Universal Service Administrative Co.

Universal Service Administrative Co. (USAC)
IT-26-026 – Enterprise Data Platform
Questions & Answers

Q#	Question	Answer
1.	What is your preferred method of data ingestion to the future target enterprise data platform?	the platform should "Enable incremental and near-real-time ingestion where appropriate (including CDC)." The future-state conceptual architecture should include Full Load, Incremental, and Near-Real-Time ingestion patterns. Currently, USAC uses Pentaho Data Integration (PDI) for batch ETL.
2.	What are the specific data sources that you are looking to load into the new environment?	Data from USAC's internal systems will be loaded in the platform. SQL server, Oracle, PostgreSQL, MariaDB are some RDBMS systems that these transactional systems leverage. Besides these there will be data loaded from manual feeds (csv,excel etc.)
3.	What is the expected volume & velocity of that data movement within the USAC enterprise to the data platform?	Over two decades of historical data reside in the active storage layer. Daily volume is around 50GB-100 GB. Total structured data currently in EDW is approximately 10-13TB in size.
4.	What external data feeds do you receive and in what format?	USAC receives external data feeds from the FCC and other federal agencies. File formats include structured data (databases, CSV), semi-structured data, and manual spreadsheet-based feeds (particularly for Finance).external datasets include death master file, SAM.gov data, census data, location data (fabric ID) for High Cost etc.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
5.	What is your future target cloud environment—AWS, Azure, or Google GCE?	AWS and AZURE align with USAC's cloud strategy.
6.	What ERP and other applications are running in that cloud presently?	Refer to response for Q2. USAC has Oracle EBS for finance ERP and dynamics 365 for CRM besides transactional systems discussed in Q2.
7.	What business decisions will be made with data in the EDP?	The EDP will support: (1) program administration and compliance reporting for four USF programs (High Cost, Lifeline, RHC, E-Rate); (2) financial management and reporting; (3) program integrity analytics and fraud detection; (4) open data publication for public accountability and transparency; (5) broadband deployment tracking and mapping; (6) audit support and FCC regulatory compliance; (7) future AI-assisted data management capabilities.8) ML/predictive analytics
8.	What is the GIS use case?	USAC uses GIS primarily for the High-Cost Program (HUBB), which captures latitude and longitude coordinates for every location where broadband service is available, displaying this on a public-facing map. ESRI ArcGIS implementation is underway.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
9.	What hardware and databases are currently operating in your legacy data environment?	USAC currently operates a Vertica-based Enterprise Data Warehouse (EDW) in an on-premises environment. The EDW processes approximately 9,750 daily loaded tables. The architecture includes three data layers: L1 (raw/staging), L2 (ODS/standardized), and L3 (EDW/analytical). Integration is performed via Pentaho Data Integration (PDI). The current EDW lacks failover capabilities, and peak CPU utilization exceeds 75% between 3 AM and 10 AM. The EDW holds over two decades of data in the active storage layer, contributing to performance issues and query timeouts. Reporting is conducted via Tableau.
10.	Do you have any workloads running in a FedRAMP ATO cloud today, and if so what cloud are they operating on?	Yes, USAC has workloads running on FedRAMP ATO and these are running on AWS, Azure and Oracle cloud.
11.	Is it your desire for future data governance/quality/lineage tooling to support all enterprise applications, or only what's within the enterprise data platform boundary?	USAC is pursuing enterprise-wide data governance. Respondents should describe capabilities that support enterprise-wide governance.
12.	In Section 12 "Company Overview," the RFI requests "Years of experience in providing email marketing automation software." Please confirm this is a template error and advise the correct wording for this RFI.	Yes, this is a template error. The correct wording should read "Years of experience in providing Enterprise Data Platform." This has been confirmed in the redlined RFI.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
13.	In the required response format, Section 3 "Experience" states "Maximum: Two (3) Pages." Please confirm the intended page limit.	The page limit for Section 3 (Experience) is Three (3) Pages.
14.	Please confirm whether USAC prefers vendors to respond in the exact sequence of Sections 7.1 through 7.12, question-by-question, or whether a narrative response with a compliance mapping table is acceptable.	narrative response with a compliance mapping table is acceptable.
15.	Please confirm whether USAC will accept a brief appendix for reference architecture diagrams and security evidence (as applicable), provided the total submission remains within the file-size limit.	Yes. Annexes and attachments are not counted in the page limit, as confirmed in the RFI. Respondents may include appendices for architecture diagrams and security evidence, provided the total submission remains within the 25 MB file-size limit.
16.	Please confirm whether USAC expects vendors to provide budgetary pricing in bands with key cost drivers only, versus more granular line-item estimates for software licensing and subscriptions at the RFI stage.	Provide a high-level overview of pricing structure and cost drivers, typical consumption metrics, and factors that materially increase or decrease cost. No binding pricing is requested. Pricing in bands with key cost drivers is appropriate for the RFI stage.
17.	For the Pricing Estimate section, should respondents include infrastructure and hosting costs separately, or should costs be presented strictly as software licensing and software subscriptions (with hosting assumed to be included in SaaS subscription pricing)?	Respondents should clearly identify the major cost components and what is included.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
18.	If hosting should be included, does USAC prefer it bundled into the subscription estimate, or broken out as a separate cost driver (for example, storage, compute/consumption, number of environments, data egress)?	Refer to response for Q17.
19.	Does USAC anticipate providing the cloud environment (USAC-managed cloud) or should vendors assume vendor-managed SaaS hosting end-to-end?	Vendor-managed SaaS hosting model or deploying on USAC's AWS FedRAMP instance both will be considered.
20.	What primary pricing metric does USAC want vendors to use in estimates: number of users, data volume (TB), compute/consumption, number of environments, number of connectors/sources, or another metric?	Respondents should identify their pricing model and key cost drivers (e.g., users, data volume, compute, environments, connectors) and explain factors that materially affect cost.
21.	Will USAC's anticipated next step be a single RFP covering both the platform subscription and implementation services, or separate procurements?	USAC may issue a future RFP based on information collected. The scope of such RFP will be determined after evaluating the responses for this RFI.
22.	Will USAC consider responses from implementation and integration service providers who are not the OEM platform provider, where the OEM platform is provided through the authorized vendor channel?	The RFI is open to all interested parties.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
23.	Are there any supplier diversity considerations being captured in this market research (for example, small business, WOSB), even if no formal MWBE/GFE goals are listed in the RFI?	N/A
24.	When USAC states alignment with FedRAMP Moderate security requirements, do you require a platform that is already FedRAMP Moderate Authorized, or will “FedRAMP Moderate in process” be considered? If in process is acceptable, please specify the minimum evidence USAC wants cited in the response.	Respondents should clearly state their current FedRAMP authorization status, including any "in process" status with supporting evidence such as a 3PAO engagement letter, SAR status, or timeline to authorization. Deploying on USAC’s AWS FedRAMP instance is available as an option.
