the state-of-the-art.

5.A.2. Effectiveness of Proposed Work Plan

The feasibility and likelihood that the proposed approach for satisfying the Program's milestones and metrics are explicitly described and clearly substantiated along with risk mitigation strategies for achieving stated milestones and metrics. The proposal reflects a mature and quantitative understanding of the Program milestones and metrics, and the statistical confidence with which they may be measured. The offeror may also propose additional milestones, metrics and waypoints as needed. All such milestones metrics and waypoints are clear and well-defined, with a logical connection to enabling offeror decisions and/or Government decisions. The schedule to achieve the milestones and waypoints is realistic and reasonable.

The role and relationships of prime and sub-contractors is clearly delineated with all participants fully documented. Work plans demonstrate the ability to provide full Government visibility into and interaction with key technical activities and personnel; and a single point of responsibility for contract performance. Work plans must also demonstrate that key personnel have sufficient time committed to the Program to accomplish their described Program roles.

The requirement for and the anticipated use or integration of Government Furnished Property (GFP) including all equipment, facilities, information, etc., is fully described including dates when such GFP, GFE (Government Furnished Equipment), GFI (Government Furnished Information) or other similar Government-provided resources will be required.

The offeror's proposed intellectual property and data rights are consistent with the Government's need to be able to communicate Program information across Government organizations and to support transition of the Program results to Intelligence Community users at a reasonable cost.

5.A.3. Contribution and Relevance to Program Goals

The offeror describes how the proposed solution meets the letter and intent of the stated Program goals, and all elements within the proposal exhibit a comprehensive understanding of the problems, challenges, and goals. The offeror clearly addresses how the proposed effort will meet and progressively demonstrate progress to accomplishing the ACE program goals. The proposed approach to intellectual property rights is consistent with the government's stated goals and offers the best value to the Government.

5.A.4. Relevant Experience and Expertise

The offeror's capabilities, related experience, facilities, techniques, or unique combination of these which are integral factors for achieving the proposal's objectives will be evaluated, as well as qualifications, capabilities, and experience of the proposed principal investigator, team leader, and key personnel critical in achieving the proposal objectives. Time commitments of key personnel must be sufficient for their proposed responsibilities in the effort.

5.A.5. Cost Realism

The proposed costs are reasonable and realistic for the work proposed. Estimates are "realistic" when they are neither excessive nor insufficient for the effort to be accomplished. The proposal documents all anticipated costs including those of associate, participating organizations. The proposal demonstrates that the respondent has fully analyzed budget requirements and addressed resulting cost risks. Other sponsors who have funded or are funding this offeror for the same or similar efforts are identified. The Government shall evaluate how well all cost data are traceable and reconcilable.

IARPA recognizes that undue emphasis on cost may motivate Offerors 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. IARPA 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.

After selection and before award, the Contracting Officer will negotiate cost/price reasonableness.

5.B. Review and Selection Process

It is the policy of IARPA to ensure impartial, equitable, comprehensive proposal evaluations and to select the source (or sources) whose offer meets the Government's technical, policy and programmatic goals. In order to provide the desired evaluation, qualified Government personnel will conduct reviews and (if necessary) convene panels of experts in the appropriate areas.

Proposals will only be evaluated against the criteria described under Section 5.A above, and will not be evaluated against other proposals since they are not submitted in accordance with a common work statement. For evaluation purposes, a proposal is the document described in Section 4. Other supporting or background materials submitted with the proposal will be considered for the reviewer's convenience only and not considered as part of the proposal.

As noted above, the Government intends to use employees of Booz Allen Hamilton, as well as employees of the MITRE Corporation, to assist in administering the evaluation of the proposals as well as provide expert advice regarding portions of the proposals submitted to the Government. Booz Allen Hamilton will also provide logistical support in carrying out the evaluation process. These personnel will have signed and be subject to the terms and conditions of non-disclosure agreements. By submission of its proposal, an offeror 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 your consent to the use of contractor support personnel in assisting the review of your submittal(s) under this BAA. Only Government personnel will make evaluations and award determinations under this BAA.

5.C. Proposal Retention

It is the policy of IARPA to treat all proposals as competitive information and to disclose their contents only for the purpose of evaluation. Proposals will not be returned. Upon completion of the source selection process, the original of each proposal received will be retained at IARPA and all other non-required copies will be destroyed. A certification of destruction may be requested, provided that the formal request is sent to IARPA via e-mail within 5 days after notification of proposal results.

