DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
2026 Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) Program
Commercial Solutions Opening (CSO)
Component-Specific Proposal Instructions
Release 4

To the extent possible, all Department of the Army component specific text follows the same numbering as the related sections in the Department of War (DoW) 2026 SBIR Program CSO. Supplemental numbering is used only when the text cannot be integrated intelligibly with the DoW 2026 SBIR Program CSO counterpart.

Each Small Business Concern (SBC) (also referred to herein as "proposer", "offeror", and/or "firm") is encouraged to thoroughly review the DoW 2026 SBIR Program CSO, to include any amendments/revisions, and the Army component-specific proposal instructions herein.

Please note that these instructions contain active hyperlinks. Offerors are encouraged to utilize these hyperlinks for additional information and resources. Ensure your browser or Portable Document Format viewer settings permit hyperlink access to take full advantage of these resources.

The following resources are provided to assist SBCs with SBIR Program Opportunities:

- The DoW 2026 SBIR Program CSO is located at: https://www.dodsbirsttr.mil/submissions/solicitation-documents/active-solicitations.

- To remain apprised of important programmatic and solicitation changes, SBCs should register for the Defense SBIR / Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) Innovation Portal (DSIP) Listserv at: https://www.dodsbirsttr.mil/submissions/login.

- Department of the Army's SBIR|STTR Website: https://www.armysbir.army.mil/.

Table of Contents

1.0 PROGRAM DESCRIPTION 4

1.1 Introduction 4

1.5 Majority Ownership in Part by Multiple Venture Capital, Hedge Fund, and Private Equity Firms 4

1.7 Direct to Phase II (DP2) Program 4

1.8 Program on Innovation Open Topics 4

1.9 Discretionary Technical and Business Assistance (TABA) 4

1.10 Department of the Army Phase II Enhancement Policy 5

1.10.1 Overview 5

1.10.2 Application Process 6

1.10.3 Limitations 6

2 CERTIFICATIONS AND REGISTRATIONS 7

2.1 System for Award Management (SAM) Registration 7

2.3 DoW SBIR|STTR Innovation Portal (DSIP) Registration 7

3 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS AND REQUIREMENTS 7

3.7 Phase I Proposal Instructions 7

3.8 Phase II Proposal Information 14

3.9 Direct to Phase II (DP2) Proposal Instructions 14

3.10 Expeditionary Technologies (xTech) Prize Competition Selectees 17

3.11 Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) 17

3.12 Arms, Ammunition, and Explosives (AA&E) 17

4 METHOD OF SELECTION AND EVALUATION CRITERIA 19

4.1 Evaluation Process 19

4.1.1 Initial Screening 19

4.1.2 Technical Evaluation (Not Applicable to xTech Prize Competition Selectees) 19

4.1.3 Selection (Not Applicable to xTech Prize Competition Selectees) 21

4.2 Evaluation Criteria 21

4.3 Proposal Status and Feedback 21

4.5 Pre-Award and Post Award Protests 21

5 ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS 22

5.1 Award Information 22

5.1.1 Additional Award Considerations 22

5.1.2 Possible Contract Award 23

5.2 Contract Requirements 23
5.6 Invention Reporting 24
6 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION 25
6.3 Contact Information 25

1.0 PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

1.1 Introduction

The future Army must be capable of conducting Multi-Domain Operations (MDO) as part of an integrated Joint Force across an array of situations in multiple theaters by 2035. The MDO concept describes how the Army will support the Joint Force in the rapid and continuous integration of all domains of warfare – land, sea, air, and cyberspace – to deter and prevail as we compete short of conflict, and fight and win if deterrence fails. The Army must provide game-changing capabilities to our Soldiers. To capitalize on small business innovation and reduce the time from solicitation to award, the Army leverages an approach that advertises SBIR funding opportunities through the DoW SBIR CSO process, with monthly topic releases. Additionally, the Army has established a contracting activity dedicated to executing all SBIR|STTR Phase I and Phase II awards for Army customers.

1.5 Majority Ownership in Part by Multiple Venture Capital, Hedge Fund, and Private Equity Firms

Under the Department of the Army's SBIR Program, proposing SBCs that are owned in majority part by multiple venture capital operating companies (VCOCs), hedge funds (HF), or private equity funds (PEF) are eligible to submit applications or receive awards. Reference may be made to the DoW 2026 SBIR Program CSO, including revisions/amendments, as well as 13 CFR 121.702, regarding eligibility standards, to include ownership and control requirements, applicable to the SBIR program.

All applicants that are majority-owned by multiple VCOC, HF or PEF, and are submitting a proposal to an Army Topic, shall complete the certification at Verification of Eligibility of Small Business Joint Ventures, prior to submitting an application/proposal and must include the certification with their submission.

1.7 Direct to Phase II (DP2) Program

Implementing the authority granted by 15 U.S.C. §638 (cc), as amended, the U.S. Army will be conducting 'Direct to Phase II' awards for eligible SBIR topics. For topics leveraging this authority, please refer to Section 3.9, Direct to Phase II (DP2) Proposal Instructions, below.

1.8 Program on Innovation Open Topics

This release may contain an open topic. Proposing SBCs shall refer to the DoW 2026 SBIR Program CSO, to include any amendments/revisions, for additional information regarding open topic submissions.

1.9 Discretionary Technical and Business Assistance (TABA)

The Small Business Innovation and Economic Security Act Section 7 mandates agencies to offer TABA. The Army SBIR|STTR program provides TABA to assist awardees in making informed technical decisions, mitigating risks, and accelerating commercialization. Army may provide up to $6,500 per Phase I project and up to $50,000 per DP2 project if the SBC supports the need for TABA sufficiently as determined by the Government. These amounts are in addition to the maximum award funding guideline limitation listed above. TABA funding is not guaranteed and is based upon the review of the services requested and the available TABA budget. Proposers may choose one of the following options:

- Option 1 - Army-Preferred Vendor(s): Proposers/Offerors may receive up to $6,500 per Phase I project and up to $50,000 per DP2 for assistance services. **If selecting to utilize the Army's preferred provider(s), the cost for TABA does not need to be included in the DSIP cost proposal (Volume 3).** If approved, this funding is provided directly to the Army's preferred

provider(s) to perform the assistance agreed upon. Participation is voluntary, and application instructions are provided upon contract award. The Army's preferred provider(s) and the current services they are offering can be found on the Army SBIR|STTR Website https://www.armysbir.army.mil/taba/. Frequently requested services include:

- Customized market research and strategy
- Intellectual Property support
- Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) compliance
- Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) Compliance
- Communications and Marketing

- Option 2 - Firm-Selected Vendor: Proposers/Offerors may request to contract TABA services through one or more TABA providers or through funding used to hire new or augment staff, or direct staff to conduct or participate in training activities consistent with the goals listed in 15 U.S.C.§638(q)(1) for up to $6,500 per Phase I project and up to $50,000 per DP2 in total obligations. These amounts are in addition to the maximum award funding guideline limitation specified in the respective SBIR/STTR topic. **If selecting to utilize your own TABA provider, the proposed TABA amount must be included in the DSIP Cost Volume (Volume 3) and can be in addition to the maximum funding limitation for this topic, and details of TABA request must be included in Supporting Documents (Volume 5).**

  - Cost Volume (Volume 3) Requirements: Proposers must explicitly state the intent to use an outside provider in the proposal and include the associated costs in the Cost Volume. TABA costs cannot include any profit/fee for the proposer/offeror. Additionally, TABA costs cannot be factored into the calculation of general and administrative expenses (G&A) for the proposer/offeror. The amount is based on the original contract period of performance and does not apply to period of performance extensions and/or enhancements. **TABA funding will be denied if costs are omitted from the initial proposal submission or if the TABA costs proposed exceed $6,500 per Phase I project or $50,000 per DP2 project.**

  - Details of TABA Request: **A detailed rationale for the requested TABA services must be included in Supporting Documents (Volume 5) of the proposal.** A statement (maximum of 2 pages) is required to clearly demonstrate the provider's specialized expertise and relevant experience. This documentation must include at a minimum:
    - TABA provider(s) name
    - TABA provider(s) point of contact, email address, and phone number
    - An explanation of the TABA provider(s) suitability and qualifications to provide the service
    - Outline of the specific tasks to be performed
    - Total TABA provider(s) cost, number of hours, and labor rates (average/blended rate is acceptable).

1.10 Department of the Army Phase II Enhancement Policy

1.10.1 Overview

To further encourage the transition of SBIR|STTR research into DoW acquisition programs as well as the private sector, the Department of the Army may provide a Phase II awardee with up to $500,000.00 in

matching SBIR funding (on a dollar-for-dollar basis) if the performer obtains commitment of non-SBIR|STTR funding from a DoW component(s), Federal Agency(ies), and/or a commercial investor(s).

Enhancement funding is typically applied to an active Phase II award via a contract modification and will result in an additional period of performance that is commensurate with the total funding received, typically 6 to 18 months (18 months being the maximum). On a case-by-case basis, however, a new Phase II contract may be awarded if appropriate. The proposed Enhancement effort must develop, deliver, and integrate a technology or product into a program within a DoW component(s), Federal Agency(ies), and/or the commercial sector.

1.10.2 Application Process

Enhancement requests should be submitted at least 6 months prior to the end of the Phase II period of performance to allow adequate time to complete the contracting process. Applications to the Enhancement Program will be reviewed for overall merit, transition potential, commercialization strategy, and value to the Army mission and are typically initiated through the Contracting Officer Representative (COR), Technical Point(s) of Contact (TPOC), SBIR|STTR Coordinator, and/or the Army SBIR|STTR Program Office, with oversight and input from the Contracting Officer.

Upon Army SBIR|STTR Program's Source Selection Authority (SSA) approval to proceed, assigned contracting personnel will prepare and issue a letter request for proposal (RFP), soliciting the firm's Enhancement proposal.

1.10.3 Limitations

All Enhancement requests are subject to the approval of the Army SBIR|STTR Program's SSA, successful completion of negotiations, and the availability of funding.

In order to be considered for matching SBIR funds under a Phase II Enhancement, the Contracting Officer must receive certified proof of the non-SBIR|STTR funding transfer. Certification consists of a notarized letter, stating that "$ in cash has been transferred to [company name] from [investor name] in accordance with the DA Enhancement Program procedures" that is signed by both the awardee and its investor. The letter must be sent to the Contracting Officer along with a copy of the SBIR awardees bank statement showing the funds were deposited. This certification should be received by the Contracting Officer within 45 days of the Enhancement approval notification. Failure of the awardee to certify and provide proof of the Investor's total cash contribution may significantly delay the Phase II enhancement or result in the awardee becoming ineligible for the Phase II Enhancement.

"Outside investment" must meet DoW Guidelines to qualify for Phase II Enhancement matching funds.

Eligible third-party investors include:

- Non-SBIR|STTR Department of Defense funds
- Any other non-SBIR|STTR federal agency funds
- An SBC other than the eligible/performing SBC
- Venture capital firms
- Individual investors
- A non-SBIR|STTR federal, state, or local government; or
- Any combination thereof

Ineligible sources include:

- The eligible SBC's internal research and development funds

- Funding in forms other than cash (such as in-kind or other tangible assets)
- Funding from the owners of the eligible SBC, or the family members or affiliates of such owners; or
- Funding attained through loans or other forms of debt obligations

2 CERTIFICATIONS AND REGISTRATIONS

2.1 System for Award Management (SAM) Registration

Interested SBCs are required to be registered and active in SAM in accordance with FAR Provision 52.204-7, System for Award Management, when submitting an offer or quotation and at time of award. Proposals or offers submitted by firms failing to meet this requirement may be deemed unresponsive.