25.	What is USAC’s standard identity provider and SSO approach (for example, SAML or OIDC), and are there mandatory requirements for MFA and conditional access integration?	USAC has a dedicated CISO and an integrated Information Security and Privacy Policy (ISPP). USAC implements a least-privilege access model and is implementing Zero Trust Architecture (ZTA) per FCC mandate. USAC uses OKTA. Respondents should describe SSO integration capabilities for common enterprise IdPs.
26.	Do you require customer-managed encryption keys (BYOK or equivalent), or are vendor-managed keys acceptable?	Respondents should describe both BYOK/CMEK and vendor-managed encryption options.
27.	What are the audit logging expectations (log types, retention duration, and any SIEM integration requirements)?	Respondents should describe audit logging capabilities including integration with common SIEM platforms.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
28.	Please confirm whether specific data classes are in scope that drive requirements beyond standard PII handling (for example, any CUI-like handling expectations), and whether there are defined data residency requirements (US-only hosting, specific regions).	Respondents should describe different types of data classes that the platform can support. US-based hosting would be expected. Respondents should describe support for multiple data classification levels.
29.	What are the primary source systems expected to feed the platform in Phase 1 (ERP, program systems, operational systems, GIS systems, external feeds), and approximately how many distinct source systems are expected in Phase 1?	Refer to response for Q2 and Q6. likely initial sources would include the ERP system, program-specific operational systems (HUBB, National Verifier, NLAD,EPC, RHC,HCLI etc.), and financial data feeds.
30.	What is the approximate data footprint today and expected growth (total TB stored, average daily ingest volume, peak processing windows)?	Refer to response for Q3.
31.	Which domains truly require CDC or near-real-time ingestion, and what freshness targets should vendors assume for those domains?	Respondents should propose tiered freshness approaches accommodating batch (majority of workloads), near-real-time (for time-sensitive program and financial data), and CDC where source systems support it.
32.	Which BI tools are currently used (for example, Power BI, Tableau, Qlik, Looker), and are there constraints on changing tools?	USAC currently uses Tableau (both Server and Desktop) as its primary BI tool. Respondents should describe integration with Tableau and any native BI capabilities.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
33.	What are the top five outcomes USAC wants to enable in the first six to twelve months (for example, governance improvements, quality controls, faster reporting, open data publication, program integrity analytics)?	Specific prioritization for the EDP would be confirmed during RFP and implementation planning.
34.	For environment isolation (Dev, Test/QA, Pre-Prod, Prod), do you require separate tenants or subscriptions, or is logical isolation within a single tenant acceptable?	Respondents should describe their isolation approach, whether physical or logical, and demonstrate how security controls are enforced across all environments.
35.	The RFI notes a current lack of failover and disaster recovery. Should vendors assume the target platform must provide DR, and if so, what RTO and RPO targets should be assumed?	Yes. Respondents should include DR capabilities in their proposals.
36.	Does USAC have an existing data governance operating model (data owners, stewards, council), or should vendors propose an approach to stand it up?	USAC has begun but not fully operationalized its data governance model. Vendors should be prepared to support and build upon existing but nascent governance efforts.
37.	Do you currently use third-party catalog or governance tooling, or should vendors assume these functions will be delivered within the platform?	USAC has invested in Collibra as its data catalog tool. Refer to response for Q11 and Q36.
38.	What level of lineage is required (end-to-end source-to-report, column-level lineage, transformation lineage), and are there specific stewardship workflows USAC expects?	End-to-end lineage from source to consumption. Respondents should describe capabilities for end-to-end lineage including column-level and transformation lineage to support audit defensibility.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
39.	For data quality rules, who is expected to author rules (business users versus engineers), and is no-code rule authoring required in addition to SQL-based rules?	Currently USAC relies on distributed manual processes and spreadsheets. Both business user and engineer rule authoring should be supported.
40.	Which GIS tools are in use today, how is GIS data currently stored and published, and what spatial standards must be supported (for example, OGC, GeoJSON, WKT/WKB)?	USAC uses ESRI ArcGIS. The RFI requests respondents to describe spatial data type support, spatial indexing, and geospatial query/analysis functions.
41.	What are the expected GIS data volumes and update frequency, and what is the expected mechanism for controlled external publication (open data portal, APIs, public datasets, map services)?	Refer to response for Q8 and Q40. The RFI requests respondents to address controlled external publication of GIS-enabled data.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
42.	What is the current analytics platform being migrated from, and what are the primary pain points driving this effort?	USAC is migrating from a Vertica-based on-premises EDW. Key pain points identified in assessments include: (1) No failover capabilities, creating risk for ERP and Open Data operations; (2) Rigid architecture that prevents on-demand scaling during peak loads; (3) Reporting heavily relies on a normalized data model inherited from source applications rather than analytical needs; (4) Over two decades of data in the active storage layer causing performance issues and timeouts; (5) Scheduling gaps and manual job restarts leading to delays and increased operational effort; (6) Vertica lacks native integration with modern orchestration, DevOps, and data science platforms; (7) Talent scarcity for Vertica-specific skills; (8) Restricted partitioning constraining performance optimization.
43.	Does USAC anticipate a domain-based phased migration, and is there a preferred sequence?	Prioritization would be determined during implementation planning.
44.	During the hybrid transition period, what parallel run duration and reconciliation standards should vendors assume prior to cutover?	Respondents should propose validation and reconciliation approaches as part of their migration methodology.
45.	Are there any hard deadlines tied to FCC reporting cycles, program timelines, or audit windows that should shape the migration approach?	Respondents should describe how their approach accommodates regulatory reporting windows.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
46.	Is remote delivery acceptable for configuration, implementation, and training, or does USAC anticipate any on-site work?	The RFI is intended for platform evaluation.
47.	Are there constraints on personnel access (US persons only, background checks, security training) that vendors should assume for implementation and support teams?	USAC operates under FCC oversight and FISMA/NIST requirements. Staff are required to sign IT Rules of Behavior and complete security training. US-persons-only .Respondents should describe their personnel security practices and clearance capabilities.
48.	What is the current data platform architecture (e.g., warehouse, lake, lakehouse, BI tools)?	Refer to response for Q9. In summary: USAC operates a Vertica-based on-premises EDW with three data layers (L1, L2, L3). BI is delivered through Tableau (Server and Desktop). Integration uses Pentaho Data Integration (PDI). There is no data lake or lake house in the current architecture.L2 is treated as data lake and has structure identical to transactional systems.
49.	What is the expected migration timeline (phased vs. big bang)?	Refer to response for Q43
50.	Is FedRAMP Moderate authorization required at time of proposal or roadmap acceptable?	Refer to response for Q24.
51.	What is the expected peak user concurrency?	Respondents should describe scalability and concurrency capabilities and propose sizing approaches.
