

**Universal Service Administrative Co. (USAC)
RFP IT-26-139 - AI Consulting and Support Services
Questions & Answers**

Note: USAC received multiple identical or highly similar questions from different offerors. To streamline the review process and reduce redundancy, some repetitive questions were not included in this final list.

Q#	Question	Answer
1.	Location of Performance / On-Site Cadence (Section B.4): The RFP notes a general expectation that Contractor Staff be on-site at USAC's Washington, DC headquarters at least two days per week, while also indicating USAC may approve virtual work or another location at its sole discretion. Given this engagement is strategic and assessment-based, governance review, roadmap development, and an executive briefing, rather than day-to-day systems or IT operations work, would USAC consider a cadence built around scheduled on-site observation and working sessions (kickoff, key milestones, and the Executive Briefing), with discovery and analysis conducted remotely between those visits? We are glad to travel to Washington, DC regularly for this engagement and want to propose a structure that keeps us close to your team without requiring a fixed twice-weekly presence for the full four-month term.	Yes, USAC does not require regular weekly presence of the contractor employee at USAC's office for performance of the contract services. However, it is USAC's preference to hold key meetings such as Executive Briefing and Final Readout in person at USAC's office. Offerors may propose their preferred onsite schedule as part of their proposal. In person attendance is not mandatory but preferred.
2.	(Section E.6.C.3) Each reference must include a contract number. For commercial or non-federal engagements where no contract number was assigned, is a purchase order number, task order number, or engagement identifier acceptable?	Yes
3.	What is USAC's anticipated award date and Effective Date for the four-month Contract Term?	The award date will be October 2026. USAC does not have a specific date.
4.	Would it be acceptable for the work of this contract to be performed totally remotely, as long as all services are performed within the United States, as required?	See question #1
5.	Does executive leadership already have success metrics for the engagement? If so, are you willing to share those metrics and success criteria?	While the AI Executive team has drafted some success metrics, we are looking for this vendor to provide their insights and industry best practices to help refine them.
6.	What insights, lessons learned, and success metrics have emerged from current Microsoft Copilot pilot users, and how are those insights shaping enterprise-wide deployment plans?	USAC is currently piloting the implementation of Copilot.
7.	Are there data classifications beyond what is described in the confidentiality requirements?	The categories that apply are USAC Data, Confidential Information, and PII as defined in Section C.16 and the Privacy and Security Addendum. Any additional internal handling or labeling requirements will be provided at the Kick-Off Meeting.
8.	Does the pilot recommendation require a business case and ROI estimates?	Yes. The Pilot Recommendation should include a business case with an estimated value or return hypothesis, the risk profile, data and compliance dependencies, governance controls, success measures, prerequisites, and a high-level implementation plan

		sufficient for USAC to decide whether to initiate the pilot. Building, configuring, deploying, or operating the pilot is not in scope under this Contract.
9.	Will USAC identify meetings that may be recorded using approved native teleconference functionality? When recording is prohibited, will USAC provide meeting transcripts, summaries, or other approved artifacts for project documentation?	All AI Governance meetings have detail meeting notes, risks and decisions documented. These will be provided to the incoming vendor to help them get up to speed.
10.	If an offeror identifies a proposed subcontractor, workshare, personnel, and responsibilities in its proposal, will contract award constitute USAC's consent to that subcontractor, or will a separate consent request still be required at least 30 days before subcontract performance?	The contract award will constitute USAC's consent to that subcontractor,
11.	Whether an offeror with fewer than two directly relevant contracts will receive a neutral past-performance rating rather than an unfavorable one.	USAC requires that the offeror must submit two (2) to three (3) current or recently completed contracts for services similar in scope to those required by this solicitation
12.	Who is the incumbent vendor currently providing similar services? Is the incumbent vendor allowed to participate in this RFP?	This is a new requirement. No incumbent vendor.
13.	Is county open to an offshore-blended delivery model, and are there any data residency or US-only staffing restrictions?	No
14.	We ask USAC to Allow COI statements and mitigation plans to be excluded from the Volume 1 4 page limit and submit as an appendix to Volume 1	No
15.	Which business units, programs, and support functions are in scope, and how does USAC want them prioritized?	All programs and divisions are in scope for AI implementation. The AI Governance Committee understands the usage and value may differ not only by division but also by team. Initially USC is looking to start with lower-risk AI implementation and not use AI for direct USF program administration at this time, but may expand use to USF administration as comfort levels increase.
16.	How many stakeholder interviews, workshops, and executive readouts does USAC expect within the four-month fixed-price engagement?	USAC is anticipating around 2-3 weeks of current state analysis, given much work has already been documented and this time would be spent clarifying and doing any deep dive sessions.
17.	Since the contract is Firm-Fixed-Price and travel is included in the price, can USAC provide an estimate of the expected number of in-person meetings or anticipated travel requirements during the four-month engagement?	See questions #1
18.	How should PM@USAC be applied to this strategic consulting engagement?	PM@USAC requires all projects to have a charter, project schedule and conduct lessons learn.
19.	How many draft and final briefing sessions should offerors include in the FFP?	Offerors should propose. USAC expects one Executive Briefing and Final Readout to the AI Executive Committee, with a draft version provided for review in advance of the final session.
20.	Discovery volume: Please provide an estimate of the number of stakeholder interviews or workshops, participating business and functional groups, and existing documents or artifacts expected to be reviewed.	See question #16
21.	Conflicts of interest: For purposes of disclosure, does ordinary-course commercial activity with a USF	Offerors must determine if they have any potential conflict of interest.

	contributor, beneficiary, service provider, applicant, or USAC technology vendor constitute a potential conflict, and what mitigation measures does USAC generally consider acceptable?	
22.	Would USAC consider granting an extension to the proposal submission deadline?	No. The Proposal Due Date remains September 30, 2026 at 11:00 AM ET. If any date changes, USAC will post a notice on its website as described in Section E.1.E.
23.	Are the cover page and table of contents excluded from the overall page count limit?	Yes, See RFP Section E for more information.
24.	How many end user devices and servers do you have in your environment?	USAC is not providing device or server counts in this solicitation. The technology readiness assessment is an enterprise architecture and AI enablement review, not an asset-level inventory.
25.	How many total users (user identities) exist in your environment, and of that population how many are W2 employees vs independent contractors vs outsourced entities constitute that number	USAC is not providing identity population data in this solicitation. Workforce information relevant to the Readiness Assessment will be made available at the Kick-Off Meeting.
26.	Are there any key outsourcing arrangements whereby we would need to coordinate with and potentially interview Third Parties in order to execute the discovery and analysis components of this engagement? How many entities and what role do those entities play?	Interviews under this engagement will be with USAC personnel. USAC does not expect the Contractor to interview third parties. If a third-party discussion becomes necessary, it will be arranged through the USAC point of contact.
27.	You mentioned some Use Case development, are you able to share the formal taxonomy currently leveraged and examples of those Use Cases as well as the total number? What business functions map to the Use Cases?	The Use Cases are a means in which the AI Executive Committee is currently collecting AI ideas from USAC staff. These Use Case are reviewed by the AI Core PMO team and once a decision is made, it is communicated to the requestor. Use Cases are providing more insights into how, where and prioritization of future AI implementation.
28.	Has USAC identified potential pilot candidates, or should the Contractor identify and prioritize them?	While the AI Executive Committee has ideas, the hope is the Contractor would help provide their insights.
29.	Are the Kick-Off Meeting and the Executive Briefing and Final Readout expected to be delivered in person at USAC Headquarters?	Yes, see Q #1. Key meetings are required to be in person and these are such examples.
30.	What outcomes would USAC consider most important at the end of the four-month engagement?	USAC is looking for a realistic AI governance and implementation roadmap that will support a successful and accepted adoption of AI and meet strategic goals.
31.	Could USAC clarify whether experience performed for a commercial client in a regulated industry may be considered relevant even if the client was not subject to federal funding or reporting requirements comparable to USAC?	Yes
32.	Section E - 6.1.d P. 51 - Will USAC allow offerors to include diagrams and charts as images as long as the text is not distorted, and aligns with the required text size no smaller than 9-point Times New Roman as outlined in the RFP?	Yes
33.	Are there any minimum corporate experience requirements that must be independently satisfied by the Prime Offeror, or can the required experience be demonstrated collectively through the proposed team?	USAC prefers past performance examples as prime offeror but will review any proposed past performance experience.

34.	For past-performance examples submitted for a teaming partner or subcontractor, what level of involvement by the Prime Offeror is required for USAC to consider the experience relevant to the proposed team?	See the answer to question #33
35.	Will USAC evaluate the combined capabilities, qualifications, and relevant experience of the Prime Offeror and its proposed teaming partners/subcontractors when evaluating the Technical Approach and Capabilities factors?	See the answer to question #33
36.	If a teaming partner or subcontractor's experience is used in the proposal, will USAC require any specific documentation, such as teaming agreements, letters of commitment, or confirmation of the partner's role in the referenced engagements?	USAC will not require additional documentation but the proposal should state the required information outlined in RFP section E.
37.	For cloud-based tools used by the contractor solely for internal project delivery, does the FedRAMP requirement apply even when the tool does not store or process USAC Data, Confidential Information, or PII?	FedRAMP requirements attach to Contractor IT that accesses, stores, processes, or transmits USAC Data, Confidential Information, or PII. A tool that does none of those is outside that requirement. Any AI tool still requires prior written approval under Section 3.3 of the Privacy and Security Addendum regardless of the data involved.
38.	Can USAC clarify the expected level of on-site staffing and whether the two-days-per-week office requirement applies to all contractor personnel or only personnel required to report in person?	See question #1
39.	Can USAC confirm whether ongoing contracts that have not yet been completed may be submitted as one of the required 2–3 past-performance examples?	Yes
40.	If an Offeror has relevant experience under multiple task orders, statements of work, or work orders performed under a larger master contract, may those engagements be presented separately as past-performance examples?	Yes
41.	Where a prior engagement involved multiple members of a team or joint delivery arrangement, can the Offeror describe its specific scope and contribution to demonstrate the relevance of that engagement?	Yes
42.	Can USAC share an anticipated budget range or expected level of effort in hours?	USAC does not share the budget range or level of effort. Offerors must propose a reasonable price based on the SOW included in the RFP.
43.	Are USAC's program systems, including the E-Rate Productivity Center, the Lifeline National Eligibility Verifier, the National Lifeline Accountability Database, the High Cost Universal Broadband Portal, and RHC Connect, within scope for the technology and data readiness assessment, or is the assessment limited to enterprise and back-office systems?	See Q #15
44.	Scope and Workload Assumptions To support consistent staffing and pricing among Offerors, can USAC provide estimated quantities for the following: a. Business units and program offices included in the assessment; b. Stakeholder interviews; c. Workshops or facilitated sessions; d. Governance committee and executive presentations;	USAC is not providing estimated quantities. Offerors should propose the level of engagement their approach requires and price accordingly. See question #16 for the duration USAC anticipates for current state analysis.

	and e. Existing strategies, policies, inventories and technical artifacts expected to be reviewed?	
45.	What business outcomes drove this initiative? Cost savings, workforce productivity, constituent experience, compliance, or all of the above?	While USAC is slowly increasing our knowledge of AI, our experience in implementing AI is a key driver for this initiative.
46.	The acceptance criteria for the AI Implementation Strategy include cost tracking and forecasting models, program-line allocation methodology, indicative resourcing, and oversight controls. Please clarify the expected level of fidelity. Does USAC expect rough-order-of-magnitude ranges, a detailed total-cost-of-ownership model, position-level workforce estimates, vendor consumption forecasts, or a budget-ready multiyear financial model? What internal cost, staffing, licensing, and program-budget information will USAC make available?	USAC expects planning-level estimates rather than a budget-ready multiyear financial model or estimates supported by vendor quotations. The value is in a methodology USAC can maintain after the engagement ends. Relevant internal cost, licensing, and program budget information will be made available at the Kick-Off Meeting.
47.	How will USAC evaluate pricing realism and reasonableness given variability in assessment depth and stakeholder access?	USAC will evaluate price as described in Section E.7.3, assessing whether the proposed price is realistic and sufficient for the approach and scope the Offeror has proposed in its technical volume.
48.	Pilot recommendation: Please clarify the expected contents of the single pilot recommendation, including whether USAC expects a business case, use-case requirements, data dependencies, architecture, governance controls, implementation plan, resourcing, schedule, and estimated cost.	See question #8.
49.	Section B.5.A.1 (Current State Assessment), Pages 6–7 - For the Readiness Assessment (organizational and technology), approximately how many USAC divisions, programs, or business units should the Contractor plan to assess? Should the assessment span all four USF programs (High Cost, Lifeline, RHC, and E-Rate) plus supporting divisions, or is USAC limiting the scope to specific programs or divisions?	See question #15. All programs and divisions are in scope. Offerors should propose the depth of assessment appropriate to each.
50.	RFP Document – Can the Government please tell us if there's a prior contractor doing this work? If yes, please provide us the contract number, its dollar value and historical level of effort.	No, USAC has no prior contract for this AI Governance and implementation work. Thus far it has all been handled internally.
51.	Please clarify the anticipated level of engagement for this effort, including the estimated number of stakeholder interviews, workshops, governance meetings, executive briefings, and other recurring meetings that offerors should assume when developing their technical and pricing approaches.	See question #44.
52.	Use of AI (Volume 2 / Attachment 1): Please confirm how the two versions of Attachment 1 (with-AI and without-AI scenarios) will be used in the price evaluation — specifically, whether USAC will evaluate and select one scenario at award, and whether prior written approval for proposed AI use will be determined before or after Contract issuance.	USAC will review both pricing options before award and will prior written approval for proposed AI use will be determined before or after Contract issuance.
53.	Regarding the Volume 2 requirement to submit separate versions of Attachment 1 – Bid Sheet for 'scenarios with	Either way is acceptable

