



PEO TIS UxV Payloads Against Modern Signals Assessment Event
Q&A Telecon Transcript
17 June 2026

- 1. What frequency range are you looking to detect with this system?**
The desired frequency range is 1 GHz to 20 GHz. Solutions covering only portions of this spectrum may still be considered if they demonstrate strong capability within those ranges.
- 2. Plan/thoughts for APNT/M-Code? weapons MILGPS receivers which are on every precision weapon in DOW will enable UAS to get within 1/2km of 100kw jammer.**
The Government stated that this topic is not a focus of the current effort.
- 3. What is the ideal timeframe for the synthetic data generation and how large of a dataset is desired?**
The desired capability is real-time data generation and reporting. Data volumes will vary depending on the operational environment and the number of emitters present.
- 4. What are the SWaP and technical attributes associated with USSOCOM Modular Payload Standard 6.1?**
The Modular Payload Standard defines size, weight, power, and related technical requirements. Respondents should refer directly to the published standard for specific details.
- 5. Or are you looking only for a solution that senses, reduces footprint, and then re-transmits the signal? Will you review a footprint-reduction-only solution?**
The Government is seeking solutions that collect, identify, and locate signals. Retransmission of signals is not a requirement.
- 6. How soon do you want this payload deployed, and on exactly which platforms?**
Deployment is desired as soon as possible following testing and evaluation. Specific platform details were not provided due to operational security considerations.
- 7. Are you expecting to buy a few off-the-shelf payloads for immediate deployment later this year, or a formal, multi-month integration and ruggedization track?**
High-TRL solutions may be considered for near-term procurement. Solutions requiring additional development would likely undergo an RDT&E effort prior to operational deployment.
- 8. Can you share any info on specific funding limits, average award sizes, or preferred contract vehicles**
Funding and award sizes will vary depending on the acquisition strategy. Multiple contracting pathways, including existing SOFWERX and Government vehicles, may be utilized.
- 9. What specific types of modern signals or environments are you most focused on?**
The primary focus is radar detection, classification, and analysis in maritime environments.





- 10. Why the emphasis on volatile memory on board the sensor and edge reprogrammability? Because these drones/surface vessels may occasionally be captured or lost?**
Idea would be sensitive information to be stored in volatile memory should the platform have technical issues and the owner loses positive control. There are multiple mechanisms to leverage volatile memory. In the same instance, if nonvolatile memory has data protection mechanism (encrypted, etc)
- 11. Which specific UAS/USV/UUV platforms will the demonstration use? What is the exact make and model of the vessel?**
Specific platform details were not released. Government-provided maritime platforms will be used during the assessment event.
- 12. Is full hardware compliance required out of the box, or could software-defined architectures that can be adapted during the downselect phase be acceptable?**
Out-of-the-box compliance is preferred. However, strong technical solutions that require additional development may still be considered.
- 13. What are the US content restrictions? Could some components be sourced from suppliers based in allied nations?**
U.S. content is preferred; however, components sourced from allied nations may be acceptable.
- 14. Will any portion of the 3-7 August assessment event be conducted in an operational scenario?**
Yes. The assessment will include controlled operational scenarios using representative emitters and maritime environments.
- 15. What is the primary platform size/group for UAS? Group 1,2,3?**
Although UAS integration is not part of the current effort, future applications would likely focus on Group 2 and Group 3 platforms.
- 16. Does SOCOM have secured funding for this opportunity should the technology be demonstrated at this event? If so, what amount?**
Yes. Funding is available to support the capability, but specific funding amounts were not disclosed.
- 17. How many awardees would be pursued provided there was a successful demonstration of technology?**
The Government anticipates selecting one to three technologies for further development depending on performance and suitability.
- 18. If we include PI (appropriately marked), how can we address the requirement to mark a box that confirms there is no proprietary information?**
Mark the Box as you see fit. The Evaluators will be a mixture of Government, military and SETA contractors. We will abide by Trade Secrets Act 18 U.S.C. § 1905.



19. Are you taking submissions for platforms (UxS) that can facilitate these integrations?

Platform submissions may be forwarded to the appropriate Government office; however, the focus of this effort is payload capability rather than platforms.

