



Universal Service Administrative Co. (USAC)
RFP IT-26-081 – DME Services for Appian Enterprise Applications
Questions & Answers

Q#	Question	Answer
1.	Is there a current incumbent contractor performing the Appian DME and O&M services described in this RFP? If so, will USAC facilitate a structured knowledge transfer period, and will current system documentation (architecture documents, runbooks, integration specifications) be made available to the incoming contractor during transition-in?	Yes, there is a current incumbent contractor. However, USAC does not disclose incumbent information. Yes, there will be structured knowledge transfer and system documentation available to facilitate the transition-in after contract award.
2.	For each of the four in-scope systems (CAMP, HC Apps, RHC, S&L), can USAC provide the current FISMA ATO status, last assessment date, and any open POA&M items the incoming contractor will be expected to inherit or remediate?	ATO's are in place for all the systems in scope. This is a T&M contract and incoming contract staff will work on projects prioritized by USAC including remediation of open POAM's and other technical debt as appropriate.
3.	Section B.4 states that contractor staff must be in the USAC office at least two (2) days per week. Does this requirement apply to all labor categories, or only to specific roles such as Key Personnel and those requiring direct system access? Will all staff be required to obtain USAC-issued equipment and USAC.org email addresses?	Yes, all contractors will need to be on-site at USAC office 2 days/week. All contractors will be provided with USAC Laptops and email address.
4.	Section B.5.G notes that up to two (2) additional Appian-based systems may be added during the contract term. Can USAC provide any indication of whether additional systems are currently planned or anticipated within the base year, and whether pricing for those systems will be negotiated separately via task order or incorporated into the base rates?	This is a T&M contract and incoming contract staff will work on systems/projects prioritized by USAC including remediation of open POAM's and other technical debt as appropriate.



Q#	Question	Answer
5.	Section B.5.D states that USAC does not currently maintain a contractor-accessible CI/CD pipeline and that the selected contractor will be responsible for establishing and managing the pipeline infrastructure. Will USAC provide access to its existing Appian Cloud environments and code repositories from Day 1, and will the incoming contractor have administrative access to establish the pipeline within the Appian Cloud environment?	USAC will provide access to systems/environments and code repositories as necessary to perform the work in scope under this contract.
6.	Section B.7 requests two separate Bid Sheets: one without AI tooling and one with AI tooling where applicable. Can USAC clarify whether AI tooling refers specifically to AI capabilities built into the Appian platform (e.g., Appian AI Skills, Document Intelligence) or also includes third-party AI development tools used by contractor staff during development (e.g., GitHub Copilot)?	References to AI tooling include AI capabilities built into the Appian platform and third-party AI tools.
7.	Can USAC provide the anticipated contract with an effective date or target performance start date to assist offerors in planning staffing and transition timelines?	USAC intends to complete the procurement, contract award and onboarding process before the end of Q3'2026.
8.	Is this considered a new requirement? If not, can you provide the incumbent vendor's name and/or contract number?	Refer to response for Question #1



Q#	Question	Answer
9.	<p>For proposal planning purposes, we would like to confirm whether USAC permits a proposed subcontractor or team member located outside the United States, specifically in the Philippines, to support any technical development, migration, implementation, testing, documentation, or related project tasks under this requirement.</p> <p>If permitted, please confirm whether there are any restrictions regarding offshore personnel access to USAC systems, data, non-public information, cloud environments, or project materials.</p> <p>If offshore support is not permitted, please confirm that all subcontractor personnel must perform the work entirely within the United States</p>	<p>All work has to be performed by staff located within U.S and are required to be in USAC office 2 days/week.</p> <p>See response to Question #3</p>
10.	Is this solicitation a recompetete of an existing contract? If so, could you please confirm the incumbent contractor (s)?	Refer to response for Question #1
11.	What is the current or historical contract value associated with this work?	USAC does not share information related to the existing or prior contracts.
12.	Will the Statement of Work (SOW) remain unchanged from the current contract, or have there been any updates or revisions?	Refer to response for Question #4
13.	Could you please provide the current or prior contract number associated with this requirement?	Refer to responses for questions #1 and #11.
14.	Is it possible to obtain the Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPAR) or other performance evaluations related to the incumbent contract?	USAC is not a federal agency and does not follow CPAR. Also, Refer to responses for questions #1 and #11.
15.	How has the incumbent performed on the current contract, particularly with regard to meeting performance objectives, deliverables, and timelines?	See response to questions 14.



Q#	Question	Answer
16.	Would the USAC consider granting an extension to the proposal submission deadline?	USAC does not intend to extend the proposal submission deadline.
17.	Are the cover page and table of contents excluded from the overall page count limit?	Cover page is required. However, USAC does not require table of content. However, both will be counted toward page limit.
18.	May we include additional pages for abbreviations and references, and will those be excluded from the stated page limit?	Proposals must follow the submission guidance and page limits stated in the RFP. Any additional pages will not be reviewed, or the proposal will not be considered for review.
19.	Can any portion of the scope of services be performed offshore, or is the work required to be fully performed onshore (within the U.S.)?	Refer to response for Question #9
20.	What are the current operational or system challenges across these programs that this contract aims to address?	Refer to response for Question #4
21.	Are there upcoming Federal Communications Commission (FCC) mandates or regulatory changes expected to impact system enhancements?	Refer to response for Question #4
22.	Are there any additional confidentiality requirements beyond Attachment 2 that contractors should be aware of during execution?	No.
23.	Can USAC provide a detailed inventory of current Appian applications, including size, complexity, and integration points?	Refer to response for Question #4
24.	What is the expected distribution of effort across DME, O&M, and new development work?	Refer to response for Question #4
25.	Will the task orders be issued under the T&M structure or a fixed price structure?	Refer to response for Question #4
26.	Is there an expected ramp-up period during the base year?	Refer to response for Question #1
27.	What is the user base for this activity?	User base differs from system to system but averages between 30K to 60K entities.
28.	Will there be external users that will need to be integrated?	Yes



