FOSOV: Vehicle Telematics and Sensor Technologies Assessment Event (AE)
Q&A Telecon Transcript
22 January 2026

1. **How soon after the AE do you envision work actually starting?**
   Work is expected to begin in FY26, depending on the contracting mechanism.

2. **Are you limited in how many awards for viable solutions you can make?**
   No, there is no limitation on how many awards or viable solutions can be made.

3. **Can a company have more than one submission that describes different alternatives to consider and evaluate for each problem area?**
   No, only one submission is allowed per company.

4. **Do you envision needing any chosen provider to also provide system integration and deployment to prod and testing support after a selection is made?**
   Yes. A TRL 7 solution is expected to still require additional development and testing support with the government after selection.

5. **Could US citizens leverage licensed technology from Canadian-based companies as part of a solution, if only US citizens are involved in crafting the solution?**
   Yes, that is possible, but the government will pay special attention to non-U.S.-based technologies and supply chain security.

6. **Will the Government provide the following details: a. Type of data collected by sensors and telematics systems (video, infrared, voice, etc.), b. If performers have access to unencrypted sensor data before it is handed over for encryption or to radio, c. Size, Weight, and Power restrictions on any "dongles" inserted between sensors and radio, d. Radio transceiver uplink/downlink capabilities (kbps, Mbps, Gbps, etc.), and e. Packet size restrictions.**
   Not at this time.

7. **Is it acceptable if provider demonstrates technology at TRL 3/4 within 90 days of selection, with a path of reaching TRL 7?**
   No. TRL 3/4 is expected to take longer than the government's timeline to reach a demo-ready state and TRL 7.

8. **What are the objectives and thresholds for integration? Are all aspects of integration viable such as vehicle integration to stand alone devices considered?**
   The effort is not being framed as formal "big-R" requirements; we are focused on demoable capabilities. Both vehicle-integrated and standalone solutions are acceptable.

9. **Could you please discuss the scale of the project from the budget point of view?** Budget framing should be referenced through Congressional budget information. The effort is expected to start small but has large growth potential.

10. **Is the government interested in a solution that can be rapidly uninstalled from one commercial vehicle and installed into another?**
    Yes, that is of particular interest.

11. **Can Large size nonprofits participate in this effort by themselves? Or do we need to tie up small businesses?**
    Nonprofits are permitted to participate.

12. **Are the vehicle below not already viable? #1 Toyota Land Cruiser 70 Series**
    Yes, the Toyota Land Cruiser 70 Series is viable.

13. **#2 Toyota Hilux (export base) #3 Isuzu D-Max / N-Series #4 Mahindra Bolero / Scorpio Classic #5 Suzuki Jimny (non-EU trims) Toyota Hilux is already part of the current portfolio.**
    The government is still determining other vehicles of interest and will not publish a list.

14. **Which vehicle data sources must be monitored (GPS, CAN bus, cellular, Wi-Fi/Bluetooth, sensors), and what 'normal vs risky' behavior should the system flag?** The government is seeking industry expertise to help define what should be monitored and what behaviors should be flagged, and does not want to dictate a specific approach.

15. **Which emissions are the priority to reduce (cellular, Wi-Fi/Bluetooth, key fob, GPS leak, ECU noise) and what level of reduction/standoff distance is required?**
    This is undetermined, and all are within the realm of possible. The government does not want to set guardrails on expectations.

16. **Does everyone working on the project need to be a US citizen?**
    Yes, however some latitude can be considered in source of supply for hardware components.

17. **Is there interest in commercial data that would allow for DigitalOverwatch to understand telematic signatures that might be visible to adversaries or 3rd parties?** Yes, telematics signatures visible to adversaries are a concern, and this effort is pursuing solutions to mitigate those capabilities.

18. **Which operational unit or program office is the intended end user?**
    The intended end user is the Family of Special Operations Vehicles (FOSOV), led by the Non-Standard Commercial Vehicle (NSCV) program.

19. **Is there interest in cellular signature management (secure global SIMs) solutions that could be applied to vehicle signature reduction efforts?**
    Potentially yes, though the operational use case was not fully defined during the telecon.

20. **What is the anticipated transition mechanism following white paper selection (OTA, SBIR, other)?**
    Multiple mechanisms are possible, including those listed on the SOFWERX website, and all listed options are considered potential.

21. **What is the notional timeline from white paper submission to downselect?**
    The timeline is published on the SOFWERX website, and the telecon referred participants there.

22. **Is the intent focused on near-term deployable capability or exploratory experimentation?**
    The intent is near-term deployable capability, consistent with TRL 7 expectations.

23. **Should the vehicles be manufactured by orgs. that are head quartered in USA?**
    No. Commercial OEM vehicles from anywhere in the world are applicable.

24. **Will evaluation criteria be weighed more toward operational relevance or technical innovation?**
    There's no answer to that.

