Q&A

ATEC HQ 003

AI Assurance Autonomous System Validation

1. Registration. Is an active SAM.gov registration with a UEI (and CAGE, if separately required) a prerequisite to submit at Phase 1, or only a prerequisite to award?

   A1: An active SAM.gov registration is not a prerequisite for Phase 1 submission. However, vendors must complete registration to be eligible for an award; this process can take upwards of six weeks to complete.

2. Instrument. The AOS lists several authorities, including 10 U.S.C. §4021, §4022 and §3458 / DFARS 212.70. Is a particular instrument anticipated for this Call, and — if a §4022 prototype Other Transaction is contemplated — how are the nontraditional-defense-contractor participation or cost-share conditions expected to be satisfied?

   A2: No single instrument is pre-determined or exclusively anticipated for this Call, as the Government reserves the right to award any instrument or combination of structures utilizing the most appropriate authority under the overarching AOS. If a prototype Other Transaction (OT) under 10 U.S.C. § 4022 is utilized, the awardee must satisfy statutory requirements through significant nontraditional-defense-contractor or small business participation, or by providing a one-third non-Federal cost share.

3. Maturity expected at Phase 1. What level of technical maturity and what form of supporting evidence does Phase 1 evaluation expect? Specifically, is simulation-based evidence of system behavior acceptable at this phase, or is evidence from physical testing required?

   A3: ATEC expects solutions to demonstrate a viable path toward operational integration, and we strongly encourage vendors to propose their highest-maturity capabilities. Both simulation-based models and physical test data are acceptable forms of supporting evidence.

4. Does ATEC envision the proposed solution operating as a fully autonomous capability, or should it also include user-interactive workflows for configuration, oversight, and decision support?

   A4: ATEC is seeking solutions that offer the highest degree of automated processing while prioritizing highly tailorable, user-defined configurations for iterative scenario analysis and decision support. Vendors are invited to propose intuitive interface frameworks that balance autonomous processing with effective human-in-the-loop oversight, enabling evaluators to rapidly configure and analyze varied test parameters.

5. Will the Government provide representative Government-furnished datasets, AI models, test ranges, or simulation/LVC environments? If so, at what security classification and DoD Impact Level? Alternatively, should offerors assume synthetic data and models?

A5: For the Phase 1 white paper and presentation, vendors should utilize their own datasets, models, and virtual environments to best demonstrate the mature capabilities of their proposed solutions. Within their proposals, vendors should outline their specific integration concepts to illustrate how their capabilities would interface with government-furnished systems, ranges, or data meshes in subsequent phases.

6. The desired solution attributes span adaptive AI verification, DCRA-V metrics, real-time assurance, and DIL-edge operations across multiple mission areas. Will solutions addressing a focused subset of these capabilities be evaluated competitively, or is a single integrated solution expected to address all listed attributes?

   A6: ATEC is seeking comprehensive, integrated solutions, but highly competitive proposals addressing a focused subset of the desired capabilities will be fully evaluated. Vendors are encouraged to propose their complete capability.

7. Are there existing ATEC test frameworks, DCRA-V tools, data schemas, architectures, APIs, or MOSA/interface standards that proposed solutions should integrate with or complement?

   A7: ATEC utilizes standard military data schemas, mission command architectures, and modern digital engineering frameworks, but we are not dictating specific interface constraints at this phase. Vendors should propose their open, Modular Open Systems Approach (MOSA)-compliant solutions and describe their platform's native ability to integrate with diverse government and legacy test environments

8. What contract type(s) does the Government anticipate using for any resulting award (e.g., FFP, T&M, Cost-Reimbursement, or hybrid)? Additionally, should the proposed "out-the-door" price be based on an initial pilot effort or a full operational deployment?

   A8: No single contract type is predetermined or exclusively anticipated for this Call, as the Government reserves the right to award any contract type or combination of structures utilizing the most appropriate authority. Proposed pricing should be based on the initial pilot effort, with separate, scalable options provided for full operational deployment.

9. For Reverse Industry Week and any follow-on pilot, is there a priority use case, system, or directorate the Government would prefer offerors focus on? Is there a minimum Technology Readiness Level (TRL) expected for commercially ready solutions?

   A9: Offerors should focus on demonstrating their core, scalable technologies rather than a single specific platform or directorate, though ATEC is highly interested in solutions that scale across our aviation, ground maneuver, and air defense portfolios. While there is no strict minimum TRL requirement for Phase 1, vendors should propose mature, commercially ready solutions capable of rapid prototyping and deployment.

10. Beyond the requirements identified in the Call for Solutions, are any additional Army Open Solicitation forms, representations, or certifications required with the Phase 1 Solution Brief?

    A10: There are no additional forms, representations, or certifications required to be submitted with the Phase 1 Solution Brief outside of what is detailed in the Call for Solutions or overarching

Army Open Solicitation. However, offerors must maintain an active registration in SAM.gov to remain eligible for potential award

11. The evaluation criteria reference commercial viability, but the submission instructions do not include a dedicated past performance section. Should relevant customer references and past performance be included, and if so, where should they be incorporated within the Solution Brief, and do they count toward the page/slide limit?

    A11: Formal past performance or dedicated customer reference lists are not required; however, demonstrating commercial viability is a core evaluation criterion. Vendors are encouraged to incorporate relevant commercial or government use-cases, previous pilot successes, or current customer traction directly within the Solution Brief, keeping in mind that those details will count toward the total page/slide limit.