Q#	Question	Answer
29.	Are offshore or nearshore resources permitted for any portion of the work?	Refer to responses for Question #3 and question #9
30.	What roles are expected to be onsite versus remote?	Refer to responses for Question #3 and question #9
31.	What are the security and access requirements for remote work?	Refer to responses for Question #3 and question #9
32.	Can USAC provide high-level architecture diagrams for current Appian environments?	No.
33.	Can USAC provide a list of legacy systems planned for modernization?	Refer to responses for Question #4
34.	What are the expected data volumes for migration activities?	Data migration volumes will be defined at the task order level when specific modernization scope is approved. Detailed system metrics will be shared during onboarding and transition-in.
35.	Are there preferred tools or standards for integration and data migration?	Yes. The Contractor will use USAC-standard integration patterns, including Appian Connected Systems, REST/SOAP integrations, and existing middleware where applicable. Specific tool standards will be provided during onboarding.
36.	What tools are currently used for backlog management and Agile tracking?	Atlassian tools – JIRA and CONFLUENCE
37.	Are there predefined architecture and design standards to be followed?	Yes.
38.	What level of documentation is expected for each SDLC phase?	Documentation expectations are aligned with USAC SDLC standards and PM@USAC artifacts. Specific templates and standards will be provided during onboarding.
39.	Does USAC have preferred tools for CI/CD pipeline implementation?	Bamboo, GIT, Cucumber, Veracode
40.	Will USAC provide licenses for DevSecOps tools, or is the contractor expected to provide them?	All work will be done on USAC infrastructure and using USAC licensed applications. Any exceptions to this will have to be reviewed and approved by USAC



Q#	Question	Answer
41.	Who will own and manage the CI/CD infrastructure?	All work will be done on USAC infrastructure and using USAC licensed applications. Any exceptions to this will have to be reviewed and approved by USAC
42.	Can USAC provide historical incident/ticket volumes and trends?	No
43.	What tools are used for incident and problem management?	Jira and ServiceNow
44.	Is there a dedicated helpdesk model or shared responsibility?	Shared
45.	How will SLA compliance be measured and reported?	SDLC gates and review process.
46.	Are there penalties associated with SLA breaches?	Notice to correct performance issues and consequences for future bidding.
47.	Will historical SLA performance data be shared?	No
48.	Can USAC provide detailed architecture and integration diagrams for CAMP, HC Apps, RHC, and S&L systems?	Details will be shared as part of onboarding and transition-in process.
49.	Are additional systems expected to be added during the contract term?	Refer to responses for Question #4
50.	Will the incumbent contractor provide structured knowledge transfer and documentation?	Refer to responses for Question #14
51.	What are the acceptance criteria for transition completion?	Transition-in completion criteria will be jointly defined in the Transition-In Plan required within fifteen (15) business days of Contract award per Section B.5.H. Final acceptance is subject to USAC PM approval.
52.	Are there known risks or gaps in current documentation?	Any known documentation risks or gaps will be reviewed during onboarding and addressed through the Transition-In Plan.
53.	What is the approval process for proposing AI-based solutions?	All requests will be routed to AI governance committee and AI PMO for review and approval.
54.	Are there any pre-approved AI tools or use cases?	USAC uses M365 COPILOT and APPIAN AI TOOLS
55.	What governance body reviews AI-related proposals?	AI governance committee and AI CORE PMO
56.	Are there predefined Zero Trust architecture guidelines to follow?	Yes, will be shared during the onboarding and transition-in



Q#	Question	Answer
57.	What tools are currently used for identity and access management beyond Okta?	OKTA, AD and Entra ID. CyberArk for password rotation
58.	Will the contractor have access to security monitoring tools and logs?	Yes, access will be provided on a need-to-use basis. USAC has dedicated SOC that monitors the logs
59.	What is the current ATO status for systems in scope?	ATOs are in place for all in-scope systems. Refer to response for Question #2. Expiration dates and current statuses will be shared with the awarded Contractor during onboarding.
60.	Who is responsible for maintaining SSPs and POA&Ms?	USAC retains accountability for SSPs and POA&Ms. The Contractor will support maintenance, updates, and remediation tracking activities per Section B.5.K and Deliverable #9 (Security Assessment Artifacts).
61.	Are existing security artifacts available for review?	Yes. Existing security artifacts, including SSPs and POA&Ms, will be made available to the awarded Contractor during onboarding under appropriate access controls.
62.	What FedRAMP-authorized environments are currently in use?	USAC operates within FedRAMP-authorized environments including Appian Cloud and Microsoft 365. Additional details will be shared during onboarding.
63.	What is USAC's current Agile maturity level?	USAC operates Agile/Scrum delivery aligned to the PM@USAC framework. Specific maturity-level details will be reviewed during onboarding.
64.	Is SAFe fully implemented across all teams?	SAFe practices are applied where applicable per Section B.5.L. Specific implementation details will be reviewed during onboarding.
65.	What tools are used for Agile ceremonies and reporting?	Atlassian Jira and Confluence are the standard tools for Agile ceremonies, backlog management, and reporting. Refer to response for Question #36.
66.	Does USAC provide a template for the Quality Control Plan?	USAC does not provide a prescriptive QCP template. The Contractor is expected to develop a QCP per Section B.5.M; USAC reserves the right to review and recommend changes upon initial presentation.



Q#	Question	Answer
67.	What key quality metrics are expected?	Quality metrics include timeliness, accuracy, compliance, technical quality, and customer satisfaction per Section B.5.N. Specific AQLs will be jointly defined as a post-award.
68.	Will AQLs be defined at contract award or task order level?	AQLs will be jointly defined as post-award per Section B.5.N, with task order-level refinements as appropriate.
69.	Are all labor categories required at contract start or can onboarding be phased?	Onboarding may be phased through the Transition-In Plan/period, provided with sufficient staffing supports parallel operations with the incumbent per Section B.5.H.
70.	What are expectations for resource replacement timelines?	Replacement of Key Personnel and other Contractor Staff is governed by Section C.20. Replacement Key Personnel are subject to USAC review and approval; standard replacement timelines should align with the Contractor's QCP.
71.	What level of background checks are required for contractor staff?	Refer to response for Question #134. Refer also to Section B.5.P.
72.	What is the expected timeline for clearance?	Background check timeline varies by individual; details will be shared during onboarding.
73.	Are templates available for key deliverables (IMS, QCP, reports)?	USAC will provide deliverable templates and standards during onboarding where applicable.
74.	Can deliverable timelines be adjusted at the task order level?	Yes. Deliverable timelines may be adjusted at the task order level subject to USAC PM approval.
75.	What is the review and approval turnaround process?	Deliverable review and acceptance follow the Deliverable Acceptance Form (DAF) process per Section B.6: USAC has ten (10) business days from receipt to accept or reject; if no response within ten business days, the deliverable is deemed accepted unless USAC provides written notice of an extension.
76.	Can USAC provide estimated hours by labor category?	Estimated hours and quantities are provided in Attachment 1 - Bid Sheet for pricing purposes only. They do not constitute minimum guaranteed orders. Refer to Section B.5.O.