25. **Are electric vehicles applicable?**
    Yes. Any commercial OEM vehicle is potentially applicable.

26. **Could you expound a bit on your threat model? (ex. All electromagnetic emissions, or only the communications channel?)**
    The threat model includes all electromagnetic emissions, with acknowledgement that some areas may be more common or higher priority in the current threat environment.

27. **Is there an interest in traditional rental vehicles such as BMW?**
    Yes. Any OEM commercial vehicles are considered applicable.

28. **Would solutions that only support portions of the NSCV fleet be acceptable?**
    The solicitation allows for “one or more” capabilities, and does not assume one company will provide all capabilities.

29. **Are you assuming only software solutions, or software/hardware?**
    Would suppliers have to show manufacturing ability? Solutions may be software, hardware, or a combination. Manufacturing ability was not explicitly requested, but a demo is required.

30. **Are there any sensing technologies that do NOT qualify?**
    Not enough information to answer.

31. **How does a company get feedback for a technology purchased by FOSOV for evaluation?**
    If selected, the company will present at the assessment event and engage directly with government stakeholders, including Q&A; and feedback discussions.

32. **Is there a particular CAN bus standard version(s) that applies to your fleet?**
    No.

33. **Can US permanent residents (not US citizens) participate in this program?**
    No.

34. **Are you looking for trafficability assessments/forecasts for the ground vehicles that predict wet roads, snow covered, etc.? Think WAZE for the SOF operator?**
    Not expressed as a requirement in the write up.

35. **Is there interest in capabilities that will defeat/mitigate traffic camera systems and other urban camera systems or LPRs?**
    Yes.

36. **Are you open to collaborating with other USG organizations that may have existing, but sensitive, solutions?**
    Yes. White papers may be submitted through SOFWERX by other government entities, though follow-on engagement may occur government-to-government.

37. **Are you open to modular software-defined approaches that sit above existing vehicle telematics and sensor stacks, for cross-vendor integration, and edge processing?**
    Yes.

38. **Does NVSC have the capacity to coordinate partnerships with Commercial Vehicle OEMs and solution providers under FOSOV?**
    Yes, potentially, but it depends and includes caveats. It has been done before, but it will not occur within the 90-day demo window.

39. **Are solutions expected to function across multiple vehicle types or mission profiles?** Yes, that is a good assumption. The government seeks reuse and economies of scale, though not necessarily a single solution that solves every challenge.

40. **Is digital footprint/dust of interest to the program in cases where it remains on-vehicle without emission?**
    Yes.

41. **How interested is the government in monitoring-only solutions that address only capability #1 without addressing #2 or #3?**
    The solicitation allows for one or more capabilities, and does not assume one company will provide all capabilities.

42. **What hardware solutions are you interested in hearing about (i.e. networking kits, routers, switches, etc) for the demonstrations?**
    The government is looking for demonstrations of capability and is not specifying particular internal components or parts.

43. **Are capabilities that can be quickly installed and perform partial support to SIGMAN into a commandeered vehicle of interest?**
    Yes.

44. **Is on-vehicle processing or local decision support within scope, or is the focus primarily centralized analysis?**
    Centralized analysis was not explicitly required. Local decision support is of interest, and the government is open to being educated on architectural approaches.

45. **Are NATO partners allowed to participate in the proposal ecosystem?**
    NATO partners should reach out to through the designated government liaison or coordinator in leu of submitting through SOFWERX.

46. **Is the primary emphasis on data collection, data utilization, or end-to-end operational outcomes?**
    The primary emphasis is end-to-end operational effectiveness outcomes.

47. **Is freedom-of-movement the primary concern for Signature Management onboard commercial vehicles?**
    Are there other mission aspects that you see as important? Yes, freedom of movement is the primary concern. Other mission aspects were not clearly defined during the telecon.

48. **Is it allowed for a vehicle to show an error state while obfuscating signatures? Ex: disrupting TPMS may trigger a dashboard error without affecting performance**
    If the capability meets all other requirements and is at a TRL 7.

49. **Is collaboration with a modified or unmodified friendly mobile device in scope?**
    It is an area of interest, but the telecon did not define it as formal "scope."

50. **Is the problem concentrating on a specific range (distance from vehicle)?**
    Signature depends on adversary distance from vehicle. No specific range is being targeted. The government may need to be educated on what is possible.

51. **Should solutions assume consistent infrastructure availability, or variable operating conditions?**
    Solutions should assume variable operating conditions. Infrastructure may still exist in many environments, and performers should consider operational realities accordingly.

52. **Are solutions expected to continue providing value if connectivity or resources fluctuate?**
    Sounds like an implied feature that sounds good but lacks a context to provide a clear answer.

53. **Is adaptability to different operational contexts considered a positive attribute?**
    Operating in contested or challenged environments is viewed positively, and adaptability is aligned with that expectation.

