

**DARPA-PA-25-07-04 Resilient
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
As of 10/12/2026**

27Q: Does DARPA expect the acceleration conditioning to be performed starting on early age (<7 days) or on mature concrete (≥ 28 days), and will curing time need to be considered in the 1000x acceleration calculations?

27A: DARPA does not currently prescribe a single coupon age or curing regimen for all approaches. Proposers should define and justify their curing and conditioning-start protocol, including its relevance to the real-world baseline data used for validation. For purposes of reporting material acceleration, proposers should clearly distinguish specimen fabrication/curing or preconditioning time from the accelerated environmental-exposure interval, unless early-age evolution is an intentional and validated component of the proposed degradation model. The proposed calculation basis should support the required comparison to natural real-world degradation and mechanistic consistency.

26Q: In regard to the material accelerator, does DARPA consider only the acceleration chamber and equipment used to directly apply acceleration as part of the deliverable for materials accelerator hardware or do they also include characterization equipment as part of that deliverable, i.e., if micro-CT is used is a micro-CT system capable of being placed on the Class 1 or 2 vehicle required to be delivered as well?

26A: DARPA intends the Material Accelerator hardware deliverable to be comprised of the transportable physical platform that applies the coupled accelerated stressors to material coupons, as well as sensing, controls, and data-acquisition elements integral to operation of that platform. Proposers must employ and justify an appropriate method for assessing morphological accuracy; however, standalone characterization equipment used to support validation (e.g., an external micro-CT, SEM, or MIP system) is not required to be included in the transportable Material Accelerator hardware deliverable solely because it is used for characterization. If a proposer's concept relies on characterization equipment as an integrated and necessary component of the fieldable prototype, the proposer should clearly identify it in the system architecture and explain how the proposed system satisfies the solicitation's transportability requirement.

25Q: Is there a voluntary teaming directory, participant networking channel, or other established mechanism through which prospective subcontractors can identify and contact eligible prime proposers?

25A: Teaming opportunities, e.g. Information Session attendee list and Proposer Profile, were provided in DARPA-SN-26-106 for the Resilient Disruption Opportunity (DO) Information Session.

24Q: Is a separate Task Description Document required for each subawardee or is this requirement satisfied by the “Schedule of Milestones and Payments” that will be included in the cost workbook?

24A: Only one Task Description Document (TDD) should be submitted. Per the instructions in the TDD Template, each defined task/subtask must identify (by name) the primary organization (prime contractor, subawardee(s), consultants(s)) responsible for execution.

23Q: Are biosketches and Current & Pending Support documents required for each PI and Co-PI?

23A: All key personnel named in the proposal are required to submit the Common Disclosure Forms.

22Q: Does the two-page Data Sourcing Narrative and Data Sharing Agreement count toward the Technical Volume page limit, or are those pages permitted in addition to the Technical Volume page limit?

22A: The two-page (maximum) Data Sourcing section, the narrative describing what data the proposer would share if awarded, and the Data Sharing Agreement should be included within the 10-page limit of the Technical Volume 1.

21Q: Is there a maximum number of products/publications that may be included in each individual's biosketch?

21A: There is no limit. All works from at least the last 5 years should be included in the biographical sketch.

-----↑↑↑New Q/A↑↑↑-----

20Q: Can an organization that did not independently submit a Resilient abstract participate as a subcontractor or team member on a full proposal led by a prime that did submit a conforming abstract?

20A: Yes.

19Q: Should the Task Description and Data Sourcing sections be appended to Volume 1 as part of a single document, or should they be uploaded as separate files within the submission ZIP file?

19A: The Task Description document is a separate file, outside the page limits of Volume 1. This should be uploaded as a separate file within the proposal submission zip file. The Data Sourcing section should be included in the page limits of Volume 1.

18Q: Based on the resilient data submission template, it appears that DARPA is seeking ASTM standard test data from previously published reports or databases. Could you please confirm if

this understanding is correct? Could you please also clarify which of the following can be an appropriate source of the historical data: (i) damage data (e.g., crack extent, corrosion, spalling) collected through field evaluations of a relatively old (10 to 30 years) real concrete structure, (ii) ASTM standard test results obtained by evaluating concrete core samples collected from a relatively old (10 to 30 years) real concrete structure or (iii) concrete samples prepared in the laboratory and exposed to ASTM standard test methods (e.g., ASTM C666, C1202, etc.), which do not consider combination of stressor as the real structures?

18A: Resilient is seeking to build a database with as much historical data as possible, from any sources that are available to the performers. All listed sources would be appropriate.

17Q: One of our partner agencies will provide historical data on real-life structures but is not comfortable disclosing the exact data collection locations. Can you please confirm if we are allowed to use historical data without disclosing the exact data collection location?

17A: Please see the “Specimen_Profiles” tab in the “Resilient_Data_Submission_Template” attachment for details on what types of associated information are being requested. While exact location data is not explicitly requested, it's possible that additional clarification will be needed after proposers are selected, however we do not anticipate needing any finer granularity than the zip code of the exposure of a material or structure in the field.

16Q: Are you able to review, or meet to discuss, a revised concept that was discouraged?

16A: Please see FAQ #10.

15Q: The solicitation states that “Proposals that include a UARC, FFRDC, Government entities, or National Laboratory as a subcontractor may also be deemed non-conforming unless: (1) their role is clearly defined in the technical proposal with a point of contact, and (2) a rough order of magnitude cost is provided in the technical proposal only—cost proposals must exclude their funding, as DARPA will not fund them through the prime.” Can you please confirm that for the proposal submission, these entities only need to clarify well their role and submit a rough budget estimate? If selected, these entities will then send a detailed budget and statement of work to DARPA to be funded directly?