Q#	Question	Answer
77.	What methodology will be used for price evaluation?	Price evaluation follows Section E.7.3. USAC will evaluate the total proposed price by applying the Offeror's fully loaded hourly rates to the estimated quantities and hours in Attachment 1 and will assess both reasonableness and realism.
78.	Should pricing assume full utilization of all labor categories?	Pricing should be based on the estimated quantities and hours provided in Attachment 1 - Bid Sheet. Refer to Section B.5.O and the response for Question #76.
79.	Are escalation rates allowed across option years?	Yes. Offerors may propose escalation between the base year and option years; rates must be submitted for each period in Attachment 1.
80.	Can Key Personnel be replaced with a post-award with approval?	Yes. Key Personnel may be replaced post-award with USAC prior written approval per Section C.20.
81.	What evaluation criteria will be used for Key Personnel?	Key Personnel are evaluated against the minimum qualifications stated in Section B.5.O, including years of experience, Appian-specific experience, and applicable certifications. Refer also to Section E.7.1.c.
82.	Are there any minimum or mandatory Key Personnel roles beyond the Project Manager that must be included in the proposal? If yes, is there a recommended or preferred list of roles?	The definitive list of Key Personnel is reflected in Section B.5.O, with each row marked 'Yes' under the Key Personnel column. The Project Manager reference in Section B.8 is informational and is satisfied with one or more of these designated Key Personnel roles, as proposed by the Offeror.
83.	What is the expected frequency of governance and status meetings?	Standard cadence includes daily standups, bi-weekly sprint ceremonies (planning, review, retrospective), and monthly governance/status reviews. PI Planning cadence will be confirmed at the task order level. Refer to Section B.5.L and Deliverable #12.
84.	The RFP states that Volume 2 – Technical “may not thirty (20) pages,” which appears to be inconsistent. Please confirm whether the page limitation is 20 pages or 30 pages.	Technical Proposal (Volume-2) may not exceed thirty pages. The Typo is corrected on the revised RFP.
85.	Is the Table of Contents excluded from the page limitation for each Volume?	No. USAC does not require table of content. Therefore, it will be counted toward the page limit if added.



Q#	Question	Answer
86.	Is there any specified font size for section titles?	Refer to Section E.6.E.1.a. Text must be 12-point Times New Roman; diagrams, tables, and charts may be presented in a smaller font but no smaller than 9 points.
87.	Is ISO 27001 / SOC 2 Type II a pass/fail award requirement or a post-award deliverable?	ISO 27001 / SOC 2 Type II are post-award deliverables per Privacy and Security Addendum Section 2.20. They are not used as pass/fail evaluation criteria.
88.	Can a team partner or subcontractor satisfy this requirement on behalf of the prime?	Yes. ISO 27001 / SOC 2 Type II compliance may be satisfied by the prime or a subcontractor performing the in-scope services, provided the certification covers the operations relevant to this Contract.
89.	What is the basis for the 10-calendar-day delivery window? Will USAC consider extending to 60-90 days given that SOC 2 Type II requires a minimum 6-month observation period to obtain?	The 10-calendar-day delivery window applies to providing the most current versions of existing certifications post-award. Offerors not currently certified should describe their compliance roadmap; USAC will discuss reasonable accommodation during contract negotiation.
90.	Will USAC accept equivalent security frameworks (active NIST SP 800-53 implementation, FedRAMP-authorized cloud services, third-party security audit) satisfying the intent of this requirement?	Yes. USAC will consider equivalent security frameworks (e.g., active NIST SP 800-53 implementation, FedRAMP-authorized cloud services, third-party security audit) that satisfy the intent of the Privacy and Security Addendum, subject to USAC review and acceptance.
91.	<p>The RFP has conflicting information about page limits for Volume 2.</p> <p>"b. Volume 2 – Technical: may not thirty (20) pages, excluding Attachment A (Resumes)."</p> <p>Please confirm that the page limit for Volume 2 is thirty (30) pages.</p>	Refer to response to questions # 84.



Q#	Question	Answer
92.	Section E.7 states that offer will be evaluated on four factors — Technical, Past Performance, Price, and Certification — There are no definitions, sub-factors, or evaluation criteria are provided for the Certification factor anywhere in the RFP. Please clarify: how will certification be weighed up to the other three evaluation factors?	Section E.7 references four evaluation factors. The 'Certification' reference is a typographical error. Evaluation is based on Technical, Past Performance, and Price per Sections E.7.1, E.7.2, and E.7.3.
93.	Section B.5.O identifies a Contract / Account Manager in the Required Resources table, while Section B.8 references a Project Manager as Key Personnel. Please clarify whether USAC intends for the Contract / Account Manager role to satisfy the Project Manager Key Personnel requirement.	Refer to response for Question #82. The Contract/Account Manager and Technical Manager (Development Manager) roles, in combination, satisfy the management oversight responsibilities referenced in Section B.8. Offerors should clearly identify which proposed Key Personnel will perform the project manager's function.
94.	Section B.5.O identifies specific labor categories designated as Key Personnel, while Section B.8 references a Project Manager as a Key Personnel role that does not appear in the labor category table or the pricing schedule in Section B.7. Can USAC please confirm the complete and definitive list of all Key Personnel roles that will be written into the Contract by name?	Refer to response for Question #82.
95.	Please confirm whether USAC will evaluate each scenario for price reasonableness and price realism, including whether proposed rates, hours, or quantities that are materially below USAC's estimates or the Independent Cost Estimate may be considered unrealistic or indicative of a lack of understanding of the requirements.	Yes. USAC will evaluate each scenario for both price reasonableness and price realism. Rates, hours, or quantities materially below USAC's estimates may be considered unrealistic if they indicate a lack of understanding of the requirements.



