

DARPA-PA-25-07 & DARPA-PA-25-07-06
Selective Harnessing of Intrinsic Neuroplasticity Engineering (SHINE)
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
as of 10/5/2026

43Q: Would a novel approach combining data science and machine learning to build focused modeling and algorithmic intelligence for analysis and simulation to gain meaningful insight into variability testing neuroplasticity in healthy and sick patients be within scope provided it included unique quantifiable metrics based on verified data sources for evaluation and repeat testing?

What data, metrics or evaluation criteria would be recommended or required for such an approach (e.g., data procurement, benchmarks, formats, etc.) or can this be included in the research?

43A: No, this is not in scope.

42Q: Are we able to include additional slides in the Summary Slide to accommodate answers?

42A: No.

41Q: Do cost proposals from subcontractors need to be entirely standalone or could the costs be clearly delineated?

41A: Standalone, please submit separate PRICE proposal documents for each entity, with the appropriate substantiating documentation

40Q: Can a principal investigator be listed on more than one proposal for this call?

40A: Yes; however, they cannot be the principal investigator on more than one effort.

-----↑↑↑New Q/A↑↑↑-----

39Q: How can my institute determine whether it meets the eligibility for DARPA SHINE award?

How can we confirm if our organization has the CMMC Unique Identifier (UID)? Also, how can we check if we have annual CMMC affirmation?

39A: For Eligibility, please review Section 7 of the Disruptionneering Program Announcement.

For CMMC information, please review Page 8 of the solicitation, under “Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification Requirements.” Proposers must first register for a PIEE log in to gain access to the SPRS system and complete the CMMC information.

Resources: <https://piee.eb.mil/> and <https://www.sprs.csd.disa.mil/cmmc.htm>

38Q: Where can we add overhead or F&A on the budget template?

38A: SHINE is requesting price proposals. Proposed prices should be entered into the “Cost Buildup Workbook Amendment 1” with fully burdened rates, inclusive of all applicable indirect costs. Visibility into indirect rates/costs is not required. Proposers must provide justification in “Volume 2 Price Proposal” and any supporting documentation as required.

37Q: Preparing a Track B proposal in response to the SHINE opportunity. We have attached a one-page Executive Summary that provides a brief overview of the project and our proposed approach. Our project asks whether neuroplasticity can be directed by [targeting] of a defined neuronal population. We propose to develop a systemically delivered [platform using] cell-type-restricted expression. As a first demonstration, we would [target XYZ] selectively in [ABC] interneurons of [a specific brain region] and determine whether [our intervention] is sufficient to selectively alter perforant-path plasticity while sparing neighboring circuitry.

1. Does this mechanistic sequence fit SHINE’s intended definition of selective neuroplasticity?
2. For the positive-control requirement, would optogenetic activation of the same [specific] population be an appropriate orthogonal positive control?

37A: Regarding question 37 Part 1. We will not read or attempt to evaluate proposals or summaries prior to the solicitation deadline. Questions to the SHINE mailbox, especially regarding if work is within scope, should be written in a manner that is somewhat generic so that the question and its answer can be posted for all potential proposers to view. The proposed work appears to be in scope. Regarding question 37 Part 2: We will not evaluate merit or appropriateness of proposed technical work in the FAQs. If the clarification is instead around the invasiveness of the control experiment, please see question and answer 6 for more detail.

36Q: I am an Early-Stage Investigator and a first-time DARPA proposer. Does DARPA consider career stage in any way during evaluation, or are there particular expectations or considerations for early-career investigators or first-time DARPA teams that we should be aware of?

36A: Career stage is not specifically considered or evaluated for or against during the proposal selection process. Evaluation criteria for proposals can be found in Section 3 of DARPA-PA-25-07 Amendment 1. Strong proposals will justify why “the proposed technical team has the expertise and experience to accomplish the proposed tasks.” Justification for the team’s technical expertise can take many forms, such as relevant peer-reviewed citations and experimental data. It is recommended that all proposers, not just first-time proposers, carefully read the solicitation and craft their proposal to meet the program milestones and metrics.