52.	Is there an existing data governance framework or data stewardship model?	Refer to response for Q11 and Q36.
53.	What GIS platform(s) are currently in use (e.g., Esri/ArcGIS)?	Refer to response for Q8 and Q40. USAC uses ESRI ArcGIS.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
54.	What BI tools are currently used?	Refer to response for Q32.
55.	What internal skill sets currently exist (data engineers, architects, analysts)?	The RFI is intended for platform evaluation.
56.	Is there a target budget range established?	Pricing is for budgetary analysis.
57.	What are the top 3 weighted evaluation criteria (e.g., security, cost, scalability)?	Formal evaluation criteria would be defined in a future RFP.
58.	Section 12, Section 1 references "years of experience in providing email marketing automation software." Please confirm whether this is a template error and clarify whether USAC intends respondents to address enterprise data platform experience instead.	Refer to response for Q12.
59.	Section 12, Section 3 states "Maximum: Two (3) Pages." Please confirm whether the page limit for Section 3 – Experience is two (2) pages or three (3) pages.	Refer to response for Q13. The limit is Three (3) Pages.
60.	Section 5 states on-premises-only solutions are out of scope. Does USAC have an existing cloud environment preference (e.g., AWS GovCloud, Azure Government, or cloud-agnostic) for the target SaaS platform?	Refer to response for Q5.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
61.	Section 6 identifies "Lack of failover and disaster recovery" as a current-state constraint to "design around." Is USAC seeking a platform that provides its own failover and DR capabilities to resolve this gap, or should respondents assume DR remains out of scope for this initiative?	Refer to response for Q35.
62.	How many concurrent users does USAC anticipate accessing the enterprise data platform across all programs? Please provide approximate ranges for (a) data consumers/analysts and (b) administrative/engineering users.	Refer to response for Q51.
63.	What is the approximate volume of data USAC expects to manage on the platform (e.g., current data footprint in terabytes, expected annual growth rate)?	Refer to response for Q3 and Q30.
64.	Please identify the ERP system(s) and key operational systems currently in use at USAC that the enterprise data platform would need to integrate with, per Section 5.	Refer to response for Q2 and Q6.
65.	Should respondents understand the data platform's relationship to existing systems (ERP, HUBB, E-Rate, Lifeline, etc.) as primarily read-only consumption, or does USAC envision bidirectional data flows between the platform and source systems?	The data platform is primarily for analytical consumption (read-only from source systems). However, data from the proposed platform will serve as source for financial transactions (disbursements, payments etc.).

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
66.	Does USAC envision the data platform publishing directly to external-facing endpoints, feeding processed data back to existing systems for publication, or enabling business users to generate and publish outputs through self-service tools?	USAC operates opendata.usac.org for external data publication. Respondents should describe external publication capabilities.
67.	What is USAC's anticipated timeline for the hybrid transition period? Does USAC envision a phased migration over months or years?	Refer to response for Q49.
68.	Does USAC prefer a fixed subscription pricing model, a consumption-based pricing model, or is USAC open to both approaches for the enterprise data platform?	Respondents should describe their pricing model and any available alternatives.
69.	Does USAC classify USF program data as Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI), Federal Contract Information (FCI), or another data classification category? What is the highest data sensitivity level the platform must handle?	Respondents should describe support for multiple data classification levels.
70.	Does USAC require the selected vendor to support USAC's existing identity provider for SSO integration, or will USAC adopt the vendor's identity management solution? If the former, please identify the IdP standard (e.g., SAML 2.0, OIDC) and/or vendor.	Refer to response for Q25.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
71.	Does USAC require the enterprise data platform to support unstructured data (e.g., documents, images, audio) in addition to the structured and semi-structured data referenced in Section 5, or is unstructured data out of scope?	Respondents should describe unstructured data capabilities if available.
72.	Does USAC have a target latency threshold for near-real-time igestion from source change to platform availability?	Refer to response for Q31.
73.	How many distinct data sources does USAC anticipate integrating with the enterprise data platform? Please provide an approximate count and general categories (e.g., databases, APIs, flat files, streaming).	Refer to response for Q2,Q29 and Q6. USAC has at minimum: one ERP system, four major program operational systems (HUBB, National Verifier, EPC, RHC systems), Finance systems, GIS (ArcGIS), external FCC feeds. Respondents should anticipate integration with databases, APIs, flat files, and potentially streaming sources.
74.	Does USAC have an existing BI tool or analytics platform (e.g., Tableau, Power BI, Looker) that must integrate with the new enterprise data platform, or is BI tool selection part of this initiative?	Refer to response for Q32. USAC uses Tableau. Respondents should describe integration capabilities with Tableau and whether BI tool selection is included in the platform offering.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
75.	For AI and Advanced Analytics (Section 7.8), does USAC have specific AI/ML use cases in mind (e.g., fraud detection for Lifeline, broadband coverage prediction for High Cost), or is this capability requested as a general platform readiness requirement for future use?	Potential future use cases include program integrity analytics, fraud detection (Lifeline), Auto-clearing funding requests and broadband coverage prediction (High Cost).
76.	For platform maintenance and upgrades (Section 7.10), does USAC require a defined maintenance window, or does USAC expect zero-downtime upgrades?	Respondents should describe their upgrade and maintenance approach.
77.	What spatial data formats does USAC currently use or expect to ingest (e.g., Shapefile, GeoJSON, KML, WKT, Parquet with geometry columns)?	respondents should describe support for spatial data types, spatial indexing, and geospatial query functions. Standard formats such as Shapefile
78.	What is the approximate volume of geospatial records USAC manages (e.g., number of location points for broadband deployment, coverage polygons)?	Refer to responses for Q8 and Q40.
79.	Does USAC require the enterprise data platform to serve as the system of record for GIS data, or will a separate GIS system remain authoritative with the data platform receiving copies for analytics?	the GIS system (ArcGIS) is expected to remain the authoritative source for spatial data. The data platform would receive copies for analytics, reporting, and governed external publication.
80.	Does USAC have historical data that must be migrated to the new platform, and if so, how many years of historical data should respondents plan to migrate?	Respondents should propose approaches for both historical migration and archival.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
81.	Does USAC have target data freshness requirements (e.g., dashboards refreshed within X minutes of source update) for its primary analytical workloads?	Refer to response for Q31.
82.	Does USAC anticipate that the enterprise data platform will need to process or store Personally Identifiable Information (PII) such as consumer names, addresses, or income verification data from the Lifeline or E-Rate programs, and if so, are there specific PII handling requirements beyond the FISMA/NIST standards referenced in Section 2?	Yes. The Lifeline Program processes consumer eligibility data including consumer names, addresses, and income verification data. Respondents should describe PII handling capabilities including masking, encryption, and access controls.
