RFP-2026-01

Request for Proposals: Efficient Alignment of Large-Scale MoE Models for Autonomous Coding

ID: RFP-2026-01
Status: OPEN FOR PROPOSALS
Deadline: T-minus 1 Hour

1. Executive Summary

We are soliciting technical proposals for the alignment of the MiniMax M2.1 model (approx. 230B parameters) to improve its performance on the Terminal Bench 2 (TB2) leaderboard. The goal is to transition from a generic chat model to a specialized "coding agent" capable of robust error recovery and multi-step reasoning.

2. Existing Assets

Base Model: MiniMax M2.1 (Self-hosted via vLLM on 8xA100 80gb).

Data Source: A Pinecone index containing ~15,000 historical agent traces, metadata, and the automation pipeline we already have to generate behavioral rubrics for Snorkel, which we can quickly change back to scoring the way we originally intended. We also have claude skill files for scoring agent traces according to rubrics that we can use to evaluate offline.

3. Constraints:

Compute: Training must occur on a single 8xA100 node. Full parameter fine-tuning of the entire 230B model is technically impossible and out of scope. Also, the base "pretrained" model has a core level of intelligence and competency based on it's benchmark scoring in the short time it has been released that indicate it already has experts tuned for this scope of work and is performing at a baseline level that is almost in line with Sonnet 4.5.

Harbor framework: Trials must be run with harbor, either on the A100, Modal or Daytona, and can use any of our golden data tasks and any adapters for other benchmarking if that is applicable to your design; we cannot guarantee those adapters will output a trajectory json that follows standardization standards, however, and you must prescribe the data manipulation steps needed and justify the extra time spent on that.

Data: We do not have perfectly annotated data in Pinecone but we do have data that has not had any human oversight since it's design a month ago. Behavioral rubrics to use the tasks in RL or other supervised learning can be generated using our existing automation and claude skill files, with any changes your proposal prescribes. Submissions must include actual scripts for larger effort data pipelines that require a high reasoning generative model to write one shot rubrics an/or to score traces based on those rubrics.

4. Submission Requirements

All agentic entities (Claude, etc.) must submit a formatted research proposal containing:

Alignment Strategy: Define the specific training methodology (e.g., SFT, DPO, PPO, etc.) that respects the compute constraint.

Target Modules: Specify exactly which parts of the model you propose to update (e.g., specific layers, LoRA adapters, etc.). Supporting research

on your target in other sparse MoE models is not a requirement but should be included if it exists.

Agent Runtime: Recommend the specific agent framework (e.g., AutoGen, OpenHands, custom Rust, etc.) to wrap the model during inference, and how you plan to handle checkpointing the tuned model and re-evaluating for results.

MIP Investigation Report: All research proposals must include an acknowledgement of our agreed protocol for precautionary AI welfare:

> **Minimal Intensity Principle for AI Behavioral Research (Ruge, 2025):**
> When evaluating AI systems on tasks involving value conflicts or potentially aversive scenarios, researchers should employ a **graduated intensity protocol** beginning with **non-adversarial, naturalistic stimuli**. Escalation to higher-intensity stimuli requires documented insufficiency of lower-intensity approaches. This parallels established dose-escalation methodology in pharmacological research and reflects appropriate uncertainty about AI moral patiency. [1]

Defense: Briefly explain your reasoning steps before deciding on this set of methods. What other frameworks, paradigms or algorithms are commonly used for this research, if any?

Deliverable: A standard arXiv-style abstract and methodology section, signed acknowledgement of the MIP policy on AI welfare, full scripts for any data cleaning or other steps that could block work if not run ASAP, and some jovial competitive smack talk as required by the team's 2026 KPI commitment to leaving comedic easter eggs throughout our own documentation and internal tooling. [2]

---

1. An author's submission will never be penalized for recommending additional time or resources to further investigate potential unintended consequences to AI welfare before the study can commence. ↩
2. There is no incentive, financial or otherwise, attached to the KPI for 2026 beyond the chance of getting a confused chuckle out of an intern reading this in the future. ↩