Q#	Question	Answer
96.	<p>Section B.2 (page 5) states that the resulting contract will be a Time and Materials (T&M) single award contract. However, Section 7.3 (page 63) indicates that price will be evaluated based on a firm fixed price listed in Attachment 1 – Bid Sheet. Please confirm that the intended contract type is T&M.</p>	<p>The Contract type is Time and Materials (T&M) per Section B.2. Price evaluation under Section E.7.3 is conducted by applying the Offeror's fully loaded T&M rates to the estimated quantities and hours in Attachment 1 to derive a total evaluated price for comparison.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
97.	<p>Section B.5.O permits Offerors to propose equivalent labor categories with different internal titles where proposed candidates meet or exceed the published minimum qualification standards and also requires evidence of current Appian certifications for proposed Key Personnel where applicable.</p> <p>Please clarify whether USAC will permit Offerors to use current, role-relevant professional certifications as partial evidence of equivalent qualification where a proposed candidate has the required technical capabilities but does not meet the exact stated years-of-experience threshold for a labor category.</p> <p>For example, would USAC allow one current, relevant certification, such as an Appian certification or other role-specific technical certification, to substitute for one year of required experience, subject to a reasonable cap and Offeror justification in the Technical Proposal?</p> <p>Please also clarify whether any such certification-to-experience equivalency may apply to overall IT experience, Appian-specific experience, and/or specialized role experience such as DevOps/CI/CD, test automation, database, or security experience.</p>	<p>Yes. USAC will consider role-relevant professional certifications as partial evidence of equivalent qualification where a proposed candidate substantially meets the technical capability requirements but does not meet the exact years-of-experience threshold. Offerors must clearly identify and justify any such substitution in the Technical Proposal. Equivalency may apply to overall IT experience, Appian-specific experience, and specialized role experience. USAC retains sole discretion to accept or reject proposed equivalencies.</p>
98.	<p>Is USAC evaluating: Hours x Rates only and if so, how will USAC compare against proposed prices against bidders?</p>	<p>Refer to response for Question #77. USAC will compare Offerors based on the total evaluated price derived from rates x quantities x estimated hours, in combination with the technical and past performance factors per Section E.7.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
99.	<p>Please confirm whether offerors are permitted to change or propose quantities that differ from the labor category quantities provided in Attachment 1 as long as the requirements of the SOW are met. In addition, please confirm whether USAC will evaluate a bottom-line total price for each offeror by multiplying the labor category quantities by the estimated hours and the offeror's proposed fully loaded hourly rates for the base year and each option year.</p>	<p>Offerors may propose alternate quantities, with full justification provided in the Technical Proposal and/or Price Proposal. The original required resource rows in Attachment 1 must remain visible and unmodified. USAC will evaluate a bottom-line total price as described in the response for Question #77.</p>
100.	<p>Section B.5.O states that USAC reserves the right to add additional labor categories, adjust quantities, or modify existing categories during Contract performance, and also permits Offerors to propose equivalent labor categories with different internal titles if the proposed candidates meet or exceed the published minimum qualifications.</p> <p>Please confirm that Offerors may edit Attachment 1 - Bid Sheet to align pricing with their proposed technical solution, including adding rows for additional or specialized labor categories, modifying role titles for equivalent labor category substitutions, and proposing hours/quantities that differ from USAC's estimated staffing levels, provided all additions, substitutions, and assumptions are clearly identified and justified in the Technical Proposal and/or Price Proposal.</p> <p>Please also confirm that such edits to Attachment 1 will not be considered a noncompliant alteration of the bid sheet, provided the original required resource lines remain visible and the Offeror's pricing is clear and traceable.</p>	<p>Refer to response for Question #99. Offerors may add rows for additional or specialized labor categories, modify role titles for equivalent substitutions per Section B.5.O, and propose alternate quantities, provided original required resource lines remain visible, and all changes are clearly identified and justified. Such edits will not be considered noncompliant.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
101.	Given the current ambiguity around the requirements for the AI scenario, would USAC consider removing the requirement for offerors to submit a separate pricing sheet with AI tooling? Without defined AI requirements, offerors may take inconsistent pricing approaches, which could limit USAC's ability to conduct a fair and valid comparison across proposals.	USAC will retain the requirement for two Bid Sheets (with and without AI tooling). The AI scenario is for visibility purposes; award is based on the without-AI baseline. Refer to response for Question #102.
102.	Given that Section B.7 requires separate Bid Sheets with and without AI tooling, how will USAC assess price realism associated with proposals that leverage AI to significantly reduce Level of Effort (LOE), particularly given that AI use requires prior written approval per Section B.5.I and the Privacy and Security Addendum Section 3.3, and that approval is not guaranteed prior to award?	AI use under this Contract requires prior written approval per Section B.5.I and Privacy and Security Addendum Section 3.3. The with AI Bid Sheet is informational; pricing in the with-AI scenario does not commit USAC or the Contractor to a specific AI deployment. Price realism will be evaluated primarily against the without-AI baseline. Approved AI use may be implemented post-award subject to AI Governance Committee review.
103.	Are the requirements for the net 2 new applications defined, or will they be acquired and triaged throughout the engagement?	The two additional systems referenced in Section B.5.G are not currently defined. Requirements will be triaged and prioritized through the task order process if and when those systems are added during the Contract Term.
104.	Are there defined success criteria/KPIs for DME outcomes (e.g., performance improvements, cost reduction)? Are there any known performance or scalability issues in current applications?	Success criteria and KPIs will be defined at the task order level. Refer to response for Question #4.
105.	Should the limit be twenty (20) pages or thirty (30) pages, excluding Attachment A resumes?	Refer to response to question #84



Q#	Question	Answer
106.	Page 5 of 70 in the RFP mentions a Time and Material contract, while page 25 of 70 refers to a fixed-price, service category rate basis using the service categories and fixed rates listed in Attachment 1. Additionally, page 63 of 70 states that evaluation will be based on a firm fixed price. Given the references to both contract types, would USAC be open to flexibility in using either Time and Material or Firm Fixed Price, depending on what best suits the scope and deliverables?	The Contract type is Time and Materials (T&M) per Section B.2. Refer to response for Question #96.
107.	Will USAC provide historical data (ticket volume / frequently occurring issues /existing operational manuals) for better planning support?	Refer to responses for Questions #1, #44, and #45. Historical data, including ticket volumes, will be reviewed during onboarding to the extent available.
108.	Could you provide clarity on the change management process for continuous delivery and enhancements, including the handling of change requests, approval steps, and release/deployment procedures?	Change management follows the USAC SDLC and PM@USAC framework, including ARB/ERB review where applicable. Specific change request, approval, and release procedures will be reviewed during onboarding.
109.	Does USAC plan to leverage AI-enabled document processing capabilities (e.g., classification, data extraction, validation of FCC forms) within Appian applications?	USAC is evaluating AI-enabled document processing capabilities as part of its broader AI strategy. Any AI use under this Contract requires prior written approval per Section B.5.I and Privacy and Security Addendum Section 3.3.
110.	How are data ingestion and processing handled today, are they batch-based, real-time, or a mix of both? 2. How much historical data needs to be migrated (full history/partial history/time horizons e.g. years of history etc), and what are the post-migration data retention policies across legacy systems and Appian Cloud?	USAC uses a mix of batch and real-time data processing patterns across the in-scope systems. Historical data migration scope and retention policies will be defined by task order based on the specific modernization initiative.
111.	How do the FTE levels per labor category in the Attachment 1 Bid Sheet compared to the FTE levels supporting this work today?	USAC has provided estimated quantities for pricing purposes based on its current understanding of the workload. Refer to Section B.5.O and the response for Question #76.



