



**SBIR 26.BZ R4 Q&A Telecon Transcript
09 July 2026**

- **SOC26BZ04-DV005: Replanning for Evasive Autonomy to Counter Threats (REACT)**

SBIR Process Timeline

01 July 2026: Topic issued for pre-release

22 July 2026: USSOCOM begins accepting proposals via DSIP

05 August 2026: DSIP Topic Q&A closes to new questions at 12:00 PM ET

19 August 2026: Deadline for receipt of proposals no later than 12:00 PM ET

1. What is the main focus of this effort: electronic warfare (EW), GPS-denied replanning, threat avoidance, multi-agent coordination, or commander's intent translation?

The primary focus is on threat-aware replanning in GPS-denied and contested environments, with emphasis on threat avoidance and multi-agent coordination. Commander's intent translation is outside the primary scope of this effort.

2. How should industry frame human control: human-in-the-loop approval, on-the-loop supervision, recommendations only, or bounded autonomy?

The Government envisions an on-the-loop supervision model with bounded autonomy. Autonomous systems should execute within approved mission parameters while allowing a human operator to supervise and intervene when necessary, rather than approving every individual action.

3. What integration should performers prioritize: TAK/ATAK, open APIs, edge computing, mission planning tools, or swarm control interfaces?

Priority should be given to TAK/ATAK integration, open APIs, edge computing compatibility, and swarm control interfaces. Although the effort is simulation-based, proposed solutions should be designed with future deployment on operational hardware in mind.

4. We recently completed a TACFI effort aligned with this solicitation. Can we submit for this topic or pursue a Phase III effort?

Organizations are encouraged to submit proposals if their previous work aligns with the objectives of this solicitation. Questions regarding potential Phase III opportunities should be submitted through the official DSIP question portal.

5. Are there any preferred simulation frameworks, training paradigms, or experimental architectures?

No specific simulation framework is required. Proposed solutions should be compatible with the Government's Phantom Open Architecture. The Government expects performers to provide recommendations for integrating their algorithms into that architecture.





6. What constitutes a baseline approach in programmatic provenance? What has historically demonstrated meaningful performance gains?

A baseline approach is auction algorithms (e.g., consensus-based auction algorithms or bundle algorithms). Non-implemented but interesting comparison would be RL (specifically, PPO or some variant).

Lessons learned tell us game-theoretic approaches work well. A common approach is RL for ease of implementation (assuming access to a performant sim).

7. How can industry contact the technical team regarding Phase III opportunities?

Technical questions and follow-up discussions must be submitted publicly through the Department of War SBIR/STTR Innovation Portal (DSIP). Direct communication with the technical team is not permitted.

8. At what point are operational scenarios developed? Will scenario details be provided after award, or should assumptions be made in the proposal?

Proposers should make reasonable assumptions consistent with an Indo-Pacific operational scenario. The Government is interested in missions involving GPS-denied environments, kinetic and non-kinetic threats, moving targets, and autonomous swarm survivability while maintaining target tracking.

9. When will the Phantom SDK be provided?

The Phantom SDK will be provided at the beginning of the project.

10. What level of cross-domain unmanned system control or intelligence integration is expected?

This effort is limited to airborne assets. Cross-domain integration is outside the scope of this topic.

11. If the solution is intended to integrate with TAK or similar systems, is that expected during this effort or in a future phase?

Integration with TAK or a similar operational environment is expected by the conclusion of the performance period.

12. Is this a Direct to Phase II opportunity? What are the submission requirements?

This is a Direct to Phase II solicitation. Offerors must submit a feasibility study along with the required proposal documentation in accordance with the SOCOM-specific instructions published on the DSIP portal.



13. The solicitation references STRATBOT technology around code development. Is integration with STRATBOT required?

No. Integration with STRATBOT is not required.

14. What will the training and evaluation scenarios look like? How many scenarios will be used, and how will they be specified?

The Government anticipates evaluating solutions through simulation using mission vignettes that define objectives and threat conditions. Approximately four to five scenarios are expected, although the exact number is still to be determined. Scenario specifications will be provided in a structured format determined during project execution.

15. Have performance criteria been established for swarm reactions to threats?

Performance criteria will depend on the specific operational scenario. Success will focus on maintaining mission objectives under contested conditions while demonstrating scalable, threat-aware planning integrated with the Government's Phantom architecture.

16. Is the Government seeking autonomy that replans within pre-approved mission boundaries while allowing human supervision?