SBCs may only submit offers using their legal business name or 'Doing Business As' (DBA) name, as indicated in the SAM registration for the provided Unique Entity Identifier (UEI). A firm submitting an offer using a DBA name shall have the DBA registered and linked to their current, active, SAM registration. Please refer to section 2.3 below for instructions regarding the correlation between your firm's DSIP account profile, and the SAM.

Firms must not be debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, or voluntarily excluded from Government contracting within the SAM –

- Contractors debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, or voluntarily excluded, are excluded from receiving an award. Contractors that are debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, or voluntarily excluded, are also excluded from conducting business with the Government as agents or representatives of other contractors.
- Contractors and other entities that have an active exclusion record in SAM because they have been declared ineligible on the basis of statutory or other regulatory procedures are excluded from receiving an award under the conditions and for the period set forth in the statute or regulation.
- The Army SBIR|STTR Program will not consent to subcontracts with these contractors.

2.3 DoW SBIR|STTR Innovation Portal (DSIP) Registration

It is the SBCs responsibility to ensure that the firm's DSIP account profile information correlates to the data found within the firm's SAM registration. This includes, but is not limited to the following:

- 5-Digit Commercial and Government Entity Code
- 12-Digit UEI
- Legal Business Name
- "Doing Business As" Name
- Physical Address

Failure to correlate the SBCs entity information between the DSIP application and SAM and/or submit required certifications may significantly delay funding agreement award or become grounds for cancellation of the funding agreement.

3 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

3.7 Phase I Proposal Instructions

The following proposal instructions supplement, and in some cases, supersede, those found within the

DoW 2026 SBIR Program CSO, including any amendments/revisions/appendices.

a. Proposal Coversheet (Volume 1)
The proposal coversheet is prepared on DSIP and in accordance with the DoW solicitation.

b. Technical Volume Format (Volume 2)
Proposals shall adhere to the formatting instructions provided in the DoW 2026 SBIR Program CSO, including any amendments/revisions, as supplemented by the technical volume formatting requirements described herein. Information provided in these Service/Component-specific proposal instructions take precedence over any instructions listed in the DoW 2026 SBIR Program CSO. **Submissions that fail to conform to the technical volume formatting requirements shall be deemed unresponsive.**

1. **File Type**: The Technical Volume shall be a single Adobe Acrobat (supporting Windows 10-11) Portable Document Format (.pdf) searchable text format file, including graphics. PDF files that cannot be opened using Adobe Acrobat products may be rejected by the Government. Perform a virus check before uploading the technical volume file. If a virus is detected, the proposal may be rejected. Do not lock, password protect or encrypt the uploaded file. Do not include or embed active graphics, such as videos, moving pictures, or other similar media, in the document.

2. **Length**: The Technical Volume shall not exceed seven (7) pages including all key sections described in Section 3.7(c), Technical Volume Content. The seven (7) page limit applies to the entire Technical Volume submission as uploaded to DSIP. At the Government's discretion, if included in the submission, pages that clearly do not substantiate or contribute to the technical approach, such as a cover sheet or table of contents, may be excluded from the page count. However, any appendices or supplemental content/materials that expand upon the requirements described in section 3.7(c), shall count toward the seven (7) page limitation. SBCs may allocate any portion of the technical volume page limit to each of the key sections, as desired. It is the proposing SBCs responsibility to ensure that the Technical Volume file uploaded to DSIP complies with the stated page limitation.

3. **Layout**: Number all proposal pages consecutively. Submit a direct, concise, and informative research or R&D proposal (no type smaller than 10-point on standard 8-1/2" x 11" paper with one-inch margins, including the header). The header on each page of the technical volume, which may be included in the one-inch margin, should contain the proposing SBC's name, topic number, and the DSIP assigned proposal number from the cover sheet.

4. **General**:
   - Technical volume MUST be a single Adobe Acrobat PDF file
   - Graphics are strongly encouraged to be included throughout the white paper as you see fit. Ensure they are logical and easy to read. Supporting images should be thoughtful and visually attractive.
   - For plots and charts: Include title, caption, axes labels, and be sure to include scale.
   - Avoid jargon and define all technical terms
   - Use the "Compress Pictures" feature to reduce file size when possible.

c. Technical Volume Content (Volume 2)

The following technical volume content instructions supersede those stated in the DoW 2026 SBIR Program CSO, including any amendments/revisions/appendices.

Offerors must address the requirements outlined for the Non-Proprietary Work Plan in Supporting Documents (Volume 5). This overview should directly reflect the key elements of the technical approach detailed in this volume, ensuring consistency between both documents.

The Technical Volume shall be structured in the following order:

i. **Introduction;**
ii. **Army Benefits;**
iii. **Technical Approach;**
iv. **Programmatic Potential; and**
v. **Commercial Potential**

Each of the key sections align directly with the evaluation rubric, Phase I Evaluation Criteria (Appendix A), ensuring clarity in how proposals will be assessed. The following outlines the specific content expectations for each section of the Technical Volume, as guided by the evaluation criteria in Appendix A. Offerors should ensure their proposals clearly address the key elements identified in the rubric to maximize the proposal's competitiveness.

i. **Introduction**: Write a clear, concise description of what your innovation does or will do, and where you are in your evolution. Make clear its intended impact on the Army. Evaluators should "get it" after reading this.

ii. **Army Benefits**: Briefly describe any identified Army use cases, the solutions' advantages and potential level of impact and scale of impact the solution would have for the Army. If you are unsure how an Army end-user might benefit from this technology or the scale of impact it could have, please provide an analogous use case to allow the Army evaluators a way to connect the dots using their knowledge of potential Army use cases when evaluating this section. The rubric prompts below are provided to guide you in preparing this section:

- **Alignment.** Argue your technology innovation is aligned with this Army topic's priorities as defined in the solicitation.
- **Solution's Advantages.** Prove your prospective customers will choose you given limited resources and myriad choices. Have you accounted for indirect substitute products as well as direct competitors?
- **Solution's Impact.** The Army seeks higher-risk, high-impact solutions through SBIR - not engineering changes or incremental improvements. Use this section to describe your technology's impact and improvement upon the state of the art.

iii. **Technical Approach**: Provide details and supporting data on how the proposer is going to solve the problem. It shall detail key elements of the firm's approach, the technical team, and any risks and mitigation plans identified. Use data to substantiate your claims that your technical risk mitigation plans are credible. Show us quality data attributed to reliable, credible sources. The rubric prompts below are provided to guide you in preparing this section:

- **Scientific Feasibility.** Convince readers that your innovation is built atop sound scientific and/or engineering principles. Ensure that your feasibility argument

adequately responds to the requirements this Army topic.

- **Enabling Technologies.** Do the required enabling technologies introduce added risk?
- **Technical Team.** Briefly list and describe your core scientific and technical team with an emphasis on their past accomplishments and experiences that would relate to this Army SBIR topic. As a reminder, the primary employment of the Principal Investigator/Project Manager must be with the SBC (or the Research Institution – STTR only) at the time of award and during the conduct of the proposed project.
- **Technical Risk and Mitigation Plans.** Describe any technical risks that still exist between you and a fully mature solution and your plans to mitigate those risks.

iv. **Programmatic Potential**: Outline where your company is today, what will be accomplished under this SBIR effort with Army customer discovery and in identifying the risks and mitigation plans for successfully transitioning beyond SBIR funding into a contract with an Army or integration with an Army system. The rubric prompts below are provided to guide you in preparing this section:

- **Project Milestone Schedule.** Outline your execution plan. What milestones do you hope to accomplish, and what deliverables if any do you hope to produce during this phase and subsequent phases of the effort.
- **Army Customer Discovery and Validation.** Argue you are "getting out of the building" to engage in productive customer-discovery with Army stakeholders and describe any customer validation you may have received formally or informally to date on this proposed technology.
- **Army Transition Pathways.** Describe the next type of deal you aim to make with the Army following this award. Briefly outline your current plan to unlock that next opportunity and/or share the biggest risks you see post this SBIR award to transition this technology to the Army.

v. **Commercialization Potential**: Highlight any commercial market for this solution that the DoW can build upon. Describe your past success and future potential in commercial applications. The rubric prompts below are provided to guide you in preparing this section:

- **R&D to Product Revenue.** Argue that your team members have transitioned research and development efforts into products successfully, as evidenced by product revenue. (Product revenue is realized by directly selling a solution to solve a problem vs. selling consulting, services, or research activities.)
- **Competitive Edge.** Why will you win? A small company needs to have a competitive edge in the marketplace: Something your team does very well that is difficult to match. Some examples may include: well protected intellectual property; unmatched relevant experience; a novel business model; network effects; etc.
- **Other People's Money.** Make the case for the commercial market (non-DoW) potential of your technology from which the Army will benefit.

d. Cost Volume Content (Volume 3)

Cost and duration limits are detailed within each topic. With the exception of the instructions provided below, Offerors must comply with all Cost Volume (Volume 3) requirements outlined in the DoW 2026 SBIR Program CSO. Note: Options are not anticipated at this time. If an option is identified in the topic posting, costs for the Base and Option shall be separated and clearly identified.

In anticipation of a possible contract award, all proposed costs shall be accompanied by documentation to substantiate how the cost was derived. Failure to include supporting documentation with the proposal may delay any potential contract award, as the proposer will be asked to submit the necessary documentation to the Contracting Officer to substantiate costs. It is important to respond as quickly as possible to the Contracting Officer's request for documentation. Failure or refusal to provide documentation may result in dissolution of the contract action.

e. Company Commercialization Report (Volume 4)

Completion of the CCR as Volume 4 of the proposal submission in DSIP is required for prior SBIR|STTR awardees. Please refer to the DoW 2026 SBIR Program CSO for full details on this requirement. Information contained in the CCR will be considered by the Army during proposal evaluations.

f. Supporting Documents (Volume 5)

Volume 5 is provided for proposing SBCs to submit additional documentation to support the Cover Sheet (Volume 1) and the Technical Volume (Volume 2), and the Cost Volume (Volume 3). A completed proposal submission in DSIP does NOT indicate that the mandatory supporting documents have been uploaded. It is the responsibility of the proposing SBC to ensure that the mandatory documents listed above have been uploaded and included with the proposal submission.

All proposing SBCs are REQUIRED to submit the following documents to Volume 5:

1. Non-Proprietary Work Plan: This summary, which should be based upon the technical approach discussed in your Technical Volume (Volume 2), is subject to a two (2) page limit and should provide a clear and concise overview of the proposed project's technical objectives, key milestones and their target completion dates, associated key deliverables, and the anticipated project duration. This information will serve as the basis for publicly releasable information about the project and will serve as the basis for establishing performance requirements within the contract. Therefore, the summary should be written in a manner understandable to a technically literate audience without disclosing sensitive or proprietary information.
2. List of Foreign Citizens. Identify any foreign nationals or individuals holding dual citizenship expected to be involved on this project as a direct employee, subcontractor, consultant, or Research Institution. For these individuals, please specify and include in a single PDF file, a table listing their citizenship(s), countries of origin, type of visa or work permit under which they are performing, and an explanation of their anticipated level of involvement on this project (see example below). Failure to provide this information may significantly delay selection, and/or any potential contract award.

