

DPA26BZ06-DV027
Casualty Operations & Resource Prediction Software (CORPS)
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

1. For the physiology/medical-benefit model, may the detailed fidelity and validation thresholds be established at the Month 6 Government Technical Baseline Review as described, with the proposal supplying a medically justified model-development and validation plan? We understand that documented prior Phase I-equivalent feasibility remains required at proposal submission.

A: Yes. Performers are encouraged to propose a medically justified modeling approach that outlines anticipated fidelity, performance objectives, assumptions, and validation methods. Month 6 Government Technical Baseline Review provides an opportunity to work with the Government to refine and finalize specific fidelity requirements and quantitative validation thresholds. Proposals should still provide sufficient technical justification to demonstrate feasibility, including evidence of prior Phase I-equivalent feasibility, and establish a credible foundation for continued model development and validation.

2. "Physiology model" at M3. What model fidelity does M3 exit criterion 1a expect? For example: population-level survival as a function of injury severity and time to intervention, or patient-level physiologic state modeling. Is the performer expected to define this in the Operational Model Baseline?

A: M3 does not prescribe a specific level of physiology model fidelity. Rather, performers are expected to propose and justify a modeling approach appropriate to the operational decisions CORPS is intended to support. Population-level models that predict survivability as a function of injury severity, time to intervention, and available medical resources may be appropriate, provided they can meaningfully differentiate the anticipated medical outcomes of alternative Courses of Action (COAs).

3. "Automated COA generation" at M3. Should Prototype #1 generate candidate courses of action automatically from the available resources and constraints? Or is automated evaluation and ranking of user-specified COAs acceptable at M3, with generation matured in later prototypes?

A: Prototype #1 must demonstrate an initial capability to automatically generate and rank candidate COAs based on available resources, casualty requirements, and operational constraints. Fully mature or optimized COA generation is not expected at M3. Performers may progressively enhance this capability in subsequent prototypes and should define the proposed functionality, limitations, and maturation approach in the Operational Model Baseline.

4. Military data for M2. M2 calls for "representative military and civilian datasets." Does the Government anticipate providing Government-furnished casualty or theater data, or

synthetic scenarios, during Phase II? Or should performers plan on public and synthetic military data only? If Government data is anticipated, will it be CUI?

A: Performers should plan to meet M2 requirements using publicly available, independently sourced, or synthetic datasets representative of military and civilian casualty scenarios. Government-furnished data is not guaranteed and should not be assumed for proposal development or milestone completion. The Government may facilitate access to additional operationally relevant datasets or scenarios during Phase II, subject to availability and applicable access restrictions. Any such data will be identified and handled according to its applicable security and dissemination requirements, including CUI where designated.

5. Military user evaluations. The topic requires at least four prototypes "supporting different military user evaluations," an M4 user assessment and an M5 tabletop exercise. Will DARPA arrange access to military end users and exercises, or should performers identify and budget for their own evaluation partners? Should performers plan to conduct live exercises themselves, or will CORPS evaluations be able to use DARPA-sponsored MASCAL simulation events?

A: The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) may facilitate access to military end users, operational scenarios, or Government-sponsored Mass Casualty (MASCAL) simulation events; however, such support is not guaranteed and should not be assumed in proposals. Live exercises are not required. Simulation-based evaluations and tabletop exercises are acceptable, provided they satisfy the applicable milestone objectives and Government-approved evaluation criteria. The Month 4 (M4) user assessment should focus on usability, operational relevance, and user feedback, while the Month 5 (M5) tabletop exercise should demonstrate the prototype's ability to support casualty prediction, resource allocation, and Course of Action (COA) evaluation within a representative operational scenario.

6. DoD planning-tool integration. Can DARPA name the existing DoD planning tools or systems it considers the priority integration targets, so the Phase II architecture can plan interfaces for them?

A: DARPA has not designated specific Department of War (DoW) planning systems as mandatory integration targets. During Phase II, performers are expected to demonstrate interoperability through defined interfaces, data exchange capabilities, and representative integration scenarios, rather than direct connectivity to operational DoW systems. Performers should identify relevant systems and data standards and propose a modular architecture supporting future integration. DARPA may coordinate with military stakeholders to prioritize integration opportunities based on operational needs and transition potential.

7. Payment milestones. If DV027 is awarded as a FAR-based Firm-Fixed Price contract, are payments tied to the topic's milestone reviews (end of Months 2, 5, 8, 11, 15 and 18, then 20, 22 and 24 in the option)? Or are they tied to the ≤ 1 -month intermediary milestones the instructions require in the Technical Plan? Other Release 6 topics (e.g. DV023,

DV026) specify "fixed payable milestones"; the DV027 topic does not. Should proposers define their own payable-milestone schedule?

A: The DV027 technical milestones and reviews establish program performance expectations but do not automatically constitute payment milestones. The intermediary milestones required in the Technical Plan are intended to demonstrate technical progress and are not necessarily payable events.

For a Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR)-based Firm-Fixed-Price contract, performers should propose a payment schedule aligned with measurable deliverables and technical progress. The final payment milestones, amounts, and acceptance criteria will be established during contract negotiations and incorporated into the resulting award. Performers should not assume that either the topic's technical reviews or the monthly intermediary milestones will automatically trigger payment.

8. Relationship to existing DoD medical planning tools. The topic asks for "integration into existing DoD planning tools." DoD already fields medical planning and casualty-estimation tools, such as the Medical Planners' Toolkit (including CREStT) and the Joint Medical Planning Tool. Should CORPS be designed to complement them, e.g. by importing their planning rates as priors or exporting crisis-time casualty streams in a compatible form? Are there specific tools or interfaces DARPA expects CORPS to integrate with or avoid duplicating?

A: CORPS is intended to complement, not duplicate, existing Department of Defense (DoD) medical planning capabilities. Performers should leverage relevant planning data, casualty estimation methods, and established data standards where appropriate, while demonstrating how CORPS advances dynamic casualty prediction, medical resource optimization, and operational decision support. Performers should propose a modular, interoperable architecture that enables data exchange with existing tools and supports future integration. Specific integration priorities may be refined with military stakeholders during Phase II based on operational needs and transition potential.