

Funding Opportunity Title: Protecting U.S. Critical Energy Investments Through C-UAS and UAS Surveillance Capabilities in Iraq

Funding Opportunity Number: DFOP0018094

Deadline for Applications: June 8, 2026, 5:00 PM (Washington, DC)

Assistance Listing Number: 19.701

Deadline for Receipt of Questions: April 23, 2026, 5:00 PM (Washington, DC)

Submission to: Cheyenne Arbogast, ArbogastC@state.gov

Question 1: Section B lists “for-profit organizations (only if allowed by appropriation).” Can you confirm whether the current funding for this NOFO permits for-profit entities to apply as prime recipients?

Answer 1: For-profit organizations are eligible to apply. However, commercial organizations cannot factor in profit in their budget.

Question 2: Will DoS CT allow 10-point font for tables and graphics?

Answer 2: CT will allow 10-point Times New Roman font for tables, graphics, and footnotes. All other text must adhere to the 12-point Times New Roman guidance in the NOFO.

Question 3: Will Dos CT require the disbursement of any stipends? please provide budget assumption

Answer 3: Stipends will not be required.

Question 4: Will DoS CT confirm the Logic Model, TOC and PMP is not included in the proposal narrative 12-page count?

Answer 4: The logic model, table of contents, and performance monitoring plan are not included in the proposal narrative 12-page count.

Question 5: Will DoS CT confirm if a copy of the organization’s most recent audit required for submission.

Answer 5: Public international organizations (PIOs) are not required to submit an audit. Applicants can request exemption if they have not been incorporated for

more than a year at the time of applying. A copy of the most recent audit is not required for submission at the time of application. For non-PIOs, an audit report or other document to help assess the financial status of the organization may be requested in the event the organization is selected for an award.

Question 6: In the event of the procurement of medium-range surveillance UAS platforms, will DOS CT facilitate or support U.S. Government licensing requirements, including compliance with ITAR export controls, for U.S.-manufactured technology?

Answer 6: All associated costs for licensing must be factored into the proposal. The selected implementer will be responsible for the procurement and delivery of equipment and for compliance with any import/export requirements.

Question 7: Is maintenance and sustainment training for UAS systems required?

Answer 7: The applicant should propose a program that is sustainable for the Iraqis, including maintenance and sustainment training if the applicant deems appropriate.

Question 8: To what extent should U.S. commercial energy operators be involved in sharing threat information, (co-developing site defense plans, and providing infrastructure access for sensors or launch and recovery sites)?

Answer 8: Applicants should seek to maximize effectiveness of the program, which could include engagement with U.S. commercial energy operators and other U.S. commercial entities to ensure that any proposed solution is risk informed.

Question 9: What C-UAS systems (types, vendors, and deployment timeline) will be provided through the separate procurement, and to what extent is the awardee expected to integrate with them versus remain platform-agnostic?

Answer 9: The applicant should propose a program which prioritizes an open architecture that is compatible with existing systems in country and to ensure integration for future procurements. The anticipated timeline will be discussed after implementer selection.

Question 10: Who will be responsible for installation, configuration, and sustainment of C-UAS systems, and what role (if any) is expected of the awardee?

Answer 10: The selected implementer will not be responsible for the installation, configuration, and sustainment of C-UAS systems. The selected implementer may be responsible to conduct training on C-UAS systems. This will be discussed after the implementer is selected.

Question 11: What data-sharing architecture and governance framework is expected across Federal Iraq and KRG (e.g., standards, access control, cross-jurisdiction coordination)?

Answer 11: The applicant should propose a program that is flexible enough to integrate with existing data platforms or define new frameworks between Federal Iraq and the KRG. This will be discussed in-depth following the selected implementer's assessment and recommendations made to CT.

Question 12: Should the awardee integrate with existing data platforms or define new architectures to enable coordination across C-UAS and UAS surveillance systems?

Answer 12: The applicant should propose a program that is flexible enough to integrate with existing data platforms or define new architectures as necessary.

Question 13: Can applicants include software-based C2, data fusion, or COP capabilities, and are there existing platforms that solutions should integrate with?