35Q: Regarding the Quantifiable change in Neuroplasticity metric in Section F. Metrics (DARPA-PA-25-07-06 Amendment 1, pg. 6):

The metrics table lists the SHINE Target for this metric as "Demonstrate effects of neuroplasticity with effect size > 0.6 ." The paragraph immediately following the table states that all proposed solutions must achieve universal biological baselines for targeting ($\geq 3:1$ ratio), pathway activation (≥ 2 -fold increase), and remodeling ($\geq 25\%$ increase).

Two clarifications would help proposers size their studies appropriately:

1. Which threshold governs the neuroplasticity metric — effect size > 0.6 , a $\geq 25\%$ increase in the remodeling measure, or both?
2. Is the effect size threshold intended as a detection requirement (i.e., the study must be powered to detect an effect of 0.6) or as a demonstrated magnitude (i.e., the observed effect size must exceed 0.6)?

These two readings imply substantially different sample sizes, so the answer has a direct bearing on study design and cost.

35A: Proposals will be evaluated against all metrics stated in the solicitation; in this case neuroplasticity will be assessed on both effect size (> 0.6) and remodeling ($\geq 25\%$).

Proposers should power their study to minimally detect a 0.6 magnitude effect. Proposers should justify their sample sizes with a power analysis and include an estimated expected effect size in their proposal.

34Q: My team is considering Track B with a proposed proof-of-concept that would evaluate a regionally delivered, cell-type-restricted, temporally controlled biological intervention designed to induce a localized adult neuroplasticity-permissive state within a predefined, structurally preserved neural circuit.

The proposed work would use an adult circuit without substantial baseline neuronal or cellular loss.

Would DARPA consider this class of biologically gated, regionally delivered, cell-type-restricted neuroplasticity platform responsive to Track B?

34A: Yes, this is in scope.

33Q: Would the program consider supporting research on spinal cord plasticity and repair, or is the focus exclusively on the brain?

33A: The SHINE program is exclusively focused on inducing circuit-selective neuroplasticity within the brain. Research focused on the spinal cord is outside the scope of this solicitation.

32Q: Does the exclusion of "isolated physical neuromodulation" mean that focused ultrasound (FUS) used alone as a neuromodulatory intervention is out of scope, even if it targets a specific biological plasticity mechanism? Or does SHINE strictly require the physical modality to be combined with a distinct, separate biological or pharmacological agent?

32A: Yes, focused ultrasound used alone is strictly out of scope, regardless of the downstream biological pathways it triggers. The SHINE program seeks to fund methods that advance significantly beyond the current state-of-the-art for physical neuromodulation. A responsive proposal would therefore use a physical modality not as the sole therapeutic agent, but as a component within an integrated system, for instance, to catalyze the delivery or activation of a distinct, targeted biological or pharmacological mechanism.

31Q: What is the F&A (indirect) rate limit on the DARPA SHINE DARPA-PA-25-07-06 Selective Harnessing of Intrinsic Neuroplasticity Engineering (SHINE), is full IDC allowed?

31A: As listed in the SHINE Streamlined Cost Buildup Workbook, Amendment 1, "4. Cost elements above should be fully burdened, inclusive of all applicable indirect costs. Visibility into indirect rates/costs is not required.
5. Proposers must provide justification in Volume 2 Price Proposal and any supporting documentation as required."

30Q: If a proposer has an affiliated organization (with its own UEI/CAGE code) that provides a CMMC-compliant environment for handling FCI and CUI, and that affiliated organization provides affirmation in the proposal that their own CAGE code has a corresponding SPRS, would that proposer be eligible to apply? The affiliated organization would provide service licenses and oversight for the proposer to operate in a fully compliant environment.

30A: The solicitation requires "prime performers and subcontractors to demonstrate compliance with CMMC Level 1."

29Q: Are we allowed to propose additional payable milestones?

29A: The fixed milestones for this program must include, at a minimum, the five (5) milestones listed in the solicitation (for both Track A and Track B). Should the Proposer want to propose additional milestones, they must revise Attachment 1 (TDD) and the Schedule of Milestones and Payments tab in the Streamlined Cost Buildup Workbook to include the additional Milestones for consideration.

28Q: For Track A, is an approach that combines an FDA-approved drug with a novel, non-invasive biofeedback protocol, used as a gating mechanism to direct plasticity, considered in scope?

28A: Yes, that approach is in scope.

27Q: For a projection-based intervention where the stimulation site and the site of intended plasticity are anatomically distinct, where must the 3:1 Intervention Selectivity metric be demonstrated: at the stimulation site, the downstream target, or both?