   NOTE: submitting small business concerns often incorrectly assume that all individuals with dual citizenship or a work permit will be permitted to work on SBIR|STTR projects and fail to identify them. As a reminder, applicants must report any and all individuals who are considered foreign nationals (including dual citizens) as defined in the DoD SBIR|STTR BAAs and are expected to be involved in the project. Additional information may be requested during negotiations in order to verify the foreign national's eligibility to participate. Supplemental information provided in response to this paragraph will be protected in accordance with the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a), if applicable, and the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552(b)(6)).

Note: If NO foreign nationals will be involved in proposed work, a statement to that effect must be substituted for the table.

Name [include direct employees, subcontractors, and consultants]	Citizenship(s)	Type of Visa or Work Permit	Level of Involvement (Role)

3. Key Personnel: Identify all Key personnel involved in the project to include information directly related to education and experience. A technical resume for the Principle Investigator including publications, if any, must be included. Technical resumes for other technical staff, subcontractors and consultants, if any, are also useful and may be included in Volume 5.

All proposing SBCs are required to submit the following documents to Volume 5, *if applicable*:

1. SBIR|STTR Funding Agreement Certification
2. Verification of Eligibility of Small Business Joint Ventures
3. Assertion of use, release, or disclosure restriction (in accordance with DFARS 252.227-7017)
4. DD Form 2345, Military Critical Technical Data Agreement – Applicable to actions subject to ITAR
5. (IF APPLICABLE) SBC-selected Details of TABA Request
   NOTE: This is not required if selecting to use one of the Army's preferred TABA provider(s). **If selecting to use your own TABA provider, you are required to include a detailed rationale in two (2) pages or less,** for the requested TABA services to clearly demonstrate the provider's specialized expertise and relevant experience. This documentation must include at a minimum:
   a. TABA provider(s) name
   b. TABA provider(s) point of contact, email address, and phone number
   c. An explanation of the TABA provider(s) suitability and qualifications to provide the service
   d. Outline of the specific tasks to be performed
   e. Total TABA provider(s) cost, number of hours, and labor rates (average/blended rate is acceptable).

   If contracting TABA services through one or more TABA providers, the providers cannot be your firm or any affiliated entity, and TABA costs must be directly related to their services, excluding indirect costs, profit, or fees passed through by your company. TABA

costs cannot be factored into the calculation of general and administrative expenses (G&A) for the proposing SBC.

6. Other Documentation such as Letters of Support

In addition to the Volume 5 requirements, the Department of the Army may accept the following documents in Volume 5:

7. Cost/Pricing Information
8. Other (only as specified in the topic)

Please only submit documents that are identified immediately above, and as required by the DoW 2026 SBIR Program CSO. All other documents submitted will be disregarded, including but not limited to promotional and non-project related information.

g. Fraud, Waste and Abuse Training (Volume 6)

Fraud, Waste and Abuse training material can be found in the Volume 6 section of the proposal submission module in DSIP and must be thoroughly reviewed once per year to proceed with proposal submission.

h. Disclosures of Foreign Affiliations or Relationships to Foreign Countries (Volume 7)

Proposers must complete the web-form regarding foreign affiliations to assess national security risks. PDF uploads are no longer accepted.

> **Mandatory Compliance Statement:** Disclosure of foreign affiliations or relationships on this form does not mean automatic denial; however, failure to complete this form completely and accurately may result in the proposal being deemed administratively non-compliant and unresponsive. Unresponsive proposals are un-awardable and may be excluded from technical evaluation and removed from further consideration.

NOTE: Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 638(vv), 15 U.S.C. § 638(g)(13), and the SBA SBIR|STTR Policy Directive, disclosures must consider the following when it comes to affiliations to include subcontractors, subsidiaries, joint ventures, consultants, and the employees of such institutions:

- Foreign Affiliations: Any subsidiary, parent company, or joint venture that is based in, funded by, or has a foreign affiliation with any foreign country of concern.
- Contractual/Financial Obligations: Any current or pending contractual or financial obligation or other business arrangement with a foreign entity. Firms are advised that a subcontracting agreement is, by definition, a contractual and financial obligation.
- Related Entities: Any foreign business entity, offshore entity, or entity outside the United States related to the SBC. A subcontractor is an entity "related" to the SBC's performance of the federal award and must be disclosed to ensure the agency can assess foreign influence.
- Covered Individuals: By definition, the term ‘covered individual’ means an individual, regardless of their official title, labor category, or designation as ‘Key Personnel, who contributes in a substantive, meaningful way to the scientific development or execution of the project. This requirement applies to all individuals performing work on the project, whether they are employed by the Prime SBC, a subcontractor, a consultant, or a partnering Research Institution.

3.8 Phase II Proposal Information

Unless a Topic posting specifies that the DA will be accepting Direct to Phase II proposal submissions, Phase II proposals may only be submitted by Phase I awardees. Submission of Phase II proposals is not permitted at this time, and if submitted, will be rejected without evaluation. Phase II proposal preparation and submission instructions will be provided via subsequent notification.

3.9 Direct to Phase II (DP2) Proposal Instructions

Offerors may submit DP2 proposals only if allowed pursuant to the topic posting. With the exception of the DP2 component specific proposal instructions for the Technical Volume (Volume 2), identified below, DP2 Proposals shall follow the Phase I Proposal Instructions described above.

b. Technical Volume Format (Volume 2)

2. **Length**: The Technical Volume shall not exceed 15 pages including all key sections described in Section 3.9(c), Technical Volume Content. The 15-page limit applies to the entire Technical Volume submission as uploaded to DSIP. At the Government's discretion, if included in the submission, pages that clearly do not substantiate or contribute to the technical approach, such as a cover sheet or table of contents, may be excluded from the page count. However, any appendices or supplemental content/materials that expand upon the requirements described in section 3.9(c), shall count toward the 15-page limitation. SBCs may allocate any portion of the technical volume page limit to each of the key sections, as desired. It is the proposing SBCs responsibility to ensure that the Technical Volume file uploaded to DSIP complies with the stated page limitation.

c. Technical Volume Content (Volume 2)

The following instructions supersede those stated in the DoW 2026 SBIR Program CSO, including any amendments/revisions/appendices.

Offerors must address the requirements outlined for the Non-Proprietary Work Plan in Supporting Documents (Volume 5). This overview should directly reflect the key elements of the technical approach detailed in this volume, ensuring consistency between both documents.

The Technical Volume shall be structured in the following order:

i. **Introduction;**
ii. **Army Benefits;**
iii. **Feasibility for Direct to Phase II;**
iv. **Technical Approach;**
v. **Programmatic Potential; and**
vi. **Commercial Potential**

Each of the key sections align directly with the evaluation rubric, Direct to Phase II Evaluation Criteria (Appendix B), ensuring clarity in how proposals will be assessed. The following outlines the specific content expectations for each section of the Technical Volume, as guided by the evaluation criteria in Appendix B. Offerors should ensure their proposals clearly address the key elements identified in the rubric to maximize the proposal's competitiveness.

i. **Introduction**: Write a clear, concise description of what your innovation does or will do, and where you are in your evolution. Make clear its intended impact on the Army. Evaluators

should "get it" after reading this.

ii. **Army Benefits**: Briefly describe any identified Army use cases, the solutions' advantages and potential level of impact and scale of impact the solution would have for the Army. If you are unsure how an Army end-user might benefit from this technology or the scale of impact it could have, please provide an analogous use case to allow the Army evaluators a way to connect the dots using their knowledge of potential Army use cases when evaluating this section. The rubric prompts below are provided to guide you in preparing this section:

- **Alignment.** Argue your technology innovation is aligned with this Army topic's priorities as defined in the solicitation.
- **Solution's Advantages.** Prove your prospective customers will choose you given limited resources and myriad choices. Have you accounted for indirect substitute products as well as direct competitors?
- **Solution's Impact.** The Army seeks higher-risk, high-impact solutions through SBIR - not engineering changes or incremental improvements. Use this section to describe your technology's impact and improvement upon the state of the art.

iii. **Feasibility for Direct to Phase II:** Provide documentation that demonstrates the scientific and technical merit, feasibility, and commercialization potential of ideas that would otherwise have been accomplished in a SBIR Phase I feasibility study. Use data to substantiate your claims. Documentation should include all relevant information including, but not limited to: technical reports, test data, prototype designs/models, and performance goals/results. Work submitted within this section must have been substantially performed by the proposer and/or the Principal Investigator. Feasibility documentation cannot be based upon any prior or ongoing federally funded SBIR or STTR work and DP2 proposals MUST NOT logically extend from any prior or ongoing federally funded SBIR or STTR work. DP2 authority is intended for companies that have matured their technologies ***outside*** of the SBIR/STTR pipeline, and who are ready for Phase II development without requiring a Phase I feasibility study. This ensures that DP2 funding is directed towards novel, non-SBIR/STTR funded R&D, rather than the continuation or repurposing of work already supported through prior SBIR/STTR awards. Proposals that derive from previously funded SBIR/STTR work are not eligible for DP2 consideration. The rubric prompts below are provided to guide you in preparing this section:

- **Proof of Feasibility.** Provide documentation to substantiate the scientific and technical merit and feasibility has been met.
- **Work Ownership.** Document the people, organizations, and any intellectual property (IP) ownership responsible for the work products in this section. The work must have been at least "substantially" performed by your organization and/or the proposed principal investigator for this research, and your firm must either own any IP discussed outright or have appropriate and sufficient licenses thereto.
- **New Research.** Prove that the proposed DP2 research is not in any way a logical extension of previous or ongoing federally funded SBIR or STTR research.
- **Prototype Delivery.** Demonstrate that the research will result in appropriately mature Prototype at the conclusion of the DP2 SBIR contract.

iv. **Technical Approach**: Provide details and supporting data on how the proposer is going to solve the problem. It shall detail key elements of the firm's approach, the technical team, and

any risks and mitigation plans identified. Use data to substantiate your claims that your technical risk mitigation plans are credible. Show us quality data attributed to reliable, credible sources. The rubric prompts below are provided to guide you in preparing this section:

- **Scientific Feasibility.** Convince readers that your innovation is built atop sound scientific and/or engineering principles. Ensure that your feasibility argument adequately responds to the requirements this Army topic.
- **Enabling Technologies.** Do the required enabling technologies introduce added risk?
- **Technical Team.** Briefly list and describe your core scientific and technical team with an emphasis on their past accomplishments and experiences that would relate to this Army SBIR topic.
- **Technical Risk and Mitigation Plans.** Describe any technical risks that still exist between you and a fully mature solution and your plans to mitigate those risks.

v. **Programmatic Potential**: Outline where your company is today, what will be accomplished under this SBIR effort with Army customer discovery and in identifying the risks and mitigation plans for successfully transitioning beyond SBIR funding into a contract with an Army or integration with an Army system. The rubric prompts below are provided to guide you in preparing this section:

- **Project Milestone Schedule.** Outline your execution plan. What milestones do you hope to accomplish, and what deliverables if any do you hope to produce during this phase and subsequent phases of the effort.
- **Army Customer Discovery and Validation.** Argue you are "getting out of the building" to engage in productive customer-discovery with Army stakeholders and describe any customer validation you may have received formally or informally to date on this proposed technology.
- **Army Transition Pathways.** Describe the next type of deal you aim to make with the Army following this award. Briefly outline your current plan to unlock that next opportunity and/or share the biggest risks you see post this SBIR award to transition this technology to the Army.

vi. **Commercialization Potential**: Highlight any commercial market for this solution that the DoW can build upon. Describe your past success and future potential in commercial applications. The rubric prompts below are provided to guide you in preparing this section:

- **R&D to Product Revenue.** Argue that your team members have transitioned research and development efforts into products successfully, as evidenced by product revenue. (Product revenue is realized by directly selling a solution to solve a problem vs. selling consulting, services, or research activities.)
- **Competitive Edge.** Why will you win? A small company needs to have a competitive edge in the marketplace: Something your team does very well that is difficult to match. Some examples may include: well protected intellectual property; unmatched relevant experience; a novel business model; network effects; etc.
- **Other People's Money.** Make the case for the commercial market (non-DoW) potential of your technology from which the Army will benefit.