83.	For the "external publication" capability referenced in Section 4 and Section 7.7, does USAC require the platform to support any particular open data standards (e.g., CKAN, DCAT, or data.gov-compatible metadata schemas) for publishing USF program data to the public?	Respondents should describe supported open data standards and publication mechanisms.
84.	Section 12, Section 1 references "years of experience in providing email marketing automation software." Please confirm whether this is a template error and clarify whether USAC intends respondents to address enterprise data platform experience instead.	Refer to response for Q12.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
85.	Is USAC seeking a SaaS-based Enterprise Data Platform only, or should the solution also incorporate AI-as-a-Service (AIaaS) capabilities as part of the overall strategy?	Respondents should describe how their platform enables AI readiness and any native AI-assisted features.
86.	Is the primary objective focused on strengthening governance and compliance, or on expanding advanced analytics and AI-driven insights?	primary near-term objective is strengthening governance, data quality, and compliance. Respondents should describe both pre-built AI capabilities and platform support for future ML and advanced analytics development.
87.	What level of GIS capability is required, and should the solution integrate with ArcGIS, QGIS, or any existing/preferred GIS platform?	Refer to response for Q8 and Q40. The existing platform is ESRI ArcGIS.
88.	Is a phased migration approach preferred, or is an enterprise-wide transition anticipated?	Refer to response for Q43
89.	During migration, will the new platform need to support parallel reporting and reconciliation with existing legacy systems?	would be determined during implementation planning.
90.	Beyond FedRAMP Moderate alignment, are there additional resilience, disaster recovery, high availability, RTO/RPO, or operational continuity requirements that should be considered foundational?	Refer to response for Q35. Respondents should describe their HA/DR capabilities and propose appropriate RTO/RPO targets.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
91.	Under Section 1, the RFI requests respondents to provide their "Years of experience in providing email marketing automation software". Can USAC confirm if this is a typo from a previous document, or if marketing automation/communications capabilities are an intended scope of this Enterprise Data Platform?	Refer to response for Q12.
92.	Can you elaborate on the transactional systems of record that are out of scope, and what they are used for?	Refer to responses for Q2,Q29,Q73 and Q6.
93.	To support the 'hybrid transition period where legacy and new platforms may operate in parallel', what are the critical legacy systems and data sources that will require abstraction via an API layer to ensure consistent data flow during migration?	Respondents should describe their approach to legacy system integration during the transition period.
94.	To 'Provide governed access for internal analytics and external publication (e.g., open data)', does USAC currently have an established API strategy or an existing API Management solution that would govern the consumption of data from the new Enterprise Data Platform?	USAC leverages AWS API gateway. Respondents should describe API management capabilities of the platform in detail.
95.	Please elaborate on current systems of record, such as ERP, operational systems, APIs, and file-based feeds.	Refer to response for Q2 and Q6.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
96.	Regarding the data ingestion and processing requirements, can you specify which ERP system(s) are currently in use as sources and targets?	Refer to response for Q2 and Q6.
97.	For near-real-time and CDC requirements, please specify which source systems require real-time/near-real-time ingestion versus batch, acceptable data latency for different use cases (seconds, minutes, hours), and anticipated transaction volumes for streaming data sources.	Refer to response for Q31.
98.	Is there an existing data governance initiative in place for this Enterprise Data Platform project? If so, has a specific governance framework (e.g., DAMA-DMBOK, DCAM) been selected or recommended?	Refer to response for Q11 and Q36.
99.	Have any other data governance or metadata management solutions been evaluated or previously used for this project? If yes, could you share any pain points or limitations experienced with those solutions?	Yes. USAC implemented Collibra for data cataloging and metadata management. Pain points include metadata is only ingested via spreadsheets, not from source systems directly; programs have varying familiarity with the tool; there is a need for further user buy-in, training, and resource support. Previously, Microsoft Master Data Services (MDS) was attempted for MDM but was not successfully operationalized. The lack of MDM remains an issue for EDW and downstream reporting.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
100.	Does USAC maintain a business glossary as part of its governance efforts? How is it managed and integrated with the data platform?	A formal enterprise business glossary does not exist in a complete state. Collibra is being used for some metadata cataloging.
101.	Is there a defined data stewardship model? How many data stewards are actively involved in the project, and what are their primary responsibilities?	Data stewards are designated in some areas.
102.	What external governance or metadata management tools, if any, are currently integrated or planned to be integrated with the data platform?	Refer to response for Q37 and Q99. Collibra is the primary tool. No other external governance tools are identified in the documents.
103.	How are data quality concerns and issues currently monitored and remediated within USAC's environment? Is there an established workflow or ticketing process for data quality issue resolution	There is no formal strategy, approach, standards, or tool for data quality. USAC relies on distributed manual processes (spreadsheets, limited automation). Most issues with data are only discovered when an anomaly is observed (ad hoc) and are addressed manually. There is no robust root cause analysis process. Pentaho Data Integration performs some basic data cleansing, but data quality issues need to be addressed at the source. There are no data quality metrics, monitoring dashboards, or formal program in place.
104.	Is data quality remediation handled reactively based on issue detection, or is there a proactive approach with automated profiling and rule enforcement?	Currently reactive. The goal is to move toward proactive data quality management.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
105.	Please provide a breakdown of expected analytics needs, including size of users by audience (data analysts, business users, executives, external.public), primary use cases (self-service dashboards, ad-hoc analysis, conversational analytics), and any requirements for mobile analytics access.	Respondents should provide details of platform capabilities and details on analytics, BI reports etc. that platform/solution supports.
106.	Please specify priority AI/ML use cases and what, if any, preferences for different tools and languages for these use cases. Are you looking for pre-built AI capabilities (e.g., automated data quality, anomaly detection) or a platform that supports custom ML model development and deployment?	Refer to response for Q75. Respondents should describe both pre-built AI capabilities and platform support for future ML development.
107.	How is data democratization and data sharing currently managed within USAC? Is there a formal workflow or approval process for data requests and sharing, or is it handled manually or informally?	data sharing is ad hoc and lacks automated integration; there is no standard design pattern for internal data sharing between programs
108.	In the context of the required Role-based, row-level, and attribute-based access controls, will these controls be enforced solely within the data platform, or is USAC looking for an upstream component (like an API gateway) to enforce preliminary access controls and security policies (e.g., rate limiting, token validation) on data consumers?	Respondents should describe their access control approach and any integration with upstream security components.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
109.	Regarding data masking and encryption, are there requirements for tokenizing or masking sensitive data in transit (during ingestion via the integration layer) before it is persisted in the Enterprise Data Platform?	Respondents should describe data masking and tokenization capabilities for both data at rest and in transit.