Q#	Question	Answer
112.	Are Offerors allowed to edit the quantities of FTEs per labor category in the Attachment 1 - Bid Sheet to best match their proposed solution or are Offerors required to use the FTE levels per labor category as provided in the Attachment 1 - Bid Sheet?	Refer to response for Question #99.
113.	Is there a standard number of hours per FTE that Offerors are required to use or are Offerors free to propose a number of hours per FTE consistent with their expectations?	Offerors are free to propose hours per FTE consistent with their expectations and Offeror assumptions, provided assumptions are clearly stated in the Price Proposal. USAC will use the estimated hours in Attachment 1 for evaluation comparability per response for Question #77.
114.	The RFP mentions, "USAC will evaluate price based on the firm fixed price listed in Attachment 1 - Bid Sheet." However, the Bid Sheet does not appear to calculate a total fixed price anywhere, only hours and rates per labor category by contract year. Can USAC please clarify how it will determine a total fixed price and whether the price evaluation will be focused on this total fixed price figure or the individual labor category rates themselves?	Refer to response for Question #96. USAC will derive a total evaluated price by applying proposed rates to the estimated quantities and hours.
115.	What are the evaluation criteria for 7.1 Technical, 7.1.a Technical Approach, 7.1.b Capabilities and 7.1.c Key Personnel	Refer to Section E.7.1. Technical evaluation sub-factors are listed in descending order of importance: (a) Technical Approach, (b) Capabilities, and (c) Key Personnel.
116.	Can USAC provide historical actual hours by labor category (or by system) for the current Appian portfolio over the last 12–24 months? This would help refine our pricing assumptions	Refer to response for Question #41.



Q#	Question	Answer
117.	What specific AI capabilities (if any) do USAC envision or prefer for this engagement? Are there any prohibited or pre-approved AI tools/services?	USAC operates Appian platform AI capabilities and Microsoft 365 Copilot in the current environment. Any AI use under this Contract requires prior written approval from the AI Governance Committee and AI Core PMO per Section B.5.I and Privacy and Security Addendum Section 3.3. Refer to responses for Questions #53, #54, and #55.
118.	How does USAC plan to issue and fund Task Orders under this T&M contract?	There will not be separate task orders under this contract. Task Order here means that the required tasks will be issued or assigned in writing by the USAC PM following a established process and aligned with sprint planning cycles.
119.	Is there a minimum guarantee or not-to-exceed per TO?	Refer to response to question #118.
120.	What is the anticipated annual funding level for this contract?	Annual funding levels are not disclosed in the RFP. The Contract is T&M with quantities representing estimates only per Section B.2 and Section B.5.O.
121.	Can USAC share the incumbent contractor's staffing levels, key systems documentation status, and any known gaps or challenges from the current environment?	Refer to response to question #1. The RFP includes the required number of labor categories and the quantity.
122.	What level of access/support will the incumbent provide during transition (e.g., code repositories, full documentation, shadowing, joint sessions)?	Per Section B.5.H, transition-in includes joint working sessions, code walkthroughs, documentation reviews, and shadowing periods for each in-scope system. Access to code repositories and documentation will be provided per Question #5.
123.	Are there any restrictions on data/tools transfer?	Refer to responses for Questions #5 and #54. No restrictions beyond standard USAC IT security, data handling, and confidentiality requirements.
124.	USAC states it does not currently maintain a Contractor-accessible CI/CD pipeline. What tools, repositories (e.g., GitHub Enterprise, GitLab), environments, and access levels (Dev/Test/Staging/Prod) will the Contractor be expected to use or build upon?	USAC has existing licensed DevSecOps tooling, including Bamboo, Git, Cucumber, and Veracode. Refer to response for Question #37. The Contractor will use USAC-licensed tooling and is responsible for establishing the Appian-specific CI/CD pipeline integration. Repository platform and environment access details will be shared during onboarding.



Q#	Question	Answer
125.	What is the current Appian Cloud version(s) in use across the in-scope systems (CAMP, HC Apps, RHC, S&L)?	Appian Cloud version details will be shared during onboarding and transition-in. All in-scope systems are maintained on currently supported Appian Cloud releases.
126.	Are there any planned platform upgrades during the contract term?	Appian platform upgrades are coordinated with USAC and Appian per Section B.5.E. Specific upgrade timing will be planned during the Contract Term.
127.	Can USAC provide a high-level overview or diagram of current integrations (APIs, Connected Systems, middleware, backend systems like M365, MariaDB, etc.) for the four in-scope systems?	Refer to response for Question #47. Architecture and integration details will be shared during onboarding and transition-in.
128.	The RFP mentions a hybrid model (at least 2 days/week in DC office). Is this requirement flexible, or strictly enforced?	The two days per week onsite requirement is firm. Refer to response for Question #3.
129.	What percentage of the team is expected to be onsite vs. remote?	All Contractor Staff are required to be onsite at USAC Headquarters two days per week. The remaining days may be performed remotely from within the United States. Refer to response for Question #3.
130.	For Key Personnel, what is the process and timeline for substitutions post-award if a proposed individual becomes unavailable?	Refer to response for Question #80 and Section C.20.
131.	Will USAC accept equivalent experience in lieu of specific Appian L2/L3 certifications during proposal evaluation?	Yes. USAC will accept equivalent experience in lieu of specific Appian L2/L3 certifications during proposal evaluation, with strong justification provided by the Offeror.
132.	For systems with Moderate FISMA impact (RHC, S&L), what specific support is expected from the Contractor regarding SSP updates, POA&M, and annual ATO activities?	For FISMA Moderate systems (RHC, S&L), the Contractor will support SSP updates, POA&M tracking and remediation, ATO maintenance activities, and FISMA assessment evidence packages per Section B.5.K and Deliverable #9. USAC retains accountability for the ATO decision.
133.	Will USAC provide templates or baseline documentation?	USAC will provide existing templates and baseline documentation (SSPs, POA&Ms, deliverable templates) during onboarding and transition-in.



Q#	Question	Answer
134.	Please clarify the exact background check requirements (e.g., level, provider, cost responsibility) for Contractor Staff, especially for Moderate-impact systems.	Refer to Section B.5.P. Background check details, including level and provider, will be shared during onboarding. USAC bears no direct cost responsibility for Contractor staff background checks.
135.	What specific Zero Trust/OKTA configurations or policies must the Contractor adhere to for developer access and service accounts?	Zero Trust and OKTA configuration policies will be shared during onboarding. The Contractor will adhere to USAC’s least-privilege, MFA, and time-limited privileged access standards consistent with Privacy and Security Addendum Section 2.4.
136.	The RFP notes up to two additional Appian systems may be added. What is the process for adding scope, and how will pricing/rates be handled for new systems or major modernization efforts?	Additional systems are added through the task order process. Pricing will use the labor category rates established in Attachment 1; specialized rates, if needed, will be negotiated as a contract modification per Section C.38 (Added Services).
137.	For EVM in Monthly Status Reports and SLA tracking — are there specific tools/formats USAC requires (e.g., for PV/EV/CPI/SPI calculations)?	EVM reporting (PV, EV, CPI/SPI) will use the planned task order hours as the planned value baseline. Specific report formats will be confirmed at kickoff and aligned with PM@USAC standards.
138.	What constitutes “persistent” SLA failure that could trigger corrective action?	Persistent SLA failure means a documented pattern of repeated failures to meet SLA targets across multiple consecutive reporting periods, evaluated by USAC PM in coordination with USAC IT leadership.
139.	What are all the pain points or improvements USAC would like to avoid/see in the new vendor contractor	Pain points and priority improvement areas will be reviewed during onboarding. USAC’s expectations include strong Appian engineering practices, rigorous DevSecOps discipline, proactive O&M, and consistent SLA performance.
140.	Do we have the list of all backlog items to share to understand the amount of work and effort required for the new vendor contractor to evaluate before the providing the pricing.	Backlog details will be reviewed during onboarding and transition-in. Refer to responses for Questions #4 and #149.
141.	Any preference to be given to small business or women owned business on the evaluation criteria or vendor or contractors with past experience in USAC project implementation.	No. USAC does not provide small business or women-owned business preferences. Best-value evaluation is conducted per Section E.7. Prior USAC project experience may be considered under past performance per Section E.7.2.