3.10 Prize Competition Selectees

This section applies exclusively to companies selected as winners in Part 2 of the respective Expeditionary Technologies (xTech) Prize Competition, DIU Challenge, or other competitive processes that leverage the DoW prize authority. These companies, having successfully competed their solutions to Army and DoW experts, are the only SBCs eligible to submit Army SBIR proposals under the corresponding topic area.

DoW Prize Competition selectees must follow the Army Phase I or DP2 Proposal Submission Instructions, with one important exception regarding the Technical Volume (Volume 2). In lieu of submitting a full Technical Volume (Volume 2), selectees shall submit the Non-Proprietary Work Plan, outlined in Section f. Supporting Documents (Volume 5) of the Army Phase I or DP2 Proposal Submission Instructions, in place of a Technical Volume. This waives the requirement to include the Non-Proprietary Work Plan in Volume 5 – Supporting Documents. Ensure your Non-Proprietary Work Plan adheres to the guidelines outlined in Section f. Supporting Documents (Volume 5), including the two (2) page limitation.

All remaining proposal volumes, including any applicable and/or optional documents discussed in Section f. Supporting Documentation (Volume 5) must be completed according to the standard Army Phase I or DP2 Proposal Submission Instructions.

NOTE: The Technical Evaluation (Section 4.1.2) and Selection (Section 4.1.3) guidance defined below do not apply to DoW Prize Competition selectees. Your proposals have already undergone a comprehensive evaluation as part of the xTech competition.

3.11 Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI)

Successful firms will be required to comply with CUI DoDI 5200.48. Firms must monitor CUI for aggregation and compilation based on the potential to generate classified information pursuant to security classification guidance addressing the accumulation of unclassified data or information. Firms shall report the potential of classification of aggregated or compiled CUI to ASA(ALT) Security Manager. Firms, pursuant to mandatory DoW contract provisions, will submit unclassified DoW information for review and approval for release and approval for release in accordance with the standard DoDI 5230.09. All CUI records must follow the approved mandatory disposition authorities whenever the DoW provides CUI to, or CUI is generated by, non-DoW entities in accordance with Section 1220-1236 of Title 36, CFR, Section 3301a of Title 44, U.S.C., DoDI 5200.48.

3.12 Arms, Ammunition, and Explosives (AA&E)

If the proposed statement of work requires the use, development, production, manufacture, purchase, or delivery of Arms, Ammunition and Explosives (AA&E) data and/or hardware, the offeror shall follow the following instructions:

a. References:

1. MIL-STD-1168 - Ammunition Lot Numbering and Ammunition Data Cards
2. DODM 5100.76 - Physical Security of Sensitive Conventional Arms, Ammunition, and Explosives (AA&E)
3. AR 190-11 - Physical Security of Arms, Ammunition, and Explosives
4. Defense Transportation Regulation 4500.9-R

5. Technical Bulletin (TB) 700-2

b. The offeror, in its proposal, and resulting contractor, in performance of the work, shall comply with the requirements of the following DFARS provisions/clauses:

1. 252.223-7002, Safety Precautions for Ammunition and Explosives (NOV 2023);
2. 252.223-7003, Change in Place of Performance-Ammunition and Explosives (DEC 1991); and
3. 252.223-7007, Safeguarding Sensitive Conventional Arms, Ammunition, and Explosives (NOV 2023).

c. The offeror, in its proposal, and resulting contractor, in performance of the work, shall provide proper storage and accountability. These standards are set forth in Department of War (DOW) 5100.76-M, entitled "Physical Security of Sensitive Conventional Arms, Ammunition and Explosives".

d. Prior to any contract award, the offeror must first pass a pre-award physical security inspection of its and its subcontractor's facilities, conducted by Defense Security Service (DSS). See DOD 5100.76-M, Appendix 2, Attachment 1, for a listing of DSS regions. Facilities, including any subcontractor facilities, that do not meet all of the security requirements of DOD 5100.76-M will not be awarded a contract.

e. If the proposed statement of work requires transportation of Sensitive Conventional AA&E, the standards set forth in Defense Transportation Regulation 4500.9-R., Defense Traffic Management, shall be followed.

f. Place of Performance: In accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) provision/clause 52.215-6, Place of Performance (OCT 1997), and DFARS provision/clause 252.223-7003, Change in Place of Performance—Ammunition and Explosives (DEC 1991), the offeror shall include the following information in Volume 5 of its proposal. Failure to include this information in proposals involving AA&E may result in the proposal being deemed unresponsive.

1. The offeror, in the performance of any contract resulting from this solicitation, □ intends, □ does not intend [check applicable block] to use one or more plants or facilities located at a different address from the address of the offeror as indicated in its proposal.
2. If the offeror or respondent checks "intends" in paragraph (a), it shall include the following required information for each and every plant or facility (including subcontractor plants or facilities) located at a different address from the address of the offeror as indicated in its proposal.
    i. Firm Name
    ii. Place of Performance (Street Address, City, State, County, ZIP Code)
    iii. Name and Address of Owner and Operator of the Plant or Facility

g. In accordance with local procedures and DFARS provision/clause 252.223-7007, Safeguarding Sensitive Conventional Arms, Ammunition, and Explosives (NOV 2023), the offeror shall include the following information in Volume 5 of its proposal for itself and for each plant or facility (including subcontractor plants or facilities) that the offeror listed as a "Place of Performance". The offeror shall include the information to the best of its ability in order to avoid delay in contract award. Do not include locations that will not use, develop, produce, manufacture, purchase, or deliver AA&E in performance of the work.

1. Firm Name
2. Identify if the firm is the prime-contractor or sub-contractor
3. Place of Performance (Street Address, City, State, County, ZIP Code)
4. Unique Entity Identification (UEI) and Cage Code
5. Confirm that address and cage code match the information in SAM.gov ("unknown" is an acceptable response if unable to look up sub-contractors)
6. Full name, phone number, and email address for a point of contact at this location
7. Description of the AA&E and/or work involving AA&E
8. National Stock Number (NSN) of the AA&E (if none exist, indicate "N/A")
9. Identify the Security Risk Classification (SRC) of the AA&E (Instructions for determining the SRC are found in Enclosure 7 (p. 40 - p.46) of DODM 5100.76) (The SRC can be either I, II, III, IV or U) ("unknown" is an acceptable response if Government input is required to make this determination)
10. Identify the hazard classification (HC) of the AA&E (Instructions for determining the HC are found in Chapter 2 (p.2) of TB 700-2) ("unknown" is an acceptable answer if Government input is required to make this determination)
11. Identify whether the AA&E will be furnished by the Government as Government Furnished Property (GFP) or if it will be developed, produced, manufactured, or purchased by the prime or sub-contractor

4 METHOD OF SELECTION AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

4.1 Evaluation Process

Army SBIR wards will be made based on a comprehensive evaluation that includes an initial compliance screening, followed by a comprehensive evaluation of the Technical Proposal (Volume 2) utilizing evaluation criteria in Appendix A, foreign risk assessment, a review of all other submitted proposal volumes, and review of other considerations described below. SBIR awards are made in accordance with the SBA SBIR|STTR Policy Directive guidelines, current version.

4.1.1 Initial Screening

Proposals will only be evaluated in response to an active, corresponding Army topic. Proposals will be initially screened to determine responsiveness, timeliness, and SBC eligibility. Assessment of responsiveness and eligibility may continue during technical evaluation, and after selection. For purposes of this solicitation, these terms are defined as:

Responsiveness: When a proposal fails to meet a material requirement of the solicitation, to include compulsory terms and conditions, the proposal shall be deemed unresponsive.

Timeliness: A Timely Proposal is one that is received by the Government on or before the due date and prior to the established set time.

SBC Eligibility: To be eligible, SBCs must meet all requirements listed in the "Eligibility" section, Title 13 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Section 121.702, and the SBA SBIR|STTR Policy Directive.

4.1.2 Comprehensive Evaluation

It is the policy of the Army to ensure equitable and comprehensive proposal evaluations based on the evaluation criteria and to select the source (or sources) whose offer meets the Government's technical,

policy, and programmatic goals. Selections for further consideration of possible contract award will be based on a determination of the overall technical merit, foreign risk assessment, and assessment of other considerations of each proposal described below. As a common statement of work does not exist, each proposal is assessed on their own individual merit to determine how well the proposal meets the criteria stated in the overarching program solicitation and this corresponding opportunity. Proposals will not be evaluated against each other during the evaluation process.

> **Note**: Designated support contractors may review submissions for the purposes of technical evaluation. All support contractors are bound by appropriate non-disclosure agreements. Submission of a response constitutes your ascent to these contractors handling your submission data.

4.1.2.1 National Security And Foreign Risk Assessment

In accordance with 15 U.S.C. §638(vv), 15 U.S.C. §638(g)(13) and the active program solicitation, the Army will conduct a foreign risk assessment review of every proposal. The Army will not make awards that pose unacceptable security risks, to include risks to national security.

Proposers are advised that the Army relies upon statutory authority rather than non-regulatory guidance documents. While the Department of War's Attachment 2: Defense SBIR and STTR Due Diligence Program Common Risk Matrix (13 May 2024) provides helpful implementation context, it is purely illustrative and non-exhaustive. The Army's assessment is not limited to the factors or countries of concern listed in that matrix. Instead, the Army evaluates Foreign Disclosure (Volume 7) and all areas identified under 15 U.S.C. § 638(vv), including cybersecurity practices, patent analysis, employee analysis (including subcontractor employee foreign affiliations), foreign ownership, financial ties and obligations, and employee ties to foreign entities.

If risks are identified, the Army will evaluate, at its sole discretion and on a case-by-case basis, whether those risks can be adequately mitigated. The Army is not required to coordinate with the proposer to develop a mitigation plan, nor is it obligated to disclose the specific findings of the due diligence review. All determinations regarding the feasibility of mitigation will be based on the cumulative findings of the review. Where the Army determines that identified risks cannot be effectively mitigated, the proposal may be removed from further consideration for award, regardless of technical evaluation results.