27A: For a projection-based approach, the Intervention Selectivity metric must be demonstrated at the site of intended neuroplasticity. The core objective of SHINE is to achieve circuit-selective remodeling. Therefore, while selectivity at the site of physical intervention is a critical part of the mechanism, the primary requirement is to show that the resulting biological effect (i.e., the induced plasticity) is spatially confined to the intended downstream neural substrate.

26Q: Disruptioneering – Other Transaction for Prototype Agreement, Article XXI – The Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification article is referenced in the Table of Contents, but there is no associated text in the body of the Agreement. Please provide draft text for review.

26A: We will insert the Article and update the solicitation via an Amendment.

25Q: Disruptioneering – Other Transaction for Prototype Agreement, Article XX – How can an offeror determine whether the Fundamental Research Risk-Based Security (FRRBS) article will be applicable?

- The draft language for this article makes several references to the Performer's approved mitigation plan. If this is required to be submitted at the proposal stage, can you please provide guidance on what should be included in such a plan?

25A: Please see Section IV. A. Proposal Content and Format of the Solicitation. "As of the date of publication of this opportunity, the Government expects that program goals as described herein may be met by proposers intending to perform fundamental research and does not anticipate applying publication restrictions on research results (i.e., papers, journal articles, etc.) to individual awards for fundamental research that may result from this opportunity."

24Q: Section 4.2 of DARPA-PA-25-07 states, "Anyone submitting a proposal requesting a fundamental research OT must comply with the Fundamental Research Risk-Based Security Reviews (FRRBS) requirements as outlined," and references the DARPA landing page for proposer instructions, but I'm not sure I understand what is actually needed from offerors at the proposal stage. Can you confirm that the following items are all that is needed to comply?

- explanation in the proposal of which proposed efforts are fundamental research and why the proposed efforts should be considered fundamental research
- inclusion of Key Personnel's Common Form for Biographical Sketch
- inclusion of Key Personnel's Common Form for Current and Pending (Other) Support

24A: Correct. When submitting the BioSketch and Current and Pending Support forms please be sure to include both items for each key person on your program, and ensure the forms are certified at the end of the document.

23Q: Can a Track B project be performed with human subjects rather than animals?

23A: The solicitation specifies that Human Subject Research (HSR) is allowed only in Track A. Track B is restricted to in vitro and preclinical animal models. An approach involving human subjects would need to be proposed under Track A and meet the corresponding requirement of leveraging a mature technology with existing human safety data.

22Q: Can you review my idea/materials and provide feedback on whether I should apply?

22A: Thank you for your interest. The DARPA SHINE Team is not reviewing materials from potential proposers or taking individual calls. Please refer to the SHINE Solicitation and content within to clarify. If something is unclear, please submit a specific question for response and inclusion in the FAQs.

21Q: Is an approach that uses physical neuromodulation (e.g., focused ultrasound) to activate a cell-type specific molecular gate, which in turn enables patterned neuromodulation to direct plasticity, considered responsive to Track B?

21A: An approach that uses a physical modality (e.g., focused ultrasound) to activate a distinct, engineered biological mechanism (e.g., a molecular gate) does fall within the scope of SHINE.

20Q: For a Track B proposal, is preliminary data for durable plasticity required at the time of submission?

20A: While preliminary data is beneficial, it is not a strict requirement for a Track B proposal. However, the proposal must present a strong and scientifically sound mechanistic hypothesis for why the proposed approach will lead to durable plasticity.

19Q: Does stereotactic delivery of a biodegradable, fully resorbable depot through a burr hole in a rodent model fall within the intended definition of "minimally invasive," or is it excluded as an "invasive surgical implant"?

19A: The SHINE program prioritizes approaches that are truly non-invasive and possess a low barrier to eventual human application. While a burr hole is less invasive than a full craniotomy, any procedure that requires breaching the skull is not considered "minimally invasive" within the scope of this program. The exclusion is intended to steer the program towards technologies that do not require surgical intervention for delivery.

18Q: Can we change the months associated with Milestones? For example, can we propose that our "Experimental Baseline & Validation Protocol" would end in Month 2 or in Month 4? Or must it be accomplished only within Month 3?