20. What is the target UxS size, and will these be provided to industry during the competition?

Government-provided platforms will be available during the event. Participants will be given a limited integration window before demonstrations.

21. Do you have a prioritization of specific problems you require solved, or do you have a prioritization of specific capabilities you would like provided?

Focused on detection, classification and localization of RADAR signals. Localization can be direction finding (preferred) or geolocation. This capability will provide maritime domain awareness. Ideally, being able to classify radars helps discern and potentially identify vessels of interest.

22. Considering a different approach and being aware of SWAP, is it acceptable to have a UxS detection payload solution that's in two separate locations?

Yes. Alternative architectures may be considered if they provide operational value.

23. Are you open to a platform-agnostic protocol that can be natively embedded into existing software-defined payloads to handle data control paths at the edge?

The Government indicated that adaptable software-defined approaches may be considered if they provide a strong overall solution.

24. Are you exploring Free Space Optics (FSO) or tactical optical comms for the swarm? Could an mTLS gateway-to-gateway gossip over optics be considered w/o optics?

No. Communications enhancements are outside the primary scope of this effort.

25. What acquisition mechanism or pathway does the government intend to use for an acquisition (direct award, OTA, etc.)?

The anticipated acquisition pathway is through existing Government contracting mechanisms, including IDIQ contracts.

26. How soon after the demonstration does the government intend to make an award?

The evaluation process is expected to take approximately 30 days, with follow-on actions anticipated during the beginning of Fiscal Year 2027.

27. Are the capabilities from the evaluation criteria listed in priority order?

No. Multiple evaluation factors will be considered collectively.

28. Is full 1–20 GHz coverage required for a competitive assessment, or are partial-band payloads acceptable if they show strong detect/classify/localize?

Full-spectrum coverage is preferred, but partial-band solutions may remain competitive if they perform exceptionally well.





29. Are Applicants required to bring a physical platform (USV or otherwise?) to demonstrate their Electronic Intelligence (ELINT) system capability?

No. The Government will provide demonstration platforms.

30. If "Maritime Platform for Demonstration" is provided by the government, when will Applicants have the ability to perform any necessary integration efforts?

Integration will occur during the assessment event, with approximately two to three hours allocated before demonstrations.

31. is data exfiltration from the airborne platform part of this demonstration?

No.

32. Are there desired and/or required detection metrics regarding location accuracy, and would providing analysis data better inform your evaluation?

Yes. Location accuracy is an evaluation factor, and validated performance data will strengthen submissions.

33. Is there interest in training and mission planning?

Yes. Training and mission planning are important capabilities, though not primary evaluation criteria.

34. Are you primarily evaluating standalone payloads, or is distributed sensing and geolocation across multiple UxVs of interest?

The primary focus is standalone payload capability, although distributed sensing remains an area of future interest.

**35. Will mission data be provided? How much support required for data output?
Is SOCOM providing the test infrastructure?**

Selected participants will receive mission information and output expectations following down-selection. Government test infrastructure will be provided.

36. How strong of a desirement is there for Mod Payload form factor?

If not Mod Payload Swap – what are the operational constraints WRT SWaP and Platform types

Modular Payload compliance is highly desirable because it reduces integration complexity and non-recurring engineering requirements. Alternative solutions may still be considered.

37. Is there any interest in lower TRL solutions? or further events that may be more suitable for lower TRL solutions in this area?

Lower-TRL technologies remain of interest for future efforts, although higher-TRL solutions are preferred for this event.





38. How much time will be allowed for integration onto platforms? What is the maximum time allowed for integrations onto platforms?

Approximately two to three hours are planned, with flexibility up to four or five hours if required.

39. Is there a minimum threshold target geo-location accuracy?

Specific geolocation thresholds exist but were not released due to classification and operational sensitivity considerations.

40. Are swarms (3 or more platforms) for collaborative geo under consideration?

Yes, for future applications. Swarm operations will not be evaluated during this event.

41. Is there a maximum payload SWaP?

Allowable SWaP depends on the platform selected. Solutions should remain as close as practical to Modular Payload standards.

42. Are alternative (non-PDW) based methods of signal classification acceptable?

Yes. Alternative approaches that achieve the desired objectives will be considered.