4.1.2.2 Technical Evaluation (Not Applicable to DoW Prize Competition Selectees)

Proposals passing the initial screening will receive a technical evaluation based on the evaluation criteria in Appendix A unless the foreign risk assessment uncovers unacceptable security risks, to include risks to national security, or other disqualifying assessment concerns described below are identified. Technical evaluations, if conducted, will follow the stated evaluation criteria and will undergo a review by a cadre of subject matter expert evaluators who will evaluate responsive proposals based on the weighted rubric outlined in the Army's Phase II Valid Evaluation Criteria (Appendix A). Because foreign risk assessments run parallel to the technical evaluation process, the Army reserves the right to adjust evaluation sequencing. If a risk determination is made at any point based on foreign risk assessments or other assessment considerations, the technical evaluation may be paused, suspended, or entirely foregone at the Government's sole discretion. The pausing or withholding of a technical evaluation does not create a right or expectation for the proposer to receive a mitigation period. Where the Army determines that identified risks cannot be effectively mitigated, the proposal will be deemed un-awardable, any technical evaluation will be terminated, and the proposal will be removed from further consideration.

4.1.2.3 Other Assessment Considerations

Prohibited Products and Services: In accordance with Revolutionary Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Overhaul (RFO) FAR 25.502, the Government will eliminate any offeror that is unacceptable for reasons other than price, including the use of prohibited sources. Proposers and their subcontractors are strictly prohibited from utilizing products or services that violate the prohibitions listed in RFO FAR 40.202. This includes, but is not limited to, TikTok/ByteDance, Kaspersky, and specific unmanned aircraft systems (drones).

4.1.3 Selection (Not Applicable to DoW Prize Competition Selectees)

Proposing firms will be notified via email of selection or non-selection status of its Phase I or DP2 proposal within 90 days of the closing date of the Topic. The notification will be sent to the Corporate Official listed on the proposal cover sheet, from the Army SBIR|STTR Program Office mailbox.

Selected proposals are not guaranteed a contract award. Proposers shall not regard the notification email (selection decision notice) as an authorization to commit or expend funds. Upon selection, proposals are forwarded to a Government Contracting Officer for further evaluation and contract negotiation. A Government Contracting Officer may contact the proposer to discuss and request additional information required for award. This may include representations and certifications, certified or other than certified cost data, and/or other information as applicable to the proposed award. Proposers shall not regard these communications as an authorization to commence work or commit or expend funds.

4.2 Evaluation Criteria

To apply the DoW Evaluation criteria, the Army uses structured scoring rubrics that are developed and approved by Army SBIR|STTR program stakeholders. These rubrics, which are implemented in Valid Eval, define the evaluation factors, scoring scales, and any assigned weightings applied, ensuring proposals are evaluated consistently, transparently, and in direct alignment with the solicitation's stated criteria.

Please refer to Appendices A and B for the Army's Phase I and DP2 evaluation rubrics, respectively.

4.3 Proposal Status and Feedback

The Army promotes transparency regarding the technical evaluation for all Army SBIR proposals. The Army will provide feedback to offerors in accordance with the SBA SBIR|STTR Policy Directive. The selection decision notice contains instructions for obtaining feedback. Offerors are entitled to no more than one feedback per proposal.

NOTE: Feedback is not the same as a FAR Part 15 debriefing. The competitive procedures for this solicitation are governed by the SBA SBIR|STTR Policy Directive. Therefore, offerors are neither entitled to, nor will they be provided FAR Part 15 debriefs.

4.5 Pre-Award and Post Award Protests

Pre-award agency protests related to the terms of the CSO must be served to the point of contact listed in the DoW 2026 SBIR Program CSO.

Post award agency protests related to a selection or award decision must be served to the following address:

Email: usarmy.SBIRSTTR@army.mil
Mailing Address:
U.S. Army SBIR|STTR Office
2530 Crystal Drive; Suite 11192
Arlington, Virginia 22202

Firms shall follow the DoW 2026 SBIR Program CSO for protests filed with the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and size protests regarding the small business status of a selected proposing small business concern.

5 ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Award Information

a. Number of Awards. The number of awards will depend upon funds availability. The Army reserves the right to award none, one, or more than one contract under any topic. No awards will be made until evaluation of all qualified proposals for a specific topic have been made. The Army is not responsible for costs incurred before award receipt.

b. Type of Funding Agreement. The Army plans to execute funding agreements as FAR-based, firm-fixed-price contracts. Fixed price payments shall be tied to measurable milestones or deliverables, as agreed to by the Government. Milestone schedules are used as a means to monitor technical progress, to mitigate technical and cost risk, and to address the cashflow needs of awardees. The Government Contracting Officer retains the right to negotiate a contract type and price (or estimated cost and fee) that will promote the Government's interest, result in reasonable contractor risk, and provide the contractor with the greatest incentive for efficient and economical performance (FAR Subpart 16.1 – Selecting Contract Types).

c. Dollar Value and Period of Performance. Award funding guideline and associative period of performance limitations have been established for each SBIR|STTR Topic. **Proposals exceeding these limitations will be deemed unresponsive**.

5.1.1 Additional Award Considerations

a. Contractor Responsibility: SBCs will be evaluated for responsibility, meaning the prospective SBC meets the standards set forth in FAR 9.104. A prospective contractor must affirmatively demonstrate its responsibility, including, when necessary, the responsibility of its proposed subcontractors.

b. Use of Foreign Nationals/Persons: In considering an SBC's utilization of foreign national personnel, the Government may withdraw from negotiations based on deleterious findings associated with a firm's Foreign Disclosure (Volume 7) or matters of national security not limited to: persons tied to foreign countries of concern; foreign influence or ownership; inability to clear the firm or personnel for security clearances; risk associated with Military Critical Technologies; or other related issues.

c. Fair and Reasonable Price: In accordance with FAR 15.402(a), Contracting officers shall

purchase supplies and services from responsible sources at fair and reasonable prices. As a result, Contracting Officials will conduct proposal analysis in accordance with the techniques identified at FAR 13.106-3 and/or 15.404-1. Proposals lacking a fair and reasonable price will be deemed unsuccessful.

5.1.2 Possible Contract Award

If at any point the proposal is deemed untimely, unresponsive, or the SBC (or its subcontractors) is deemed ineligible or non-responsible, the proposal will be unsuccessful, meaning the proposal is not one that will result in an award (it is un-awardable). Successful proposals, therefore, are those that have met all stated requirements and qualifications and will receive an award.

Upon an affirmative determination of proposal timeliness, responsiveness, compliance, and price reasonableness, as well as prospective contractor eligibility and responsibility, the Contracting Officer may proceed with an award, subject to the availability of funds. Unless a Government Contracting Officer signs an award document (e.g., contract), no obligations to provide funding are made. The Government may cancel award of the contract action at any time.

If signed by the Government Contracting Officer, the award document is the official and authorizing instrument, thereafter, referred to as the "contract". The period of performance will begin upon the effective date of the contract. The Contracting Officer will email the signed contract to the principal investigator and/or an authorized organization representative.

5.2 Contract Requirements

In addition to the contractual requirements specified in the DoW 2026 SBIR Program CSO, awards under the Army SBIR|STTR Program are also subject to the following:

5.2.1 Deliverable Requirements

a. Hardware (Prototype) Deliverables (if applicable): See topic for information to determine if development and delivery of prototypes is required. If your proposal identifies hardware that will be delivered to the government, be aware of the possible requirement for unique item identification in accordance with DFARS Clause 252.211- 7003, Item Unique Identification and Valuation. More information regarding item identification and valuation requirements may be found at DFARS Section 211.274.

b. Data Deliverables (Contract Data Requirements Lists – CDRLS):
Data can be in the form of test data, computer software, algorithms, design details, progress reports, technical data, financial or management reports, or any information required by contract to be delivered. Data is ordered using single or multiple DD Form 1423, Contract Data Requirements Lists (CDRLS), which will be located in the contract at Section J, Exhibits. A CDRL is the "data delivery" vehicle providing the what, when, who, and how of the delivery. CDRLS require the contractor to formally deliver the data (contractual obligation) to the Government. Each CDRL will reference a Data Item Description (DID) that describes data content, format, media, and intended use of a single data product. Each DID is uniquely numbered to identify the data deliverables in terms of purpose, description, requirements, and preparation instructions. DIDs may be viewed using the Acquisition Streamlining and Standardization Information System (ASSIST).

All funding agreements executed under the Army SBIR|STTR Program shall include the following CDRL requirements:

1. Status Reports: Under the authority of DID number DI-MGMT-80368A, status reports are due at a specified time after contract award and periodically (e.g., Monthly, Bi-monthly, Quarterly) thereafter in accordance with the prepared DD Form 1423 that will be incorporated via Section J, Exhibits of any resultant contracts.

2. Scientific and Technical Report: Under the authority of DID number DI-MISC-80711A, a final report shall be delivered in accordance with the prepared DD Form 1423 that will be incorporated via Section J, Exhibits of any resultant contract.

The Army end-user or customer may require additional deliverables or documentation including Software documentation and user manuals; Engineering drawings; Operation and Maintenance documentation; Safety hazard analysis when the project will result in partial or total development/ delivery of hardware; and/or updated commercialization results.

5.2.2 Meeting Requirements:

a. Start of Work Meeting: The contractor shall hold a start of work meeting at its facility, unless some other location is designated in the contract, within 30 calendar days after contract award. The Start of Work Meeting is to assure a clear and mutual understanding of the contract terms, conditions, line items, technical requirements and sequence of events needed for successful execution of the contracted effort. The contractor shall coordinate with the Government to arrange a schedule and agenda for the meeting.

b. Periodic (e.g., Monthly, Bi-Monthly, Quarterly) Review Meetings: Periodic review meetings shall be conducted to monitor and report on status of contractor effort towards achieving contract objectives, identify accomplishments to date and difficulties encountered, and compare the status achieved to planned goals and the resources expended.

5.6 Invention Reporting

In accordance with FAR clause 52.227-11, “Patent Rights-Ownership by the Contractor”, and DFARS clause 252.227-7039, “Patents – Reporting of Subject Inventions”, the contractor shall execute the following:

a. Interim Report of Inventions and Subcontracts: Under all Phase II SBIR contracts, the contractor shall deliver an Interim Report of Inventions and Subcontracts, DD Form 882,12-months from the date of initial contract award, listing subject inventions during that period and stating that all subject inventions have been disclosed or that there are no such inventions.

b. Final Report of Inventions and Subcontracts: Under all Phase I and Phase II SBIR contracts, the contractor shall deliver a Final Report of Inventions and Subcontracts, DD Form 882, within six (6) months after completion of the contracted work, listing all subject inventions or stating that there were no such inventions.

c. SBIR awardees must report inventions within two months of the inventor's report to the awardee. The reporting of inventions may be accomplished by submitting paper documentation, including fax, or through the Edison Invention Reporting System at www.iedison.gov.