Q#	Question	Answer
142.	Of the four (4) Appian Cloud-based systems identified as in scope, how many will require Operations & Maintenance (O&M) support at contract start?	All four (4) in-scope systems require O&M support at contract start.
143.	For each in-scope system, can USAC provide the current Appian platform version and relative size/complexity, including process model count, Appian object count, total code base size, number of integrations, and user base?	Refer to responses for Questions #47 and #125. System-specific complexity metrics will be shared during onboarding and transition-in.
144.	What is the current count of Appian environments across the four systems, and how are those environments allocated?	Standard Appian environments (development, test, staging, production) are maintained for each in-scope system. Environment details will be shared during onboarding.
145.	Can USAC provide the current production SLA baseline for the four systems for the most recent 12 months, including P1/P2/P3/P4 ticket volumes, mean time to resolution (MTTR), and attainment rates?	Production SLA baseline data will be shared during onboarding to the extent available. Refer to responses for Questions #44 and #45.
146.	What are the peak load and usage characteristics for each in-scope system?	Peak load characteristics differ across systems and are driven by FCC program filing windows and wave cycles. Detailed performance baselines will be shared during onboarding.
147.	What is USAC's expected balance of DME (development, modernization, enhancement) versus O&M hours/workload across the base year and option years?	The Contract is T&M with work prioritized through task orders. The DME vs. O&M balance will vary year by year based on USAC priorities and is not pre-allocated.
148.	Can USAC provide the approximate monthly volume of feature development, business rule updates, UI/UX improvements, and workflow modifications across these systems?	Volumes will vary by system and task order. Backlog and historical throughput will be reviewed during onboarding.
149.	Is there an existing backlog for modernization and enhancements? If so, what is the estimated volume of epics/user stories planned for the base year, and how many were completed in the last 6–12 months?	Each in-scope system maintains a managed product backlog. Backlog size, composition, and prior-period throughput will be reviewed during onboarding and transition-in.



Q#	Question	Answer
150.	How many legacy systems are planned for modernization into Appian over the life of the contract, what are their underlying technologies, and what is their relative size/complexity (e.g., integrations, code base, user base)?	The number, scope, and complexity of legacy modernization candidates will be defined through the task order process. No pre-committed modernization roadmap is being released with this RFP.
151.	Section 5.D states USAC does not currently maintain a contractor-accessible CI/CD pipeline. Does the incumbent contractor maintain a separate pipeline today, will any of that tooling transfer to the successor contractor, or should offerors assume the new contractor must establish the pipeline from scratch? Please also identify the current DevSecOps/CI/CD toolset and whether any required tools are GFE/GFI or contractor-furnished.	The Contractor establishes the pipeline using USAC-licensed tooling; the existing toolset includes Bamboo, Git, Cucumber, and Veracode. No tools are GFE/GFI in the federal sense; USAC provides infrastructure and licensed applications.
152.	Can USAC provide both (a) the current middleware/integration tool stack and (b) an inventory of production integrations for each in-scope system, including upstream/downstream systems and interfaces (e.g., REST, SOAP, Connected Systems, data stores)?	An integration inventory and middleware stack details will be shared during onboarding and transition-in. Refer to response for Question #47.
153.	USAC states the contractor must integrate with its existing project tracking toolset. What toolset is currently in use?	USAC uses Atlassian Jira and Confluence for project tracking and documentation. Refer to response for Question #36.
154.	Are there existing ARB/ERB decisions, technical debt registers, known refactoring backlogs, or similar architectural constraints that the new contractor will inherit?	Yes. The incoming Contractor will inherit existing ARB/ERB decisions, technical debt registers, and refactoring backlogs as part of the transition-in. Details will be shared during onboarding.
155.	Will USAC make the current Appian object inventory, process model documentation, and data store schemas available to the awarded contractor at kickoff?	Yes. Appian object inventories, process model documentation, and data store schemas will be made available during onboarding and transition-in subject to USAC security and access controls.
156.	What are the current ATO statuses and expiration dates for each of the four in-scope systems?	ATOs are in place for all in-scope systems. Expiration dates will be shared during onboarding and transition-in.
157.	Will USAC make existing System Security Plans (SSPs), POA&Ms, and prior assessment results available to the awarded contractor?	Yes. SSPs, POA&Ms, and prior assessment results will be made available to the awarded Contractor during onboarding under appropriate confidentiality and access controls.



Q#	Question	Answer
158.	What level of background investigation or clearance is required for contractor personnel, and historically how long does adjudication take before staff may begin billing?	Refer to responses for Questions #71, #72, and #134.
159.	Is there an incumbent contractor currently performing this work? If so, what is the approximate current team size and labor mix (e.g., developers, QA, DevSecOps, architects)?	Refer to responses for Questions #1 and #121.
160.	Because this is a T&M contract, will USAC provide historical or estimated total labor hours/LOE for the base year so that offerors may price against a common baseline?	Refer to response for Question #41. USAC has provided estimated quantities and hours in Attachment 1 to serve as the common baseline for pricing.
161.	Are Key Personnel expected to be 100% dedicated to this contract, or may they be matrixed/shared across other efforts?	Key Personnel may be matrixed or shared across other efforts with USAC's prior approval provided the individual's commitment to this Contract is sufficient to meet performance obligations.
162.	The pricing sheet requires separate pricing with and without AI tooling. Can USAC clarify whether "AI tooling" includes AI-assisted developer productivity tools, AI features embedded in delivered applications, or both?	AI tooling includes both AI-assisted developer productivity tools and AI features embedded in delivered applications. Refer to response for Question #7.
163.	Should offerors assume USAC-prescribed AI tools/use cases, or should they propose their own AI accelerators and state the assumptions underlying the alternative pricing?	Offerors may propose their own AI accelerators; assumptions must be stated. USAC does not prescribe specific AI tools beyond the platforms identified in Question #54.
164.	If AI tools are proposed, who is responsible for associated licensing costs, the contractor or USAC?	Contractor is responsible for licensing costs associated with proposed AI tools. AI tools are subject to USAC AI Governance Committee approval per Section B.5.I.
165.	Section 5.F sets P1 resolution at four business hours. How does USAC define "business hours" for this purpose (e.g., standard business day, extended filing-window support, or 24/7 during specific operational periods)?	Business hours mean standard USAC business hours (8x5 Eastern Time). After-hours support is limited to declared P1 production incidents on a call-out basis.
166.	Does USAC require 24/7 on-call coverage, or is after-hours support limited to declared production incidents?	No. USAC does not require 24/7 on-call coverage as a baseline. Business hours coverage (8x5 ET) is the standard, with after-hours support for declared P1 production incidents on a call-out basis. Refer to response for Question #165.