Yes. The desired capability is autonomous replanning within established mission constraints while maintaining human supervisory authority and override capability.

17. Where does this effort fit within the Find, Fix, Track, Target, Engage, Assess (F2T2EA) chain?

This effort primarily supports the Find, Fix, Track, and Target portions of the kill chain by enabling autonomous swarms to locate, maintain custody of, and report target information for follow-on systems.

18. The proposal references Government-approved modeling frameworks such as Markov Decision Processes (MDPs). Are proposers expected to use these?

Proposers should clearly describe and justify their chosen planning framework. Government-approved architectural documentation is expected, but performers may recommend the planning methodology that best supports transition.

19. Is this effort building upon an existing capability or creating a new one?

The effort expands upon existing multi-agent planning approaches but represents a new capability focused specifically on operating in threat-rich environments where traditional auction-based planning methods are insufficient.



20. Is the expectation that performers develop both the algorithm and the simulation environment?

Performers may either develop a simulation environment or use an existing simulator. The Government is primarily interested in demonstrating the algorithm within a simulation that is sufficiently realistic to support confidence in real-world application.

21. Will the Government provide the simulation environment, or are performers responsible for selecting one?

The Government will not provide a simulation environment. Performers are responsible for selecting and justifying a simulator that appropriately represents the operational environment and supports transition to real-world implementation.

22. Are there recommended simulation environments available?

Specific simulator recommendations were not available during the teleconference. The Government indicated that recommendations may be provided in the approved transcript.

23. What is the envisioned transition path to PEO Fixed Wing following Phase II?

The Government intends to use the results of this effort to expand the Phantom framework by incorporating multi-agent planning capabilities. Successful technologies may transition into future prototyping, experimentation, and operational deployment efforts in coordination with PEO Fixed Wing.

24. What minimum prior evidence is considered sufficient to demonstrate technical feasibility?

At a minimum, proposers should demonstrate successful simulation results, preferably involving multi-agent autonomy or comparable unmanned system applications.

25. Should simulations assume the swarm is already assembled at the beginning of the scenario?

No. Proposers should not assume the swarm begins in a fully established formation.

26. Should proposals focus specifically on maritime Find, Fix, Track, Target, Engage, Assess missions or more broadly on Adaptive Airborne Enterprise missions?

The Government recommends focusing on the maritime Find, Fix, Track, Target, Engage, Assess mission set, as this best aligns with the objectives of the topic.

27. Should proposers assume homogeneous or heterogeneous Group 1–3 unmanned aircraft?



The Government recommends assuming heterogeneous Group 1–3 airborne platforms with similar aircraft embodiments. Solutions should also assume low-cost, attritable systems with limited onboard computing resources.

28. What assumptions should be made regarding onboard computing, sensors, endurance, communications, navigation quality, and autonomous authority?

Proposers should assume low-cost airborne platforms operating at relatively low altitudes with line-of-sight communications of approximately 10–20 miles. Electro-optical and infrared sensors should be assumed, along with bounded autonomous operation under human supervision.

29. What adversary models should be represented during Phase II simulation?

Simulations should include integrated air defense systems, electronic warfare, kinetic threats, weather effects, deceptive targets, and adaptive adversary behavior. Cyber effects are not required.

30. How should proposers interpret the requirement to encode commander's intent into a formal utility function?

The utility function should represent a weighted combination of mission objectives that can be adjusted by the operator, balancing factors such as mission success, survivability, and target custody.

31. Are there preferred modeling frameworks, programming interfaces, or software environments that proposers should align with?

The Government expects proposers to recommend an appropriate framework and justify its transition path into Government systems rather than requiring a specific implementation.

32. What degraded environment assumptions should drive autonomous planning?

Solutions should account for GPS denial, navigation uncertainty, communication degradation, bandwidth limitations, latency, message loss, and swarm network management while maintaining mission effectiveness under contested conditions.

33. What simulation and integration artifacts will be most valuable to the Government?

The Government values demonstration within a realistic simulation environment, integration with TAK decision-support capabilities, recommendations for expanding the Phantom architecture, and planning modules that can transition into operational autonomy stacks.

34. What quantitative measures will determine success at the conclusion of Phase II?



The Government will evaluate mission effectiveness, readiness for transition, scalability across increasing numbers of autonomous platforms, efficient execution on representative edge computing hardware, and the ability to integrate into the Government's middleware architecture. Performance should scale gracefully as the number of autonomous agents increases while maintaining operational effectiveness.