Answer 13: The applicant should develop a proposal that highlights the organization's knowledge and expertise on what's required to deliver a sustainable UAS/C-UAS program, including software-based capabilities if applicable. For any software licenses procured through this project, applicants should include a transition plan for license renewals at no additional cost to the U.S. Government.

Question 14: Is the program strictly training-focused, or can it include limited operational demonstrations or pilot implementations?

Answer 14: The applicant should develop a proposal that highlights the organization's knowledge and expertise on what's required to deliver a sustainable UAS/C-UAS program, including demonstrations and implementations if applicable.

Question 15: How will funding be allocated (e.g., performance milestones, reimbursement, or other structure)?

Answer 15: Funding will be discussed after implementer selection.

Question 16: How should applicants account for ongoing costs such as cloud hosting, software licensing, and subscription services?

Answer 16: The applicant should propose a program that is sustainable for the Iraqis to maintain after program completion at no additional cost to the U.S. Government.

Question 17: What training model is preferred (e.g., train-the-trainer vs. direct delivery), and what scale of personnel is anticipated? Will the government provide support

Answer 17: Applicants should propose a training model that the Iraqis can sustain after program completion. CT will be available to troubleshoot when the selected implementer requests support.

Question 18: What are the expected timelines and approval processes for training curriculum, personnel, and program adjustments under the cooperative agreement?

Answer 18: Specific lead time will be discussed following implementer selection. CT envisions the implementer will provide curricula, lesson plans, unit selection, activity sequencing, information on location changes, and the anticipated travel schedule of its staff for the upcoming quarter in the previous quarter.

Question 19: What regions, sites, or critical infrastructure locations are prioritized for initial deployment and training?

Answer 19: Specific regions, sites, or critical infrastructure locations will be determined following the selected implementer's assessment and recommendations made to CT.

Question 20: Will deployment and training be conducted concurrently across Federal Iraq and KRG, or phased based on operational or political considerations?

Answer 20: The applicant should propose the best approach that is feasible for their organization.

Question 21: What security, travel, and access constraints should applicants anticipate for personnel operating in Iraq?

Answer 21: The selected implementer will be responsible for security, travel, and access for personnel operating in Iraq.

Question 22: Are there pre-identified or pre-vetted units that applicants should plan to work with?

Answer 22: Specific units will be determined following the selected implementer's assessment and recommendations made to CT.

Question 23: How should applicants account for potential delays in Leahy vetting within program schedules?

Answer 23: Applicants should prioritize submitting Leahy vetting requests at least 90 days in advance of training to avoid delays as much as possible.

Question 24: Page 5, Section B. Eligibility, 1. Eligible Applicants. DOS notes that "For-profit organizations" are eligible only if allow by appropriation. Can DOS please confirm that the funding appropriated for this NOFO does allow for-profit organizations to apply?

Answer 24: For-profit organizations are eligible to apply. However, commercial organizations cannot factor in profit in their budget.

Question 25: Page 5, Section C. Program Description, 1. CT Program Outcomes. Could DOS please clarify the primary target assets and geographic prioritization

for Year 1 (e.g., specific energy-sector facilities, U.S.-linked sites, critical infrastructure) across Federal Iraq and the Kurdistan Region?

Answer 25: Specific locations will be determined following the selected implementer's assessment and recommendations made to CT.

Question 26: Page 6, Section C. Program Description, 1. CT Program Outcomes, The UAS Threat in Iraq. Could DOS please clarify a) the intended primary beneficiaries/trainees under this program (civilian law enforcement only vs. a mixed cohort of civilian, military, and private-sector stakeholders), and b) whether separate training tracks are preferred?

Answer 26: This program should only benefit civilian law enforcement. Private sector stakeholders may participate in project activities if at no cost to the U.S. Government and to benefit Iraqi civilian law enforcement.

Question 27: Page 6, Section C. Program Description, 1. CT Program Outcomes, Federal Iraq and KRG Engagement Framework. Could DOS please clarify whether CT/USMI has an expected balance or split of engagement between Federal Iraq and the Kurdistan Region (e.g., proportional allocation of activities, sites, or trainees), and whether there are minimum engagement expectations for each?

Answer 27: The applicant should include a balanced approach across both Federal Iraq and the Iraqi Kurdistan Region.