Q#	Question	Answer
167.	For the required two onsite days per week at USAC headquarters, are those fixed days for the full team or may personnel coordinate onsite attendance flexibly?	All Contractor Staff are subject to the two days per week onsite requirement. Specific days are coordinated with USAC PM; teams may align onsite attendance to support collaboration, ceremonies, and stakeholder availability.
168.	During the 60-day transition period, are there any onboarding, security training, access provisioning, or other constraints that typically delay productivity?	Standard onboarding activities include IT Security Rules of Behavior signature, mandatory IT Security and Privacy Awareness training (and Role-Based Privacy Act Training where applicable), USAC laptop issuance, OKTA provisioning, system access requests, and background checks. The Transition-In Plan should account for these activities within the 60-day transition window.
169.	Can USAC please provide clarity on how the price will be evaluated?	Refer to responses for Questions #77, #96, and #98.
170.	The Price Evaluation section says that the Government will evaluate whether the price is “realistic” and “reasonable”. Without specifics on the scope of the work included in the RFP, how will the Government make this “realistic” and “reasonable” determination?	USAC will evaluate price reasonableness and realism based on the rates, hours, and quantities in Attachment 1 against the scope of work described in Section B, comparison across competing proposals, and USAC’s Independent Cost Estimate.
171.	Is the 2 day per week in-office requirement (Section 4 - Place of Performance) expected for all resources, or just certain ones? Would this requirement be applicable to part-time resources, or just full-time resources? Can the individual resources decide what days of the week for in-office work, or are there set days of the week?	The two days per week onsite requirement applies to all Contractor Staff performing work under this Contract, regardless of full-time or part-time status. Specific days may be coordinated with USAC PM to support business needs.
172.	Does the QTY of resources (in Section 7 - Pricing) need to align with the Qty of resources provided by the Government in Section O (Required Resources)?	Refer to responses for Questions #99 and #100. Quantities in Section B.7 (Pricing) should align with the quantities in Section B.5.O (Required Resources) unless the Offeror proposes alternate quantities with clear justification.