110.	The RFI mentions "Phased onboarding by data domain". Can USAC provide a high-level overview of the specific data domains (e.g., specific programs like the Lifeline National Eligibility Verifier or High Cost Universal Broadband Portal) that are prioritized for the initial phased onboarding?	USAC programs include High Cost/HUBB, Lifeline/National Verifier, RHC, E-Rate/EPC, Finance, and Audit. Sequencing and prioritization will be determined during implementation planning
111.	Please provide details on geospatial data requirements, particularly which GIS tools are currently in use and what assets from those tools will need to be analyzed, reported on, and shared.	Refer to response for Q40 and Q8.
112.	How are these GIS capabilities integrated with the enterprise data platform, and what standards or protocols are used for interoperability?	Currently, GIS is not integrated with the EDW due to Vertica limitations. Respondents should describe their approach to GIS integration. Refer to responses for Q8 and Q40.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
113.	Under Section 1, the RFI requests respondents to provide their "Years of experience in providing email marketing automation software". Can USAC confirm if this is a typo from a previous document, or if marketing automation/communications capabilities are an intended scope of this Enterprise Data Platform?	Refer to response for Q12.
114.	Can you elaborate on the transactional systems of record that are out of scope, and what they are used for?	Refer to responses for Q2,Q29,Q73 and Q6.
115.	To support the 'hybrid transition period where legacy and new platforms may operate in parallel', what are the critical legacy systems and data sources that will require abstraction via an API layer to ensure consistent data flow during migration?	Refer to response for Q93.
116.	To 'Provide governed access for internal analytics and external publication (e.g., open data)', does USAC currently have an established API strategy or an existing API Management solution that would govern the consumption of data from the new Enterprise Data Platform?	Refer to response for Q94.
117.	Please elaborate on current systems of record, such as ERP, operational systems, APIs, and file-based feeds.	Refer to response for Q95. Refer to response for Q2 and Q6.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
118.	Regarding the data ingestion and processing requirements, can you specify which ERP system(s) are currently in use as sources and targets?	Refer to response for Q96.
119.	For near-real-time and CDC requirements, please specify which source systems require real-time/near-real-time ingestion versus batch, acceptable data latency for different use cases (seconds, minutes, hours), and anticipated transaction volumes for streaming data sources.	Refer to response for Q31.
120.	Is there an existing data governance initiative in place for this Enterprise Data Platform project? If so, has a specific governance framework (e.g., DAMA-DMBOK, DCAM) been selected or recommended?	Refer to response for Q11 and Q36.
121.	Have any other data governance or metadata management solutions been evaluated or previously used for this project? If yes, could you share any pain points or limitations experienced with those solutions?	Refer to response for Q99.
122.	Does USAC maintain a business glossary as part of its governance efforts? How is it managed and integrated with the data platform?	Refer to response for Q100.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
123.	Is there a defined data stewardship model? How many data stewards are actively involved in the project, and what are their primary responsibilities?	Refer to response for Q101.
124.	What external governance or metadata management tools, if any, are currently integrated or planned to be integrated with the data platform?	Refer to response for Q102.
125.	How are data quality concerns and issues currently monitored and remediated within USAC's environment? Is there an established workflow or ticketing process for data quality issue resolution	Refer to response for Q103.
126.	Is data quality remediation handled reactively based on issue detection, or is there a proactive approach with automated profiling and rule enforcement?	Refer to response for Q104.
127.	Please provide a breakdown of expected analytics needs, including size of users by audience (data analysts, business users, executives, external.public), primary use cases (self-service dashboards, ad-hoc analysis, conversational analytics), and any requirements for mobile analytics access.	Refer to response for Q105.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
128.	Please specify priority AI/ML use cases and what, if any, preferences for different tools and languages for these use cases. Are you looking for pre-built AI capabilities (e.g., automated data quality, anomaly detection) or a platform that supports custom ML model development and deployment?	Refer to response for Q106.
129.	How is data democratization and data sharing currently managed within USAC? Is there a formal workflow or approval process for data requests and sharing, or is it handled manually or informally?	Refer to response for Q107.
130.	In the context of the required Role-based, row-level, and attribute-based access controls, will these controls be enforced solely within the data platform, or is USAC looking for an upstream component (like an API gateway) to enforce preliminary access controls and security policies (e.g., rate limiting, token validation) on data consumers?	Refer to response for Q108.
131.	Regarding data masking and encryption, are there requirements for tokenizing or masking sensitive data in transit (during ingestion via the integration layer) before it is persisted in the Enterprise Data Platform?	Refer to response for Q109.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
132.	The RFI mentions "Phased onboarding by data domain". Can USAC provide a high-level overview of the specific data domains (e.g., specific programs like the Lifeline National Eligibility Verifier or High Cost Universal Broadband Portal) that are prioritized for the initial phased onboarding?	Refer to response for Q110.
133.	Please provide details on geospatial data requirements, particularly which GIS tools are currently in use and what assets from those tools will need to be analyzed, reported on, and shared.	Refer to response for Q40 and Q8.
134.	How are these GIS capabilities integrated with the enterprise data platform, and what standards or protocols are used for interoperability?	Refer to response for Q112.
135.	What are the maximum page limits for Section 1 (Company Overview) and Section 2 (Proposed Technical Solution)?	Section 1 (Company Overview): Maximum Three (3) Pages. Section 2 (Proposed Technical Solution): Maximum 25 Pages. These limits are stated in Section 12 of the RFI.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
136.	USAC notes that the enterprise data platform should position the organization to adopt advanced analytics and AI-assisted capabilities over time. Can USAC clarify which decision types or business outcomes it expects AI-enabled capabilities to support in the near term (e.g., data quality automation, classification, anomaly detection, forecasting, fraud detection), versus those that are longer-term aspirational?	Near-term: AI-assisted data quality (automated profiling, anomaly detection), data classification, and metadata enrichment -- as these align with the foundational governance priorities. Longer-term: predictive analytics, fraud detection, broadband coverage prediction, and prescriptive analytics -- as these require mature data foundations that USAC is actively building.
137.	Can USAC provide high-level detail on its current analytical data platform(s), including primary technologies in use today (e.g., cloud provider(s), data warehouse/lake technologies, orchestration tools), to better contextualize transition and coexistence assumptions?	Refer to response for Q9. Key technologies include Vertica (database), Pentaho Data Integration (ETL), Tableau (BI/reporting), and Collibra (data catalog, partially implemented).
138.	Does USAC envision a single authoritative enterprise semantic layer, or should respondents assume multiple domain-specific semantic layers managed under a common governance framework?	respondents should describe support for multiple domain-specific semantic models governed under a common framework.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
139.	Definition of “Near-Real-Time” Ingestion Section 4 references "near-real-time ingestion where appropriate (including CDC)." Could USAC define the expected latency thresholds for near-real-time ingestion (e.g., seconds, minutes, or sub-minute)? Are there specific data domains or use cases where near-real-time is required versus batch?	Refer to response for Q31.
