

**Q 72: Please clarify what tasks are considered “Major Tasks” for the purposes of the Estimated Cost Breakdown (BAA Section 4.B.2.b).**

A: There is no common statement of work, so each offeror is free to define their own work breakdown structure. The major tasks used in the Estimated Cost Breakdown should match those defined in the proposed statement of work (BAA Section 4.B.1.c(ii)).

**Q 73: Please clarify what documentation is required for the “proposed subcontract costs and equipment purchases” in the estimated cost breakdown section of the cost proposal.**

A: As described in BAA Section 4.B.2.b, for each subcontract the estimated cost breakdown should include a cost element breakdown for the subcontractor’s overall effort, base period, and each option period using the template provided in BAA Appendix F. Offerors must also include a copy of each subcontractor’s proposal. Documentation associated with equipment purchases should provide supporting cost and pricing information in sufficient detail to substantiate the summary cost estimates in Proposal Volume 1. In addition, offerors must include a letter stating why the requested equipment cannot be provided by the offeror’s own funding and, for information technology purchases, why it is in the Government’s best interests for these resources to be acquired rather than procured as a cloud service.

**Q 74: If an offeror from an educational institution requests authorization to deviate from the cost templates (as described in BAA Section 4.B.2.b), when will a confirmation be sent?**

A: IARPA will typically respond to requests to deviate from the cost templates within a few business days.

**Q 75: Should consultants be included as “Team Members” in IDEAS?**

A: Yes.

**Q 76: Does the IDEAS system impose a file size limit?**

A: Yes, the file size limit is 2,047 MB.

**Q 77: Is there a way to see the completed proposal in IDEAS, prior to submission?**

A: Before final submission, offerors will see a summary page that lists all of the information they entered into the electronic coversheet as well as all of the documents that they uploaded. Offerors may use this summary to verify that their proposal is complete prior to submission.

**Q 78: Will IARPA accept proposals that include a design and development effort for new sensing technology (hardware and software)?**

A: As described in BAA Sections 1.C.1.c and 1.C.2.a (for neurophysiological and neuroanatomical data, respectively), IARPA anticipates that existing technologies can be scaled up to meet the data acquisition targets in each phase, but offerors may propose to develop new technologies that have exceptional promise for exceeding these targets if the technologies can be expected to mature within the program timeline.

**Q 79: If a prime contractor submits an OCI Certification Letter (as described in BAA Section 3.A.1), is it certifying that every individual in the organization, and in all of its subcontractors' organizations, have no conflicts of interest at the time of application (or throughout the award period)? What are the obligations of the prime organization in identifying and/or managing the subcontractors' conflicts of interest?**

A: As described in the OCI Letter Template provided in BAA Appendix D, the prime is certifying that there are no OCIs, real or perceived, for itself and its subcontractors at the time the application is submitted. If an OCI issue arises after submission of the proposal, the offeror shall submit the OCI waiver request to the Contracting Officer via the email provided in the BAA: [dni-iarpa-baa-14-06@iarpa.gov](mailto:dni-iarpa-baa-14-06@iarpa.gov). After award, the prime is responsible for ensuring that no OCI issues occur under the contract and for bringing any OCI issues that arise to the immediate attention of the Contracting Officer.

**Q 80: Our (unpaid) consultant has definite deliverables, but his company's policies prohibit him from specifying a level of effort in his commitment letter. Should this issue be described in the Transmittal Letter?**

A: This issue should be addressed in the "Cost Summary" section of your Executive Summary (BAA Section 4.B.1.b(vi)), the "Cost" section of your Detailed Proposal (BAA Section 4.B.1.c(v)), and in the "Estimated Cost Breakdown" of your Cost Proposal (BAA Section 4.B.2.b). Please also refer to the response to Question 40 for other considerations associated with unpaid consultants.

**Q 81: Our organization may have some difficulty in accepting certain FAR and/or DFAR clauses, and other compliance requirements referenced in BAA Section 6. Should these anticipated issues be described in the Transmittal Letter?**

A: Yes, you may describe any anticipated contracting issues in your Transmittal Letter. Note that DFAR clauses will not be applicable to contracts awarded under MICrONS.

**Q 82: Can IARPA specify the particular terms that will apply to future intellectual property generated under a MICrONS award? Or, can IARPA provide a draft of the contract that awardees will be expected to sign if their proposals are selected for negotiation?**

A: As described in the answer to Question 24, the BAA is flexible with regard to contract type, so IARPA does not provide a standard clause set or draft contract. Offerors should expect that the standard FAR clauses pertinent to the negotiated contract type will be included in the finalized contract document, with appropriate alternates for educational institutions and non-profit organizations.

**Q 83: If one or more of the neural algorithms proposed for use as part of a MICrONS project has been patented, or is in the provisional patent stage, does this render the project ineligible for funding?**

A: No, this does not render the project ineligible for funding. As described in BAA Section 4.B.1.c(iii), IARPA prefers unlimited rights in all deliverables and offerors must use Attachment 2 to identify any proprietary content in their proposed deliverables and associated support systems. The offeror's proposed approach to intellectual property rights is one of many considerations in the evaluation of proposals (see BAA Section 5.A for details).