6 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

6.3 Contact Information

SBC's may direct questions to the following Points of Contact, as described below:

a. Army Component Specific Proposal Instructions: General questions regarding the administration of the Army SBIR Program, and the Army Component-Specific Proposal Instructions should be submitted as soon as possible, but not later than 15 days prior to solicitation closing, and can be directed to the following:
Email: usarmy.SBIRSTTR@army.mil
Website: https://www.armysbir.army.mil/
Mailing Address: U.S. Army SBIR|STTR Office
2530 Crystal Drive, Suite 11192
Arlington, Virginia 22202

Army 2026 SBIR CSO Topic Index
Release 4

ARM26BX04-NV008 TITLE: Asymmetric Collaborative Counter Swarm

- Phase I (Feasibility)
- 1-6 months, up to $300,000

ARM26BX04-DV009 TITLE: UH-60M Patient Handling System

- Direct to Phase II (Prototype)
- 12-18 months, up to $2,000,000

ARM26BX04-DV010 TITLE: Ground-Based Affordable Mass (G-BAM)

- Direct to Phase II (Prototype)
- 18-24 months, up to $2,000,000

ARM26BX04-NV008 TITLE: Asymmetric Collaborative Counter Swarm

OUSW (R&E) CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY AREA(S): Quantum and Battlefield Information Dominance; Applied Artificial Intelligence

COMPONENT TECHNOLOGY PRIORITY AREA(S): Integrated Network System-of-Systems; Advanced Computing and Software

PROJECTED CMMC LEVEL REQUIREMENT: Level 1

OBJECTIVE: Develop and integrate a distributed Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology that can collaboratively command and control a multi-agent Group 1 or Group 2 Unmanned Aerial System (UAS) swarm to defend an area against a numerically superior enemy swarm. AI system must be able to interface with existing, standard platform autonomy and perception systems. System must also not rely on a centralized control node.

DESCRIPTION: Develop and integrate distributed Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology that can collaboratively control a multi-agent Group 1 or Group 2 Unmanned Aerial System (UAS) swarm to defend an area against a numerically superior attacking enemy swarm. The vast majority of counter-UAS systems are optimized for a 1 vs 1 scenario, in which the interceptor UAS seeks to destroy, degrade, disable, or capture a single enemy UAS. This approach typically relies on a sensor package and kinetic or non-kinetic effector optimized to degrade/destroy a single enemy UAS of a specific class (size, range, speed, etc.). To defend an area against a numerically superior enemy swarm, individual UAS platforms must collaborate to determine the optimal strategy for many individual 1 vs N scenarios. Individual UAS platforms must demonstrate the ability to target a cluster of enemy platforms through AI algorithms and active or passive inter-drone communication for targeting information from other friendly platform perspectives. The UAS platform employed can be an off-the-shelf OEM or custom-built. Key system attributes include:

- Must be able to collaborate across a homogeneous set of Group 1 or Group 2 UAS platforms to actively inform each friendly platform (given permissive network environment) of enemy UAS location, velocity, track, etc.
- Must be able to execute algorithms under extreme SWaP-C constraints with a total compute payload under 2 lbs.
- Must be able to passively collaborate and achieve similar, but degraded performance within a non-permissive network/communications environment.
- A single UAS platform must demonstrate the ability to degrade/destroy N enemy UAS within a range of 10 meters through either kinetic or non-kinetic effectors.
- Friendly UAS swarm must be able to severely degrade the combat power of the enemy to a fraction of X% of its original size.
- Although 100% degradation of the enemy swarm is ideal, depending on the degree of asymmetry, it may not be realistic. Therefore, a target final enemy combat power goal is achieved from the degree of enemy/friendly asymmetry. As shown in Figure 1, in a scenario where there is no initial asymmetry and our 1 v 1 capabilities are superior, the enemy should retain 0% of its original combat power. However, if that enemy/friendly initial combat power ratio were 4/1, final enemy combat power might be 75% of its original. The ideal curve is one in which final enemy combat power is 0% regardless of the initial asymmetric combat power advantages the enemy possesses.

This effort is not designed to create, design, or deliver a new UAS platform as the end item. Rather, it is meant to develop technology that will leverage the existing capabilities of OEM drone platforms or, if necessary, custom-built drones by the performer. The key deliverable is a suite of AI and other software algorithms that continuously plan and take optimal actions in a decentralized manner. The algorithms run on each individual UAS platform, take advantage of active communications with other friendly platforms when operating in a permissive network environment, but can still operate under a denied or degraded network environment by communicating passively.

PHASE I: This topic is accepting Phase I submissions for a cost limit up to $300,000 and a 1-6-month period of performance.

Conduct a feasibility study to assess what is in the art of the possible that satisfies the requirements specified in the above “Objective” and “Description” paragraphs. Propose multiple algorithmic approaches, sensors packages, and assess tradeoffs in performance according to different combinations of such parameters.

PHASE II: Develop, install, and demonstrate a prototype system determined to be the most feasible solution during the Phase I feasibility study on a Group 1 or Group 2 Program of Record UAS (or custom-built drone). Simulation may be used for demonstration at very large scale for cost purposes. However, demonstrations of swarm behavior must include hardware for smaller swarms. The primary demonstrable capability is the decentralized execution of AI algorithms that enable active or passive collaboration of a friendly swarm of homogeneous UAS platforms that reduce the combat power of a numerically superior enemy swarm to a maximum degree. Multiple evaluations in hardware demonstrating effective 1-N targeting will be conducted to ensure core capability can scale to larger swarms.

PHASE III DUAL USE APPLICATIONS: Protection of critical infrastructure in CONUS. These are considered soft targets even if they are government facilities. We have recently seen the threat domestically launched drones can have on any structure given how easily unidentified drones have been able to fly unencumbered in CONUS.

REFERENCES:

1. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/9784823?casa_token=Fbx3MSdQuYwAAAAA:NpovByuBDIXLY9bcZf8CUOjho8l3zA8cDLzz76Mp7Dmnvhb_4hpYJJCZyr9_Ew88BKJaBs0FTg

KEYWORDS: asymmetric; collaborative; denied; artificial intelligence; distributed

ARM26BX04-DV009 TITLE: UH-60M Patient Handling System

OUSW (R&E) CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY AREA(S): Quantum and Battlefield Information Dominance

COMPONENT TECHNOLOGY PRIORITY AREA(S): Advanced Materials; Combat Casualty Care; Military Operational Medicine; Mission Readiness & Disaster Programs

PROJECTED CMMC LEVEL REQUIREMENT: Level 1

OBJECTIVE: This topic will explore optimizing the UH-60M interior to provide improved capability over the existing HH-60M in terms of survivability, functionality, and patient access by designing a modular Patient Handling System (PHS) that could be tailored to fit a multitude of aircraft.

DESCRIPTION: All U.S. Army COMPOs face a technical problem concerning the ability to augment the MEDEVAC fleet to reach the end strength goal of 446 MEDEVAC aircraft. The capability gap is driven by the reduction of the HH-60M fleet numbers, cancellation of the UH-60V program, and the divestment of the UH-60L MEDVAC variant. A new MEDEVAC PHS is required to support a MEDEVAC capability on the UH-60M aircraft and support the end strength goal of 446 MEDEVAC aircraft. The UH-60M aircraft will require an all-new technological solution that does not currently exist due to the design differences of the internal cabin structure between the UH-60M and HH-60M aircraft.

PHASE I: This topic is accepting Direct to Phase II submissions for a cost limit up to $2,000,000 and a 12-18-month period of performance.

In order for proposers to submit a DP2 proposal, they must provide the justification documentation to substantiate that the scientific and technical merit and feasibility described above has been met and describes the potential military and/or commercial applications. Documentation should include all relevant information including, but not limited to: technical reports, test data, prototype designs/models, and performance goals/results.

(DIRECT TO) PHASE II: During Phase II in addition to the standard SRR, PDR and CDR reports, key milestones for this effort will include Solid Models of new I/PHS design; Airworthiness Qualification Specification (AQS) for the new design; Technology Demonstrator/Prototype of the new design.

PHASE III DUAL USE APPLICATIONS: The optimized, lightweight Patient Handling System will lend itself to commercial medical evacuation missions on aircraft, ground vehicles, and developing heavy lift Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS). Specific to the aircraft market collectively known as Helicopter Emergency Medical Service (HEMS), There are over 1,00 aircraft serving this mission in the United States providing critical transports to nearly 300,00 patients annually. Further broken down there is an estimated 230,00 critical care transports by ground vehicles, and 40,000 by fixed wing aircraft. The opportunity nearly triples when the global HEMS fleet is considered.

REFERENCES:

1. https://www.army.mil/article/281837/army_paramedics_shape_future_medevac_aircraft_design

KEYWORDS: medevac; patient; handling; system; UH-60M; modular

ARM26BX04-DV010 TITLE: Ground-Based Affordable Mass (G-BAM) Challenge

NOTE: The following topic number, ARM26BX04-DV010 – Ground-Based Affordable Mass (G-BAM), in this release is tied to a Defense Innovation Unit (DIU) Challenge Commercial Solutions Openings. The DIU G-BAM Prize Challenge will be used to identify small business concerns that meet the criteria for a potential SBIR Direct-to-Phase II (DP2) award under this topic. **Finalist selected from the DIU G-BAM Prize Challenge will be the only firms eligible to submit a SBIR DP2 proposal under this topic.** Proposals submitted to this topic by non-winners of the DIU G-BAM Prize Challenge will not be evaluated.

How to Apply: Visit the DIU Open Solicitations page to read the full Challenge Announcement, topic details, and application instructions here:

https://www.diu.mil/work-with-us/open-solicitations

July 2 2026: White paper submission window opens via link above

July 14 2026 at 23:59:59 US/Eastern Time ET: Response deadline via link above

(Challenge Submission Window Subject to Change, please refer to DIU Open Solicitations page)

DIU Prize Challenge applications are NOT submitted to DSIP. Small business concerns that do not submit an application through the DIU Open Solicitations page (https://www.diu.mil/work-with-us/open-solicitations**) before the deadline will be ineligible to compete or submit a full SBIR proposal to DSIP. The DSIP proposal submission window tied to this topic is for the winners of the competition only.**

ARM26BX04-DV010 TITLE: Ground-Based Affordable Mass (G-BAM) Challenge

OUSW (R&E) CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY AREA(S): Applied Artificial Intelligence

COMPONENT TECHNOLOGY PRIORITY AREA(S): Trusted AI & Autonomy

PROJECTED CMMC LEVEL REQUIREMENT: Level 1

NOTE: The following topic number, ARM26BX04-DV010 – Ground-Based Affordable Mass (G-BAM), in this release is tied to a Defense Innovation Unit (DIU) Challenge Commercial Solutions Openings. The DIU G-BAM Prize Challenge will be used to identify small business concerns that meet the criteria for a potential SBIR Direct-to-Phase II (DP2) award under this topic. Finalist selected from the DIU G-BAM Prize Challenge will be the only firms eligible to submit an SBIR DP2 proposal under this topic. Proposals submitted to this topic by non-winners of the DIU Prize G-BAM Challenge will not be evaluated.

How to Apply: Visit the DIU Open Solicitations page to read the full Challenge Announcement, topic details, and application instructions here:

https://www.diu.mil/work-with-us/open-solicitations

July 2 2026: White paper submission window opens via link above

July 14 2026 at 23:59:59 US/Eastern Time ET: Response deadline via link above

(Challenge Submission Window Subject to Change, please refer to DIU Open Solicitations page)

DIU Prize Challenge applications are NOT submitted to DSIP. Small business concerns that do not submit an application through the DIU Open Solicitations page (https://www.diu.mil/work-with-us/open-solicitations) before the deadline will be ineligible to compete or submit a full SBIR proposal to DSIP. The DSIP proposal submission window tied to this topic is for the winners of the competition only.

