U.S. ARMY

PEO IEW&S

The following questions were posed during the AIDP-NEXT virtual Industry Day on 12 February 2026

PM TS:

Q1: What is the requirement of AIDP to enable actionable intelligence? For example, send a digital call for fire to a field artillery unit that doesn't have to be "swivel chaired" to be executed, or imagery for a maneuver force to receive real time updates on enemy disposition and location?

A1: The Government will release a Draft and Final Call For Solutions (CFS) that will address the objectives for this effort.

Q2: What is the timeline from NET/NEF to full integration with the MICOE school houses for training new Soldiers on the system? My sources tell me up to 4 years. If this is the case what is the plan to address the delta gap for training Soldiers on the system at the unit once a NET/ NEF is completed and a subsequent PCS cycle renders that training null from personnel turnover?

A2: The school house is focused on training analysts on the tasks and functions themselves versus learning a system. The future intent is to have NET training available but also have the vendor provide a UI that is innovative and doesn't require weeks of training to enable an analyst to perform their workflows.

Q3: Written list for mentioned regulation and documents

A3: Reference Army Publication Website for latest version publications: https://armypubs.army.mil/

1. FM 2-0 Intelligence
2. ATP 2-33.4 Intelligence Analysis
3. ATP 2-01.3 Intelligence preparation of the Operational Environment
4. ATP 2.01 Collection Management
5. FM 3-60 Army Targeting (CJCSI 3370.-1C Target Development Standards; CJCSI 3162.02A Methodology for Combat Assessment)
6. ADP 3.37 Protection (FM 2-0 provides intel specificity to protection)

Q4: What requirements does AIDP have to enable actionable intel without "swivel chair ops"? For example sensor to shooter to phase 1 and 2 BDA all being sent through compatible digital messages across the WFF.

A4: The intent for AIDP is to seamlessly make data available to and consume data from current and future fires and mission command systems.

Q5: What is the frequency of Soldier Touch Points for this project? Do you anticipate engineers/developers coming to home station, users coming to the engineers, a little of both?

A5: Depending on the delivery schedule, we intend to have maximum user involvement, however, not in the form of formal Solider Touch Points.

Q6: Is there any interest in exploring current SBIR contracts in support of an AIDP-NEXT solution? We have a solid head start on these initiatives through an existing SBIR Topic Award that is currently in Phase III.

A6: Any company that submits a white paper will be evaluated and considered. Vendors are encouraged to highlight their capabilities.

Q7: How will the intel production requirements differ for users on edge devices given compute constraints, versus when they're able to operate in the cloud?

A7: Scalability of AIDP capabilities to operate within the compute footprint and user interface are critical components of this effort. The refinement of tasks and parameters for edge computing environments will be addressed in the future

Q8: Is hardware procurement part of the initial or a future delivery?

A8: Any hardware procurement is separate from this CSO

Q9: Fantastic presentation, is there going to be a schedule provided on when industry partners can expect to see draft SOO and RFPs? And will the AIDP team request industry feedback on these documents like the NGC2 program has done?

A9: We expect to release a draft Call for Solutions in early March, to be followed by a final release in late March/April 2026 timeframe informed by the feedback. Prototype contract awards are planned for June 2026. We anticipate initiating the CSO process for applications and services in FY27.

Q10: Does the AIDP team anticipate running concurrent prototypes via OTA's to integrate multiple capabilities like the NGC2 program has done?

A10: The strategy is to award 1 or more prototype contracts for the Data Platform. The actual prototyping effort will have a different focus/scope as compared to NGC2 and will result in a single award for the AIDP Data Platform within 12 months of prototype contract start.

Q11: To what extent will the AIDP program office facilitate industry teaming arrangements?

A11: Addressed in brief and available on the slides. The extent of the Government facilitation of teaming is gathering the information and posting it on sam.gov.

Q12: Do you want our team to provide a COOP solution within our product?

A12: The government is looking to leverage the services provided by commercial cloud providers to deliver the COOP abilities. A successful solution will be capable of taking advantage of those services natively to provide redundancy and backup at the cloud services layer. The specific level of COOP will be defined during prototyping but likely targeting Impact Level "Moderate" under the NIST/FedRAMP model.PM TS:

Q13: What is the lowest echelon that will be supported by the capabilities developed as part of the AIDP Next initiative?

A13: Battalion

Q14: Why would you use an SDK prone to the SaaS subscription model when that very model is untenable long term?

A14: Consistent with a performance-based approach, the Government is not prescribing a specific

solution/model. Industry is encouraged to propose an approach that best meets the objectives described.

Q15: A few questions related to vendor-lock in. Is the Army concerned about vendor-lock in as it relates to the overall solution? Is the Army requiring the solution to enable any part of the overall capability to be able to be replaced so that they can take advantage of the best available technology without massive re-writes and/or chasing a new solution every 5 years?

A15: Yes, the Government recognizes the risk of a vendor-lock and periodic large-scale requirement rewrites due to technology evolution. To mitigate this, the program is emphasizing modular, flexible architecture that enables incremental updates and adaptability to emerging technologies. At various points throughout the prototyping phase, we will ask the vendor to conduct self-assessments around establishing the environment, modular design, key interfaces, open standards, and the government will certify conformance through technical test activities in a lab environment

Q16: What is the role of the Hydra API within AIDP-Next? Will it be the required open standard for data sharing?

A16: AIDP requires Modular Open Systems Architecture along with well documented APIs and SDKs to enable 3rd Party Integration into the platform. Hydra is the current government defined OpenAPI that is used to exchange intelligence products and conduct workflows to build Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment (IPOE) products that will be within scope of the prototyping phase. Additional open interfaces and standards will likely be required like those from the Open Geospatial Consortium (OGC) and the Integrated Sensor Architecture (ISA). The details of these interfaces will be included in the bidders library.

Q17: Can we receive a list/overview of tools and capabilities currently in AIDP to assist industry teaming to enhance interoperability?

A17: Our Draft Call for Solutions will include the objectives for the next iteration of AIDP. As stated in the briefing, the next iteration of AIDP may look entirely different than the current AIDP tool and all responsive solutions will be considered.

Q18: Will the government provide access to AIDP that will enable companies that do not currently have access to ensure solutions meet the Army's needs/ challenges? Thinking about challenge areas such as common UX, and ensuring doctrinal workflows, etc.

A18: Offerors are expected to propose an approach based on the information and objectives provided in the final CFS.

Q19: AIDP is software, how is the tactical compute, communications, and security hardware selected and procured?

A19: The Government intends the solution to be platform-agnostic. Offerors should propose architectures that are portable across compliant platforms without requiring redesign.

Q20: How does AIDP-NEXT integrate or interact with the current AIDP & TWB solution?

A20: The next iteration of AIDP (prototype) will be separate from the current AIDP solution.

Q21: With message and data types becoming more vendor specific is there any forecasted interoperability with USMTF (MIL-STD-6040/6018) for Joint and Combined interoperability?

A21: The goal of the AIDP-Next effort is to not use vendor specific messages/exchanges, so we maintain modularity & openness for third party integration of applications and analytics in follow-on announcements. The Hydra API is one way the government is doing this; the government defines the interface and data model to exchange products & collaborate on workflows. The vendor still performs

the implementation the best way possible for their product offering. The interfaces of external systems AIDP-Next needs to exchange with PM IS&A has little control over; we need a flexible way to ingress & egress data in new formats/interfaces as they arise.