SECTION 6: AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

6.A. Award Notices

As soon as the evaluation of a proposal is complete, the offeror will be notified that: 1) the proposal has been selected for funding pending contract negotiations, or, 2) the proposal has not been selected.

6.B. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

6.B.1. Security

The Government anticipates that proposals submitted under this BAA will be unclassified. Offerors choosing to submit a classified proposal must first receive permission from the Original Classification Authority to use their information in replying

to this BAA. Applicable classification guide(s) should be submitted to ensure that the proposal is protected appropriately.

Offerors choosing to submit a classified proposal are reminded that the proposal deadline remains the same regardless of whether the offeror's proposal, in whole or in part, is classified. Additional processing time may be required if all or part of a submission is classified. In the event that an offeror chooses to submit a classified proposal or submit any documentation that may be classified, the following information is applicable.

Collateral Classified Information: Use classification and marking guidance provided by previously issued security classification guides 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) First Class Registered Mail or U.S. Postal Service Express Mail. 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:

TO BE OPENED BY
IARPA Security Office
ATTN: IARPA-BAA-10-05

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

IARPA/MS2 Building
Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI)
Washington, DC 20511

Information Above Collateral Secret Level: For submissions above the Collateral Secret level, contact the IARPA Security Office at 301-851-7580 for further guidance and instructions prior to transmitting information to IARPA.

Offerors must have existing and in-place prior to execution of an award, approved capabilities (personnel, facilities, and information systems) to perform research and development at the classification level they propose.

Security classification guidance will not be provided at this time since IARPA is soliciting ideas only. After reviewing the incoming proposals, if a determination is made that the award instrument may result in access to classified information, a security classification guide will be issued and attached as part of the award.

6.B.2 Proprietary Data

It is the policy of IARPA to treat all proposals as competitive information, and to disclose their contents only for the purpose of evaluation.

All proposals containing proprietary data should have the cover page and each page containing proprietary data clearly marked as containing proprietary data. It is the

offeror’s responsibility to clearly define to the Government what is considered proprietary data.

All data gathered by performers and researchers must be obtained in accordance with U.S. laws and in compliance with the End User License Agreement, Copyright Laws, Terms of Service, and laws and policies regarding privacy protection of U.S. Persons. Before using such data, the performer must provide proof that the data was acquired in accordance with U.S. laws and regulations. Performers can use their own data for development purposes as long as it follows these guidelines.

6.B.3. Intellectual Property

6.B.3.a. Procurement Contract Offerors

6.B.3.a.1. Noncommercial Items (Technical Data and Computer Software)

Offerors responding to this BAA requesting a procurement contract to be issued under the FAR 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. In the event that offerors do not submit such information, 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 offerors should identify the data and software in question as subject to Government Purpose Rights (GPR).⁸ The Government will automatically assume that any such GPR restriction is limited to a period of five (5) years, at which time the Government will acquire “unlimited rights” unless the parties agree otherwise. Offerors are advised that the Government will use this information during the source selection evaluation process to evaluate the impact of any identified restrictions and may request additional information from the offeror, as may be necessary, to evaluate the offeror’s assertions. If no restrictions are intended, then the offeror should state “NONE.”

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

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

⁸ “Government purpose rights” means the rights to use, modify, reproduce, release, perform, display, or disclose technical data and computer software within the Government without restriction; and to release or disclose technical data and computer software outside the Government and authorize persons to whom release or disclosure has been made to use, modify, reproduce, release, perform, display, or disclose that data or software for any United States Government purpose. United States Government purposes include any activity in which the United States Government is a party, including cooperative agreements with international or multi-national defense organizations, or sales or transfers by the United States Government to foreign governments or international organizations. Government purposes include competitive procurement, but do not include the rights to use, modify, reproduce, release, perform, display, or disclose technical data or computer software for commercial purposes or authorize others to do so.

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

6.B.3.a.2. Commercial Items (Technical Data and Computer Software)

Offerors responding to this BAA requesting a procurement contract to be issued under the FAR 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 offerors 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 offeror, as may be necessary, to evaluate the offeror’s assertions. If no restrictions are intended, then the offeror should state “NONE.”

