## HR0011SB20254-04 TurboFCL Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

- To meet feasibility requirements of the topic, firms need to provide proof of development and application of language models to a DoD application regarding process improvement and/or security related matters, to include contract number and contract deliverables. Does corporate experience performing LLM deployment/integration for process improvement/efficiency within the federal government meet this requirement or is a DoD customer a requirement?
   A: A DoD customer is a requirement as it is distinct and unique from other organizations in the federal government.
- Firms also need to provide proof of experience navigating the facility and personnel clearance processes, to include any assistance provided to small businesses or nontraditional contractors to assist them in these processes. For this requirement, is a printout confirmation of FCL status sufficient to show experience of navigating the FCL/PCL process? Or is there something more required to be shown as evidence? Does a person who was involved in the initial FCL process, such as a President or CEO, need to be a part of the bid?
   A: Proof of ECL can be part of meeting this requirement, but the company must

A: Proof of FCL can be part of meeting this requirement, but the company must demonstrate they have sufficient knowledge and experience with the FCL process and requirements. In the option period they will be required to assist multiple companies with varied company structures navigate the FCL process by verifying the inputs and outputs of the prototype application. Having a singular experience navigating the process successfully one time does not demonstrate sufficient experience or expertise to meet this requirement.

- 3. Does the government prefer an on premise or cloud solution for Phase 2? What about for Phase 3/production?
  A: A web/cloud-based application would be preferred so that it can be used by companies across the country.
- 4. Having built systems like this in the past, they've always been rules based so I'm curious why language model technology is being proposed for this project.
  A: Language model technology is not required for the entire application; it is up to the offeror to propose the best solution. However, certain capabilities that are desired, such as a "chatbot" type feature that can answer questions specific to the FCL process, would require or highly benefit from language model technology.
- 5. Will the successful proposer have to provide this expert, or will the government make those resources available?
  A: The successful proposer will have to provide facility clearance expertise as the government will not be providing that resource. As part of the proposal, the successful proposer must demonstrate that they have this facility clearance expertise and have demonstrated expertise navigating the facility clearance process.
- 6. Will DCSA be a part of the initial Period of Performance, reviewing milestone achievements along with DARPA?
   A: Possibly
- If DCSA is not part of this period, would it be permissible to coordinate a monthly Working Group that includes the Performer, DARPA, and DCSA?
   A: Possibly

8. Is the name "TURBO FCL" a requirement to keep, or is it simply being used to demonstrate DARPA intent?
A: The name "TURBO FCL is only used to demonstrate intent.