54. **What is the lowest TRL level you are willing to accept?**
    TRL 7.

55. **Are ground vehicles the only type of platform the solution should work on? Are airborne platforms of interest? Are all platforms expected to be manned?**
    The effort is focused on ground mobility and commercial OEM vehicles.

56. **Are there any specific sections of the template you want us to emphasize, and can you share the primary use-case scenario you want this solution to support?**
    No specific template sections were emphasized, and operator use-case scenarios will not be provided. The focus is freedom of movement and OEM commercial vehicles.

57. **Could a solution be submitted already being evaluated by a SOF team at the unit level and would their feedback benefit the submission?**
    Yes, if the performer has permission to discuss it in the white paper, and that information may be relevant.

58. **Would OEM technologies with state-of-the-art Driver assistance have an advantage in this AE? eg: lane following, collision etc(not referring to fully unmanned)**

No, it is not assumed that this would be an advantage.

59. **If the technology we provide is built in Norway by non-US citizens, but all comms are done through US persons, will that be considered?**
The origin of the solution is the deciding factor. See question #45 about NATO Partners.

60. **If the applicant is at TRL-6 with an active program to demonstrate TRL-7, will they be considered?**
Situational, still submit to be considered.

61. **Would you be interested in white papers that detail the 90-day ready capability AND the proposed capability with 9 months of development time working with NSCV?**
Yes, if the solution can be demonstrated within 90 days and then improved over time. If nothing can be demonstrated in 90 days, it is likely outside the engagement bounds.

62. **Are solutions permitted to modify the vehicle, control units, sensors, etc.? Concern for voiding warranty?**
Yes, there are use cases where warranty concerns are less important and others where permanent alteration is not desired. Both are of interest.

63. **Are solutions that can detect a third-party UAS in pursuit of the commercial vehicle of interest for this assessment event?**
Yes, that is considered a freedom of movement challenge.

64. **Why is allowing proprietary information an issue? How do you expect other custom advanced non industry solution to be presented?**
Submissions should be unclassified and non-proprietary because they are collected through a third-party platform. Performers should share what they are comfortable submitting, and more detail can be presented if selected.

65. **Are you able to share your priority with vehicle manufacturers?**
No. Priorities are not decided, but commercial vehicles are broadly of interest.

66. **Do you have an expectation for interfacing the system with operators/drivers in the commercial vehicle? (Voice alerts, ATAK notifications, screen, etc?)**
Yes, human-machine interface considerations are of interest, and tying operator interaction to freedom of movement is important.

67. **How about control of digital footprint? Post op on rental cars? Ability to wipe use and interaction?**
Yes, there is interest, and it falls within the area of controlling digital footprint/dust associated with operating vehicles.

68. **Is there interest in the vehicle having thermal and multi spectrum camo integrated with the vehicle?**
No, that is out of scope for this effort.

69. **Is SOFWERX seeking modular technologies that can be applied to any vehicle system temporarily or permanently/semi-perm affixed systems?**
    Yes.

70. **What about software defined vehicle architectures. Ie automotive ethernet vs can vs hybrid vehicles looking fwd?**
    Yes, this is an area of interest.

71. **Is the solution meant to address modern commercial vehicles, or would a wider range of model years, on-board diagnostic version, etc be of interest to support?**
    A wide net is being cast, and broader vehicle types and model years are of interest.

72. **Could a faraday cage foil to keep signals "inside"be interesting?**
    Potentially yes, and industry is encouraged to educate the government on operational impacts and use cases.

73. **Is there a limit to white paper page count? I did not see this on website or assessment criteria/attachments?**
    Yes. The white paper is limited to 2 pages of text, with an additional page allowed for pictures if needed.

74. **You guys are great, and we appreciate your patience with our questions!**
    The team expressed appreciation in return.

75. **You haven't clarified any cloud or off vehicle compute/ server limitation architecturally.**
    Cloud and off-vehicle compute limitations were intentionally not specified, and cloud-connected capabilities are considered part of the freedom of movement challenge in modern vehicles.

76. **Are Low SWaP technologies of interest?**
    Yes.

77. **Would FOSOV want to combine or connect multiple solutions? (would it be of interest for a hardware solution to support other people's apps)?**
    Yes. Industry collaboration and combining solutions are of interest.

78. **Can you provide a "wish list" of features, or is this just a general call for solutions?**
    No wish list will be provided. Industry experts are expected to provide insights and solutions.

79. **Would use of post quantum resistant crypto be expected or required?**
    Sounds like an opportunity to educate the government about relevancy to the operator because that is very technology specific question.

80. **Can a NTDC work with more than one prime for submission?**
    This is considered a business-to-business decision, and is up to the companies involved.

81. **Is EO based passive sensing and collaborative path planning among friendly assets within the art of possible ?**
    Potentially yes, if it supports freedom of movement coordination.

82. Is there a maximum install and go time on rentals?

No.