

**DARPA-BAA-16-38-ACCESS**  
**Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**  
**as of 06/14/16**

11Q: The BAA refers to the “Chicago” software package and baseline experiments that were performed. Could you give more details on the availability of the Chicago software package (where to download it, rights, licenses, etc.)? What is the availability of the models used for baselining if we want to review and perhaps repeat some of the baseline experiments?

11A: Chicago is a code in development and specific questions about its capabilities and availability should be directed to the developer, Voss Scientific, LLC ([www.vosssci.com](http://www.vosssci.com)). The Government does not currently plan to provide Chicago as Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) to proposers.

▲▲▲New Q/A▲▲▲

10Q: Is an official transmittal letter required for an abstract submission?

10A: No, an official transmittal letter is only required for full proposal submissions.

9Q: The BAA states, “Other novel approaches are also of interest to DARPA if they can achieve the desired capability.” Will any advanced algorithms (e.g., robust/efficient preconditioners, which have the potential to speed the calculation up by 10-100 times) fit in the stated, “other novel approaches”?

9A: If the novel approach can address the goals of the BAA (allowing for petaflop performance with strong scaling on benchtop for exemplar problems of interest) it will be considered.

8Q: Is it possible to get an extension on the abstract submission deadline?

8A: Unfortunately, the deadline for abstracts remains May 20, 2016, 4:00 p.m. Eastern Time. Currently there is no plan to issue an extension; should any changes to the solicitation occur, they will be posted to [www.fbo.gov](http://www.fbo.gov).

7Q: Are abstract submissions in advance of a full proposal mandatory?

7A: Yes. Per Section IV of the BAA, “Prior to submitting a full proposal, proposers are required to first submit an abstract.”

6Q: Is a high clock rate serial code accelerator to deal with Amdahl's Law within scope for this BAA?

6A: Please read the ACCESS goals and objectives as described in the BAA. If you believe you have an idea that is within scope, you may submit an abstract as outlined in Section IV of the BAA.

5Q: There are two requests for proposals or information out labeled, “16-38.” One is DARPA-SN-16-38 (Nanoweaving) and the other is DARPA-BAA-16-38 (ACCESS). I believe it’s the latter I’m interested in but when I went looking for the Proposer’s Information Pamphlet (PIP) for ACCESS, I only found SN-16-38. How can I get the PIP for ACCESS?

5A: While both announcements include “16-38” in the title, they are for two separate areas within DARPA/DSO. The Special Notice (SN) for Nanoweaving (DARPA-*SN*-16-38) is a Request for Information (RFI) while DARPA-*BAA*-16-38 is the ACCESS Broad Agency Announcement (BAA). DARPA no longer uses a PIP for its BAAs; all information necessary for proposing to ACCESS is contained in the DARPA-BAA-16-38 announcement.

4Q: The BAA states on page 5 under Program Structure and Proposal Guidance a top level SOW and schedule will be needed for the second 30 months of the program. Is this required for the abstract?

4A: While not mandatory at the abstract phase, per the BAA, full proposals should contain such a plan as described in item 10 of Attachment 3, the Technical Management Volume Template and the BAA on page 5.

3Q: After looking at the DARPA call on new platforms for computing long range forces, are paradigm shifts in how we do the computation also of interest or is it mostly about hardware?

3A: It is expected that innovations in both hardware and software are likely required for achieving the ACCESS goals.

2Q: Does the ACCESS solicitation support hardware development in conjunction with novel algorithms?

2A: Yes, hardware developments for achieving the stated objectives and goals can be proposed.

1Q: Is the Chicago code mentioned on page 32 of the ACCESS BAA document also referred to as the Flash software tool on the University of Chicago’s plasma physics web site?

1A: No, the Chicago code is not Flash. It is an implicit electromagnetic particle-in-cell code.