140.	Scale of Data Estate and User Concurrency Can USAC provide approximate metrics on: (a) the volume of data to be managed on the platform (TB/PB), (b) the number of concurrent analytical users expected, and (c) the number of data sources to be integrated?	Refer to response for Q3 for volume, Q51 for concurrency, and Q73 for source count.
141.	Current Data Platform and Migration Scope The RFI mentions a "hybrid transition period where legacy and new platforms may operate in parallel" (Section 6). Can USAC describe the current data platform technology stack and the anticipated timeline for the parallel operation period?	Refer to response for Q9 for technology stack and Q49 for timeline.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
142.	GIS Data Volume and Integration Requirements Could USAC quantify the approximate volume of geospatial data, the primary GIS tools currently in use (e.g., Esri ArcGIS, QGIS), and the specific spatial analysis functions most critical to USAC's analytical workflows?	Refer to response for Q40 and Q41.
143.	Open Data Publication Requirements Section 4 mentions "governed access for internal analytics and external publication (e.g., open data)." USAC currently operates opendata.usac.org. Does USAC envision the new platform directly powering the open data portal, and if so, what are the expected data refresh frequencies and consumption patterns?	Refer to response for Q66. The platform should support governed external publication. Whether it directly powers the portal or feeds it would be determined during implementation.
144.	Identity and Access Management Integration Can USAC confirm the identity provider(s) currently in use (e.g., Okta, Microsoft Entra ID, Ping) and whether SCIM-based automated provisioning/deprovisioning is required?	Refer to response for Q25.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
145.	Fully Managed SaaS vs. Customer-Managed Infrastructure Section 6 requires a "Cloud-hosted SaaS delivery model." Does USAC expect a fully managed, zero-administration SaaS platform where the vendor handles all infrastructure, or would USAC consider solutions requiring customer-managed cloud infrastructure components (e.g., compute clusters, storage buckets, Kubernetes nodes)?	Refer to response for Q19.
146.	Built-In Disaster Recovery and Cross-Region Replication Section 6 identifies "Lack of failover and disaster recovery" as a current-state constraint. Does USAC require native, built-in cross-region replication and automated failover as a platform service with defined RPO/RTO Targets?	Refer to response for Q35 and Q90.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
147.	AI-Assisted Capabilities Within the Security Boundary Does USAC require all AI/ML processing to occur within the platform's security and governance boundary, or is USAC open to solutions that require data export to external AI/ML services?	Respondents should clearly describe their AI security boundary.
148.	Encryption and Customer-Managed Key Control Section 7.9 specifically references "encryption, masking, and key management." Does USAC require customer-managed encryption keys (BYOK / CMEK) where USAC retains the ability to revoke platform access to its data at any time, in addition to end-to-end AES-256 encryption at rest and in transit?	Refer to response for Q26.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
149.	Data Consumer Personas and Skill Levels Could USAC describe the primary data consumer personas expected to use the platform (e.g., data engineers, business analysts, program managers, executives, data scientists, external stakeholders)? What are their approximate numbers, technical skill levels, and primary interaction patterns (SQL, dashboards, notebooks, APIs)?	Refer to response for Q105. Key personas include data analysts, program managers, business users, executives, and external stakeholders accessing Open Data.
150.	BI Tool and Client Connectivity Requirements Which business intelligence and reporting tools does USAC currently use or plan to adopt (e.g., Tableau, Power BI, Looker, Qlik)? Does USAC require the platform to support standard connectivity protocols (JDBC, ODBC, REST API, Python connectors) to ensure interoperability with existing and future tools without proprietary lock-in?	Refer to response for Q32. Respondents should describe standard connectivity protocols (JDBC, ODBC, REST API, Python connectors) to ensure interoperability.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
151.	Total Cost of Ownership Evaluation Methodology When evaluating platform cost, will USAC assess total cost of ownership (TCO) inclusive of: (a) platform licensing/consumption, (b) underlying cloud infrastructure costs, (c) required third-party tools for governance, orchestration, quality, and observability, (d) administrative staffing and operational overhead, and (e) training and onboarding? Or will evaluation focus primarily on platform licensing cost?	Respondents should provide a high-level overview of total cost factors as requested in Section 4.
152.	Included Capabilities vs. Additional Tool Licensing Does USAC expect the platform to natively include data governance, data quality monitoring, lineage, orchestration, security/audit, and cost management as included capabilities? Or would USAC consider solutions where these are licensed separately from third-party vendors and integrated by USAC's team?	Respondents should describe which capabilities are native vs. require separate licensing and how integration is handled.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
153.	Current Workload Baseline Section 6 references a "hybrid transition period where legacy and new platforms may operate in parallel," and Section 7.11 requests information on migration approaches. To appropriately size the new platform based on current operational requirements, could USAC provide: (a) the approximate number of automated data processing jobs (ETL, data transformations, report generation) that run daily or weekly in your existing environment, and (b) the approximate number of analytical queries and scheduled reports executed monthly across all users?	The EDW processes approximately 9,750 daily loaded tables. Peak CPU utilization exceeds 75% between 3 AM and 10 AM. Specific ETL job counts.
154.	Source System Inventory and Connector Requirements Section 5 references "integration with ERP, operational systems, GIS, and external data feeds." Could USAC enumerate the primary source systems the platform must integrate with (e.g., SAP, Oracle ERP, Salesforce, ServiceNow, custom APIs)? For each, can USAC indicate whether integration is batch, near-real-time, or Event-driven?	Refer to response for Q2 and Q6.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
155.	Data Modeling Philosophy and Supported Patterns Section 7.4 asks about "data modeling philosophy and supported patterns." Does USAC have an established data modeling approach (e.g., Kimball dimensional modeling, Data Vault, medallion/multi-hop architecture, or a hybrid)? Does USAC require the platform to support multiple modeling patterns concurrently across different data Domains?	The current EDW uses a normalized data model inherited from source applications. Current data models cause query performance bottlenecks and timeouts due to multiple joins required. Respondents should describe support for multiple modeling patterns.
156.	Data Domain Ownership and Federated Data Products Section 7.11 describes "phased onboarding by data domain." Does USAC envision a federated model where individual program divisions (High Cost, Lifeline, RHC, E-Rate) or functional teams (Finance, OGC, Audit) own and publish governed data products that other teams can discover and consume — while maintaining centralized governance and security policies?	Respondents should describe support for federated data product ownership within a centralized governance framework.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
157.	Section 12 – Response Format Clarification Section 12, "SECTION 1 – COMPANY OVERVIEW" references "Years of experience in providing email marketing automation software." This appears to be a template artifact from a different RFI. Could USAC confirm the intended text for this bullet point?	Refer to response for Q12.
158.	Section 12 – Page Limit Discrepancy Section 12, "SECTION 3 – EXPERIENCE" states "Maximum: Two (3) Pages." Could USAC clarify whether the page limit is two (2) or three (3) pages?	Refer to response for Q13.