	and without AI', does USAC prefer both Bid Sheet files to be submitted as separate tabs in a single workbook, or as two distinct Excel files attached under Volume 4?	
54.	Can USAC confirm whether Volumes 1–4, Attachment 1 (Bid Sheet), and the Attachment 2: Confidentiality Agreement should be submitted as six separate attachments within a single email, or as six separate email submissions with one attachment each?	All attachments should be submitted with one email.
55.	Volume 4 Page Limit and Attachment 1 The RFP permits Attachment 1 – Bid Sheet to be submitted in Excel format in addition to Volume 4 and separately establishes a four-page limit for Volume 4. Please confirm that Attachment 1, when submitted as a separate Excel file, is excluded from the four-page Volume 4 page limitation.	Confirmed.
56.	Can USAC clarify the specific evaluation weighting and baseline expectations between the 'with AI' and 'without AI' cost and technical scenarios?	USAC does not share the weighting but will evaluate based on the evaluation factor stated in RFP Section E.
57.	Are resumes submitted as Attachment A to Volume 2 subject to a hard cap of 2 pages per individual, and does the 12-page limit for Volume 2 entirely exclude Attachment A resumes and the separate 'Exceptions to RFP Terms' attachment?	Yes to both. Resumes submitted as Attachment A are limited to two pages per individual under Section E.6.B.4.a and do not count against the twelve-page limit for Volume 2. The separate Exceptions to RFP Terms attachment also does not count against the page limits. See question #190.
58.	Does USAC anticipate exercising Optional Renewal Terms immediately following the 4-month Initial Term, and will the scope of renewals focus on pilot implementation oversight or expanded AI governance support?	No, there is no optional renewal term expected under this contract.
59.	Are offerors permitted to propose a fixed deliverable milestone payment schedule tied to the 4 formal deliverables (Current State Assessment, AI Implementation Strategy, Pilot Recommendation, Executive Readout) rather than monthly 30-day billing?	Yes, USAC prefers fixed deliverable milestone payment schedule tied to the 4 formal deliverables
60.	Deliverable schedule: Please provide the anticipated sequencing and target submission dates for the Current State Assessment, AI Implementation Strategy, Pilot Recommendation, and Executive Briefing.	USAC has not set target submission dates. Offerors should propose a deliverable sequence and schedule within the four-month Contract Term that accommodates the five business day acceptance periods described in Section B.5.B.
61.	The RFP defines Key Personnel as full time employees of the contractor. For a small firm, do the owners of the firm qualify when they are paid as W2 employees?	Yes
62.	Key Personnel Provided by Subcontractors Section C defines Key Personnel as full-time employees of the Contractor, while the proposal instructions permit the use of subcontractors and teaming partners. Please confirm whether proposed Key Personnel may be employees of a subcontractor or teaming partner, provided they meet all applicable qualification, availability, and commitment requirements.	Proposed Key Personnel may be employees of a subcontractor or teaming partner, provided they meet all applicable qualification, availability, and commitment requirements. Please note that USAC prefers all key personnel to be employees of the prime contractor.
63.	For the two versions of the bid sheet, should both assume the same scope, deliverables, and schedule, with the only difference being whether our team uses AI tools while performing the work?	Yes

64.	Does the restriction on contractor use of AI without written approval cover ordinary productivity tools such as Microsoft Copilot, or only AI applied to USAC data and deliverables?	Yes, it covers any type or use of AI
65.	Given the requirement for prior written approval before using any AI tools, services, or code, can USAC clarify whether contractors may use internally developed AI-enabled productivity tools for activities such as research, analysis, documentation, or presentation development during contract performance?	Any AI usage must be approved by our AI Core PMO, which includes IT Security, Data, and Privacy, among others. The contractor will be asked a series of questions for the team to assess and provide a decision on any AI usage.
66.	The RFP asks for separate pricing with and without the use of AI. Does this also apply if AI is used only for internal productivity and no USAC data, confidential information, or PII is entered into the AI tool?	Yes, it includes any AI type or usage
67.	Does USAC consider Contractor productivity tools used to assist with research, analysis, synthesis, drafting, or project management to constitute "use of AI" requiring the separate "with AI" pricing scenario, even where no USAC Data or Confidential Information is entered into the AI tool?	If the productivity tools are using AI, then yes. If these tools do not use any AI, as defined by the tool, a separate pricing scenario is not required.
68.	For the "with AI" Bid Sheet requested in Section E.6.B.2, should the price assume that USAC will grant the Section 3.3 written approval for the specific AI uses proposed in the technical volume?	Any proposed AI usage will need to be approved by USAC prior to award.
69.	Section E.6.B.2 (Technical Approach – Use of AI), Page 49 - The RFP requires separate Bid Sheets for scenarios with and without the use of AI. Should these reflect fundamentally different technical approaches (e.g., different staffing models or timelines), or is USAC primarily looking for a pricing differential while maintaining the same overall methodology?	Offerors must determine if they want to propose the same technical approach or different approach with each pricing option.
70.	Approximately how many USAC personnel will be made available for interviews during the assessment, and will USAC coordinate scheduling?	Currently, USAC has three AI Governance groups, and we anticipate these groups will be interviewed, as well as the leadership team and other key personnel. USAC can support in scheduling, although all contractors will have access to USAC's calendar system and can schedule meetings/reserve rooms.
71.	Stakeholder availability. Approximately how many stakeholder interviews or working sessions does USAC anticipate supporting during the Current State Assessment, and will USAC designate a single point of contact to coordinate scheduling across divisions?	See Q#70
72.	Prior USAC solicitations indicate that several USAC applications, including the E-Rate Productivity Center, are built on the Appian platform. Are USAC's Appian-based applications within the scope of the technology readiness assessment, and should the roadmap address Appian's native AI and agent capabilities alongside Microsoft's?	Yes, these are in scope and should be considered.
73.	With respect to the Microsoft Copilot rollout described in Section B.1, which licensing tiers are in scope? Specifically, does the rollout include Microsoft 365 Copilot only, or also Copilot Studio agent-building capability and an Azure OpenAI or equivalent model endpoint within USAC's tenant?	USAC is currently piloting Microsoft 365 Copilot. USAC does not currently have Copilot Studio other AI tools.

74.	USAC's RFI IT-26-026 concerns an enterprise data platform intended in part to position USAC for advanced analytics and AI-assisted data management. Should the AI Implementation Strategy treat that platform as a prerequisite dependency, and will a selection be known during this Contract's period of performance?	A selection will not be known, and the contractor should treat any required platform as a prerequisite dependency. USAC is not asking for assistance to select any such platform.
75.	USAC held an EPC Modernization Industry Day in June 2026. How should the three-year AI roadmap sequence against EPC modernization and other in-flight platform initiatives?	The roadmap should include in-flight platforms and adjust to their timelines, as these are set outside of USAC. The AI Governance team would like to see a blend of internal and external facing AI support as well.
76.	Will USAC provide its IT Strategic Plan for 2026-2028 as an input, so that the AI roadmap can be aligned to it?	Relevant information will be shared with the contractor.
77.	Section B.5.A.2 requires the roadmap to address agentic AI for both internal and external processes. Does USAC have an existing policy position or constraint regarding agentic AI in external-facing processes, including any requirement for human review before an agent takes an action affecting an applicant, beneficiary, or contributor?	USAC currently has a general AI policy and looking for the vendor to provide additional details.
78.	Will USAC share the current output of its process to review and track all software and vendors that use AI, so that AI capabilities embedded in existing vendor platforms are reflected in the assessment?	Relevant information will be shared with the contractor.
79.	Could USAC provide an overview of its current AI initiatives, platforms, tools, and use cases that should be included in the Current State Assessment?	USAC is piloting the use of copilot and has deployed a small number of machine learning models. See Q #84
80.	Please confirm the proposal submission deadline time on September 30, 2026, and confirm that Attachment A (Key Personnel resumes) and the signed Confidentiality Agreement are excluded from the page limitations in Section E.6.E.2.	The proposal due date and time is specified in RFP Section E. Attachment A (Key Personnel resumes) and the signed Confidentiality Agreement are excluded from the page limitations.
81.	Page limits and attachments. Please confirm that cover pages, tables of contents, and the Key Personnel resumes submitted as Attachment A are excluded from the page limits set forth in Section E.6, and that the optional deliverable-based price breakdown may be provided as an additional tab within Attachment 1 without counting against the Volume 4 page limit.	Confirmed.
82.	AI-Use Pre-Approval Process (Section 3.3): The RFP requires Contractor to obtain USAC's prior written approval before using AI tools in performance of the work, and requires submission of separate "with AI" and "without AI" bid sheets. Knowbl maintains proprietary, fully secure, and private AI tooling built specifically to allow engagement with sensitive data without exposure to third-party models or public infrastructure. Could USAC clarify the expected timeline for reviewing and approving AI tool use once a contract is awarded, and whether that approval can be addressed as part of contract	See Q #65
83.	Approved AI tools: a. Would contractors have access to enterprise AI models like Claude, ChatGPT or similar tools? If yes, what are the default token budgets or usage limitations? The RFP mentions USAC is rolling out CoPilot; would this also be	a. No. USAC will not provide Contractor Staff with access to USAC's enterprise AI tooling, including the Microsoft Copilot deployment described in Section B.1. Token budgets and usage limits are therefore not applicable.

	available to contracting staff? b. What other AI-based tools, if any, would be available to USAC contractors? c. What would be the hardware specifications for computers issued to contracting staff? d. Would contractor staff be allowed to run models on their local laptops using tools like LM Studio / Ollama? e. If prospective contractors would like to propose using certain tools, how would this process work? How long does the review + approval process usually take? f. What software and cloud tools do USAC issued laptops come with? Is standard office software (word processing, spreadsheets and presentations) available?	b. None. USAC is not making AI tools available to Contractor Staff under this Contract. c. and f. USAC does not anticipate issuing USAC-managed laptops or @usac.org accounts for this engagement. Contractor Staff will work on Contractor-owned equipment, and the Contractor is responsible for its own productivity software. See question #235. d. Locally run models are treated the same as any other AI tool. They must be disclosed and approved under Section 3.3 of the Privacy and Security Addendum before any use in performance of the Contract. See question #65. e. See questions #65 and #68. Offerors should describe the proposed tools and intended uses in Volume 2. The AI Core PMO, which includes IT Security, Data, and Privacy, reviews each request and issues a decision. Nothing in this response prevents an Offeror from proposing its own AI tooling for approval under Section 3.3. Question #83 addresses whether USAC supplies AI tools to the Contractor, which it does not. See questions #65, #172, and #243.
84.	Beyond Microsoft Copilot, what AI, automation, analytics, or workflow platforms are currently approved or under evaluation within USAC?	USAC has a limited number of AI, Machine Learning or software with AI to-date. The AI Governance Committee is applying a risk-averse approach and waiting for the AI External Support to provide additional guidance with ingesting AI technologies.
85.	What AI products or platforms, if any, is USAC currently using?	See Q #84
86.	Have you completed any AI risk assessments already?	Yes, a high-level risk assessment has been completed and will be shared with the contractor.
87.	Does USAC already have an inventory of potential AI use cases?	Yes, the team has collected around 24 AI Use Cases, submissions from USAC staff on how AI can be used, ranging from software to AI Agents.
88.	Is there an expectation that recommendations align to NIST AI RMF, OMB guidance, or other federal AI frameworks?	Yes
89.	Is the roadmap expected to contain prioritized use cases or only organizational recommendations?	We anticipate Use cases will be reviewed, yet USAC is open to hear from the contractor on this, as we have no requirements on this.
90.	How detailed should cost models be and what are your expectations in analyzing and presenting this information?	See question #46.
91.	Does USAC anticipate follow-on phases for implementation, governance operationalization, Copilot adoption, or AI solution deployment after completion of this strategic assessment and roadmap engagement?	Yes, USAC is in the early stages of AI governance and implementation, and further refinement of implementation, governance, and operationalization will be necessary in the future.
92.	For the scenario involving AI, should offerors assume that USAC's written approval will be available at contract kickoff? If approval is delayed or denied, would performance proceed under the offeror's without-AI price?	Yes

93.	Subject to USAC's prior written approval and applicable data restrictions, may an offeror propose controlled AI use for meeting follow-ups, action tracking, document classification, synthesis, draft development, quality review, and project-management support, provided accountable personnel review and approve every output?	See Q #65
94.	For pricing and staffing purposes, can USAC provide estimated quantities for the following: a. Stakeholder interviews and workshops; b. Participating departments or program offices; c. Current AI use cases; d. Systems or technical environments to be assessed; and e. Policies, standards, inventories, and other documents expected to be reviewed?	See question #44.
95.	For the three-year AI implementation strategy, does USAC have predefined strategic priorities or AI use cases that the contractor must incorporate, or should the contractor identify and prioritize the use cases independently?	See Q#89
96.	Does USAC expect the Contractor to identify and prioritize new AI use cases as part of the three-year roadmap, or primarily assess and develop recommendations based on use cases already identified by USAC?	See Q#89
97.	For the Agentic AI evaluation, should the Contractor assess potential use cases only at a strategic level, or also provide detailed technical and implementation recommendations?	See Q#89
98.	Section B.5.A.2 (AI Implementation Strategy), Page 7 - The three-year roadmap must include a "Target-State Operating Model and Organizational Structure." Does USAC have an existing enterprise operating model or organizational design document that can be shared as a baseline, or should the Contractor develop this from first principles based on the Current State Assessment?	USAC has an existing organizational structure and will provide relevant documentation at the Kick-Off Meeting. The target-state operating model should be developed from the findings of the Current State Assessment rather than from an existing target-state design.
99.	For the Agentic AI evaluation, does USAC expect the contractor to assess specific existing USAC use cases, or should the contractor identify potential Agentic AI use cases based on the Current State Assessment?	See Q#89
100.	Does USAC expect the recommended AI pilot to be selected from an existing USAC business process identified by USAC, or should the contractor independently identify and prioritize the pilot opportunity?	The contractor should independently identify and prioritize the pilot opportunity, but may consider existing use cases identified by USAC
101.	Does USAC currently have an AI governance framework or governance body in place, or is the selected contractor expected to develop the framework from the ground up?	USAC has an AI Governance framework set up and is anticipating the contractor to provide any improvement recommendations about a group up develop is not requested.
102.	Is USAC expecting the contractor to recommend a single AI pilot or multiple potential pilots with a final prioritization?	USAC expects a single recommended pilot, presented with the prioritization logic used to select it and the alternatives that were considered.
103.	Can USAC clarify whether the final Executive Briefing is expected to be presented directly to the AI Executive Committee and/or Board, and whether the contractor should anticipate multiple executive-level presentations?	See Q#70