18A: Proposers may submit an accelerated schedule with milestones planned for completion earlier than the months indicated in the solicitation. However, to ensure synchronization across the program portfolio for key events like the PI meeting and Government site visits, proposed milestone dates may not extend beyond those specified in the solicitation.

17Q: Would an approach using real-time monitoring of endogenous brain states to time spike-timing-dependent-plasticity (STDP)-based neuromodulation, without any chemical modulation, be considered responsive?

17A: While SHINE is interested in state-dependent activation, the burden is on the proposer to provide a compelling justification that leveraging endogenous brain states to time a physical intervention constitutes a truly novel, coupled system, and not just an optimized stimulation protocol that would otherwise be out of scope.

16Q: Can you confirm that there is no additional spreadsheet dividing the budget into fiscal year as other DARPA proposals? Are there any training/guidance for budget and administration.

16A: Please check out DARPAConnect for training and guidance
<https://www.darpa.mil/about/darpaconnect>.

15Q: Can you make sure we have absolutely the right list of forms the PI has to complete?
[Included/attached

- Proposal Template Volume 3 Administrative National Policy Requirements Document
- Proposal Template Summary Slides PowerPoint
- Proposal Template Volume 2 Price Document
- Task Description Document Template
- Proposal Template Volume 1 Technical Management Document
- Model Other Transaction OT for Prototype Document
- SHINE Streamlined Cost Buildup Workbook Amendment 1 Excel]

15A: Yes.

14Q: Would a clearance-based intervention that uses pharmacologic enhancement of glymphatic clearance to support conditions for adaptive neuroplasticity be considered responsive to the SHINE program scope?

14A: To be responsive, a proposed intervention must directly induce and spatially confine adaptive neuroplasticity to a predefined neural target. Approaches that only

create general permissive conditions for plasticity or act globally across the brain, such as enhancing systemic glymphatic clearance without a specific targeting mechanism, would be considered out of scope.

13Q: Where can I find the briefing from the Info session?

13A: Please find the program overview briefing under the resources section on the program page <https://www.darpa.mil/research/programs/shine>

12Q: For the CMMC Level 1 self-assessment requirement, may our organization submit a proposal while PIEE/SPRS registrations and Level 1 self-assessment are in progress? [We would ensure that a current Final CMMC Level 1 status, CMMC UID, and annual affirmation are posted in SPRS before award execution.]

12A: Yes. Per CMMC Section B Eligibility of Award (in the solicitation): “To be eligible for award under this solicitation, the CMMC Unique Identifier (UID) associated with the prime proposer must reflect a current CMMC status (representing either Final or Conditional status) posted in the Supplier Performance Risk System (SPRS) indicating compliance at the required level above. Additionally, the proposer must have a current annual CMMC affirmation, submitted by an authorized Affirming Official, posted in SPRS. Further, as some entities may have multiple business segments, multiple CAGE codes, etc., DARPA must reasonably be able to relate the CMMC UID in SPRS to the proposing entity.”

11Q: For Track B, how does DARPA intend the term "circuit" to be interpreted for the purpose of demonstrating selectivity? Usage in the field ranges from a minimal defined connection (e.g., a monosynaptic, two-neuron pathway) to multi-synaptic motifs to distributed systems. Is there a minimum level of circuit connectivity or complexity that DARPA expects?

11A: There is no minimal complexity required, however, justification for target choice should be provided and is necessary. As correctly identified, neuroplasticity spans from synapse level to macro scale connections. The justification will be important to discuss the purpose for this target and beneficial effect for targeting this connectivity at this specific level of complexity.

10Q: Does DARPA expect selectivity to be demonstrated in a native/innate circuit (in vivo or ex vivo), or is an engineered in vitro model that reconstitutes a defined circuit (e.g., cell-type-specific neuronal networks with functional connectivity) acceptable for demonstrating circuit- or cell-type-selective neuroplasticity in Track B, provided an in vivo maturation plan is included?

10A: “Preclinical in vitro models (such as cellular and organoid models) are allowed in Track B if the proposers can justify a credible pathway toward future in vivo validation” [Solicitation pg. 7]. Proposers must justify how their model will meet all program metrics and goals, including their ability to “determine if adaptive neuroplasticity can be induced with sufficient selectivity to preferentially modify intended neural substrates while limiting off-target remodeling.” [Solicitation page 2].