**Q 84: Does IARPA require Government Purpose Rights in all aspects of the funded project?**

A: As described in BAA Section 4.B.1.c(iii), IARPA prefers unlimited rights in all deliverables. If an offeror asserts limited or restricted rights in any deliverable or component(s) of a deliverable, the proposal must identify the potential cost for the Government to obtain Government Purpose Rights in the deliverable.

**Q 85: What is a reasonable range for the annual budgets that the MICrONS program will support?**

A: As described in the answer to Question 61, there is no predetermined size for awards. Offerors should propose a plan of work that is sufficient to achieve the program's goals, and propose estimated costs that are realistic for that work. As stated in Footnote 31 within BAA Section 5.A, "IARPA recognizes that undue emphasis on cost may motivate offerors to offer low-risk ideas with minimum uncertainty and to staff the effort with junior personnel in order to be in a more competitive posture. IARPA discourages such cost strategies. Cost reduction approaches that will be received favorably include innovative management concepts that maximize direct funding for technology and limit diversion of funds into overhead. After selection and before award, the Contracting Officer will negotiate cost/price reasonableness."

**Q 86: In which proposal section or attachment should we include letters of support from companies?**

A: There is no requirement to include letters of support from companies. However, offerors who intend to utilize consultants are required to include consultant commitment letters as described in BAA Sections 4.B.1.d and 4.B.1.d(viii).

**Q 87: Can an experimental investigator be involved in more than one proposal? Does it matter if the investigator is identified as a Key Personnel or Significant Contributor in one or both proposals?**

A: Yes, as described in BAA Section 4.B.1.c(viii), individuals (and organizations) may participate in multiple proposals. There are no restrictions on the role(s) that individual can play in the proposals.

**Q 88: If we are only focused on TA1 and TA2, do we need to constrain ourselves to a single cortical region or can we propose studies of different regions (for example, for TA1 in the visual cortex and for TA2 in the somatosensory cortex or vice versa)? In other words, is there a requirement that the work in TA1 and TA2 would be on the same cortical region?**

A: As described in BAA Section 1.A.5, in TA2 performers must collect neuroanatomical data about the same brain regions *in the same brain specimens* that are used in TA1 for neurophysiological studies. Note, however, that in TA1 offerors may propose a limited set of additional targeted data collection activities in other regions of interest (BAA Section 1.C.1.b(iii)).

**Q 89: Can the data acquisition part of the BAA include cognitive experiments?**

A: The BAA does not constrain the type of experiments that may be conducted, but performers in TA1 and TA2 must acquire data sufficient to meet the metrics defined in BAA Sections 1.B.1.c and 1.B.2.a, respectively. Note that in TA1, offerors may propose a limited set of additional targeted data collection activities that may differ from the experiments used to collect the data for the aforementioned metrics (BAA Section 1.C.1.b(iii)).

**Q 90: Can EEG data acquisition be included?**

A: Traditional EEG data would not meet the data collection metrics specified in BAA Section 1.B.1.c, but could be used as supplementary data as described in BAA Section 1.C.1.b(iii). Also see the responses to Questions 18, 52, 62, and 64.

**Q 91: Does language count as “abstract, non-sensory data”?**

A: It depends. For example, some language comprehension tasks may be construed as operating on abstract, non-sensory data, whereas speech recognition tasks typically operate on sensory (auditory) data.

**Q 92: Has IARPA negotiated rates for cloud computing and storage? If not, does IARPA plan to negotiate discounted rates in the future?**

A: To date, IARPA has not negotiated rates for cloud computing in storage, but it may do so in the future.

**Q 93: Can teams who propose to all three Technical Areas also propose to use a Government-specified commercial cloud service provider for data storage and analysis?**

A: As described in BAA Section 1.C, offerors who propose to all three Technical Areas may propose to use a commercial cloud service provider of their choice *or* a private/custom information technology solution. If the offeror proposes to use a commercial cloud service provider, they must specify their preferred provider in their proposal - there is no Government-specified commercial cloud service provider named in the BAA.

**Q 94: Would teams proposing to all three Technical Areas be permitted to propose and utilize their own information technology solution *and* be required to utilize the common commercial cloud service?**

A: No, teams proposing to all three Technical Areas would either utilize their own information technology solution *or* the common commercial cloud service provider.

**Q 95: We may be bringing new educational institutions on board after the February 9 deadline. Will it be possible for these educational institutions to request authorization, after February 9, to deviate from the cost templates?**

A: Yes, this deadline was removed in Amendment 01 to the BAA. Prospective offerors may now request authorization at any time prior to submission, but are encouraged to submit requests as soon as possible to ensure adequate time for IARPA to process and respond to the request.