104.	Can USAC provide an overview of the business units, technology environments, data sources, and existing AI use cases that are expected to be included in the current-state assessment?	See questions #15 and #179. USAC's drafted AI Strategy, AI Risk Inventory, AI policies, governance charters, and the output of its software and vendor AI tracking process will be provided at contract award.
105.	Section B.5.A.1 (Current State Assessment), Page 7 - The Readiness Assessment includes evaluation of "the extent to which the current USAC technology stack supports AI enablement." Will USAC provide an inventory of its current technology stack (platforms, tools, cloud infrastructure, data architecture) to the Contractor, or is a technology discovery exercise expected as part of the scope?	USAC will provide an inventory of its current technology stack.
106.	Can USAC provide high-level details on its current technology, data, cloud, and AI environment? If needed, can access be provided?	See Q #84
107.	Can USAC provide clarification on the expected number and availability of USAC stakeholders/business units that the contractor will need to interview or engage during the Current State Assessment?	See Q #70
108.	If AI is proposed for use in performing the Services, will USAC identify the AI tools/models that are currently approved for Contractor use, or should Offerors propose specific tools for USAC's approval?	Due to USAC's quasi-government nature, all software requests must be put out for bid, so the contractor should provide guidance on the value vs the specific tool.
109.	If contractor personnel use AI tools that have been pre-approved by USAC, will separate approval be required for each use case or engagement activity?	No, once an AI tool has been approved for a contractor, it does not need to be approved again.
110.	We ask USAC to confirm whether option years (Section C2 and B.3 conflict) are actually anticipated and if yes, how should they be priced on the single-tab Bid Sheet.	There is no option year expected under this contract.
111.	Section E.6.E.1.d requires charts and Gantt diagrams to be incorporated using their native program to prevent distortion, whereas Section E.6.E.1.f mandates that each volume be submitted in a single, standard PDF format. We ask USAC to confirm that standard high-resolution PDF insertion of graphics is acceptable in lieu of separate native file attachments.	Yes. Each volume must be submitted as a single PDF. Graphics should be inserted at sufficient resolution to remain readable when printed and must not distort the text. Separate native files are not required.
112.	Please confirm that each volume submitted as a separate PDF attachment in a single email.	Confirmed
113.	Please clarify if the vendor performing this assessment and roadmap will have any conflict of interest for the future AI development/implementation projects?	<u>USAC does not believe the awardee of this Contract will have conflict of interest for potential future AI development/implementation projects as the result of performing the services under this contract as long as the resources working on the assessment/roadmap are firewalled off from any future USAC competitive bids for AI development/implementation projects related to areas where they had access to budget or cost information, or to other competition-sensitive, non-public information, as part of developing materials or attending executive briefings where such information is shared.</u> <u>This vendor will not be able to support any implementations of future AI development/implementation projects</u>

114.	Section E.6.C.3 requires a list of two to three current or recently completed contracts for services similar in scope, while Section E.7.2 provides that past-performance evaluation includes detailed references for an Offeror's proposed teaming partner(s) and/or subcontractor(s), as applicable. May an Offeror satisfy the two-to-three similar-contract requirement using relevant contracts performed by proposed teaming partner(s) or subcontractor(s), provided the proposal clearly identifies each entity's role and supplies the required project and reference information for each?	See the answer to question #33.
115.	Can we focus detailed discovery on priorities agreed with USAC? RFP section: B.5. We propose assessing AI readiness across the organization, then focusing detailed workflow reviews and workshops on priority use cases agreed with USAC. Which functions, processes, or stakeholder groups must receive detailed review, and how many interviews and workshops should we plan for?	See questions #15 and #44.
116.	What level of detail should we provide in the pilot plan and roadmap? RFP section: B.5.B. We propose a pilot plan covering business objectives, requirements, success measures, ownership, controls, estimated costs, and implementation steps. Would this meet USAC's expectations for the pilot recommendation? For the three-year roadmap, can we use documented cost assumptions and reusable models for tracking costs, forecasting, and allocating costs across programs? Please identify any additional technical or financial detail expected and the baseline data USAC will provide for those models.	See questions #8 and #46.
117.	For the Pilot Recommendation, what level of implementation detail does USAC expect—for example, business cases, requirements, architecture, data requirements, governance controls, implementation plan, estimated cost/LOE, success measures, and implementation schedule? Or is a prioritized pilot concept and high-level implementation plan sufficient?	See question #8.
118.	Approximately how many USAC divisions, programs, governance bodies, executives, managers, technical personnel, and workforce representatives should be included in the assessment? What approximate number of interviews, focus groups, workshops, and executive sessions should Offerors assume for pricing? Will USAC schedule participants and ensure their availability? Should Offerors anticipate direct engagement with the Board, AI Executive Committee, FCC personnel, or external USF stakeholders?	See Q#70
119.	For the three-year AI Implementation Strategy, what level of specificity does USAC expect regarding initiative-level costs, staffing/resource estimates, technology dependencies, sequencing, and program-line allocation?	USAC will take the feedback and recommendations from the vendor, but the Use Cases, as written, do not need to be included. After understanding USAC's mission, goals and talking with AI Governance teams,

	Should Offerors develop detailed cost and resource models for individual AI use cases, or a higher-level enterprise planning framework that USAC can subsequently apply to specific initiatives?	the Contractor should have a better idea of the details of the roadmap.
120.	For the three-year AI roadmap, does USAC expect the contractor to provide quantified cost estimates and resource requirements for each phase, or only high-level estimates and planning assumptions?	USAC would like general/high-level estimates to support any budget planning, but details costs are not needed.
121.	USAC states that the engagement is strategic and assessment-based and does not include building, deploying, operating, or modifying AI capabilities. For the required pilot recommendation, what level of implementation readiness does USAC expect for example, should the Contractor provide a business case, use-case requirements, architecture/technology recommendations, risk and control requirements, implementation plan, success metrics, and cost estimate sufficient for USAC to initiate the pilot after this engagement?	See question #8.
122.	The engagement is described as strategic and assessment-based. Can USAC clarify the expected level of detail for the recommended AI pilot, and whether the contractor is expected to develop a pilot business case only or also provide implementation-level planning?	See question #8.
123.	Award timing and effective date. Can USAC share the anticipated contract effective date within October 2026, so offerors may plan Key Personnel availability for the kick-off meeting required within ten workdays of award?	There is no set date, as long as the vendor can plan for an October kick-off.
124.	Are there any emerging AI products or platforms that USAC is currently evaluating or particularly interested in exploring?	Any AI products or platforms USAC is exploring would be posted on our Procurement site .
125.	What level of detail does USAC expect in the three-year roadmap, including sequencing, dependencies, resourcing, and financial modeling?	See Q #119
126.	What level of detail is expected in the three-year roadmap, including costs, resources, owners, KPIs, and dependencies?	See Q #119
127.	What constraints should offerors assume when developing the pilot recommendation?	The pilot must be executable within USAC's current policy posture and existing technology environment. USAC is beginning with lower-risk AI applications and is not applying AI to direct USF program administration at this time. See question #15. USAC has not set a pilot budget ceiling.
128.	What criteria should be used to select the recommended AI pilot?	Offerors should propose the selection criteria as part of their technical approach. USAC expects criteria that address value, risk profile, data sensitivity, compliance exposure, reversibility, measurability, and organizational readiness.
129.	How should offerors interpret the AI-use restrictions for internal project delivery tooling and proposal pricing with and without AI use?	See questions #172 and #250.
130.	Subcontractor approval: May proposed subcontractors identified in the proposal be approved as part of contract award, or must the selected contractor obtain a separate	Proposed subcontractors identified in the proposal will be approved as part of contract award if all required information is included in the proposal.

	written consent at least thirty days before subcontracted work begins?	
131.	Approved AI use: For the AI-enabled scenario, will USAC provide access to an approved AI environment, or may an offeror propose its own appropriately controlled tool subject to approval under Section 3.3?	If the AI environment is available during the contract performance, USAC will provide access to that approved AI environment. Additionally, an offeror may propose its own appropriately controlled tool subject to approval under Section 3.3.
132.	Cost models: Please clarify the intended level of detail, planning horizon, required data inputs, program-line structure, and preferred format for the cost-tracking, forecasting, allocation, and oversight models.	See question #46.
133.	Agentic AI analysis: Is the agentic AI evaluation expected to remain conceptual, or should it include assessment of specific USAC processes, candidate use cases, platforms, architecture patterns, quantitative cost scenarios, or control designs?	USAC expects a decision-oriented evaluation rather than a product evaluation. The Contractor should address agentic AI concepts, oversight, output validation, monitoring, failure modes, and cost structures including consumption-based pricing, and deliver a framework USAC can use to decide whether and when agentic capabilities are appropriate and what preconditions must be met first. Candidate USAC processes may be identified to illustrate the framework. Naming specific vendors or products is out of scope; see question #158.
134.	Pre-existing intellectual property: Will USAC permit the contractor to retain ownership of pre-existing methods, templates, tools, models, and know-how incorporated into deliverables while granting USAC sufficient rights to use and modify the delivered work product?	Generally yes. USAC will consider proposed language from the vendor to protect pre-existing intellectual property.
135.	Section B.1 (Overview), Page 5 - USAC notes it has implemented AI Governance Committees (Executive, Core PMO, and Communications Group). Could USAC provide the current composition, charter, and meeting cadence of each committee so Offerors can appropriately scope the governance review?	Correct, USAC has established these groups and the selected vendor will be provided such information.
136.	Section B.1 (Overview), Page 5 - USAC states it is "in the process of making Microsoft CoPilot available to all USAC employees by the end of 2026." Should the Contractor's AI Implementation Strategy account for CoPilot as a foundational tool, or should the strategy be technology-agnostic?	Copilot is the general AI tool used for all employees. Given that, the strategy can be technology-agnostic.
137.	Given that USAC is currently working toward making Microsoft Copilot available to employees, should the roadmap specifically assess Copilot as part of the existing AI environment and future-state strategy?	See Q 136
138.	Section B.5.A.2 (AI Implementation Strategy), Page 7 - The Pilot Recommendation must be "traceable to current-state findings and executable within existing constraints." Could USAC elaborate on the key constraints (e.g., budget ceiling for a pilot, specific technology platforms that must be used, data restrictions, or program areas of priority)?	See question #127.
139.	Section B.5.A.2 (AI Implementation Strategy), Page 7 - The AI Implementation Strategy must include "cost tracking and forecasting models, program-line allocation methodology, and oversight controls." Does USAC have an existing cost allocation framework across its four	USAC allocates shared administrative and technology costs across its program lines today. The applicable methodology will be provided at the Kick-Off Meeting, and the Contractor should extend it to AI rather than develop a new one.

	program lines that the Contractor should align with, or is the Contractor expected to propose a new methodology?	
140.	Section B.5.A.1 (Current State Assessment), Pages 6–7 - Please confirm whether the Current State Assessment and three-year AI Implementation Strategy are intended to cover all USAC program divisions and enterprise support functions, or whether specific divisions, functions, or business areas should be prioritized.	See question #15.
141.	Does USAC currently operate, or plan to stand up, a centralized LLM gateway/proxy layer for routing, logging, governance, and cost/token monitoring across approved AI tools such as Copilot or other Harness's (such as Claude), or is per-tool native logging expected to satisfy the oversight mechanisms called for in the Governance Framework deliverable?	USAC does not operate a centralized LLM gateway or proxy layer today and has not decided whether to stand one up. Oversight currently relies on the controls native to each approved tool, together with the software and vendor AI review process described in question #142. USAC has not taken a position on whether per-tool native logging is sufficient to satisfy the oversight mechanisms in the Governance Framework. That is one of the questions the Contractor should answer. The Current State Assessment should establish what logging and monitoring capability exists, and the AI Implementation Strategy and Governance Framework should evaluate whether centralized routing, logging, and cost and token monitoring are warranted, identify the preconditions and dependencies, and sequence the decision within the three-year roadmap. Oversight controls should align with USAC's existing security program; see question #245. Recommendations should be expressed as capability categories rather than named products; see question #158. Designing, building, configuring, or operating any such capability is outside the scope of this Contract. See Section B.5.A and question #251.
142.	Beyond the vendor/software AI-tracking process already in place, does USAC use any automated tooling to continuously discover embedded AI features or unsanctioned AI usage across third-party applications, or is that inventory maintained manually today?	USAC maintains a documented process to review and track software and vendors that use AI. The current state of that process, including how the inventory is maintained, will be provided at the Kick-Off Meeting.
143.	Should the Current State Assessment scope in an evaluation of prompt/output guardrail tooling (content filtering, prompt-injection detection, output validation), or is that considered an implementation-phase concern outside this engagement's assessment boundary?	Evaluation of guardrail capability is within scope at the readiness and control-design level. Selection, configuration, or implementation of guardrail tooling is not.
144.	As Copilot and future generative AI tools introduce non-human identities and service accounts into your environment, does USAC's identity governance program currently extend privileged access management and role-based access controls to AI agents/service accounts, or should the Readiness Assessment treat this as a gap to formally evaluate?	USAC has an identity governance program. Its coverage of non-human identities and service accounts associated with AI should be treated as an area for the Readiness Assessment to evaluate rather than as a settled position.
145.	Does USAC's current network segmentation and EDR coverage extend to development, test, and non-domain-joined or contractor-managed endpoints, and are there existing controls to detect or restrict shadow AI usage	USAC will provide its current security architecture documentation at the Kick-Off Meeting. Offerors should not assume a specific posture for the purpose of this proposal.