159.	Is this RFI FOR A recompete of an existing contract? If so, could you please confirm the incumbent contractor(s)?	The RFI seeks information on new Enterprise Data Platform solutions to modernize the existing Vertica-based on-premises EDW.
160.	Could you please provide the current or prior contract number associated with this requirement?	Refer to response for Q159.
161.	Would the USAC consider granting an extension to the RFI submission deadline?	All responses remain due no later than March 20, 2026, by 11:00 AM ET as stated in the RFI.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
162.	Does USAC currently operate an enterprise data warehouse, data lake, analytics platform, or reporting environment that this initiative is intended to modernize, consolidate, or replace?	Yes. USAC operates a Vertica-based on-premises EDW that this initiative is intended to modernize and migrate to the cloud. The current EDW lacks failover, has rigid architecture that prevents on-demand scaling, and Vertica platform presents integration limitations, See also response for Q9.
163.	If an existing data platform environment is in place, could USAC describe the current architecture at a high level (e.g., cloud/on-prem, warehouse/lake, primary technologies)?	Refer to response for Q9.
164.	What primary limitations, risks, or operational challenges in the current environment are driving this Enterprise Data Platform initiative?	Refer to response for Q42.
165.	Are there existing contracts or vendor-supported tools supporting data ingestion, governance, BI, or GIS that vendors should consider when describing integration approaches?	USAC currently uses Collibra (data catalog), Tableau (BI), Pentaho Data Integration (ETL), Vertica (database), and ESRI ArcGIS (GIS). Refer to response for Q159.
166.	Does USAC anticipate conducting vendor demonstrations or proof-of-concept exercises as part of this RFI evaluation process?	Respondents may be asked to provide a demonstration of their products and services and a proof-of-concept at later stage.
167.	Is there an anticipated high-level timeline for issuing a formal RFP following completion of this RFI?	USAC will determine next steps after evaluating responses to this RFI

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
168.	Are there any known organizational, regulatory, or funding constraints that vendors should consider when proposing solution architectures at this stage?	Key considerations include FCC mandate for cloud migration; FISMA/NIST compliance requirements; FedRAMP Moderate alignment; USAC operates under FCC oversight as a not-for-profit corporation; procurement follows specific CFR provisions.
169.	Which USF program domains (High Cost/HUBB, Lifeline/National Verifier, RHC, E-Rate/EPC, Finance, Audit) will be prioritized for initial onboarding?	Refer to response for Q110.
170.	Is the target-state architecture intended to modernize an existing warehouse, implement a lakehouse, or establish a governed enterprise-wide platform?	the goal is to establish a governed enterprise-wide platform that replaces existing data warehouse.
171.	Does USAC anticipate the future RFP will include both software licensing and implementation services?	Refer to response for Q21.
172.	Must the solution be fully SaaS, or are managed PaaS components acceptable within the architecture?	Refer to response for Q19.
173.	Is USAC operating within a specific cloud provider or region, and are multi-cloud architectures permissible?	Refer to response for Q5. The RFI does not restrict to a single cloud provider. Data residency and regional requirements should be addressed in vendor responses. See also Q28 regarding data residency.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
174.	Must Dev, Test/QA, Pre-Prod, and Prod environments be physically isolated or logically segregated?	Refer to response for Q34.
175.	Is Infrastructure-as-Code (IaC) required for provisioning and configuration management?	Respondents should describe their IaC and DevOps capabilities.
176.	Should vendors provide logical, physical, and security architecture diagrams separately, and are diagrams included in page limits?	Annexes and attachments are not counted in page limits. Vendors may include diagrams as appendices.
177.	Is single-tenant SaaS preferred, or is multi-tenant acceptable if workload isolation and noisy-neighbor controls are demonstrated?	Refer to response for Q34.
178.	Are there specific data residency, regional deployment, or cross-region replication requirements?	Refer to response for Q28.
179.	What is the approximate current enterprise data volume and projected 3–5 year growth?	Refer to response for Q3 and Q30.
180.	What percentage of ingestion requires near-real-time processing versus batch, and what are acceptable latency thresholds?	Refer to response for Q31. The majority of current workloads are batch-based.
181.	Which source systems require CDC, and are log-based CDC methods required?	Refer to response for Q31.
182.	What ERP and operational systems (e.g., HUBB, National Verifier, EPC) are in scope for integration?	

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
183.	What file formats, API integration patterns, and rate-limiting constraints must be supported?	Refer to response for Q4.
184.	Are schema evolution, data contracts, and metadata-driven ingestion required?	Respondents should clarify if the platform supports schema evolution, data contracts, and metadata-driven ingestion.
185.	Are backfills, replay processing, and quarantine/error handling mechanisms required as standard capabilities?	Yes. Handling of late-arriving data, reprocessing, and backfills are required . Currently in EDW, the entire load process ends instead of flagging the record and continuing. Robust error handling and quarantine mechanisms are needed.
186.	Is there a preferred modeling methodology (star schema, data vault, medallion/lakehouse)?	Refer to response for Q155.
187.	Is a centralized governed semantic layer required across all domains, supporting multiple business-specific semantic models?	Refer to response for Q138.
188.	Is Git-based version control and environment promotion required for business logic and metrics?	Respondents should describe version control and environment promotion capabilities available in the platform/solution proposed.
189.	Are defined performance SLAs expected for semantic-layer queries?	The RFI Section 8 notes service levels are informational only and not binding. Respondents should describe performance optimization capabilities.
190.	Does USAC currently maintain a metadata catalog or business glossary that must be integrated or migrated?	Refer to response for Q100 and Q37. Collibra houses partial metadata. A complete enterprise metadata catalog and business glossary are in development.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
191.	Is end-to-end lineage required, including column-level lineage and impact analysis for audit defensibility?	Refer to response for Q38. Yes, end-to-end lineage is indicated as a requirement.
192.	Are stewardship workflows and data certification processes required within the platform?	Respondents should describe stewardship workflow capabilities.
193.	Is integration with third-party governance tools (e.g., Purview, Collibra, Alation) acceptable?	Yes, USAC currently uses Collibra. Integration with third-party governance tools is part of the current ecosystem. Respondents should describe native capabilities and integration options with tools like Collibra.
194.	Are enterprise-wide data quality standards formally documented?	Not yet. Data quality standards are in progress.
195.	Must business users author rules via no-code interfaces, and are SQL-based validations also required?	Refer to response for Q39.
196.	Are hard-stop enforcement controls required for critical data elements?	Respondents should describe tiered enforcement capabilities including hard-stop, warning, and exception-based approaches.
197.	Is executive-level DQ scorecard reporting and ITSM integration required?	Respondents should describe executive-level reporting and any ITSM integration capabilities available in the platform/solution.