OBJECTIVE: The United States currently faces an "unprecedented" military buildup by China and increasing air and missile threats that demand a robust deterrent. However, the current inventory of long-range strike weapons is dominated by high-cost, low-volume systems or aging strategic assets like the Minuteman III, which dates back to the 1960s. The lack of a cost-effective, ground-launched payload delivery system prevents the Joint Force from achieving producibility at scale, leaving the U.S. vulnerable in high-intensity, multi-domain environments where high-end munitions would be rapidly depleted. The objective of this topic is to facilitate innovative research on low-cost, rapidly manufacturable, payload delivery systems.

DESCRIPTION: The Department of War (DoW) is pivotally shifting toward "affordable mass" to counter peer adversaries who are rapidly expanding their military capabilities. While hypersonic systems offer high speeds, their exorbitant costs—exceeding $50 million per round—limit the military's ability to achieve the "magazine depth" necessary for prolonged conflict. This project proposes a ground-based, non-hypersonic, long-range precision payload delivery system that leverages low-cost production methods and commercial technologies to provide a scalable, high-volume alternative that is a tenth of the price of current high-end munitions.

PHASE I: This topic is accepting DP2 submissions for a cost limit up to $2,000,000 and a 12-18 month period of performance.

(DIRECT TO) PHASE II: This topic is a DP2 topic. In order for proposers to submit a DP2 proposal, they must provide justification documentation to substantiate that the scientific and technical merit and feasibility described above has been met and describes the potential military and/or commercial applications. Documentation should include all relevant information including, but not limited to: technical reports, test data, prototype designs/models, and performance goals/results. This justification must be provided during the DIU G-BAM Challenge in order to be selected as a winner and eligible to submit a DP2 proposal under this topic The results from the DIU G-BAM Challenge demonstration event, will be used to determine eligibility for DP2.

The objectives during Phase II are to produce prototype solutions that will be easy to operate by a Soldier. These products will be provided to select Army or other Department of War (DoW) units for testing and experimentation with end Users in a realistic field environment. Feedback from testing and experimentation will be provided directly to Small Businesses to iterate rapidly on recommended modifications or improvements for Army operational use. In addition, companies will work with Army partners to develop a draft technology transition and commercialization plan for DoW and commercial markets. Prototype capabilities sought include:

- Cost Efficiency: Achieve a "flyaway" unit cost of less than $2 million, representing a significant reduction from current advanced tactical missiles.
- Producibility: Demonstrate a company manufacturing process capable of producing at least 500 units annually.
- Operational Range: Validate a ground-launched threshold range exceeding 300 nm, matching or exceeding the capabilities of the Precision Strike Missile Increment One.
- Employment: Should not require the Army to develop or modify other systems for employment. Should be a “plug and play” system that easily integrates with existing transport, targeting, and situational awareness systems.

PHASE III DUAL USE APPLICATIONS: The sub-system technologies developed for low-cost, long-range payload delivery have significant applications in the civilian/commercial aerospace and logistics sectors. The artificial intelligence (AI) and autonomous navigation systems required for these munitions can be adapted for commercial cargo delivery drones and autonomous maritime vessels. Additionally, the push for additive manufacturing and rapid prototyping in the Indo-Pacific region to support these systems can revitalize domestic high-tech manufacturing, providing private companies with advanced production techniques that reduce costs for civilian infrastructure projects. Additionally, this space lends itself to the potential for development of low-cost alternate fuel technologies. Companies participating in the shoot-off are encouraged to propose tech development for manufacturing methods materials/guidance/seekers/alt propulsion, etc. to enhance their products. These are the primary opportunities for commercialization.

REFERENCES:

1. https://breakingdefense.com/2026/03/after-epic-fury-a-munitions-supplemental-becomes-imperative/
2. https://www.pbs.org/newshour/world/u-s-will-need-years-to-replenish-stockpiles-of-advanced-weapons-used-in-iran-war-new-analysis-finds

KEYWORDS: Low-cost munition; long-range; precision fires; cruise missile; one-way attack; launched effects; scalable; rapid production; advanced manufacturing; internal navigation; autonomous navigation; automated target recognition; terminal guidance.

Appendix A
Army Phase I Evaluation Criteria

Army SBIR STTR Phase I Evaluation Criteria v4-0

		DEFINITION
INTRODUCTION	*weight 3%*	Write a clear, concise description of what your innovation does or will do, and where you are in your evolution. Make clear its intended impact on the Army. Evaluators should "get it" after reading this.
ARMY BENEFITS	ALIGNMENT	Argue your technology innovation is aligned with this Army topic's priorities as defined in the solicitation.
	SOLUTION'S ADVANTAGES	Prove your prospective customers will choose you given limited resources and myriad choices. Have you accounted for indirect substitute products as well as direct competitors?
weight 15%	SOLUTION'S IMPACT	The Army seeks higher-risk, high-impact solutions through SBIR/STTR not engineering changes or incremental improvements. Use this section to describe your technology's impact and improvement upon the state of the art.
TECHNICAL APPROACH	SCIENTIFIC FEASIBILITY	Convince readers that your innovation is built atop sound scientific and/or engineering principles. Ensure that your feasibility argument adequately responds to the requirements this Army topic.
	ENABLING TECHNOLOGIES	Do the required enabling technologies introduce added risk?
	TECHNICAL TEAM	Briefly list and describe your core scientific and technical team with an emphasis on their past accomplishments and experiences that would relate to this Army SBIR/STTR topic.
	TECHNICAL RISKS AND MITIGATION PLANS	Describe any technical risks that still exist between you and a fully mature solution. What are your plans to mitigate those risks?
weight 35%	DATA QUALITY, TECHNICAL	Use data to substantiate your claims that your Technical Approach (this section of your proposal) is credible. Provide quality data attributed to reliable, credible sources.
PROGRAMMATIC POTENTIAL	PROJECT MILESTONE SCHEDULE	Outline your execution plan. What milestones do you hope to accomplish, and what deliverables (if any) do you hope to produce during this phase and subsequent phases of the effort?
	ARMY CUSTOMER DISCOVERY & VALIDATION	Argue you are "getting out of the building" to engage in productive customer-discovery with Army stakeholders. Describe any customer validation you may have received formally or informally to date on this proposed technology.
weight 20%	ARMY TRANSITION PATHWAY	Describe the next type of deal you aim to make with the Army following this award. Briefly outline your current plan to unlock that next opportunity and/or share the biggest risks you see post this SBIR/STTR award to transition this technology to the Army.
COMMERCIAL POTENTIAL	R&D TO PRODUCT REVENUE	Argue that your team members have transitioned research and development efforts into products successfully, as evidenced by product revenue. (Product revenue is realized by directly selling a solution to solve a problem vs. selling consulting, services or research activities.)
	COMPETITIVE EDGE	Why will you win? A small company needs to have a competitive edge in the marketplace: Something your team does very well that's difficult to match. Some examples include: well protected intellectual property, unmatched relevant expertise, a novel business model, or network effects.
weight 25%	OTHER PEOPLE'S MONEY	Make the case for the commercial market (non-DOD) potential of your technology from which the Army will benefit.
PROPOSAL QUALITY	QUALITY OF PROSE	Provide a clear, well written, and convincing proposal. Avoid jargon and define technical terms.
weight 2%	IMAGES, CHARTS, GRAPHICS	Graphics are encouraged throughout. Ensure they are logical and easy to read. Supporting images should be thoughtful and visually attractive. For plots and charts include: title, axis labels and captions. For technical images include appropriate scales or legends.

Army SBIR STTR Phase I Evaluation Criteria v4-0

U.S. ARMY SBIR|STTR

		UNSATISFACTORY	MARGINAL	SATISFACTORY	SUPERIOR
INTRODUCTION	*weight 3%*	Ineffective introduction. Failed to provide concise innovation proposition.	Adequate introduction. Gradually conveyed innovation's purpose and value. Should be more crisp.	Effective introduction. Systematically conveys innovation's purpose and value.	Exceptional introduction. Immediately conveys innovation's purpose and value.
ARMY BENEFITS	ALIGNMENT	Not aligned with this Army topic's priorities.	Somewhat aligned with this Army topic's priorities.	Aligned with this Army topic's priorities.	Perfectly aligned with this Army topic's priorities.
	SOLUTION'S ADVANTAGES	No evidence of competitive analysis. Undifferentiated product.	Incomplete or too narrow competitive analysis. Weak product differentiation.	Thorough competitive analysis. Strongly differentiated product. Accounted for most substitutes.	Persuasive competitive analysis. Highly differentiated, accounted for all substitutes, provides novel solution.
weight 15%	SOLUTION'S IMPACT	If successful, no improvement vs. the state of the art.	If successful, incremental improvement vs. the state of the art.	If successful, significant improvement vs. the state of the art.	If successful, radical improvement vs. the state of the art.
TECHNICAL APPROACH	SCIENTIFIC FEASIBILITY	No scientific basis for presented approach.	Incomplete scientific basis for presented approach.	Credible scientific basis for presented approach.	Convincing scientific basis for presented approach.
	ENABLING TECHNOLOGIES	Requires nonexistent or unavailable technology.	Requires emerging, cutting edge technology.	Requires proven technologies.	Requires Army-fielded technologies.
	TECHNICAL TEAM	Technical people lack qualifications OR have no experience.	Technical people are somewhat qualified and have some experience.	Technical people are highly qualified OR have significant experience.	Technical people are highly qualified AND have significant experience.
	TECHNICAL RISKS AND MITIGATION PLANS	Failed to present challenges and risks.	Inadequate risk analysis. Mitigation marginally addressed.	Credible risk analysis. Mitigation effectively addressed.	Highly credible risk analysis. Mitigation convincingly addressed.
weight 35%	DATA QUALITY, TECHNICAL	Poorly supported by data. Little to no data attribution.	Partially supported by data. Some data attribution.	Credibly supported by data. Adequate data attribution.	Persuasively supported by meaningful data. Comprehensive data attribution.
PROGRAMMATIC POTENTIAL	PROJECT MILESTONE SCHEDULE	Unclear or non-credible project milestones, or timing.	Mostly clear, credible project milestones and timing. Mostly appropriate level of detail.	Mostly clear, credible project milestones and timing. Appropriate level of detail.	Completely clear, credible project milestones and timing. Appropriate level of detail.
	ARMY CUSTOMER DISCOVERY & VALIDATION	No customer interviews completed. No validation.	A handful customer interviews completed. No validation.	Extensive interviews completed. Early validation beginning to inform transition strategy.	Exhaustive interviews completed. Validation informs credible transition strategy.
weight 20%	ARMY TRANSITION PATHWAY	Fails to identify next contract goal and/or fails to present a plan for near-term execution.	Identifies next contract goal. Has a plan for near-term execution.	Identifies stage-appropriate next contract goal. Credible plan for near-term execution.	Identifies ideal next contract goal. Convincing plan for near-term execution.
COMMERCIAL POTENTIAL	R&D TO PRODUCT REVENUE	No evidence of creating product revenue from R&D efforts.	Evidence of R&D yielding product revenue at previous company(ies).	Evidence of R&D yielding product revenue at this company.	Evidence of R&D yielding product revenue sufficient to fuel this company's growth.
	COMPETITIVE EDGE	Undifferentiated firm. Fails to argue it has an advantage.	Weakly differentiated firm. Some evidence of an advantage.	Strongly differentiated firm. Credibly argues it has durable advantage.	Highly differentiated firm. Convincingly argues it has durable advantage.
weight 25%	OTHER PEOPLE'S MONEY	Fails to present non-DoD sources for future R&D funding.	Evolving non-DoD sources of future R&D funding.	Secure non-DoD source(s) of future R&D funding.	Diverse and robust non-DoD sources of future R&D funding.
PROPOSAL QUALITY	QUALITY OF PROSE	Poorly written. Very difficult to impossible to follow argument. Several spelling or grammar errors.	Moderately written. Sometimes difficult to follow argument. A few spelling / grammar errors.	Effectively written. Convincing, easy to follow argument. No spelling or grammar errors.	Clearly and persuasively written. Compelling arguments. No spelling or grammar errors.
weight 2%	IMAGES, CHARTS, GRAPHICS	Poor visual aids. Often difficult to understand, distracting, or irrelevant.	Inadequate visual aids. Sometimes difficult to understand, distracting, or irrelevant.	Effective visual aids. Support argument in relevant ways, aiding comprehension.	Exceptional visual aids. Greatly enhance delivery and understanding.