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

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

6.B.3.b. All Offerors – Patents

Include documentation proving 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 the proposal for the IARPA program. If a patent application has been filed for an invention that the proposal utilizes, but the application has not yet been made publicly available and contains proprietary information, the offeror 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 the offeror owns the invention, or 2) proof of possession of appropriate licensing rights in the invention.

6.B.3.c. All Offerors – Intellectual Property Representations

All offerors shall 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 IARPA program. Additionally, offerors shall provide a short summary for each item asserted with less than unlimited rights that describes the nature of the restriction and the intended use of the intellectual property in the conduct of the proposed research.

6.B.4. Meeting and Travel Requirements

Performers are expected to assume responsibility for administration of their projects and to comply with contractual and Program requirements for reporting, attendance at Program workshops and availability for site visits.

6.B.4.a. PI Meetings

The ACE Program intends to hold a Program-level Kick-Off meeting during the first month of the Program and then hold annual PI meetings (See timeline in Table 4). These 2-day meetings will focus on technical aspects of the Program and on facilitating open technical exchanges, interaction and sharing among the various Program participants. Program participants will be expected to present the technical status and progress of their projects as well as to demonstrate their technical capabilities to other participants and invited guests at these events.

6.B.4.b. Site Visits

Site visits by the Contracting Officer Representative and the ACE Program Management staff will generally take place twice yearly during the life of the Program and will occur during the period between annual PI meetings. These visits will occur at the Contractor's facility. Reports on technical progress, details of successes and issues, contributions to the Program goals and technology demonstrations will be expected at such visits.

6.B.5. Human Use

All research involving human subjects, to include use of human biological specimens and human data, selected for funding must comply with the federal regulations for human subject protection, namely 45 CFR Part 46, *Protection of Human Subjects* (<http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/45cfr46.htm>).

Institutions awarded funding for research involving human subjects must provide documentation of a current Assurance of Compliance with Federal regulations for human subject protection, for example a Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Human Research Protection Federal Wide Assurance (<http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp>). All institutions engaged in human subject research, to include sub-contractors, must also have a valid Assurance.

For all proposed research that will involve human subjects, the institution must provide evidence of or a plan for review by an Institutional Review Board (IRB) on proposal submission to IARPA. The IRB conducting the review must be the IRB identified on the institution's Assurance. The protocol, separate from the proposal, must include a detailed description of the research plan, study population, risks and benefits of study participation, recruitment and consent process, data collection, and data analysis. Consult the designated IRB for guidance on writing the protocol. The informed consent document must comply with federal regulations (45 CFR Part 46).

The amount of time required to complete the IRB review/approval process may vary depending on the complexity of the research and/or the level of risk to study participants. Ample time should be allotted to complete the approval process. The IRB approval process can last between one to three months. No IARPA funding can be used towards human-subject research until ALL approvals are granted.

In limited instances, human subject research may be exempt from Federal regulations for human subject protection, for example, under Department of Health and Human Services, 45 CFR 46.101(b). Offerors claiming that their research falls within an

exemption from Federal regulations for human subject protection must provide written documentation with their proposal that cites the specific applicable exemption and explains clearly how their proposed research fits within that exemption.

6.B.6. Publication Approval

It is anticipated that research funded under this Program will be unclassified contracted fundamental research that will not require a pre-publication review. However, performers should note that pre-publication approval of certain information may be required if it is determined that its release may result in the disclosure of sensitive intelligence information. A courtesy soft copy of any work submitted for publication should be provided to the IARPA Program Manager and the Contracting Officer Representative (COR).

6.B.7. Export Control

(1) The offeror shall comply with all U.S. export control laws and regulations, including the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), 22 CFR 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 offeror shall be responsible for obtaining the appropriate licenses or other approvals, if required, for exports of (including deemed exports) hardware, technical data, and software, or for the provision of technical assistance.

(2) The offeror 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 (whether in or outside the United States), where the foreign person will have access to export-controlled technologies, including technical data or software.

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

(4) The offeror shall be responsible for ensuring that the provisions of this clause apply to its sub-contractors.

(5) The offeror will certify knowledge of and intended adherence to these requirements in the representations and certifications of the contract.