	(e.g., unsanctioned browser-based AI assistants, locally installed harnesses, etc.) on assets outside the standard managed fleet?	
146.	What visibility does USAC have presently into a) AI deployments and b) Tools that are not specifically AI deployments but have AI behavioral attributes?	See question #142.
147.	Are there any broad goals or ambitions around AI specific to USAC that you are able to share as examples (if known)	While USAC has some draft ideas/strategy, we are looking for the contractor to help us establish such goals
148.	Is there a current single owner of the AI Program today, how would you describe ownership and accountability today for AI transformation and outcomes?	Today, AI has shared ownership with the AI Executive Committee. Although IT plays a critical role, as well our Shared Services division to help organize and communicate ideas as well.
149.	How would you describe the current culture relative to AI? Is there a disconnect between leadership and operational levels that may impact the engagement and intended outcomes?	There is both a keen interest with select groups/individuals and then a cautious optimism among others. Given that, there is a joint effect by all to learn more about AI, open to more AI usage and added controls to manage the process.
150.	For the workforce readiness component of the Current State Assessment, does USAC expect an enterprise-wide workforce/skills assessment, or a higher-level assessment of the roles, capabilities, skills gaps, and organizational changes required to execute the AI roadmap?	No, we are not expecting something of that level of detail. USAC is looking for a general assessment of the future plan and how USAC should be prepare, from a workforce perspective, where we need to grow. This information can be ascertained by interviewing the AI Executive and Core PMO teams.
151.	Please also confirm the expected format for the "with AI" and "without AI" versions required under Section E.6.B.2.	Submit both versions as separate, clearly labeled tabs within the single Attachment 1 - Bid Sheet workbook.
152.	What level of detail is expected for AI cost tracking, forecasting, and ROI/value measurement?	See question #46.
153.	6.B Pg 49 - Given the AI-centric subject matter, would USAC mark compliant a submission of only an AI-enabled, human-governed approach, rather than separate "with-AI" and "without-AI" scenarios, where AI is not a bolt-on but an intrinsic method of accelerating delivery and enhancing value—subject to USAC approval and applicable controls?	No. Section E.6.B.2 requires both versions of Attachment 1 - Bid Sheet. A submission that prices only an AI-enabled approach does not meet that requirement.
154.	Could USAC clarify whether the required AI Subject Matter Expert must be a direct employee of the prime contractor, or whether this position may be filled by an employee of a proposed subcontractor or teaming partner?	Key Personnel, including the AI Subject Matter Expert, may be employees of a proposed subcontractor or teaming partner. They must be named in the proposal, be full-time employees of that firm, and the prime Offeror remains responsible for their performance.
155.	Could USAC clarify whether software, AI tools, licenses, subscriptions, and other third-party technology required by the Contractor are expected to be included in the proposed firm-fixed price or may be reimbursed separately?	All costs are included in the firm fixed price. USAC will not separately reimburse software, AI tools, licenses, subscriptions, or other third-party technology. See Section B.2.
156.	Can a proposed teaming partner or subcontractor provide the required AI SME, or must the AI SME be an employee of the Prime Offeror?	See question #154.
157.	Could USAC clarify whether the Pilot Recommendation is expected to be at a conceptual/business-case level or include detailed implementation requirements, architecture, resource estimates, costs, and execution plans?	See question #8.

158.	Could USAC clarify whether the Contractor is expected to recommend specific AI products, platforms, models, or vendors as part of the AI Implementation Strategy?	The contractor is not expected to recommend specific AI products, but USAC is looking for the types of software/platforms and and potential associated capabilities
159.	Could USAC clarify whether Microsoft Copilot is expected to be the primary Generative AI platform considered in the roadmap, or whether Offerors should evaluate multiple AI platforms and models?	USAC has selected Copilot for our general enterprise AI tool, used by all employees. For anything more, USAC is open to other vendors, should their products be a better fit for USAC.
160.	Can USAC clarify whether the contractor is expected to recommend specific AI technologies/platforms as part of the roadmap, or whether recommendations should remain technology/vendor agnostic?	See Q158
161.	Can USAC clarify whether the contractor will be responsible for developing the cost model and forecasting methodology referenced in the AI Implementation Strategy, or whether USAC will provide existing financial/program data and allocation methodologies?	See questions #46 and #139.
162.	Could USAC clarify whether an estimated budget, funding ceiling, or anticipated contract value is available to assist Offerors in developing their firm-fixed-price proposals?	See the answer to question #42
163.	What governance structures such as Centers of Excellence, governance boards, or review processes—currently exist at USAC for overseeing AI initiatives?	USAC has established a multi-level AI tool review and approval structure consisting of 1. the Center of Excellence - responsible for communicating AI use and procurement directives to staff and collecting proposed use cases from the employee community, 2. the Core PMO – a group of SMEs from applicable subject matter areas who review AI use case proposals and propose policies and guardrails to leadership, and 3. AI Executive Committee which approves AI tools and sets global AI strategy. As part of this procurement, USAC is seeking guidance on AI governance structure and implementation methodology to address and mitigate risk.
164.	What AI-related risks does USAC identify as most relevant to its mission?	USAC's principal concerns are the protection of PII and confidential business information, the accuracy and defensibility of any output that touches program decisions, human oversight, records retention and auditability, and cost control. The Contractor should validate and extend this set during the Current State Assessment.
165.	RFP Document, Page 51, of 55, Section 2.b – The RFP states Attachment A (Resumes) but there's no Attachment A given with the solicitation package. Can the Government please provide Attachment A template?	USAC does not provide a template. Offerors may use their own template.
166.	RFP Document, and Attachment , Pages 51 and 52, Price Proposal – Can the Government please help identify the level of effort for this?	See the answer to question #42
167.	Section B states that the Firm-Fixed-Price shall include all direct and indirect costs, including labor, travel, materials, overhead, G&A, taxes, and profit. Please confirm whether offerors are only required to incorporate these costs into their proposed FFP pricing, or whether USAC expects any	USAC requires FFP in Attachment 1 Bid Sheet format.. Offerors may submit FFP breakdown by deliverables if they want to.

	supporting cost detail, cost breakdown, labor category information, labor hours, or other pricing backup as part of the proposal submission beyond Attachment 1, Bid Sheet.	
168.	What level of access to USAC systems, applications, data, and technical stakeholders will be available to the contractor to perform the Technology and Data Readiness assessments?	The assessment should be performed through stakeholder interviews, documentation review, demonstrations, and architecture materials. USAC does not anticipate providing direct access to production systems, PII, or federal systems of record for this engagement. USAC will designate a single point of contact to coordinate scheduling, document requests, and divisional introductions.
169.	Will USAC provide access to its existing AI governance committees and AI Executive Committee for stakeholder interviews and presentation of recommendations?	Yes. The AI Governance Committees and the AI Executive Committee will be available for interviews, and the Executive Briefing and Final Readout is delivered to the AI Executive Committee.
170.	The RFP requires 2–3 current or recently completed contracts similar in scope and requests detailed information including contract value, period of performance, client contacts, scope, relevance, results, problems encountered, and corrective actions. Can USAC clarify whether there is a minimum contract value or minimum duration expected for a contract to be considered sufficiently similar?	The past contracts should be relevant and similar in scope and duration to the requirements stated in the RFP.
171.	Workforce assessment — Does USAC expect a quantitative workforce survey or skills inventory, or should workforce readiness be evaluated through stakeholder interviews and existing documentation? Please clarify the expected level of detail for findings “at the capability and role level.”	Workforce readiness should be assessed through stakeholder interviews and existing documentation, with findings expressed at the capability and role level. An enterprise-wide quantitative skills survey is not required.
172.	AI-assisted proposal scenario — Please define what constitutes “use of AI” in the contractor’s performance. Does this include enterprise productivity functions such as search, transcription, grammar assistance, document summarization, or analysis of public information, even when no USAC Data or Confidential Information is processed?	Section 3.3 applies to any AI tool used in performance of the Contract, including tools running only on Contractor systems and used only for drafting, analysis, summarization, or document review, and regardless of whether USAC Data is entered into them. Approval must be requested and granted in writing. Offerors should describe the intended tools and uses in Volume 2, and USAC will act on those requests at or before the Kick-Off Meeting so performance is not delayed. USAC does not maintain a pre-approved AI tool list for contractors.
173.	The RFP requires FedRAMP Moderate authorization when Contractor cloud services access, store, or process USAC Data or PII. If the Contractor performs the engagement using USAC-issued technology, USAC email, and USAC-approved systems, and does not store or process USAC Data or PII within a Contractor-managed cloud environment, please confirm that the Contractor would not be required to hold or provide a separate FedRAMP Moderate authorization for its internal systems.	See question #37.
174.	Does USAC anticipate that the Contractor performing the Current State Assessment and AI Implementation Strategy will require direct access to production USAC IT Systems, PII, or other regulated USAC Data? If so, please identify	See question #168.

	the anticipated categories of systems/data and expected level of access. If not, may the Contractor perform the assessment using interviews, documentation, demonstrations, and USAC-managed collaboration environments without establishing a direct interconnection between Contractor IT and USAC IT Systems?	
175.	May an offeror rely on recent, similar enterprise AI strategy and governance past performance from clearly identified subcontractors or teaming partners, provided the prime contractor retains full responsibility for performance?	See the answer to question #33.
176.	Past performance. Will recent commercial engagements delivering enterprise AI strategy, governance, and implementation roadmaps in regulated or highly governed settings be considered relevant where the client is not a federal agency or federal contractor?	Yes.
177.	May the experience and past performance of a proposed major subcontractor or teaming partner be used to satisfy the requirement for enterprise AI strategy and governance experience in regulated environments? If so, will USAC evaluate the relevance of the team's combined experience, or must the prime contractor independently demonstrate the required experience? May the two to three required reference contracts include contracts performed by proposed subcontractors?	See the answer to question #33.
178.	Has a contractor performed similar AI strategy or governance work for USAC before, and if so may offerors know its general nature?	This is a new requirement for USAC.
179.	Will USAC make its drafted AI Strategy, AI Risk Inventory, AI policies, and governance committee charters available to offerors before the proposal due date, subject to the executed Confidentiality Agreement (Attachment 2)? If not, will these be provided at contract kick-off?	Bidders must sign an NDA to receive these documents during the contract bidding and review process. The contract awardee will receive the information <u>during or after contract award.</u> the contract is awarded.
180.	Prior and future work. Has USAC engaged any consultant or contractor to support development of its existing AI Strategy, AI Risk Inventory, or governance committee structure? If so, will the awardee of this Contract be precluded, under USAC's conflict-of-interest provisions, from competing for any subsequent AI implementation, deployment, or support work arising from the roadmap produced under this engagement?	USAC developed its existing AI Strategy, AI Risk Inventory, and governance committee structure internally. The awardee of this Contract will not be precluded on organizational conflict of interest grounds from competing for subsequent AI implementation, deployment, or support work arising from the roadmap. <u>See the answer to question #113 for additional information.</u>
181.	Can USAC clarify the maturity of its existing AI strategy, governance framework, and AI risk inventory?	USAC has drafted an AI Strategy, an AI Risk Inventory, and AI policies, has established AI Governance Committees, and has a process in place to review and track software and vendors that use AI. The Contractor is expected to assess and refine these rather than rebuild them. The artifacts will be provided at contract award; see question #179.
182.	Will the contractor receive access to the drafted AI Strategy, AI Risk Inventory, and governance committee materials at kickoff?	Yes, these will be provided during contract award
183.	Will USAC's current AI Strategy, AI Risk Inventory, vendor-AI review process, and governance committee	See the answer to question #182

	charters be made available to the Contractor at kick-off, and within what timeframe after award?	
184.	Can USAC share examples or draft versions of the AI Strategy, AI Risk Inventory, governance artifacts, or vendor review processes referenced in the RFP?	See the answer to question #182
185.	What existing AI strategy, governance policies, standards, assessments, or documentation will be made available to the selected contractor at project kickoff?	See the answer to question #182
186.	Access to existing artifacts. Will the awardee receive USAC's draft AI Strategy, AI Risk Inventory, software/vendor AI review process documentation, and governance committee charters at or before the kick-off meeting? May offerors assume this access when estimating level of effort?	See the answer to question #182
187.	What artifacts will USAC provide at project start, including the draft AI Strategy, AI Risk Inventory, governance documents, and relevant privacy/security policies?	See the answer to question #182
188.	Could USAC clarify whether the Contractor will receive access to USAC's existing AI Strategy, AI Risk Inventory, governance documentation, policies, technology architecture, and other relevant materials at the beginning of the engagement?	See the answer to question #182
189.	Level of Effort and Background Materials 1. (Section B.1; Section B.5.A.1) Will USAC make its existing AI Strategy, AI Risk Inventory, AI governance committee charters, software and vendor AI review process, and Secure and Trustworthy Artificial Intelligence Policy available to Offerors during the question period, under the executed Confidentiality Agreement, or only to the awardee after award? Availability of these materials materially affects both the proposed technical approach and price realism. 2. (Section B.5.A.1) If those materials cannot be released during the question period, can USAC indicate their approximate extent — for example, the number of AI policy and strategy documents, the number of entries in the AI Risk Inventory, the number of AI-enabled software or vendor assessments completed to date, and the number of current or planned AI use cases — so that Offerors may size the review effort? 3. (Section B.5.A.1) Approximately how many USAC staff, and which divisions, does USAC expect to participate in interviews and workshops supporting the Current State Assessment, and over approximately how many sessions? The acceptance criteria require workforce findings "at capability and role level" — approximately how many distinct roles are in scope?	See the answer to question #182
190.	Proposal Format, Terms, and Administration 1. (Sections E.6.B.2 and E.6.E.2) Does the in-depth overview of proposed AI use count against the twelve-page limit for Volume 2, or may it be submitted as a separate attachment to the technical volume? 2. (Sections E.1.A and E.6.E.2) Do the separate	1. The in-depth overview of proposed AI use counts against the twelve-page limit for Volume 2 2. Exceptions to RFP Terms" attachment and the statement certifying that the USAC Standard Terms and Conditions have been reviewed by the Offeror's

