

**DARPA-PA-24-04-08 CLOAK**  
**Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**  
**as of 04/10/2025**

4Q: Request clarification regarding the cost categories tabs in the budget workbook for the CLOAK program, DARPA-EA-24-08. We have included costs for Materials and Supplies in the budget; however, we didn't find a dedicated M&S tab in the DARPA streamlined cost workbook. Could you confirm whether Materials and Supplies are allowable under this program? We didn't see any specific restrictions regarding M&S in the BAA. If they're allowable, should these costs be listed under the ODC line with a corresponding breakdown provided in the Volume II Cost Proposal?

Additionally, the BAA advises budgeting for two types of meetings: biannual two-day PI meetings and quarterly progress reviews, both of which are indicated to be virtual and therefore not expected to incur travel expenses. However, since the budget workbook includes a travel tab, should we plan for an in-person kickoff meeting under travel?

4A: Materials and Supplies are allowable costs under this program. While the streamlined workbook doesn't have a dedicated M&S tab, please include these costs under the Other Direct Costs (ODC) line item within the workbook. Ensure a detailed breakdown of the M&S costs is provided within your Volume II Cost Proposal, justifying the types and quantities of materials required for your proposed research.

The DO specify virtual PI meetings and quarterly progress reviews. Therefore, you should not include travel costs for these meetings. Regarding the kickoff meeting, while the workbook includes a travel tab, the kickoff meeting for Phase 1 is also expected to be virtual. Consequently, do not budget for travel expenses related to the kickoff meeting.

-----As of 04/04/2025-----

3Q: Our company requires extra time for fixed price contract review and approval by leadership. Is it possible for us to submit all we have (technical volume and cost volume) on April 14 with a statement that this fixed price costing is pending on internal risk review and leadership approval, which will be completed prior to the award?

3A: No. The document explicitly states, "DARPA's goal for this DO is to achieve an award within 98 calendar days from the posting date (March 7, 2025) of this announcement. To ensure that, DARPA reserves the right to cease negotiations when an award is not executed by both parties (DARPA and the selected organization) on or before June 13, 2025." This implies a very tight timeline, and submitting incomplete cost information would likely disqualify your proposal. The solicitation emphasizes speed and adherence to deadlines. Internal review and approval must be completed before the submission deadline. The language regarding accepting the model OT agreement as-is unless edits are proposed reinforces this strict adherence to the timeline.

2Q: Please clarify if performers are required to "provide a functional CLOAK-coated microsystem for accelerated aging testing and evaluation at the end of Month 22 of Phase 2" to DARPA or a third-party or are performers only required to execute the tests themselves and report on those results without turning in the hardware?

2A: The proposal states: "Provide a functional CLOAK-coated microsystem for accelerated aging testing and evaluation at the end of Month 22 of Phase 2." And later: "Complete a comprehensive analysis of the system..., and submission of a final report detailing the results." This strongly suggests that while the performer conducts the testing, a functional microsystem must be provided to DARPA (or potentially a designated third-party testing facility) at Month 22 of Phase 2. This allows for independent validation of the results reported in the final report. Simply reporting results without providing the physical device is unlikely to be sufficient.

1Q: Is CLOAK exclusively for MEMS position and navigation sensors but not for timing sensors?

1A: While the primary focus of CLOAK is on position and navigation sensors, particularly for GPS-denied environments, the call doesn't explicitly exclude timing sensors. The document mentions that the metrics for CLOAK are different from those for clocks, indicating an awareness of timing applications. The key objective is to mitigate drift and aging in MEMS resonators. If your approach for timing sensors addresses this objective and fits within the other specified parameters (e.g., silicon as the mechanical material, operation below 50 kHz), it could be considered. However, you would need to clearly articulate how the proposed technology applies to timing sensors and justify its relevance to the overall goals of the program within the proposal. Highlighting the potential dual-use capabilities of the technology could strengthen your application, but don't assume timing is the primary focus.