6.B.8. Subcontracting

It is the policy of the Government to enable small business and small disadvantaged business concerns to be considered fairly as sub-contractors to contractors performing work or rendering services as prime contractors or sub-contractors under Government contracts and to assure that prime contractors and sub-contractors carry out this policy. Each offeror that submits a proposal that includes sub-contractors; is selected for funding (pending negotiations); and has proposed a funding level above the maximum cited in the FAR, may be asked to submit a sub-contracting plan before award, in accordance with FAR 19.702(a) (1) and (2). The plan format is outlined in FAR 19.704. Offerors must declare teaming relationships in their proposals and must specify the type of teaming arrangement in place, including any exclusive teaming arrangements. IARPA neither promotes, nor discourages the establishment of exclusive teaming agreements

within offeror teams. Individuals or organizations associated with multiple teams must take care not to over-commit those resources being applied.

6.B.9. Reporting

Fiscal and management responsibility are important to the ACE Program. Although the number and types of reports will be specified in the award document, all performers will, at a minimum, provide the Contracting Office, Contracting Officer Representative and the ACE Program Manager with monthly technical reports and monthly financial reports. The reports shall be prepared and submitted in accordance with the procedures contained in the award document and mutually agreed upon before award. Technical reports will describe technical highlights and accomplishments, priorities and plans, issues and concerns; will provide evaluation results; and will detail future plans. Financial reports will present an on-going financial profile of the project, including total project funding, funds invoiced, funds received, funds expended during the preceding month and planned expenditures over the remaining period. Additional reports and briefing material may also be required, as appropriate, to document progress in accomplishing program metrics.

Performers will prepare a final report of their work at the conclusion of the performance period of the award (even if the research may continue under a follow-on vehicle). The final report will be delivered to the Contracting Agent, Contracting Officer Representative and the ACE Program Manager. The report will include:

- Problem definition
- Findings and approach
- System design and solution
- Possible generalization(s)
- Anticipated path ahead

6.B.10. Central Contractor Registration (CCR)

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

6.B.11. Representations and Certifications

Prospective offerors may be required to complete electronic representations and certifications at <http://orca.bpn.gov>. Successful offerors will be required to complete additional representations and certifications prior to award.

6.B.11.b. Certification for Contract Awards

Certifications and representations shall be completed by successful offerors prior to award. Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Online Representations and Certifications Application (ORCA) is at website <http://orca.bpn.gov>.

6.B.13. Lawful Use and Privacy Protection Measures

All data gathered by researchers must be obtained in accordance with U.S. laws and in compliance with the End User License Agreement, Copyright Laws, Terms of Service,

and laws and policies regarding privacy protection of U.S. Persons. Before using such data, the performer must provide proof that the data was acquired in accordance with U.S. laws and regulations.

SECTION 7: AGENCY CONTACTS

Administrative, technical or contractual questions concerning this BAA should be sent via e-mail to dni-iarpa-baa-10-05@ugov.gov. If e-mail is not available, fax questions to 301-851-7673, Attention: IARPA-BAA-10-05. All requests must include the name, email address (if available), and phone number of a point of contact for the requested information. Do not send questions with proprietary content. IARPA will accept questions about the BAA until its closing. A consolidated Question and Answer response will be periodically posted on the IARPA website (www.IARPA.gov); no answers will go directly to the submitter.

Points of Contact:

The technical POC for this effort is

Jason Matheny, IARPA, Office of Incisive Analysis
ATTN: IARPA-BAA-10-05
Office of the Director of National Intelligence
Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity (IARPA)
Washington, DC 20511
Fax: (301) 851-7673
E-mail: dni-iarpa-baa-10-05@ugov.gov

All emails must have the BAA number (IARPA-BAA-10-05) in the Subject Line.

APPENDIX A

Academic Institution Acknowledgement Letter Template

IARPA Broad Agency Announcement

IARPA-BAA-10-05

-- Please Place on Official Letterhead --

<insert date>

To: Mr. Thomas Kelso
Chief Acquisition Officer
ODNI/IARPA
Office of the Director of National Intelligence
Washington, D.C. 20511

Subject: Academic Institution Acknowledgement Letter

Reference: Executive Order 12333, As Amended, Para 2.7

This letter is to acknowledge that the undersigned is the responsible official of <insert name of the academic institution>, authorized to approve the contractual relationship in support of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence's Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity and this academic institution.

The undersigned further acknowledges that he/she is aware of the Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity's proposed contractual relationship with <insert name of institution> through <insert solicitation #> and is hereby approved by the undersigned official, serving as the president, vice-president, chancellor, vice-chancellor, or provost of the institution.