	"Exceptions to RFP Terms" attachment and the statement certifying that the USAC Standard Terms and Conditions have been reviewed by the Offeror's general counsel count against the page limits for Volumes 1 through 4? 3. (Section E.6.E.2) Page counts exclude the cover page and table of contents. Please confirm whether a list of acronyms or glossary, if provided, is likewise excluded. 4. (Sections B.3 and C.2) Section B.3 establishes a four-month Contract Term, while Section C.2 contains blanks for one-year Optional Renewal Terms. Does USAC contemplate any Optional Renewal Terms or option periods under the Contract awarded from this solicitation? 5. (Section C.22) Please specify the minimum insurance limits USAC requires for commercial general liability, professional liability, and cyber liability coverage, and confirm whether certificates of insurance are required with the proposal or only from the awardee prior to Contract execution. 6. (Section C.18) Please confirm that an Offeror may identify pre-existing, Contractor-owned methodologies, frameworks, and templates in its proposal and grant USAC the perpetual, worldwide, royalty-free, non-exclusive, transferable license described in the final paragraph of Section C.18, rather than assigning ownership of that background intellectual property to USAC. 7. (Section C.6.B) The four-month period of performance exceeds sixty days. Please confirm that invoicing every thirty days is permitted, and indicate whether USAC prefers invoices tied to acceptance of individual deliverables. 8. (Section C.40) For written and presentation deliverables, please confirm the accessibility conformance standard USAC expects under Section 508, for example WCAG 2.1 Level AA, and whether remediated, accessible PDF versions of deliverables are required. 9. (Section B.1) Was any portion of USAC's current AI Strategy, AI Risk Inventory, or AI governance framework developed with the assistance of a contractor? If so, is that firm eligible to compete under this solicitation? 10. (Section B.2; Attachment 1) Does USAC have an estimated budget, ceiling, or independent cost estimate range for this requirement that it is able to share? 11. (Attachment 2) Should the Confidentiality Agreement be executed by the Offeror with the company name and address completed and submitted with the proposal, with USAC countersigning at award? Please confirm that no additional signature block is required from USAC at the proposal stage.	general counsel will not count against the page limits for Volumes 1 through 4 3. Only the cover page and table of contents are excluded from the page count. 4. USAC does not contemplate any Optional Renewal Terms or option periods under the Contract awarded from this solicitation. 5. The insurance limits must meet the standard requirements for this type of work. Certificates of insurance may be required from the awardee prior to Contract execution. 6. Offeror may identify pre-existing, Contractor-owned methodologies, frameworks, and templates in its proposal. However, USAC does not expect any perpetual license, etc., under this contract. 7. Offerors may propose an invoicing schedule. USAC prefers invoices tied to acceptance of individual deliverables. 8. The deliverables can be 9. No portion of USAC's current AI Strategy, AI Risk Inventory, or AI governance framework was developed with the assistance of a contractor. 10. See the answer to question #42 11. Correct. The proposal should be signed by the offeror as well.
191.	Comparable Regulated Experience (Volume 3, Item 2): Will USAC consider experience in federally regulated commercial sectors (e.g., financial services) responsive? Additionally, will USAC accept enterprise AI strategy and	USAC will review the any proposed organizational experience. The individual key personnel experience will not be considered as organizational experience.

	governance work performed by proposed Key Personnel in prior in-house leadership roles?	
192.	Are there data-governance challenges preventing broader adoption today?	USAC's current constraints on broader adoption are policy and readiness driven rather than data driven. Data readiness is one of the areas the Contractor will assess. See question #265.
193.	Does USAC expect sample governance artifacts or governance recommendations only?	Recommendations, with drafted artifacts where a draft is needed to make a recommendation actionable. Standing up and operating governance remains USAC's responsibility.
194.	Can USAC clarify the expected number of stakeholder interviews, workshops, and governance working sessions that must be completed within the four-month project period?	See question #44.
195.	Beyond the required AI Subject Matter Expert, what disciplines does USAC expect to be represented on the engagement team (e.g., AI governance, risk/compliance, organizational change management, enterprise architecture, financial modeling)?	Offerors should propose the disciplines their approach requires. USAC has not prescribed roles beyond the AI Subject Matter Expert.
196.	The RFP requests experience delivering enterprise AI strategy and governance in regulated environments with federal oversight, funding, or reporting obligations comparable to USAC. Would experience with state/local government or other highly regulated organizations be considered acceptable if the engagement is otherwise directly relevant?	Yes, provided the engagement is directly relevant in scope and the environment is comparably regulated.
197.	Section E.6.C (Past Performance), Page 50 - The RFP requires "experience delivering enterprise AI strategy and governance in regulated environments with federal oversight, funding, or reporting obligations comparable to USAC's." Would USAC consider AI strategy work performed for state-regulated utilities, quasi-governmental entities, or FCC-regulated telecommunications carriers as "comparable" for purposes of this evaluation?	USAC will review the proposed past performance experience against the RFP requirements. Offerors must determine if their past performance will be comparable to the RFP requirements.
198.	Does USAC have a preferred definition or threshold for what it considers a "similar in scope" contract, particularly with respect to enterprise AI strategy, AI governance, regulated environments, and federal oversight?	No
199.	Does USAC require past performance to be specifically from public-sector, federal, or regulated-environment engagements, or may relevant commercial-sector experience in enterprise AI strategy, governance, assessment, and roadmap development also be considered?	See the answer to question #197
200.	What materials, staff support, and approved AI tools will be available? RFP sections: B.1, B.10, and E.6.B.2. We would build on USAC's existing strategy, governance, risk, technology, and data materials. Which will be available at kickoff, and will USAC name business and technical contacts to support discovery and review our findings? For the AI-assisted delivery option, which approved tools and working environments should we assume will be available for document analysis, synthesis,	See the answer to question #182

	and drafting? How much time should we allow for approval to use them?	
201.	USAC notes that it has already drafted an AI Strategy, AI Risk Inventory, AI policies, governance structures, and a process for reviewing software and vendors that use AI. Can USAC provide additional detail regarding the maturity and completeness of these existing artifacts, and clarify whether the selected Contractor is expected primarily to assess and refine them or to substantially redesign/redevelop them?	See question #181.
202.	What industry standards or governance frameworks does USAC want reflected in the target-state model?	The NIST AI Risk Management Framework and ISO/IEC 42001 are the primary benchmarks, applied together with FCC regulatory expectations and USAC's privacy, security, and records obligations.
203.	Section B.5.A.1 (Current State Assessment), Pages 6–7 - To conduct the Current State Assessment across policy, governance, risk management, regulatory compliance, and organizational readiness, could USAC clarify the level of access the Contractor will have to USAC's internal systems (e.g., data repositories, technology platforms, AI tools currently in use) and workforce (e.g., program leads, IT staff, compliance officers, executive leadership)? Specifically, will USAC designate points of contact within each division to facilitate information gathering, and are there any restrictions on the types of systems or data the Contractor may review during the assessment period?	See question #168.
204.	Could USAC clarify whether Offerors are expected to evaluate specific Agentic AI use cases or provide a broader assessment of Agentic AI readiness, governance, risks, costs, and potential applications?	See question #133.
205.	Does USAC anticipate that Contractor Staff will need access to production systems, PII, USF program participant data, or federal systems of record to perform this engagement, or should Offerors assume that the assessment can be completed using interviews, documentation, architecture information, policies, and other non-production materials?	See question #168.
206.	Can a single prior contract that encompasses multiple elements of the Scope of Services, such as AI strategy, governance, assessment, roadmap development, and AI implementation planning, be used to demonstrate experience across multiple areas of the RFP?	No, it will be considered as one example of past performance only.
207.	Governance artifacts — Beyond recommendations, is the contractor expected to draft or revise operational artifacts such as committee charters, policies, standards, RACI matrices, intake forms, risk-tiering criteria, approval workflows, control catalogs, exception processes, monitoring metrics, and Board reporting templates?	See question #193.
208.	Pilot recommendation — Does USAC expect one recommended pilot or a prioritized portfolio of candidates? Please specify whether the recommendation must include a business case, benefits estimate, implementation plan, resource plan, risk/control	See questions #8 and #102.

	assessment, architecture, success measures, and go/no-go criteria.	
209.	Place of Performance and Key Personnel 1. (Section B.4.A) Section B.4.A states that USAC presently requires Contractor Staff to be in the USAC office at least two days per week. Please confirm whether this expectation applies to all Contractor Staff assigned to the engagement, or only to those personnel whose assigned tasks require onsite presence or access to USAC IT Systems, so that Offerors may plan staffing accordingly. 2. (Sections C.1.N and B.6) Section C.1.N defines Key Personnel as "the full-time employees of Contractor." May an Offeror propose an employee of a teaming partner or subcontractor as Key Personnel — including as the AI Subject Matter Expert — provided the individual is committed by name for the full Contract Term and is subject to the substitution restrictions in Section C.20? 3. (Sections C.9 and E.6.B.3) Section C.9 requires USAC's prior written consent, obtained at least thirty days in advance, for any subcontracting. Please confirm that any teaming partner or subcontractor intended for use under the Contract must be identified in the proposal, and that USAC's evaluation of the proposal constitutes the required consent for the firms so identified. 4. (Section B.6) Section B.6 requires an AI Subject Matter Expert and permits the Offeror to propose "additional Key Personnel with a max of three." Please confirm that the maximum total number of named Key Personnel is four. 5. (Section E.6.B.4) Section E.6.B.4 asks Offerors to "indicate any other personnel that will be assigned to USAC and his/her role." Please confirm that personnel so identified are not Key Personnel for purposes of Sections B.6 and C.20, and that resumes are not required for them.	1. See the answer to question #1 2. Yes, however, USAC prefers that the Key Personnel be employee of the contractor. 3. Confirmed 4. Section B. 6 states the desired number of key personnel. Offerors should determine how many key personally they want to propose based on their technical approach. 5. Confirmed. USAC requires resumes for key personnel only.
210.	Section B.5.B requires workforce findings at the capability and role level. Approximately how many distinct roles, and which divisions, does USAC expect to be covered? Should the assessment cover the four program divisions only, or also Finance, the Office of General Counsel, Information Systems, Audit and Assurance, Enterprise Process Improvement, and Human Resources?	See questions #15 and #44. All divisions are in scope, including the enterprise support functions identified in Section A.
211.	Section B.6 requires an AI Subject Matter Expert and permits a maximum of three additional Key Personnel. Is a slate of fewer than four Key Personnel acceptable?	The AI Subject Matter Expert is required, and Section B.6 requires Offerors to propose additional Key Personnel up to a maximum of three. A slate consisting of the AI Subject Matter Expert alone does not meet Section B.6.
212.	Does the requirement for an AI Subject Matter Expert plus a maximum of three additional Key Personnel limit only the personnel designated as Key Personnel, or does it limit the total proposed team? May offerors assign additional non-key consultants, analysts, and PMO support personnel?	The limit applies only to personnel designated as Key Personnel. Offerors may propose additional analysts, project management, and other supporting staff who are not Key Personnel.
213.	Section B.6 identifies an AI Subject Matter Expert and states that the Contractor "shall propose additional Key	See question #211.

	Personnel with a max of three.” Is at least one additional Key Person required beyond the AI Subject Matter Expert, or may an Offeror propose only the AI Subject Matter Expert if that individual can perform the required engagement responsibilities?	
214.	Under Section C.1.N, may the AI Subject Matter Expert or Additional Support Key Personnel serve as a subcontractor or independent consultant for the full engagement, or must they be employed directly and full time by the offeror?	See question #154.
215.	Section B.6 (Key Personnel), Page 8 - The RFP requires one AI Subject Matter Expert and allows up to three additional Key Personnel. Are there specific roles USAC expects for the additional Key Personnel (e.g., governance/compliance specialist, change management lead, data architect), or is this left to the Offeror's discretion?	See question #195.
216.	Please confirm whether the maximum Key Personnel team consists of one AI Subject Matter Expert plus up to three additional Key Personnel (four total), or three Key Personnel total.	Four in total: one AI Subject Matter Expert plus a maximum of three additional Key Personnel.
217.	Section C defines Key Personnel as “full-time employees of Contractor,” while the proposal instructions expressly contemplate the use of subcontractors and partners. May the required AI Subject Matter Expert and/or additional Key Personnel proposed by an Offeror be employees of a proposed subcontractor or teaming partner rather than direct employees of the prime Offeror?	See question #154.
218.	To what extent will the selected contractor be expected to review production data, internal documentation, and system configurations as part of the Current State Assessment?	See question #168.
219.	Section C.1.N defines Key Personnel as full-time employees of the Contractor. Must all proposed Key Personnel already be full-time employees at the time of proposal submission, or may an individual identified by name and committed to the engagement become a full-time employee upon award/prior to the Contract Effective Date?	Named Key Personnel must be employed by the Offeror or by a proposed teaming partner or subcontractor at the time of proposal submission. See question #154.
220.	Whether past performance from Key Personnel's engagements performed at prior employers may be submitted and considered, given the RFP's emphasis on a named AI Subject Matter Expert.	Past performance references must be contracts held by the Offeror or by a proposed teaming partner or subcontractor. Individual experience gained at a prior employer may be described in the Key Personnel resumes submitted as Attachment A, but it will not be evaluated as corporate past performance under Section E.7.2.
221.	Under Section B.4.A, can USAC approve remote performance for Contractor Staff, including Key Personnel, with attendance limited to kickoff and meetings specifically designated as in-person, instead of weekly office attendance?	See question #1.
222.	Can we use an FDE-led team with specialists contributing at different stages? RFP sections: B.6 and E.6.B.4.	Yes, provided the named Key Personnel remain the same throughout the engagement and the Offeror states each role's allocation by project phase.