43. If MODPAYLOAD is your focus is there a waterproof RF connector spec available? Is there a preferred vendor that can provide this waterproof RF connector?

For USV application, recommend looking at Mod Payload standard 6.1 section 4.7.7.5.5 RF Cable Waterproofing. The standard can be found @ <https://www.jhuapl.edu/work/publications/mod-payload> . Initial focus of this is for USV. We understand that there is complexity when integrating for undersea applications to include waterproof connectors.

44. Would it be favorable to be interoperable with SOCOM Collaborative Autonomy Software baseline?

Yes. Interoperability would be viewed favorably during evaluations.

45. Assuming large businesses are welcome to bid

Yes. Participation is open regardless of business size.

46. Given the desired information requested by the government in the white paper, can the white paper page limit be increased from the existing 2-pg requirement?

The Government strongly prefers submissions remain within the two-page limit.

47. What is the bandwidth for sensor control off the UxV platform?

Available bandwidth depends on the communications architecture employed, including cellular, Starlink, and other links.

48. Estimated contract award of how many systems? and follow on production quantities and timeframes preferred?





The overall requirement is expected to involve double-digit quantities over time, with deployment desired as soon as practical.

49. The August event is targeting TRL6-7. But you stated that it needs to be operational by Oct/Nov. How many units needs to be available in Oct/Nov?

Specific quantities were not disclosed due to operational sensitivity.

50. What is the desired payload height with respect to ModPayload standard? e.g. 1U, 2U, 3U

A 2U form factor is generally preferred due to platform compatibility.

51. What communication device and data rates will be used?

Communications may include cellular networks, Starlink, MANET radios, and other platform-dependent solutions.

52. Can we provide a turn-key UAS solution - a kamikaze small UAS, which can be placed on naval/air/ground platforms, and can be autonomous antiradar/antiEW seeker

The Government is not seeking UAS strike capabilities under this effort. The focus remains maritime ELINT payloads.

53. If our payload is UAS capability should we hold off submitting for this call since the capability for this call is maritime?

No. UAS-capable solutions may still be submitted and may be relevant to future Government interests.

54. Will platforms be expected to bring cabling or is that on the payload providers?

Payload providers are expected to bring all required cabling and supporting architecture.

55. Is SOCOM interested in submission of classified data with WP? If so, how should this info be submitted?

Classified submissions are not preferred. Coordination may be arranged if classified information is necessary.

56. Can you provide any further details on the radar emitter types to be used during the demo?

Representative maritime radar emitters will be utilized. Specific details will not be released in advance.

57. What is the desired range and weight of the payload?

Payloads should align as closely as practical with Modular Payload standards. Desired operational ranges may extend to approximately 15–20 miles.

58. Will antennas be provided or do vendors bring their own?

Vendors are expected to provide all required antennas.

59. Will Starlink be made available on platform for data exfil?





Yes.

60. What are the specific bands/SOI that you are looking for?

The primary focus is radar and maritime-related signals of interest within the identified frequency ranges.

61. Is the intent to function as a standalone payload to detect, identify, locate, and report, or will payload data be fed into a larger system of systems?

Both concepts are relevant. The payload should be capable of standalone operation while supporting future integration into larger architectures.

62. UAS and USV A-kit integration is vastly different. Should we come prepared with both domains A-kit to support the event.

No. The event will focus solely on maritime platforms.

63. Is it desirable that payloads that can function either separately or collaboratively in swarms?

Yes. Independent operation is preferred, while collaborative operation is considered beneficial.

64. What kind of mounting is available for antennas? Presumably that information would be available in advance of the demo for custom mounting?

Mounting information will be provided to selected participants during integration planning.

65. What radar parameters (for example pulse width), if any, will be available to configure the system for the emitters of interest during the test event?

Parameters such as pulse width, PRI, frequency, and scan rate will be available.

66. Did the RFI intentionally state “will have volatile memory onboard the sensor” or did you mean “nonvolatile”?

The Government clarified that non-volatile memory was intended, while volatile memory considerations relate to data protection requirements.

67. Are you looking for MDF reprogramming to be demonstrated as well? Is that a priority?

No. It is considered beneficial but is not a requirement.

68. Are pulse parameters during the test event expected to be unclassified?

Yes.