9Q: Does DARPA expect a functional circuit-level output (e.g., connectivity or network-activity measures) as evidence of selectivity, or are cell-type-resolved molecular/structural measures of plasticity sufficient at the Track B proof-of-concept stage?

9A: “Molecular/structural” changes may be sufficient provided the proposal justifies how the expected observed changes meet the required SHINE metrics [Section F. Metrics, Solicitation pg.6]. Page 4 of the solicitation provides additional detail on acceptable endpoints, “The methods and experimental models used to demonstrate each objective shall be appropriate to the proposed technology and biological mechanism. Quantitative endpoints may include molecular, cellular, structural, electrophysiological, imaging, functional, behavioral, or other scientifically justified measures. SHINE does not prescribe specific biomarkers or assays; however, proposers shall justify how the selected endpoints demonstrate selective induction of adaptive neuroplasticity.” Proposals will be evaluated based on their rationale “delineating why the proposed approach can achieve the program goals and metrics.” [Section 3 of DARPA-PA-25-07 Amendment 1].

8Q: Does the DARPA SHINE program require cost share?

8A: Please view the DARPA Program Announcement (PA) for Disruptioneering to learn more about cost share. Visit SAM.gov, solicitation number DARPA-PA-25-07 Amendment 1: <https://sam.gov/opp/af580f92ade44eb997a3c47ba74888f5/view>.

“Appendix A: Other Transactions (OT) Authority

OTs for prototype projects are awarded under the authority of 10 U.S.C. § 4022. This authority allows DARPA to use OTs for prototype projects directly relevant to enhancing the mission effectiveness of military personnel and the supporting platforms, systems, components, or materials proposed to be acquired or developed by the DoD; to the improvement of platforms, systems, components, or materials proposed to be acquired or developed by the DoD; or to the improvement of platforms, systems, components, or materials in use by the Armed Forces.

OTs for prototype projects are instruments that are generally not subject to the Federal laws and regulations governing procurement contracts. OTs are not subject to the FAR, the DFARS, or any regulations governing grants or cooperative agreements regulations. There are no proscribed clauses in an OT agreement, and the agreement terms can be negotiated between the awardee and the Government. OT awardees are also not subject to the FAR/DFARS cost accounting standards. As a result, the use of OTs should streamline the award process, making it faster than the traditional Government contracting process and more akin to a commercial contract award timeline. Once the selections are made, the negotiation time will vary from contractor to contractor; however, DARPA expects all OT awards will be executed within 120 calendar days from the date a DO is released on <https://SAM.gov/>. Quick negotiations between responsive parties will enable fast awards. To ensure that DARPA achieves the Disruptioneering

goal of award within 120 calendar days from the posting date of each DO, DARPA reserves the right to cease negotiations when an award is not executed by both parties (DARPA and the selected organization) on or before the deadline explicitly listed in each DO. This deadline will be no more than 120 calendar days from the posting date of the corresponding DO.

According to 10 U.S.C. § 4022 an OT for Prototype agreement may only be awarded when one of the following conditions is met:

(A) There is at least one nontraditional defense contractor or nonprofit research institution participating to a significant extent in the prototype project.

(B) All significant participants in the transaction other than the Federal Government are small businesses (including small businesses participating in a program described under Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. § 638)) or nontraditional defense contractors or nonprofit research institution.

(C) At least one-third of the total cost of the prototype project is to be paid out of funds provided by sources other than the Federal Government.

(D) The senior procurement executive for the agency determines in writing that exceptional circumstances justify the use of a transaction that provides for innovative business arrangements or structures that would not be feasible or appropriate under a contract or would provide an opportunity to expand the defense supply base in a manner that would not be practical or feasible under a contract.

As defined by 10 U.S.C. § 3014, a nontraditional defense contractor in the OT context means an entity that is not currently performing and has not performed, for at least the one-year period preceding the solicitation of sources by the DoD for the procurement or transaction, any contract or subcontract for the DoD that is subject to full coverage under the cost accounting standards prescribed pursuant to section 1502 of title 41 and the regulations implementing such section. To be considered as participating to a significant extent, the proposal should substantiate that the effort being performed by the nontraditional defense contractor is critical to the technical success of the project.