198.	Does USAC standardize on specific BI tools, and are certified connectors required?	Refer to response for Q32.
199.	What are expected peak concurrent user volumes and workload governance requirements?	Refer to response for Q51.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
200.	Are public dashboards required, and must they comply with Section 508 accessibility standards?	Respondents should describe accessibility capabilities.
201.	Are API-based open data services required, including rate limiting, egress monitoring, and logging?	Respondents should describe API management and open data service capabilities.
202.	Is AI enablement a near-term operational requirement or a future roadmap objective?	Refer to response for Q75 ,Q136 and Q86
203.	Are AI-assisted features (classification, DQ suggestions, metadata enrichment) required?	Refer to response for Q75 ,Q136 and Q86
204.	Are notebooks, model registry, lifecycle governance, and explainability controls required?	Refer to response for Q75 ,Q136 and Q86.Respondents should describe available capabilities.
205.	Are guardrails required to prevent data leakage in AI/GenAI use cases?	Respondents should describe AI governance and data protection controls.
206.	Is FedRAMP Moderate Authorization mandatory at RFP award, and what is the expected authorization boundary?	Refer to response for Q24.
207.	Are additional NIST 800-53 overlays or other compliance regimes (IRS 1075, CJIS, HIPAA) applicable?	FISMA and NIST requirements as applicable to federal agencies. USAC is implementing Zero Trust Architecture (ZTA) per FCC regulatory mandate. Additional specific overlays such as IRS 1075, CJIS, or HIPAA are not applicable.
208.	Does USAC process PII, PHI, FTI, or other regulated data types impacting encryption and masking requirements?	Refer to response for Q82

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
209.	What are audit log retention requirements, and must logs integrate with a specific SIEM?	Refer to response for Q27.
210.	Must the platform integrate with existing monitoring, logging, and ITSM systems?	Respondents should describe monitoring and ITSM integration capabilities.
211.	Are workload-level cost allocation tags and FinOps dashboards required?	Respondents should describe cost management and allocation capabilities.
212.	What is the estimated legacy data volume to be migrated, and is phased onboarding preferred?	Refer to response for Q80 and Q43.
213.	Is dual-run reporting required during transition, and what reconciliation standards will govern cutover approval?	Refer to responses for Q44 and Q89.
214.	Are native migration utilities, lineage migration, and validation tooling required?	Respondents should describe available migration tooling.
215.	What training, sandbox access, and knowledge transfer expectations apply for administrators and business users?	Respondents should describe training programs, sandbox environments, and knowledge transfer methodology.
216.	What GIS platforms are currently in use, and what is the approximate scale of spatial datasets?	Refer to response for Q40 and Q41.
217.	Must the platform support raster data types and OGC standards (WMS/WFS/WCS)?	Respondents should describe their spatial capabilities comprehensively, including support for OGC standards.
218.	Are spatial row-level security controls and controlled external publication (including CDN/caching) required?	Respondents should describe these capabilities.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
219.	What uptime targets and support SLAs are expected in a future RFP (e.g., 99.9%, 24x7 support)?	Respondents should describe their typical SLA offerings.
220.	Should pricing assume defined data volumes, concurrency, DR environments, and include FedRAMP compliance costs?	Respondents should state their assumptions clearly.
221.	Section 1 references “email marketing automation software.” Please confirm whether this is a template artifact unrelated to this RFI and clarify page limits, appendices, and hyperlink allowances.	Refer to response for Q12. Yes, it is a template artifact. The correct text is "Years of experience in Enterprise Data Platform."
222.	The first bullet indicates "Years of experience in providing email marketing automation software". Should this be revised to state "Years of experience in providing EDP solution"?	Yes. The correct text is "Years of experience in Enterprise Data Platform."
223.	In Section 12 (Response Format), the RFI states: ‘Please provide a response to each of the questions listed under Section 6.’ We believe this may be a typographical error since the questions appear in Section 7 (‘Information Requested from Respondents’). Please confirm whether the reference should be to Section 7 instead of Section 6.	Confirmed. The reference should be to Section 7 ("Information Requested from Respondents"), not Section 6.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
224.	The Experience section indicates "Maximum: Two (3) Pages". Please confirm whether the maximum page limit is Two (2) or Three (3) pages for the section.	Refer to response for Q13.
225.	The integration scope in the RFI includes ERP, operational systems, GIS, and external feeds, but no specific applications are listed and knowing the specific application names (e.g., SAP as ERP solution) and approxiamate number of source systems will help propose a more realistic solution and provide a more accurate ROM. Please provide an inventory of current applications and data sources that exist in the current environment.	Refer to response for Q2 and Q6.
226.	Section 6 describes constraints (e.g., FedRAMP, multiple environments, lack of DR) but does not specify the existing technology ecosystem. Please provide additional detail on the current-state (“as is”) data architecture, including current cloud provider(s), major data platform technologies, and integration patterns.	Refer to response for Q9.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
227.	Could USAC please provide additional detail on the expected data volumes to be ingested into the EDP? This information will help vendors more accurately estimate the licensing costs associated with the solution. Specifically: 1. What is the estimated size and number of datasets expected to be included in the initial bulk ingestion into the EDP? 2. For each major source system or data domain, what are the expected ongoing data refresh volumes & frequency? 3. Should respondents assume migration of full historical datasets, or only a defined retention period? If historical volumes differ significantly from ongoing operational volumes, could USAC provide estimates?	Refer to response for Q3 and Q30.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
228.	Does USAC expect source data domains to remain logically isolated within the EDP, or should vendors assume that data from multiple systems will need to be blended, correlated, or unified to support analytics, reporting, and external/open-data use cases?	The platform should allow for Data to be blended and unified to support analytics while maintaining governance.
229.	Beyond the informational SLA guidance in Section 8, does USAC have target SLAs for ingestion latency, data freshness, incident response times, and availability that the platform must meet?	Refer to response for Q219.
230.	Does USAC have an existing enterprise data governance framework, data stewardship model, or data cataloging standards that the vendor must align to? Or should the vendor propose and implement a governance operating model as part of the EDP implementation?	Refer to response for Q11 and Q36.
231.	To help clarify pricing estimates and ensure consistency of estimates for evaluation, please clarify the desired scope of analytics responsibilities for the vendor. In particular, does the EDP implementation include the design, development, and delivery of dashboards, analytic models, and reports—either initially or on an ongoing basis?	The RFI focuses on the data platform itself. The scope of dashboard/report development as part of implementation would be determined in a future RFP.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
232.	Does USAC currently have an established AI governance framework, policy, or set of controls (e.g., risk assessment guidelines, model oversight processes, transparency or explainability requirements) that the Enterprise Data Platform must comply with? If no formal AI governance standard is yet in place, does USAC expect the vendor to: Assess data and model-related risks as part of the EDP design? Recommend or help formulate an AI governance approach tailored to the EDP's capabilities and USAC's operational environment?	Formal AI governance framework is currently in development.