	The FDE would lead the assessment, supported by the required AI subject-matter expert and the other roles described above. Can we propose each role's time commitment by project stage while maintaining the same named key personnel, clear responsibility for delivery, and continuity throughout the engagement?	
223.	Please clarify which Contractor Staff are required to report to USAC Headquarters at least two days per week. Does this requirement apply to all Contractor Staff, all Key Personnel, only designated positions, or only personnel specifically directed by USAC to work on-site? Does it apply every week throughout the four-month period of performance? Please also provide the anticipated frequency of meetings at the FCC offices.	See question #1. The on-site expectation applies to personnel whose participation in a given session requires in-person presence, not to all Contractor Staff every week. USAC does not currently anticipate meetings at FCC offices under this Contract.
224.	Key personnel level of effort. Does USAC expect the AI Subject Matter Expert and other Key Personnel to be dedicated full-time to this engagement, or is a part-time allocation acceptable provided deliverable timelines are met? Are there minimum weekly on-site expectations per individual under the hybrid schedule (2 days per week), or may on-site presence rotate among team members?	Part-time allocation is acceptable provided the Offeror states each individual's allocation and meets the deliverable schedule. On-site presence may rotate among team members. See question #1.
225.	Scope boundary regarding Copilot. Is an assessment of the in-progress Microsoft Copilot rollout (adoption, controls, and lessons learned) within the scope of the Current State Assessment, or should offerors treat the rollout solely as context?	Yes. The Microsoft Copilot rollout is part of USAC's current state and should be assessed as such, including governance, adoption, workforce readiness, licensing and cost management, security, use-case prioritization, and measurement of value. See question #6.
226.	Section B.5.A.1 (Current State Assessment), Pages 6–7 - Please clarify the level of access USAC anticipates providing to the Contractor for the Current State Assessment and technology readiness assessment. In addition to stakeholder interviews and document review, should the Contractor expect direct access to relevant USAC systems, applications, architecture repositories, data platforms, or other technical environments? If so, what general types of access or limitations should the Contractor plan for?	See question #168.
227.	Section E.7 (Evaluation), Page 52 - The Technical sub-factors are listed in descending order of importance (Technical Approach, Capabilities, Key Personnel). Is the Technical factor, as a whole, significantly more important than Price, or are they approximately equal in weight?	The evaluation factors and the descending order of the technical sub-factors are stated in Section E.7. USAC is not publishing relative weights for this solicitation.
228.	5.B Pgs 7-8 - Would performance of this contract—including the current-state assessment, governance framework, implementation roadmap, or pilot recommendation—create an actual, potential, or apparent organizational conflict of interest that would preclude the contractor, its affiliates, subcontractors, or key personnel from competing for or performing subsequent USAC work involving AI pilot design, implementation, deployment, operations, managed services, training, or change management?	See question #180.
229.	Could USAC clarify whether proposed Key Personnel may be replaced after proposal submission but prior to	USAC will consider a substitution request submitted before award where the replacement has equal or

	contract award, subject to USAC approval, provided the replacement personnel possess equal or greater qualifications?	greater qualifications. Approval is at USAC's discretion.
230.	Could USAC clarify whether all Key Personnel are expected to be dedicated to this engagement or whether they may support other Contractor engagements during the period of performance?	See question #224.
231.	Could USAC clarify whether Offerors may identify additional subject matter experts who can be brought into the engagement on an as-needed basis without designating them as Key Personnel?	See question #212.
232.	Addendum Section 2.13 requires that all Services, including all work performed by Contract Staff, be performed within the United States, but the RFP does not address personnel nationality or immigration status. Please confirm whether Contract Staff, including Key Personnel, are required to be U.S. citizens; whether U.S. persons (citizens and lawful permanent residents) are eligible; or whether any individual authorized to work in the United States is eligible	All Services must be performed within the United States, as required by Section 2.13 of the Privacy and Security Addendum. USAC does not impose a citizenship or lawful permanent resident requirement for this engagement. Any individual authorized to work in the United States is eligible.
233.	Applicability of Section 2.20 information security artifacts. Section 2.20 of the Privacy and Security Addendum, "Additional Requirements for Services in Contractor IT," requires the Contractor to provide an ISO 27001 compliance certification and its most current SOC 2 Type II report within ten calendar days of the Effective Date. That section closes with the note "[This provision is applicable to contracts for procuring new information technology systems/tools only]." Section B.5 states that this engagement is strategic and assessment based and "does not build, deploy, operate or modify any capabilities." On that basis we read Section 2.20 as inapplicable to this Contract, since no new information technology system or tool is being procured and no USAC data would reside in Contractor IT. Please confirm that reading. If USAC intends Section 2.20 to apply to this Contract, will USAC accept the Standard Information Gathering (SIG) Lite documentation and written information security policies already identified in that same section in place of ISO 27001 certification and a SOC 2 Type II report, given that the Contractor will have no access to USAC networks, systems, or production data?	Section 2.20 of the Privacy and Security Addendum is not applicable to this contract.
234.	Given that the Statement of Work defines the engagement as purely strategic and assessment-based (without building, hosting, operating, or deploying IT systems or software), can USAC confirm that the ISO 27001 certification and SOC 2 Type II report requirements under Section 2.20 of the Privacy and Security Addendum apply solely to contractors providing cloud/IT hosting	Confirmed

	infrastructure and are not mandatory disqualifiers for strategic advisory services performed on USAC-provided systems?	
235.	Applicability of the Privacy and Security Addendum 1. (Addendum §§ 2.10, 2.17, 2.20) Each of these provisions carries the bracketed note "[This provision is applicable to contracts for procuring new information technology systems/tools only]." Section B.5.A states that the engagement "does not build, deploy, operate or modify any capabilities." Please confirm that Sections 2.10 (Authority to Operate and FISMA documentation), 2.17 (annual FISMA and security assessments, penetration testing), and 2.20 (including ISO 27001 certification and a SOC 2 Type II report within ten calendar days of the Effective Date) do not apply to this advisory engagement. 2. (Addendum § 2.20) If USAC intends any part of Section 2.20 to apply, please identify which specific items are required, and confirm whether an Offeror whose SOC 2 Type II examination is in progress but whose report has not yet been issued at the time of award would remain eligible for award. 3. (Addendum § 2.19) Section 2.19 (Vulnerability Management, including a monthly vulnerability report and POA&M) does not carry the bracketed limitation. Given that no Contractor IT system will host or process USAC Data under this engagement, please confirm whether Section 2.19 applies, and if so, identify the scope of systems on which USAC expects the Contractor to report. 4. (Addendum § 2.8) Section 2.8 requires submission of the Contractor's insider threat program within ninety (90) days of the Effective Date. Given the four-month Contract Term, please confirm whether this requirement applies to this engagement and what form of documentation USAC considers sufficient. 5. (Section B.10; Addendum §§ 2.1, 2.6) Will Contractor Staff be permitted to use Contractor-owned corporate IT (laptops, Microsoft 365 tenant, and cloud storage) to prepare Contractor-authored deliverables that contain no USAC Data, Confidential Information, or PII? Alternatively, will USAC issue Contractor Staff USAC-managed devices and @usac.org email accounts for all work performed under the Contract? 6. (Section B.4.D) Does USAC anticipate that Contractor Staff will require access to any USAC information system designated as a federal system of record (National Verifier or the National Lifeline Accountability Database), and therefore that Role-Based Privacy Act Training will be required?	See question #236 for items 1 through 4. On item 5, Contractor Staff may use Contractor-owned IT to prepare Contractor-authored work product that contains no USAC Data, Confidential Information, or PII; USAC does not plan to issue USAC-managed devices or @usac.org accounts for this engagement. On item 6, USAC does not anticipate Contractor access to the National Verifier or NLAD, so Role-Based Privacy Act Training is not expected.
236.	Applicability of Privacy and Security Addendum Requirements Section B states that this engagement is strategic and assessment-based and that the Contractor will not build, deploy, operate, or modify AI capabilities. The Privacy and Security Addendum identifies several provisions as	Sections 2.10, 2.17, and 2.20 carry the bracketed limitation restricting them to contracts procuring new information technology systems or tools, and they do not apply to this advisory engagement. Section 2.19 does not carry that limitation and applies to Contractor IT used in performance of the Services. Where the

	“[applicable] to contracts for procuring new information technology systems/tools only.” Please confirm whether the following provisions apply to this procurement, in whole or in part: Section 2.10 – Further Requirements, including requirements for USAC IT Security approval of Contractor applications, processes, and systems; compliance with FISMA, NIST, and OMB requirements; demonstration of an Authority to Operate for systems that house USAC Data; NIST Risk Management Framework documentation; periodic FISMA compliance and system-accreditation reporting; and remediation of FISMA deficiencies. Section 2.17 – Security and Privacy Assessments, including annual FISMA compliance assessments; potential third-party assessments; FISMA ATO and continuous-monitoring requirements; penetration testing; quarterly representations regarding security-control changes; POA&M tracking; and remediation of identified weaknesses. Section 2.20 – Additional Requirements for Services in Contractor IT, including FedRAMP authorization requirements and notification of authorization changes; Cloud Protocols; security questionnaires; ISO 27001 certification; SOC 2 Type II reports; SIG Lite documentation; system ATOs or evidence of Information Security Continuous Monitoring; and related documentation requirements. Given that Section B expressly states that the engagement will not involve building, deploying, operating, or modifying AI capabilities, please confirm whether Sections 2.10, 2.17, and 2.20 are applicable to the resulting Contract. If any of these provisions apply only under certain circumstances, please identify the applicable requirements and the conditions that would trigger them, such as the Contractor’s use of Contractor IT, processing or storage of USAC Data, access to USAC IT Systems, or USAC-approved use of AI tools.	Contractor introduces no system that hosts or processes USAC Data, USAC will scope Section 2.19 reporting accordingly at the Kick-Off Meeting.
237.	Section B describes the engagement as strategic and assessment-based and states that the Contractor will not build, deploy, operate, or modify AI capabilities. Please identify which provisions of the Privacy and Security Addendum apply when the Contractor performs all work using USAC-issued technology and does not store, process, or transmit USAC Data through Contractor IT. Specifically, please clarify the applicability of requirements related to FISMA Authority to Operate, FedRAMP Moderate authorization, ISO 27001 certification, SOC 2 Type II reporting, vulnerability reporting, backups, penetration testing, and continuous monitoring.	See question #236. See also questions #168 and #37.
238.	For Section 2.20 and Section 2.10 compliance, if the Contractor performs all advisory and analysis work exclusively using USAC-issued equipment, USAC email	See question #236.

	accounts, and USAC-approved environments without storing USAC Data in external Contractor IT, will USAC waive the requirement for third-party SOC 2 Type II and ISO 27001 submissions?	
239.	For advisory-only work performed entirely using USAC-issued or approved technology, with no contractor-hosted system, how do Privacy and Security Addendum Sections 2.3 and 2.20 apply, particularly the ATO, ISO 27001 and SOC 2 requirements?	See question #236.
240.	Regarding Section 36 (National Security Supply Chain Requirements), does USAC require the initial Covered List Reasonable Inquiry certification to be submitted as part of Volume 1, or is it executed upon contract award?	It may be executed upon contract award
241.	If the contractor does not store USAC data on its own systems or connect contractor systems to USAC systems, would the FISMA, FedRAMP, and ATO requirements still apply?	No
242.	If USAC-issued systems and approved tools are used for all project work involving confidential information, would that meet USAC's security expectations?	Yes
243.	Use of Artificial Intelligence and the Bid Sheet 1. (Section E.6.B.2; Attachment 1) The RFP requires "separate versions of Attachment 1 – Bid Sheet for scenarios with and without the use of AI." Should these be submitted as two tabs within a single Excel workbook or as two separate files, and which version will USAC use for the price evaluation under Section E.7.3 and for any down-select under Section E.8? 2. (Section E.6.B.2) Please confirm that the "with AI" and "without AI" Bid Sheets are expected to reflect identical deliverables, scope, and quality standards, with the difference limited to the methods used to perform the work and the resulting cost. 3. (Addendum § 3.3) Does Section 3.3 apply to the Contractor's internal use of AI tools operating solely on Contractor systems where no USAC Data, Confidential Information, or PII is used as input — for example, drafting, editing, or formatting of Contractor-authored work product? If prior written approval is required, is that approval sought at proposal submission, at the Kick-Off Meeting, or on a per-use-case basis during performance? 4. (Addendum § 3.3) For the purpose of preparing the "with AI" pricing scenario, what categories of AI-assisted consulting activity does USAC contemplate it may permit — for example, organizing non-sensitive notes, thematic analysis of approved materials, drafting working outlines, document comparison, or quality checking? 5. (Addendum §§ 3.3, 3.3.1) Would USAC consider authorizing the use of enterprise AI services under contractual terms that exclude USAC data from model training and provide appropriate security and privacy controls, or does USAC intend to limit approved AI use to tools within USAC's own environment?	Item 1: see question #151. Item 2: confirmed, both versions must reflect identical deliverables, scope, and quality standards, with the difference limited to method and price. Items 3 and 4: see question #172. Item 5: USAC will consider enterprise AI services provided under terms that exclude USAC data from model training and provide adequate security and privacy controls; approval is case by case under Section 3.3. Item 6: material marked Available for Public Use is not subject to the authorization requirement in Section 3.3.1, but approval of the tool itself under Section 3.3 still applies.

