Universal Service Administrative Company
Request for Information - Database of Broadband-Addressable Locations
Questions & Answers

No.	Question	Answer
1	**Confidentiality:** Is there a method by which a RFI response can be submitted confidentially, or redacted in part, to protect proprietary and/or competitively sensitive information? We would like to provide a more detailed, technical response—but our ability to do that would be inhibited if the responses in their entirety will be made available via the FCC's ECFS system.	The response submitted to the email address identified in the RFI is only accessible to USAC Procurement Officials. Since the RFI states that the responses will be submitted in the FCC's ECFS system, if the respondent would like a portion of its RFI response redacted from public view, it should submit a confidentiality request in WC Docket No. 19-195 (for the Digital Opportunity Data Collection).
2	**Confidentiality:** Similarly, can the content of product demonstrations be considered confidential? Will a notice of ex parte communication be required to be filed by each demonstrating party?	The information shared in the demonstration will not be made publicly available via ECFS. The respondents should appropriately mark its shared documents/information for confidentiality, etc. However, these information will be made available to USAC and FCC staff as needed.
3	**Priority:** Will a priority be placed on database completeness, accuracy, timeline to readiness, or cost in assessing a solution?	Completeness, accuracy, recency of the data, the ability to update, and cost are all important factors to consider in creating a database of broadband-addressable locations. Regarding the elements of accuracy and completeness specifically, we note that an error rate of just 1% would mean that 1.5 million locations were missing or incorrectly placed, which could be present problems for universal service decision making. The purpose of the RFI is to get a better understanding of the different data sources that could be used to create this database and the advantages and downsides associated with each, including their accuracy, age, level of completeness, and cost. Until we know more about these factors, we cannot predict what the priority of each would be in a potential future RFP to create this database.
4	**Vintage:** How important is the vintage/recency of the data (i.e., would structure data based on imagery captured 10 years ago be judged as inadequate)?	
5	**Completeness:** How important is completeness of the data (i.e., would a solution capturing only 75% of the structures be "good enough" or "woefully inadequate")?	
6	**Ability to Update:** How important is updating capability (i.e., would the ability to update structure information year-over-year with the most recent satellite imagery available on the market be valuable)?	
7	**Timeline:** What details can you share regarding a timeline for a potential RFP and contract award for the Database of Broadband-Addressable Locations, vis-à-vis the FCC's plans for collecting service availability data from broadband service providers via the DODC? Should the database be developed (or otherwise acquired) first, or in parallel with the DODC data collection?	USAC currently have no details regarding a timeline for a potential RFP or contract award for a database of broadband-addressable locations.