15A: Yes.

14Q: The solicitation states that “FFRDCs must provide a letter, on official letterhead from their sponsoring organization, that (a) cites the specific authority establishing their eligibility to propose to Government solicitations and compete with industry, and (b) certifies the FFRDC’s compliance with the associated FFRDC sponsor agreement’s terms and conditions.” This letter requires initiating an SPP (strategic partnership proposal) to get approvals from the DOE site

office, which would easily take at least 6 weeks. Is this letter required for the main proposal submission or only if the proposal is selected?

14A: It is strongly encouraged to provide at time of proposal submission.

13Q: How is the accuracy of the predictions made by the scalability model expected to be validated?

13A: From historical and/or experimental data.

12Q: Does the full proposal need to be submitted from the same account that submitted the abstract?

12A: Full Proposal submissions should be from the same BAAT account you used to submit your abstract to expediate workflow. Should you have issues logging into BAAT (e.g., account locked, too long since you have logged in/expired account, forgotten login name/password), technical support for DARPA's Submission website may be reached at BAAT_Support@darpa.mil and is typically available during regular business hours (9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. ET).

11Q: I am trying to submit an abstract/proposal in the BAA portal, but do not see the PM name in the dropdown list. How do I proceed?

11A: Please select “No Selected PM” in the dropdown.

10Q: Is it possible to discuss our technical concept/approach with the DARPA Program Manager (PM) to see how it aligns with the opportunity?

10A: To enable open and fair competition, the PM is not holding individual meetings or commenting on ideas/technical approaches outside of the formal Resilient FAQ process.

9Q: Can you confirm whether the required CMMC Level 1 SPRS status must be in place at the time of abstract submission or full proposal submission, or whether it must be in place prior to award/award execution?

9A: Per 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.” DARPA recommends working towards this as early as possible.

8Q: At the full proposal stage, will either the narrative or the budget justification be considered Federal Contract Information (FCI)?

8A: Yes, as the goal is for information from proposal files to be incorporated into an OT Agreement award if awarded, at which point they would immediately convert to FCI, if not intended for public release.

Per 48 CFR 4.1901, "Federal Contract Information (FCI)" is defined as: information, not intended for public release, that is provided by or generated for the Government under a contract to develop or deliver a product or service to the Government, but not including information provided by the Government to the public (such as that on public Web sites) or simple transactional information, such as that necessary to process payments.

7Q: Is studying the behavior of concrete under [insert type of acceleration here] within the scope of the program?

7A: The Resilient program is agnostic to the type/mechanism/combinations of acceleration.

6Q: Is corrosion of steel in concrete in-scope?

6A: Yes, See FAQ #1.

5Q: Who is eligible to propose to the Resilient Program?

5A: All responsible sources capable of satisfying the Government's needs may submit a proposal that will be considered by DARPA. See Section 7 of DARPA-PA-25-07 Amendment 1 for information on who may be eligible to respond to this announcement.

4Q: Is DARPA expecting fully operational aging equipment as a deliverable?

4A: Yes, the development and demonstration of a fully operational piece of aging equipment, termed the "Material Accelerator," is a central requirement and a key deliverable of the program. Please see Table 1 on page 5 and Section "E. Schedule/Milestones" for more details.

3Q: Does data collection include data obtained from real structures experiencing the degradation of interest? Will DARPA provide standard datasets to validate the models that are developed?

3A: The validation strategy for the Resilient program is built upon using historical data from real structures and environments. However, DARPA will not provide a standard dataset at the beginning of the program. Instead, the Government will create a unified master database by aggregating historical data contributed by all selected performers. This shared dataset will be distributed back to all performers to serve as the common baseline for model validation (see "Federated Baseline Data Sharing Requirement," p. 6).

2Q: Does DARPA expect the scalability model to predict a structure's failure? How are we defining failure? What is the design of the structure?

2A: Yes, the model must predict failure. The solicitation defines failure in two ways:

When it fails (Time-to-failure): The model must predict the time to failure with increasing precision in each phase (see "Predictive Accuracy" in Table 1, p. 5).

How it fails (Mode of failure): The model must accurately replicate the physical degradation mechanisms observed in the real world (see "Morphological Accuracy" in Table 1, p. 5).

Furthermore, we define failure as a loss of serviceability (not just a reduction in serviceability). Depending on the structure this will mean different things. For example, for a structural element that would generally mean load carrying capacity is below design capacity.

The solicitation provides examples of target structures, an "intermediate-scale structural element (e.g., a 1-meter reinforced beam)" in Phase 1 and a "full-scale structure (e.g., a bridge pier or retaining wall)" in Phase 2 (Table 3, p. 6). The exact design parameters for modeling will be tied to the historical data in the program's federated database.

1Q: What degradation mechanisms is DARPA interested in? Are you interested in the degradation of concrete, steel, or the concrete/steel composite?

1A: The program is interested in the degradation of reinforced concrete structures as a composite system barring intrinsic material deficiencies such as known-ASR reactive materials; i.e. assuming a competent concrete mix is the baseline. The program's focus is on replicating the synergistic complexity of real-world degradation, not on studying a single material or mechanism in isolation. Please see examples of reinforced structural elements in Table 3 on page 6.