Appendix B
Army Direct to Phase II Evaluation Criteria

Army SBIR DP2 Evaluation Criteria

		DEFINITION
INTRODUCTION	weight 2%	Write a clear, concise description of what your innovation does or will do, and where you are in your evolution. Make clear its intended impact on the Army. Evaluators should "get it" after reading this.
ARMY BENEFITS	ALIGNMENT	Argue your technology innovation is aligned with this Army topic's priorities as defined in the solicitation.
	SOLUTION'S ADVANTAGES	Prove your prospective customers will choose you given limited resources and myriad choices. Have you accounted for indirect substitute products as well as direct competitors?
weight 15%	SOLUTION'S IMPACT	The Army seeks higher-risk, high-impact solutions through SBIR/STTR not engineering changes or incremental improvements. Use this section to describe your technology's impact and improvement upon the state of the art.
FEASIBILITY FOR DP2	PROOF OF FEASIBILITY	Provide documentation to substantiate the scientific and technical merit and feasibility has been met.
	WORK OWNERSHIP	Document the people and organizations and any intellectual property (IP) ownership responsible for the work products in this section. The work must have been at least "substantially" performed by your organization and/or the proposed principle investigator for this research, and your firm must either own any IP discussed outright, or has appropriate and sufficient licenses thereto.
	NEW RESEARCH	Prove that the proposed DP2 research is a not in any way a logical extension of previous or ongoing federally funded SBIR or STTR research.
weight 15%	PROTOTYPE DELIVERY	Demonstrate that the research will result in appropriately mature Prototype at the conclusion of the DP2 SBIR contract.
TECHNICAL APPROACH	SCIENTIFIC FEASIBILITY	Convince readers that your innovation is built atop sound scientific and/or engineering principles. Ensure that your feasibility argument adequately responds to the requirements this Army topic.
	ENABLING TECHNOLOGIES	Do the required enabling technologies introduce added risk?
	TECHNICAL TEAM	Briefly list and describe your core scientific and technical team with an emphasis on their past accomplishments and experiences that would relate to this Army SBIR/STTR topic.
	TECHNICAL RISKS AND MITIGATION PLANS	Describe any technical risks that still exist between you and a fully mature solution. What are your plans to mitigate those risks?
weight 25%	DATA QUALITY, TECHNICAL	Use data to substantiate your claims that your Technical Approach (this section of your proposal) is credible. Provide quality data attributed to reliable, credible sources.
PROGRAMMATIC POTENTIAL	PROJECT MILESTONE SCHEDULE	Outline your execution plan. What milestones do you hope to accomplish, and what deliverables (if any) do you hope to produce during this phase and subsequent phases of the effort?
	ARMY CUSTOMER DISCOVERY & VALIDATION	Argue you are "getting out of the building" to engage in productive customer-discovery with Army stakeholders. Describe any customer validation you may have received formally or informally to date on this proposed technology.
weight 20%	ARMY TRANSITION PATHWAY	Describe the next type of deal you aim to make with the Army following this award. Briefly outline your current plan to unlock that next opportunity and/or share the biggest risks you see post this SBIR/STTR award to transition this technology to the Army.
COMMERCIAL POTENTIAL	R&D TO PRODUCT REVENUE	Argue that your team members have transitioned research and development efforts into products successfully, as evidenced by product revenue. (Product revenue is realized by directly selling a solution to solve a problem vs. selling consulting, services or research activities.)
	COMPETITIVE EDGE	Why will you win? A small company needs to have a competitive edge in the marketplace: Something your team does very well that's difficult to match. Some examples include: well protected intellectual property, unmatched relevant expertise, a novel business model, or network effects.
weight 20%	OTHER PEOPLE'S MONEY	Make the case for the commercial market (non-DOD) potential of your technology from which the Army will benefit.
PROPOSAL QUALITY	QUALITY OF PROSE	Provide a clear, well written, and convincing proposal. Avoid jargon and define technical terms.
weight 3%	IMAGES, CHARTS, GRAPHICS	Graphics are encouraged throughout. Ensure they are logical and easy to read. Supporting images should be thoughtful and visually attractive. For plots and charts include: title, axis labels and captions. For technical images include appropriate scales or legends.

Army SBIR DP2 Evaluation Criteria

		UNSATISFACTORY	MARGINAL	SATISFACTORY	SUPERIOR
INTRODUCTION	*weight 2%*	Ineffective introduction. Failed to provide concise innovation proposition.	Adequate introduction. Gradually conveyed innovation's purpose and value. Should be more crisp.	Effective introduction. Systematically conveys innovation's purpose and value.	Exceptional introduction. Immediately conveys innovation's purpose and value.
ARMY BENEFITS	ALIGNMENT	Not aligned with this Army topic's priorities.	Somewhat aligned with this Army topic's priorities.	Aligned with this Army topic's priorities.	Perfectly aligned with this Army topic's priorities.
	SOLUTION'S ADVANTAGES	No evidence of competitive analysis. Undifferentiated product.	Incomplete or too narrow competitive analysis. Weak product differentiation.	Thorough competitive analysis. Strongly differentiated product. Accounted for most substitutes.	Persuasive competitive analysis. Highly differentiated, accounted for all substitutes, provides novel solution.
weight 15%	SOLUTION'S IMPACT	If successful, no improvement vs. the state of the art.	If successful, incremental improvement vs. the state of the art.	If successful, significant improvement vs. the state of the art.	If successful, radical improvement vs. the state of the art.
FEASIBILITY FOR DP2	PROOF OF FEASIBILITY	Fails to demonstrate Feasibility of solution.	Partially demonstrates Feasibility of solution.	Successfully demonstrates Feasibility of solution.	Unquestionably demonstrates Feasibility of solution.
	WORK OWNERSHIP	Fails to document prior Feasibility work was substantially completed by the offeror and/or the PI, AND offer's IP rights are unclear.	Partially documents prior Feasibility work was substantially completed by the offeror and/or the PI, AND offeror's rights to any necessary IP.	Sufficiently documents prior Feasibility work was substantially completed by the offeror and/or the PI, AND offeror's rights to any necessary IP.	Persuasively documents prior Feasibility work was substantially completed by the offeror and/or the PI, AND offeror's rights to any necessary IP.
	NEW RESEARCH	This research is likely a logical extension of offeror's prior SBIR / STTR work.	This research might be a logical extension of offeror's prior SBIR / STTR work.	Evidence this research is not a logical extension of offeror's prior SBIR / STTR work.	Compelling evidence this research is not a logical extension of offeror's prior SBIR / STTR work, OR offeror has no prior SBIR / STTR contracts.
weight 15%	PROTOTYPE DELIVERY	Unlikely that an appropriately mature prototype can be delivered.	Flawed argument that an appropriately mature prototype can be delivered.	Credible argument that an appropriately mature prototype can be delivered.	Convincing argument that an appropriately mature prototype can be delivered.
TECHNICAL APPROACH	SCIENTIFIC FEASIBILITY	No scientific basis for presented approach.	Incomplete scientific basis for presented approach.	Credible scientific basis for presented approach.	Convincing scientific basis for presented approach.
	ENABLING TECHNOLOGIES	Requires nonexistent or unavailable technology.	Requires emerging, cutting edge technology.	Requires proven technologies.	Requires Army-fielded technologies.
	TECHNICAL TEAM	Technical people lack qualifications OR have no experience.	Technical people are somewhat qualified and have some experience.	Technical people are highly qualified OR have significant experience.	Technical people are highly qualified AND have significant experience.
	TECHNICAL RISKS AND MITIGATION PLANS	Failed to present challenges and risks.	Inadequate risk analysis. Mitigation marginally addressed.	Credible risk analysis. Mitigation effectively addressed.	Highly credible risk analysis. Mitigation convincingly addressed.
weight 25%	DATA QUALITY, TECHNICAL	Poorly supported by data. Little to no data attribution.	Partially supported by data. Some data attribution.	Credibly supported by data. Adequate data attribution.	Persuasively supported by meaningful data. Comprehensive data attribution.
PROGRAMMATIC POTENTIAL	PROJECT MILESTONE SCHEDULE	Unclear or non-credible project milestones, or timing.	Mostly clear, credible project milestones and timing. Mostly appropriate level of detail.	Mostly clear, credible project milestones and timing. Appropriate level of detail.	Completely clear, credible project milestones and timing. Appropriate level of detail.
	ARMY CUSTOMER DISCOVERY & VALIDATION	No customer interviews completed. No validation.	A handful customer interviews completed. No validation.	Extensive interviews completed. Early validation beginning to inform transition strategy.	Exhaustive interviews completed. Validation informs credible transition strategy.
weight 20%	ARMY TRANSITION PATHWAY	Fails to identify next contract goal and/or fails to present a plan for near-term execution.	Identifies next contract goal. Has a plan for near-term execution.	Identifies stage-appropriate next contract goal. Credible plan for near-term execution.	Identifies ideal next contract goal. Convincing plan for near-term execution.
COMMERCIAL POTENTIAL	R&D TO PRODUCT REVENUE	No evidence of creating product revenue from R&D efforts.	Evidence of R&D yielding product revenue at previous company(ies).	Evidence of R&D yielding product revenue at this company.	Evidence of R&D yielding product revenue sufficient to fuel this company's growth.
	COMPETITIVE EDGE	Undifferentiated firm. Fails to argue it has an advantage.	Weakly differentiated firm. Some evidence of an advantage.	Strongly differentiated firm. Credibly argues it has durable advantage.	Highly differentiated firm. Convincingly argues it has durable advantage.
weight 20%	OTHER PEOPLE'S MONEY	Fails to present non-DoD sources for future R&D funding.	Evolving non-DoD sources of future R&D funding.	Secure non-DoD source(s) of future R&D funding.	Diverse and robust non-DoD sources of future R&D funding.
PROPOSAL QUALITY	QUALITY OF PROSE	Poorly written. Very difficult to impossible to follow argument. Several spelling or grammar errors.	Moderately written. Sometimes difficult to follow argument. A few spelling / grammar errors.	Effectively written. Convincing, easy to follow argument. No spelling or grammar errors.	Clearly and persuasively written. Compelling arguments. No spelling or grammar errors.
weight 3%	IMAGES, CHARTS, GRAPHICS	Poor visual aids. Often difficult to understand, distracting, or irrelevant.	Inadequate visual aids. Sometimes difficult to understand, distracting, or irrelevant.	Effective visual aids. Support argument in relevant ways, aiding comprehension.	Exceptional visual aids. Greatly enhance delivery and understanding.