	6. (Addendum § 3.3.1) Does the prior-authorization requirement in Section 3.3.1 extend to USAC documents that USAC has marked "Available for Public Use," such as this RFP and its attachments?	
244.	Conflicts of Interest 1. (Sections C.23 and E.6.A.4) Many engineering and technology consulting firms provide commercial services to telecommunications carriers and other entities that contribute to, or receive support from, the Universal Service Fund. Does such a commercial relationship, standing alone, constitute a disqualifying conflict of interest, or will USAC evaluate a proposed mitigation plan, for example personnel firewalls and the exclusion of named Key Personnel from engagements with USF participants for the Contract Term? Any guidance USAC can provide on the level of detail expected in a mitigation plan would be appreciated. 2. (Section E.6.A.4.b) Offerors must identify "any participation by Offeror, or any proposed subcontractor(s) or personnel associated with Offeror, in any of the universal service programs." Does this include indirect participation, for example work performed for a client that is itself an E-Rate or Rural Health Care beneficiary, or is disclosure limited to the Offeror's own participation as a contributor, applicant, or service provider?	Item 1: an ordinary-course commercial relationship with a USF contributor, beneficiary, service provider, or applicant is not automatically disqualifying. It must be disclosed, and the Offeror must propose specific mitigation measures, which USAC will evaluate under Section E.6.A.4.c. Personnel firewalls and exclusion of named Key Personnel from engagements with USF participants during the Contract Term are examples of measures USAC would consider. Item 2: disclosure covers the Offeror's own participation in the universal service programs and that of any proposed subcontractor or associated personnel. Work performed for a client that is itself a program beneficiary should be disclosed where it creates an actual, potential, or apparent conflict. See question #21.
245.	Should the oversight controls in the AI Implementation Strategy be designed to integrate with USAC's Zero Trust and FISMA maturity efforts, and if so, will the current state of those efforts be shared with the Contractor?	Yes. The oversight controls recommended in the AI Implementation Strategy should align with USAC's existing security program. Relevant current state material will be provided at the Kick-Off Meeting.
246.	You state Microsoft Copilot will be rolled out enterprise-wide by the end of 2026. Is this M365 Copilot, Copilot Chat, Security Copilot, or multiple offerings?	Microsoft 365 Copilot.
247.	Which regulatory requirements are considered most critical: privacy, FCC oversight, auditability, records retention, or all of the above?	All of them. Privacy, FCC regulatory oversight, auditability, and records retention each apply to USAC and to any recommendation produced under this Contract.
248.	Which stakeholder groups are expected to participate in the Current State Assessment (Executive Committee, Legal, Compliance, Security, HR, Program Operations, IT, etc.), and have participants already been identified?	Participation will span the four program divisions and the enterprise functions identified in Section A, including the Office of General Counsel, Information Systems, Finance, Audit and Assurance, Enterprise Process Improvement, and Human Resources, together with the AI Governance Committees. Specific participants will be identified at the Kick-Off Meeting.
249.	What documentation will USAC require to evaluate a proposed contractor AI tool or SaaS platform? For example, will USAC require system architecture, data-flow diagrams, model-provider information, SOC 2 reports, privacy controls, retention practices, human-oversight controls, or other security evidence?	Yes. USAC is interested in understanding an AI system data access, data flow diagrams, privacy/security controls and where humans are involved in the AI's work/review.
250.	Please clarify how USAC intends to evaluate and use the required pricing scenarios with and without AI. Are they alternative approaches from which USAC will select one at award, separate optional line items, or pricing	The two Bid Sheets are pricing comparison scenarios. USAC will determine at award which approach it approves under Section 3.3. The Technical Volume should present one core approach with a clearly

	comparison scenarios only? Must the Technical Volume contain two complete technical approaches, or may the Offeror provide one core approach with a clearly described AI-assisted variant? Please also define which contractor activities USAC considers “use of AI” for purposes of this requirement.	described AI-assisted variant rather than two complete technical approaches. See question #172 for what USAC considers use of AI.
251.	Please confirm that the Pilot Recommendation is limited to assessment, selection, planning, and development of an executable pilot charter and does not require prototyping, configuration, proof-of-concept development, software acquisition, deployment, or pilot operation during the four-month contract. Does USAC expect one recommended pilot or a ranked portfolio of candidate pilots? Please clarify whether the deliverable should include a business case, technical architecture, security assessment, implementation schedule, cost estimate, success measures, and acquisition strategy.	Confirmed. The Pilot Recommendation consists of identifying, evaluating, and recommending a pilot with an implementation plan. It does not include prototyping, configuration, proof-of-concept development, software acquisition, deployment, or pilot operation under this Contract. See questions #8 and #102.
252.	Should the Agentic AI Evaluation remain a strategic and governance-level assessment, or does USAC expect evaluation of specific vendors, platforms, products, architectures, or use cases? Should the Contractor provide detailed consumption-cost modeling, failure-mode analysis, testing protocols, control designs, and product comparisons? Has USAC identified any internal or external processes that should be treated as candidate agentic AI use cases?	See question #133.
253.	Which PM@USAC templates and recurring status artifacts will be mandatory?	See question #18. A charter, a project schedule, and a lessons learned exercise are required. PM@USAC templates will be provided at the Kick-Off Meeting.
254.	Key and supporting personnel: Does the maximum of three additional Key Personnel restrict only personnel designated as Key Personnel, or does it also limit non-key analysts, project management, accessibility, security, legal, or other supporting resources?	See question #212.
255.	Are there any key initiatives (security, IT, broader business) that may complicate the AI Program formalization and operationalization? If so, how?	USAC has several concurrent technology initiatives, including its enterprise data platform evaluation and E-Rate Productivity Center modernization. The roadmap should account for sequencing against initiatives of this kind, and current status will be provided at the Kick-Off Meeting.
256.	USAC states it hasn't committed to agentic AI and frames it as exploratory, but the roadmap is required to account for agentic capabilities across both internal and external processes. Does USAC want the roadmap to evaluate whether agentic AI is appropriate, including a defensible recommendation for or against it, or to assume it as a future direction and plan for it?	USAC wants a defensible recommendation on whether and when agentic AI is appropriate, not a plan that assumes adoption. See question #133.
257.	What level of stakeholder access should the Contractor expect across leadership, business, IT, security, privacy, and governance teams?	All stakeholders are included in AI Governance
258.	Should the Contractor's assessment and three-year roadmap specifically evaluate USAC's planned enterprise rollout of Microsoft Copilot, including governance, adoption, workforce readiness, licensing/cost	See question #225.

	management, security, use-case prioritization, and measurement of value?	
259.	3.3 Pgs 41-42 - Section 3.3 of the Privacy and Security Addendum requires written USAC approval before Contractor uses any AI tool, including for internal drafting or analysis. Given the kick-off meeting must happen within 10 workdays of award and the period of performance is only 4 months, what's the expected turnaround on that approval, and does USAC already maintain a pre-approved tool list?	See question #172.
260.	Could USAC clarify whether Offerors may retain ownership of pre-existing proprietary methodologies, frameworks, templates, tools, accelerators, and other intellectual property used in performing the engagement?	See question #134.
261.	Could USAC clarify whether the Contractor will be permitted to use its own enterprise AI tools for research, analysis, or document review during performance, subject to USAC approval and applicable security requirements?	See question #172.
262.	The RFP requires reporting of unauthorized AI use, security incidents, data misuse, or harmful AI output within one hour. Can USAC clarify whether this requirement applies only to incidents involving USAC systems/data or to any AI-related incident involving contractor personnel during contract performance?	The one-hour notification requirement applies to incidents affecting USAC interests, including USAC IT Systems, USAC Data, Confidential Information, PII, or work performed under this Contract.
263.	Could you please share the incumbent vendor's name, their previous response, and associated pricing for a similar contract?	See question #12. There is no incumbent vendor for this requirement.
264.	Please confirm the expected pricing and invoicing structure for this Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) requirement. Should offerors propose a single FFP amount covering the entire four-month period of performance, or should pricing be structured by individual deliverables, milestones, or monthly periods of performance? Additionally, please clarify the anticipated invoicing and payment approach associated with the selected pricing structure.	Offerors should propose a single firm fixed price covering the four-month period of performance in Attachment 1 - Bid Sheet. Offerors may also provide a breakdown by deliverable in a separate table or tab, as permitted by Section E.6.D.2.b. USAC prefers invoicing against accepted deliverable milestones rather than monthly billing. See question #59.
265.	Data-readiness scope — The Current State Assessment acceptance criteria include data readiness, but the detailed scope does not define it. Please clarify whether data readiness should include data governance, quality, lineage, access, architecture, privacy, retention, interoperability, and fitness for AI, and whether the contractor will review actual datasets or documentation only.	Data readiness covers governance, quality, lineage, classification, access, architecture, privacy, retention, and fitness for AI use. The assessment should be based on documentation, architecture material, and stakeholder interviews. Review of production datasets is not anticipated. See question #168.
266.	Microsoft Copilot scope — Which Microsoft Copilot product or products are planned for deployment—for example, Microsoft 365 Copilot, Copilot Chat, or role-specific Copilots—and what is the current status, expected user population, licensing model, and security/governance configuration? Should the contractor assess the rollout itself or treat it as a committed roadmap dependency.	Microsoft 365 Copilot
267.	What minimum coverage amounts does USAC require for each insurance type listed in the terms, and is proof of coverage required with the proposal or only before award?	USAC will review the proposed coverage limit by the offeror. Proof of coverage is required before the award but offerors may include it with their proposal

268.	Our firm uses outside counsel rather than an internal legal office. Will a certification from outside counsel satisfy the legal review requirement?	Yes
269.	Can different team members meet the two-day office requirement through an agreed schedule? RFP section: B.4.A. We would schedule office attendance around workshops, interviews, requirements gathering, and technical discovery. Can weekly coverage rotate among our proposed team members, with specialists attending for their scheduled activities? Please clarify whether the two-day minimum applies to each person or to our team as a whole, and how it applies to people who contribute only at specific stages or in occasional sessions.	Yes, see Q 1
270.	The RFP requires insurance coverage in amounts "required by law or appropriate for the industry," including professional liability and cyber liability, but does not identify minimum limits. Please provide any minimum coverage limits USAC will require for commercial general liability, professional/errors and omissions liability, cyber liability, automobile liability, and umbrella/excess coverage.	USAC has not established minimum coverage limits in this solicitation. Section C.22 requires coverage in amounts required by law or appropriate for the industry, whichever is greater.
271.	For the Deliverable Acceptance Form (DAF) process, if USAC requests revisions to a deliverable, does the 10-business-day contractor resubmission window pause or extend the overall 4-month contract schedule?	USAC expects overall contract deliverables to be completed within the overall 4-month contract schedule. However, if an extension is needed due to deliverable revisions, etc. USAC will work the vendor to properly extend the contract as needed.
272.	Are the four deliverables expected in a particular format or length, and does the final executive briefing require presenting in person at USAC headquarters?	USAC has not prescribed deliverable length. Written deliverables are expected in Microsoft Word and the Executive Briefing in Microsoft PowerPoint. See question #1 regarding on-site delivery of the final readout.
273.	Scope and Deliverables 1. (Sections B.5.A.2 and B.5.B) Please confirm that the Pilot Recommendation deliverable consists of identifying, evaluating, and recommending a pilot, together with an implementation plan, and does not include implementation, configuration, or deployment of the pilot under this Contract. 2. (Section B.5.B) The acceptance criteria for the AI Implementation Strategy require "Cost tracking and forecasting models, program-line allocation methodology, and oversight controls." Please clarify whether USAC is seeking a model that allocates projected AI cost across the four USF program lines and administrative divisions, and what level of granularity USAC expects. 3. (Section B.5.B) What level of cost accuracy does USAC expect for the three-year roadmap: rough order-of-magnitude planning estimates, budgetary estimates, or estimates supported by vendor quotations? 4. (Section B.5.B) Does USAC currently maintain a cost-allocation methodology for shared administrative or technology costs across USF program lines that the Contractor should extend to AI, or should the allocation	Item 1: confirmed, see question #251. Item 2: see questions #46 and #139; USAC is seeking a methodology that allocates projected AI cost across the four USF program lines and administrative divisions at a planning level of granularity. Item 3: rough order-of-magnitude planning estimates, see question #46. Item 4: see question #139. Item 5: see question #133. Item 6: the technology readiness assessment should remain at the level of enterprise architecture and AI enablement readiness; USAC will provide technology stack and architecture documentation at the Kick-Off Meeting, and the Copilot deployment is in scope per question #225. Item 7: see question #60. Item 8: see questions #19 and #1. Item 9: see question #253; PM@USAC artifacts should be priced as part of the firm fixed price.

	methodology be developed from first principles? 5. (Section B.5.A.2) Does USAC expect the Agentic AI Evaluation to identify specific candidate USAC use cases, or to remain at the level of concepts, oversight, output validation, monitoring, failure modes, and cost structures? 6. (Section B.5.A.1) Is the technology readiness assessment intended to remain at the level of enterprise architecture and AI enablement readiness, or does USAC expect detailed technical assessment of individual platforms, applications, and data repositories? Will USAC provide a technology stack inventory and architecture documentation, and does the assessment scope include the Microsoft Copilot deployment currently underway? 7. (Sections B.3 and B.5.B) Does USAC have target dates within the four-month term for each of the four deliverables, or should Offerors propose the deliverable schedule in their technical approach? 8. (Section B.5.B) Is the Executive Briefing and Final Readout expected to be a single session delivered to the AI Executive Committee, and is in-person delivery at USAC Headquarters or the FCC expected? 9. (Section B.11) Will PM@USAC templates and artifacts be provided at the Kick-Off Meeting? Does USAC expect specific project management deliverables (project charter, work breakdown structure, schedule, periodic status reports) in addition to the four deliverables listed in Section B.5.B, so that they may be priced?	
274.	Are the acceptance criteria in Section B.5.B the complete acceptance criteria for the four deliverables, or will USAC provide templates or additional criteria at kick-off?	The criteria in Section B.5.B are the acceptance criteria for the four deliverables. Any USAC templates that apply will be provided at the Kick-Off Meeting.
275.	What factors should drive prioritization within the roadmap: mission impact, risk reduction, operational efficiency, customer experience, implementation complexity, or expected return on investment?	Mission impact, risk reduction, and operational efficiency are USAC's primary considerations. The Contractor should propose the full prioritization model and validate it against the Current State Assessment findings.
276.	Beyond the acceptance criteria outlined in the RFP, does USAC have preferred report structures, presentation formats, or executive briefing expectations for the Current State Assessment deliverable?	All final deliverables must be done in USAC's style guide
277.	Deliverable formats and review cycles. Does USAC have preferred formats for the four deliverables (e.g., Word for the assessment and strategy, PowerPoint for the executive briefing)? Does the five-business-day acceptance period contemplate one consolidated set of USAC comments per deliverable?	See question #272. The five business day period in Section B.5.B contemplates one consolidated set of USAC comments per deliverable.
278.	Does USAC anticipate a preferred sequence or schedule for the four required deliverables? Should offerors assume one draft review cycle before formal Deliverable Acceptance Form submission, followed by the contractual correction cycle if required?	Offerors should propose the sequence. One draft review cycle before formal submission on a Deliverable Acceptance Form is a reasonable planning assumption. See question #60.
279.	Acceptance process — Should offerors assume one consolidated USAC review and comment cycle per deliverable, coordinated through the Program Manager?	Yes, the USAC PMO will collect all feedback and send consolidated feedback to the Contractor