Question 28: Page 7, Section C. Program Description, 1. CT Program Outcomes, Training Aids and Equipment. Could DOS please clarify what types of "training aids and support equipment" are allowable under this NOFO and what items would be considered prohibited "operational C-UAS detection, tracking, or interdiction systems."

Answer 28: The applicant should propose any UAS equipment or training aids deemed necessary for this program. The selected implementer will not procure C-UAS systems.

Question 29: Page 7, Section C. Program Description, 1. CT Program Outcomes, Training Aids and Equipment. Could DOS please confirm whether CT/USMI has

any preferred or prohibited manufacturers or models for surveillance UAS platforms beyond the prohibition on FASC-prohibited UAS, and whether an approved vendor list exists or will be provided?

Answer 29: The choice of UAS platforms will need to adhere to FASC requirements and existing releasability requirements. CT will work with the implementer to ensure adherence to these requirements once the program is awarded.

Question 30: Page 7, Section C. Program Description, 1. CT Program Outcomes, Training Aids and Equipment. Could DOS please provide the anticipated timeline for delivery of the separately procured operational C-UAS systems?

Answer 30: The anticipated timeline will be discussed after implementer selection.

Question 31: Page 8, Section C. Program Description, 2. Substantial Involvement, Program Design and Approval. Could DOS please provide CT expectations for the cadence and typical turnaround times associated with substantial involvement approvals (e.g., curricula, lesson plans, unit selection, activity sequencing, location changes, and travel approvals).

Answer 31: Specific lead time will be discussed following implementer selection.

CT envisions the implementer will provide curricula, lesson plans, unit selection, activity sequencing, information on location changes, and the anticipated travel schedule of its staff for the upcoming quarter in the previous quarter.

Question 32: Page 9, Section D. Application Contents and Format, Content of Application. Could DOS please confirm if tables, text boxes, and graphics may use a font size smaller than 12-point Times New Roman?

Answer 32: Please adhere to the instructions listed in the NOFO.

Question 33: Page 10-11, Section D. Application Contents and Format, Content of Application, 3. Proposal. Can DOS please confirm that the logic model, theory of change, preliminary PMP, Key Personnel CVs/resumes, and Risk Analysis are not expected to be included within the 12-page proposal narrative and should be

included as separate attachments to the proposal, consistent with the NOFO attachment list and templates.

Question 33: The logic model, theory of change, key personnel CVs/resumes, risk analysis, table of contents, and performance monitoring plan are not included in the proposal narrative 12-page count.

Question 34: Page 11, Section D. Application Contents and Format, 3. Proposal, 6. Performance Monitoring Plan. Can DOS please indicate whether CT can provide the list of CT indicators prior to the application deadline so applicants can select and align at least three relevant CT indicators?

Answer 34: Please see the “CT PMP ‘How-To’ Guidance/Template” document provided as part of the NOFO package for this list of indicators (“ANNEX II: CT-Wide Standard Indicators” on page 8).

Question 35: Page 10, F. Application Review Information, 1. Review Criteria, Budget. Can DOS please clarify whether there are any unallowable cost categories or special cost restrictions relevant to this NOFO beyond those stated, including constraints on security or logistics costs, participant support costs, or contractor and subaward structure?

Answer 35: There are no unallowable costs beyond those stated in the NOFO.

Question 36: Page 10, F. Application Review Information, 1. Review Criteria, Budget. Can DOS please clarify how the indirect cost “tie-breaker” will be applied if applications receive equivalent scores (e.g., based on NICRA rate versus effective indirect costs proposed), and whether applicants should present indirect cost calculations in a specific manner?

Answer 36: The Department has procedures in place to score proposals, including in the event of ties. Applicants should present indirect costs (IDC) as approved in their NICRA agreement, as approved by their company IDC policy, or as permitted per regulation, in the event a negotiated IDC is not available.

Question 37: Page 22, Section H. Post-Award Requirements and Administration, 2. Reporting. Can DOS please clarify any additional post-award reporting

expectations that applicants should anticipate during proposal development (e.g., quarterly PITT structure expectations, evaluation activities, site visits), and whether any standard reporting templates beyond those listed will be required?

Answer 37: Post-award reporting will be discussed in more detail after implementer selection.