If the proposer requests award of an OT as a nontraditional defense contractor, as defined above, as a nonprofit research institution, or as a small business, as defined under Section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. § 632), information must be included in the price proposal to support the claim. Additionally, if the proposer requests award of an OT agreement without the required one-third cost share, information must be included in the price proposal supporting their assertion that there is at least one nontraditional defense contractor, nonprofit research institution, or small business participating to a significant extent in the proposed prototype project or that all

significant participants in the transaction other than the Federal Government are small businesses, nonprofit research institutions, or nontraditional defense contractors. Proposers must provide in their price proposal an explanation of why the proposer believes the nontraditional defense contractor is participating to a significant extent.

Nonprofit research institutions, which include nonprofit universities, are not required to provide one-third cost share to be awarded an OT for Prototype agreement under Section 4022.

If cost share is required, proposers have wide latitude in satisfying the cost share provisions. Acceptable forms of cost share include (but may not be limited to): cash contributions (application of discretionary resources) from prime proposer and/or proposed subcontractor(s); unreimbursed labor; materials and equipment; use of materials or equipment for program duration (lease value equivalent); and intellectual property with established market value. Unacceptable forms of cost share include (but may not be limited to): foregone fee; foregone general and administrative (G&A) and cost of money (COM) if using independent research and development (IR&D) funds as cost share; valuation of intellectual property with no established market value; facilities or other assets accounted for in overhead rates applied to labor; and capital assets without clear and direct contribution to the program.

Alternative management constructs such as use of spinoff entities, IR&D resources, or direct project funding may also impact how OT provisions for nontraditional entities and/or cost share can be met. Proposers are encouraged to ask questions during the proposal period to ensure adequate understanding and acceptable implementation of the OT provisions.

If proposers meet the conditions under the statutory guidance for not providing cost share, proposers may still provide cost share at their discretion or in-kind.”

7Q: Are there any particular neural circuits that DARPA is especially interested in modulating or is this left open to the researchers?

7A: SHINE does not prescribe specific neural circuits for investigation. Per the solicitation, proposers are responsible for identifying the intended neural target—whether a region, cellular population, or functional circuit—and providing the scientific rationale for their selection within the proposal.

6Q: For Track B, may a proposer use temporary invasive methods during early proof-of-concept testing if the intended intervention prototype is ultimately non-invasive or minimally invasive?

6A: Proposals should align with SHINE’s emphasis on non-invasive or minimally invasive targeting. Approaches requiring craniotomies or permanent implantation of depth electrodes as part of the proposed intervention are out of scope. However,

temporary invasive methods used only to de-risk or validate an otherwise in-scope Track B concept may be acceptable if clearly justified and not part of the intended prototype or transition approach.

5Q: Would minimally invasive approaches that achieve neural targeting via temporary electrode placement be considered responsive to the program's objectives, or does SHINE require that targeting methods be entirely non-invasive?

5A: SHINE prioritizes non-invasive or minimally invasive targeting and does not require that all approaches be entirely non-invasive. Minimally invasive approaches may be responsive if they are clearly justified and otherwise meet the program's technical objectives and scope.

4Q: Will the Intervention Selectivity metric be evaluated against the spatial distribution of the induced neuroplastic response, the spatial distribution of the intervention itself, or both?

4A: The Intervention Selectivity metric applies to the spatial selectivity of the intervention itself within the intended neural substrate relative to appropriate off-target regions.

3Q: How can I enroll as a human research participant in this study?

3A: DARPA is a funding agency and does not directly conduct trials or enroll human research participants. Any clinical studies will be managed independently by the awarded performer institutions in accordance with their approved Institutional Review Board (IRB) protocols.

2Q: Could we build a wearable electromagnetic phased array that can electronically “write” prescribed spatiotemporal electric-field patterns into the human brain - without scalp electrodes, but still achieving cortical field strengths comparable to or greater than standard tACS?

2A: To be considered in scope, any proposed solution, including advanced physical targeting hardware, must be explicitly centered on achieving the SHINE goal of circuit-selective neuroplasticity. As noted in the Exclusion Criteria, hardware-only iteration or relying solely on physical energy to drive plasticity without a coupled biological or pharmacological mechanism is out of scope.

1Q: Will DARPA take calls to discuss SHINE program goals, approaches, questions, etc.?

1A: Thank you for your interest. DARPA SHINE Team will not be taking individual meetings with potential proposers. Please refer to the Solicitation and content within to clarify.