69. Is a non-ModPayload SDR sufficient for radar test event, if we have a ModPayload SDR and program to complete our radar DF by Nov for the ModPayload?

Yes.

70. Will IQ or access to the SOI be possible to retrain non-PDW approaches?

No.





- 71. Is there any requirement for cybersecurity accreditation at the demo event? i.e. IATT or ATO?**
No formal accreditation is required for the demonstration event.
- 72. Is communications optimization / data offload / reporting an area of interest by the PEO?**
Yes, but it is not a primary objective of this assessment.
- 73. Where can we find the USSOCOM Modular Payload Standard 6.1 to ensure we're compliant?**
The standard is publicly available through the reference identified in the RFI.
- 74. Are mod payload standard mounts available on the platform for antennae?**
Yes.
- 75. In GPS denied environments, can we rely on UxV platforms to provide dead reckoning and best-guess position/nav/timing over MP standard interfaces?**
Such capabilities may be available in future integration efforts but will not be provided for this event.
- 76. Upon hearing downselect, will vendors be told what platforms their payloads will be assigned to to help expedite integration?**
Yes.
- 77. Are the platform USV only or are there UUV targets (can present cooling challenges and antenna mounting challenges)?**
The assessment event will utilize USVs only. Future efforts may consider UUV integration.
- 78. Is data exfiltration from the USV platform part of this demo?**
Yes.
- 79. Is SOCOM Collaborative Autonomy Software ICD made available prior to test event? ICD?**
Potentially, on a case-by-case basis. It is not a primary focus area for this event.
- 80. Is data minimization (e.g. compression) before exfiltration of interest?**
Yes. Efficient data handling is considered beneficial.
- 81. Can the white paper font size be reduced to 10pt for tables, figures, etc.?**
Yes.
- 82. Is there interest for new UUVs/UUV platforms in addition to the modular payloads being requested?**
The current effort is focused on payload capabilities rather than platforms.
- 83. For USV integration of Mod Payload solutions, does the payload vendor need to provide waterproofing, or will that be provided by the USV vendor or SOCOM?**
Waterproofing responsibilities will be coordinated during integration planning.





84. For the sake of the demo, will waterproofing be evaluated or can we resolve that during real platform integration after award?

Waterproofing is not a primary evaluation criterion and may be addressed during later integration efforts.

85. Will PNT and GPS be provided to the payload?

Yes.

86. Are there going to be weather/sea state limits on the demo day?

Yes. Safety considerations will govern demonstration conditions.

87. Is 20 GHz a threshold or objective? If threshold, are there objective SOIs > 20 GHz?

Twenty gigahertz is the desired threshold. Capabilities beyond that range are considered advantageous.

88. if downselected, will we need to attend the entire week of 3-7 August or will we given a more specific date and time for assessment?

Participants will be assigned a specific date and time and should expect to attend one to two days.

89. Is there a schedule that can be shared for integration and TRR that leads to the demo event?

Detailed coordination and scheduling will occur following down-selection.

90. Is there an INS on board?

INS data may be available depending on the selected platform.

91. Is the localization capability as direction finding only, or is the gov seeking a full geolocation capability that estimates the emitter's position/coordinates?

Direction finding is valuable. Full geolocation capability is considered a significant enhancement.

92. Are classified solutions prohibited due to the exposed/unmanned environment?

No. Classified solutions are permitted but are not preferred.

93. How many technologies are you planning to downselect?

The Government intends to select at least five technologies and may select up to ten.

94. If DFis a plus, localization on this initial event is interpreted as just confirming the freq is only present?

Localization is intended to identify the direction from which a signal originates. Geolocation capability provides additional value.

95. What is a supplier only provides one portion of the solution is that not desired?





Complete solutions are preferred; however, exceptional subsystem capabilities may still be considered.

96. What other factors could be advantageous beyond those stated in the RFI?

Additional value may be provided through future growth potential, support for additional signals of interest, advanced data collection, and expanded operational utility.

97. Can the government clarify whether volatile memory requirements are driven by anti-tamper concerns, platform loss, cyber resilience, or mission flexibility?

The requirement is primarily associated with protecting sensitive information in situations involving platform loss or capture.