<Name> Date
<Position>

Copy Furnished:
Mr. John Turnicky
Chief, ODNI Contracts
Office of the Director of National Intelligence
Washington, DC 20511

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE COVER SHEET

for

VOLUME 1: Technical/Management Details

BROAD AGENCY ANNOUNCEMENT (BAA)

ACE Program

IARPA-BAA-10-05

(1) BAA Number	
(2) Lead Organization Submitting Proposal	
(3) Type of Business, Selected Among the Following Categories: "Large Business", "Small Disadvantaged Business", "Other Small Business", "HBCU", "MI", "Other Educational", or "Other Nonprofit"	
(4) Contractor's Reference Number (if any)	
(5) Other Team Members (if applicable) and Type of Business for Each	
(6) Proposal Title	
(7) Technical Point of Contact to Include: Title, First Name, Last Name, Street Address, City, State, Zip Code, Telephone, Fax (if available), Electronic Mail (if available)	
(8) Administrative Point of Contact to Include: Title, First Name, Last Name, Street Address, City, State, Zip Code, Telephone, Fax (if available), Electronic Mail (if available)	
(9) OCI Waiver or Waiver Request [see Section 3.A.1] Included?	Yes/No
(9a) If No, is written certification included?	
(10) Are one or more U.S. Academic Organizations part of your team?	Yes/No
(10a) If Yes, are you including an Academic Institution Acknowledgement Statement with your proposal for each Academic Organization that is part of your team?	Yes/No
(11) Total Funds Requested from IARPA and the Amount of Cost Share (if any)	\$
(12) Date Proposal as Submitted.	

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE COVER SHEET

for

VOLUME 2: Cost Proposal

BROAD AGENCY ANNOUNCEMENT (BAA)

ACE Program

IARPA-BAA-10-05

(1) BAA Number	
(2) Lead organization submitting proposal	
(3) Type of Business, Selected Among the Following Categories: "Large Business", "Small Disadvantaged Business", "Other Small Business", "HBCU", "MI", "Other Educational", or "Other Nonprofit"	
(4) Contractor's Reference Number (if any)	
(5) Other Team Members (if applicable) and Type of Business for Each	
(6) Proposal Title	
(7) Technical Point of Contact to Include: Title, First Name, Last Name, Street Address, City, State, Zip Code, Telephone, Fax (if available), Electronic Mail (if available)	
(8) Administrative Point of Contact to Include: Title, First Name, Last Name, Street Address, City, State, Zip Code, Telephone, Fax (if available), Electronic Mail (if available)	
(9) Award Instrument Requested: Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CPFF), Cost-Contract—No Fee, Cost Sharing Contract – No Fee, or Other Type of Procurement Contract (specify)	
(10) Place(s) and Period(s) of Performance	
(11) Total Proposed Cost Separated by Basic Award and Option(s) (if any)	
(12) Name, Address, Telephone Number of the Offeror's Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) Administration Office or Equivalent Cognizant Contract Administration Entity, if Known	
(13) Name, Address, Telephone Number of the Offeror's Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) Audit Office or Equivalent Cognizant Contract Audit Entity, if Known	
(14) Date Proposal was Prepared	
(15) DUNS Number	
(16) TIN Number	
(17) Cage Code	
(18) Proposal Validity Period [minimum of 90 days]	

APPENDIX D

Letter Template

for

Organizational Conflicts of Interest Certification

IARPA Broad Agency Announcement (BAA)

ACE Program

IARPA-BAA-10-05

(Month DD, YYYY)

Office of the Director of National Intelligence
Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity (IARPA)
Office of Incisive Analysis
ATTN: Jason Matheny
Washington, DC 20511

Subject: OCI Certification

Reference: ACE, IARPA-BAA-10-05, (Insert assigned proposal ID#, if received)

Mr. Matheny,

In accordance with IARPA Broad Area Announcement IARPA-BAA-10-05, Section 3.A.1, *Procurement Integrity, Standards of Conduct, Ethical Considerations, and Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI)*, and on behalf of _____ (offeror name) I certify that neither _____ (offeror name), **nor any of our subcontractor teammates** has as a potential conflict of interest, real or perceived, as it pertains to the ACE Program.

If you have any questions, or need any additional information, please contact (Insert name of contact) at (Insert phone number) or (Insert e-mail address).

Sincerely,

(Insert organization name) (Must be signed by an official that has the authority to bind the organization)

(Insert signature)

(Insert name of signatory)

(Insert title of signatory)