	How will comments that introduce requirements outside the agreed acceptance criteria be handled?	
280.	Please confirm whether an offeror may identify pre-existing methodologies, templates, governance frameworks, software, models, and know-how as background intellectual property while providing USAC the rights required to use the contract-specific deliverables.	See question #134.
281.	If an offeror provides an FFP breakdown by deliverable, does USAC anticipate invoicing according to accepted deliverable milestones, or should offerors propose another allocation for periodic invoicing?	USAC anticipates invoicing against accepted deliverable milestones, consistent with the Deliverable Acceptance Form process in Section B.5.B. See questions #59 and #264.
282.	Please provide USAC's desired sequence and target completion dates for the Current-State Assessment, AI Implementation Strategy, Pilot Recommendation, and Executive Briefing and Final Readout. Should Offerors assume draft and final versions of each deliverable? How many review and revision cycles should be included? Will comments be consolidated through one USAC point of contact? Does the four-month period of performance include all five-business-day acceptance periods, corrections, final acceptance, and scheduling of the Executive Committee briefing?	See questions #60, #277, and #278. The four-month period of performance includes the acceptance periods, any corrections, final acceptance, and the Executive Committee briefing. Comments will be consolidated through the single USAC point of contact.
283.	Section B.3 (Contract Term), Page 5 - The contract term is four (4) months. Given the breadth of deliverables (Current State Assessment, three-year AI Implementation Strategy, Pilot Recommendation, and Executive Briefing), could USAC confirm whether the four-month term is inclusive of the deliverable review and acceptance periods, or does the term cover only the Contractor's performance period?	Yes
284.	What executive and Board audiences should the operating model, roadmap, and final briefing address?	The AI Executive Committee
285.	Does USAC have a preferred roadmap format, maturity scale, prioritization model, or standards crosswalk?	USAC has no preferred roadmap format or maturity scale. Offerors should propose what their methodology uses, and USAC will agree the format at the Kick-Off Meeting. On the prioritization model, USAC has not prescribed one. The Contractor should propose it and validate it against the Current State Assessment findings. USAC's primary considerations are mission impact, risk reduction, and operational efficiency; see question #275. On the standards crosswalk, the gap analysis and target-state model should be benchmarked against the NIST AI Risk Management Framework and ISO/IEC 42001, applied together with FCC regulatory expectations and USAC's privacy, security, and records obligations. See question #202. USAC does not require a particular crosswalk template.
286.	Acceptance: For each deliverable, will USAC provide one consolidated set of comments against the stated	Yes

	acceptance criteria, and will acceptance be based solely on completeness and conformity with the solicitation?	
287.	Contractor technology: Does USAC expect all assessment work and deliverable development to occur exclusively on USAC-issued technology, or may an approved contractor-managed environment be used if no USAC Data is stored or processed outside USAC?	All USAC work must occur exclusively on USAC-issued technology, and shared via USAC email and/or USAC network,
288.	Section 508: Which deliverables must be Section 508 conformant, and does USAC require a specific testing method, checklist, or accessibility conformance report? Federal guidance identifies PDFs, Word documents, spreadsheets, and presentations as electronic documents potentially subject to Section 508 requirements. [section508.gov]	Section C.40 applies to Services under the Contract. Written deliverables and presentations should be prepared so they are accessible. USAC is not requiring a specific testing method, checklist, or accessibility conformance report.
289.	Termination compensation: If USAC terminates for convenience, will payment include accepted deliverables, completed services, and demonstrable work in process performed before the effective termination date?	Yes, subject to review and approval by USAC.
290.	USAC is mid-rollout of CoPilot to all employees by end of 2026. Should the roadmap treat the CoPilot rollout as a fixed given to build around, or is its scope and pace something the strategy is expected to assess and potentially reshape?	See Q 159
291.	Are there specific business units or USAC programs that should be prioritized in the assessment and roadmap?	No business unit or program is being singled out for deeper assessment. All programs and divisions are in scope, including the enterprise support functions identified in Section A. See questions #15 and #210. Sequencing is a different matter. USAC is starting with lower-risk AI applications and is not applying AI to direct USF program administration at this time, though it may expand to USF administration as comfort levels increase. The roadmap and the pilot recommendation should reflect that posture. See questions #15 and #127.
292.	Should deliverables be provided in editable source formats (Word, PowerPoint, Excel) in addition to PDF?	Yes
293.	5.B Pgs 7-8 - Does USAC anticipate that implementation of the recommended pilot or roadmap initiatives could be acquired through an extension, option, modification, or follow-on task under the resulting contract, or does USAC expect such work to be separately competed?	See question #180. USAC expects implementation work arising from the roadmap to be separately competed.
294.	Does USAC anticipate follow-on procurements to implement the roadmap developed under this Contract? Would the awardee of this Contract be eligible to compete for that implementation work, or excluded on organizational conflict of interest grounds?	See question #180.
295.	Could USAC clarify the anticipated number of stakeholder interviews, workshops, and working sessions that Offerors should assume when developing the required deliverables?	See Q 70
296.	Could USAC clarify whether requested revisions during the deliverable acceptance process will be limited to	Yes. Revisions requested during the acceptance process will be limited to what is necessary to satisfy the acceptance criteria stated in Section B.5.B. A

	corrections necessary to satisfy the stated acceptance criteria and will not constitute additional scope?	change to the scope or direction of a deliverable would be handled through the contract modification process rather than as a rejected deliverable.
297.	The RFP requires deliverables to be corrected within ten business days following rejection at no additional cost. Can USAC clarify whether revisions are limited to addressing comments against the stated acceptance criteria, or could USAC request substantive changes to the scope/direction of a deliverable?	See question #296. The ten business day correction period applies to comments raised against the stated acceptance criteria. Substantive changes to scope or direction would be addressed through the contract modification process.
298.	Please identify the primary business units, governance bodies, and stakeholder groups expected to participate in the current-state assessment and roadmap activities, including any anticipated FCC stakeholder involvement.	See Q 70
299.	Since the initial contract term is four months, can USAC confirm that all four major deliverables, including the three-year AI roadmap, governance framework, pilot recommendation, and executive briefing, are expected to be completed within the initial four-month period?	Yes
300.	Experience & Past Performance (Volume 3): For the list of two (2) to three (3) current or recently completed contracts for similar services, will USAC consider commercial or non-federal engagements, and/or demonstrable work artifacts (e.g., delivered AI-governance frameworks, readiness assessments, working analytical tools with documentation), as evidence of capability for firms whose relevant experience was not performed under a contract of record?	Yes
301.	In Volume 3 (Past Performance), the RFP requires 2 to 3 contracts demonstrating enterprise AI strategy and governance in regulated environments within the past 3 years. Will USAC accept relevant commercial and public sector AI governance and advisory references that adhere to NIST AI RMF standards if federal USF-specific experience is not available?	Yes
302.	Can USAC clarify if the cover page and table of contents for each of the four proposal volumes are strictly excluded from the respective volume page counts (Volume 1: 4 pages, Volume 2: 12 pages, Volume 3: 5 pages, Volume 4: 4 pages)?	Cover page and table of contents for each of the four proposal volumes are excluded from the respective volume page counts
303.	Will USAC accept commercial engagements of similar scope as past performance references? Where the firm is newer, will USAC consider work the named Key Personnel performed while employed inside a large regulated enterprise?	USAC will accept commercial engagements of similar scope as past performance references. Key Personnel experience will be considered as qualification for the proposed Key Personnel not as organizational experience.
304.	Section E.6.C.3 requests two to three similar contracts. Will teaming-partner references be evaluated on the same basis as the prime offeror's references? May an offeror include a completed engagement for a commercial client that is subject to a confidentiality restriction, identified by industry and scope, with a reference	Teaming partner and subcontractor references will be evaluated on the same relevance, recency, and quality basis as the prime Offeror's references, with the performing entity clearly identified. See questions #33 and #320. On engagements subject to a confidentiality restriction, see question #312.
305.	Contract References (Volume 3, Item 3): If an offeror submits fewer than two contract references along with a written explanation, will USAC evaluate the proposal on	Section E.6.C.3 requires two to three references, and question #11 confirms that requirement. An Offeror that submits fewer should not assume a written explanation will be accepted in place of the required

	the provided references, or will it be deemed non-responsive?	references. USAC will evaluate what is submitted and may find Volume 3 non-compliant.
306.	Past Performance Substitution: The RFP asks for past performance references demonstrating AI strategy and governance work in regulated environments with federal oversight, funding, or reporting obligations comparable to USAC's. Would USAC consider past performance in other highly regulated commercial sectors, such as financial services or engagements involving clients with highly sensitive data, as satisfying this criterion, given the comparable rigor of governance and compliance obligations even though the regulator is not federal?	Yes. USAC will consider engagements in other highly regulated environments where the work is comparable in scope and the governance and compliance obligations are of comparable rigor. See questions #196, #197, #301, and #303.
307.	Volume 3 requests two to three comparable contracts, and the evaluation criteria address teaming partners and subcontractors. May all required references come from a named subcontractor if the prime does not have comparable contracts of its own? If so, what evidence of the subcontractor's commitment should accompany the proposal?	Yes. Where the prime Offeror does not hold comparable contracts of its own, references may be supplied by a named teaming partner or subcontractor, provided the performing entity and its role are clearly identified. USAC prefers past performance held by the prime; see question #33. No additional documentation beyond the information required by Section E.6.C.3 is required; see questions #36 and #10.
308.	May a proposed key person's comparable work performed at a previous employer count toward the Volume 3 references when the employer and the individual's role are clearly identified and the customer consents to being contacted? Or is that experience considered only in the personnel evaluation?	See questions #220 and #303. Work a proposed key person performed at a previous employer is considered in the evaluation of that individual's qualifications, not as organizational past performance under Volume 3.
309.	May the requested two or three past-performance references consist of a combination of prime-offeror and proposed-subcontractor projects, such as one prime-offeror project and one or two subcontractor projects, provided the performing entity and relevance are clearly identified?	Yes, provided the performing entity and the relevance of each engagement are clearly identified. See questions #33 and #307.
310.	For Volume 3, may commercial-client engagements be submitted as past performance when the engagement does not have a government-style contract number? If so, may the offeror provide the applicable agreement identifier or project name, together with value, dates, scope, and reference contacts?	Yes. See question #2. Where no contract number was assigned, a purchase order number, task order number, or engagement identifier is acceptable. All other elements required by Section E.6.C.3 must still be provided, including value, period of performance, scope, and reference contacts.
311.	Sections E.6.C and E.7.2 request two to three recent comparable contracts and allow teaming-partner references. May those contracts be supplied entirely by a named performing partner or subcontractor, with its role and reference attribution clearly identified?	Yes. See questions #33, #307, and #309.
312.	Past performance under NDA. Where an otherwise relevant engagement is subject to a confidentiality agreement, may an offeror describe the engagement with the client identified generically (e.g., by sector and size) while providing the reference contact information confidentially for USAC's direct verification?	Yes. Where a confidentiality agreement prevents naming the client, the engagement may be described by sector, size, scope, value, and period of performance. Working reference contact information must still be provided so USAC can transmit a past performance questionnaire. Offerors should identify such material as Confidential Information under Section E.3. Section E.6.C.3.b applies: USAC may not consider a contract for which it cannot obtain a reference.

313.	Section E.6.C.3 (Past Performance References), Page 50 - Past performance contracts must be "no older than three (3) years from the date of the solicitation." Does the three-year lookback period apply from the RFP issue date (August 31, 2026) or from the proposal due date (September 30, 2026)?	The three-year lookback runs from the solicitation issue date, August 31, 2026.
314.	General - May we include additional pages for abbreviations and references, and will those be excluded from the stated page limit?	No. Only the cover page and table of contents are excluded from the page limits. Lists of abbreviations and references count against the applicable volume limit. See question #190.
315.	Section B.3 specifies a four-month term, while Section C.2 references optional one-year renewal terms. Please confirm the intended Initial Term and whether any renewal options will be exercised.	The Initial Term is four months, as stated in Section B.3. No Optional Renewal Terms are anticipated under this Contract, and none should be priced on Attachment 1 - Bid Sheet. See questions #58 and #110.
316.	Could USAC clarify whether commercial-sector client references will be accepted for the required past performance examples, provided the engagements are comparable in scope, complexity, and organizational scale?	Yes. See questions #300, #301, #303, and #306.
317.	Could USAC clarify whether Offerors may use past performance from a parent company, subsidiary, affiliate, or other commonly controlled entity to satisfy the experience requirements?	Yes, provided the proposal identifies the entity that actually performed the work and explains how the resources, personnel, or capability behind that experience will be available to this engagement.
318.	If the Prime Offeror does not independently have the required relevant past performance, can the relevant experience and past performance of a proposed teaming partner or subcontractor be submitted as the primary past-performance examples for evaluation?	Yes. See questions #33 and #307. USAC prefers past performance held by the prime Offeror but will review any past performance proposed, with the performing entity clearly identified.
319.	Can the Offeror utilize the experience, qualifications, references, and past performance of proposed consultants who will support the delivery of the services under this RFP?	Yes, where those consultants are named in the proposal as part of the proposed team and the performing entity for each reference is clearly identified. Individual experience is evaluated as personnel qualification rather than organizational past performance; see questions #303 and #308.
320.	Can USAC clarify how the past performance of proposed teaming partners and/or subcontractors will be considered and weighted in the overall evaluation of the Offeror?	Teaming partner and subcontractor past performance is evaluated under Section E.7.2 on the same relevance, recency, and quality basis as the prime Offeror's, with the performing entity clearly identified. USAC prefers past performance held by the prime; see question #33. USAC is not publishing separate weighting; see question #227.
321.	For the required 2–3 past-performance references, does “within the last 3 years” mean that the contract must have been completed within the last three years, or that the contract may have started earlier but must have been active or completed during the three-year period?	The contract must have been active or completed within the three-year period. A contract that began earlier and continued into that period is acceptable. Ongoing contracts may also be submitted; see question #39. On the start of the lookback period, see question #313.
322.	For past-performance references, can USAC accept references from clients who are unable to complete the formal PPQ but can otherwise provide verification of the Offeror’s performance?	USAC's expectation is a completed past performance questionnaire. Under Section E.6.C.3.b, the Offeror is responsible for ensuring the questionnaire is completed and returned, and USAC may not consider a contract for which it cannot obtain a reference. Alternative written verification may be submitted but

		should not be assumed to substitute for the questionnaire.
--	--	--