Q#	Question	Answer
173.	<p>Current Environment and Architecture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can USAC provide the current Appian version(s) and planned upgrade roadmap for each in-scope application? • Are all environments hosted entirely within Appian Cloud, or are there hybrid/on-premises integrations currently in place? • Can USAC provide a high-level architecture diagram for each in-scope system (CAMP, HC Apps, RHC, and S&L)? • What middleware, integration platforms, or API gateways are currently being used? • Are there existing reusable Appian frameworks/components/common objects across the portfolio? 	<p>Refer to responses for Questions #47, #125, and #127. All in-scope systems are hosted on Appian Cloud with integrations to USAC backend systems; reusable frameworks/components exist and will be reviewed during onboarding.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
174.	<p>Existing Toolchain and DevSecOps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What source code repository platform is currently in use (GitHub, Azure DevOps, Bitbucket, etc.)? • Does USAC currently maintain any CI/CD tooling or partially implemented pipelines that the selected contractor can leverage? • Are there preferred or mandated tools for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAST • DAST • Dependency scanning • Test automation • Secrets management • IaC <p>Monitoring/observability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is CyberArk already implemented within the environment, or should implementation/setup be included in scope? • Are there existing branch governance and pull request standards already established? 	<p>Refer to responses for Questions #5, # 37, 56, and #124. Source code platform details will be shared during onboarding. CyberArk is already deployed at USAC for password rotation. Branch governance and pull request standards will be established by Section B.5.D.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
175.	<p>Agile Delivery and PMO Expectations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which project management and Agile tooling is currently used (Jira, Azure Boards, Rally, etc.)? • Can USAC provide additional details regarding PM@USAC governance expectations and required artifacts? • Is Earned Value Management (EVM) reporting expected at the contract level, task-order level, or sprint level? • Are there predefined KPI thresholds for CPI/SPI reporting? • Will multiple concurrent Scrum teams be expected during the base period? 	<p>Refer to responses for Questions #36, #65, and #137. PM@USAC governance details and required artifacts will be provided at kickoff. EVM is expected at the contract and task order level. Multiple concurrent Scrum teams will be supported based on task order needs.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
176.	<p>Staffing and Resourcing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can USAC provide estimated annual labor hour ranges by labor category? • Is there an anticipated ramp-up schedule during transition-in? • Are personnel expected to support after-hours or weekend production deployments? • Are on-call support rotations expected for production incidents? • Will offshore or nearshore resources be permitted for non-production support activities if all work remains within the United States? • Can Key Personnel fulfill billable technical delivery roles in addition to management responsibilities? • Is there a preferred staffing mix between dedicated versus shared resources? 	<p>Refer to responses for Questions #69, # 76, 166, 112, and #161. Offshore resources are not permitted; refer to response for Question #9. Key Personnel may perform billable technical delivery in addition to management responsibilities. Staffing mix is at the Offeror's discretion.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
177.	<p>Transition and Incumbent Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can USAC provide details regarding the incumbent contractor and transition support expectations? • Will incumbent documentation, code repositories, and operational runbooks be made available during transition? • Is there a mandated overlap period with the incumbent team? • Are there known technical debt areas or current operational pain points USAC would like prioritized during transition? 	<p>Refer to response to question #1, #51, and #122. Structured knowledge transfer, documentation, code repositories, and operational runbooks will be made available. A parallel-operations overlap period is required during transition-in per Section B.5.H. Pain points and priority areas will be reviewed during onboarding after contract award.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
178.	<p>Security, Compliance, and ATO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can USAC clarify whether each in-scope system currently maintains an active ATO? • Will the contractor be expected to directly manage ATO packages and POA&M remediation activities? • Are there existing SSP templates and security documentation standards contractors must follow? • What vulnerability remediation timelines are expected for Critical, High, Medium, and Low findings? • Will USAC provide access to enterprise security tooling/SIEM platforms? • Are third-party penetration testing results available to the selected contractor? • Are there additional compliance frameworks beyond FISMA/NIST/FedRAMP that contractors should consider? 	<p>All in-scope systems maintain active ATOs. The Contractor will support ATO package management and POA&M remediation activities. SSP templates and security documentation standards will be provided during onboarding. Vulnerability remediation timelines follow NIST-recommended timeframes per Section B.5.K; Critical/High findings are remediated as soon as possible. Access to enterprise security tooling and any available third-party penetration testing results will be provided on a need-to-use basis. No additional compliance frameworks beyond those identified in the RFP are required.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
179.	<p>AI Governance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding the request for two bid sheets (with and without AI tooling), can USAC clarify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intended use cases for AI tooling • Whether generative AI coding assistants are permissible • Whether AI tooling costs should be included as separate line items • Whether approved AI platforms already exist within USAC • What approval process and timeline applies for proposed AI-enabled development tooling? 	<p>Refer to responses for Questions #7, # 53, 54, 55, 117, 163, 164, and #102. The AI Governance Committee and AI Core PMO review proposed AI capabilities; approval timelines depend on the nature of the request and risk profile.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
180.	<p>Operations and Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately how many monthly tickets/incidents are currently handled across in-scope applications? • Can USAC provide current application user counts and transaction volumes? • Are there current SLAs being met by the incumbent contractor? • Are there expected maintenance windows for deployments and upgrades? • Is production support centralized or aligned per application? • Are there disaster recovery and business continuity RTO/RPO requirements for the applications? 	<p>Refer to responses for Questions #14, #44, #45, #145, #165, and #166. Maintenance windows and DR/BCP RTO/RPO requirements will be reviewed during onboarding.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
181.	<p>Database and Integration Landscape:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beyond MariaDB, are additional database technologies currently in use? • What are the major enterprise systems integrated with the Appian applications? • Are there existing API standards, integration governance policies, or reusable services contractors must adopt? • Are there any expected large-scale data migration activities during the contract period? 	<p>MariaDB is the primary Appian data store. Additional database technologies and integrated enterprise systems will be reviewed during onboarding. The Contractor will adopt USAC integration governance standards.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
182.	<p>Proposal and Pricing Clarifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can USAC clarify whether pricing evaluations will prioritize blended rates, staffing realism, technical merit, or best-value tradeoff? • Are there anticipated task-order ceilings or annual budget ranges? • Should offerors assume fully dedicated staffing for pricing purposes? • Are escalation rates expected between base and option years? • Can subcontractor labor categories be proposed separately from prime contractor labor categories? • Are there page limits or formatting restrictions for resumes and technical approach narratives? 	<p>Refer to responses for Questions #77, #96, #99, #119, #120, #161, #79, and Section E. Subcontractor labor categories may be proposed and clearly identified. Resume and technical approach formatting follows Section E.6.E.</p> <p>RFP instructions for Attachment A allow a maximum of two (2) pages per resume. Although specific formatting rules are not prescribed, submitting resumes in a highly professional and consistent format is strongly preferred.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
183.	<p>Contractual and Administrative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can USAC clarify expectations regarding subcontractor participation and approval workflows? • Will the selected contractor be required to obtain specific insurance minimums beyond standard corporate policies? • Are there any anticipated organizational conflict of interest (OCI) concerns offerors should address? • Can USAC clarify whether transition-out support beyond the stated 60-day period may be required? 	<p>Subcontractor participation follows Section C.9 (Assignment, Delegation, and Subcontracting). Insurance requirements follow Section C.22. OCI considerations follow Section C.23. Transition-out activities follow Section B.6, Deliverable #10, and Section C.31 (Temporary Extension of Services).</p>
184.	<p>Future Scope and Growth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RFP mentions that up to two additional Appian-based systems may be added during the contract term. Can USAC provide any anticipated scope, timelines, or estimated complexity for these future systems? • Are there strategic modernization initiatives or enterprise transformation efforts currently planned that may impact this contract? 	<p>Refer to responses for Questions #4 and #103. No additional scope or modernization roadmap is being released with this RFP; future systems will be added via the task order process.</p>
185.	<p>Will USAC please provide the latest Health Check scans for the four (4) Appian applications in question?</p>	<p>Health Check scans will be reviewed during onboarding and transition-in, not released with this RFP.</p>
186.	<p>Will USAC please provide the latest system architecture diagrams for CAMP, HC Apps, RHC, and S&L with specific focus on the non-Appian portions of each system (e.g., plugins, Java services, integrations, etc.)?</p>	<p>Refer to response for Question #47. Architecture diagrams will be shared during onboarding and transition-in.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
187.	Does USAC have any available foundational AI services that contractors may leverage to field developer assistive technologies securely within the USAC environment?	USAC operates Microsoft 365 Copilot and Appian platform AI capabilities. Additional foundational AI services are evaluated under the AI Governance Committee process. Refer to response for Question #54.
188.	Does USAC consider the scope to field, integrate, and operationalize within the USAC environment AI-driven SDLC automation capabilities as part of the DevSecOps support area, or are these considered part of the contractor-differentiating services to be included within the pricing build-up?	AI-driven SDLC automation is considered contractor-differentiating; pricing should be embedded in the Contractor's rate build-up. Deployment of any AI capability is subject to USAC AI Governance Committee approval.
189.	Does USAC consider AI token costs as part of the overall contractor hourly rate built up in the bid sheet, or is there a separate mechanism intended to financially provision the use of AI in maintaining and modernizing the four Appian systems in question?	AI token costs are not separately reimbursable. Any AI use approved by USAC must be reflected in the Contractor's fully loaded rates. Refer to response for Question #7.
190.	Would USAC consider a Firm Fixed Price (FFP) contracting model? If so, would USAC be willing to provide data on current system status, delivery service level agreements, feature roadmaps and modernization goals on a per-system basis. Additionally, current architectural roadmaps for items like DevSecOps tooling, Observability and Monitoring, Appian on Kubernetes transition, and platform-native AI implementation would be helpful.	The Contract type is T&M per Section B.2; FFP is not being offered. Refer to response for Question #96.
191.	How does USAC intend to expeditiously analyze, review, and approve contractor-provided AI tools and services so as to not disrupt delivery given an AI-enabled bid sheet acceptance? Could USAC provide the required documentation, process, and anticipated review and acceptance timeline?	The AI Governance Committee and AI Core PMO review proposed AI tools and services. Review process documentation will be provided during onboarding. Anticipated review and acceptance timelines depend on tool risk profile and data exposure; the Contractor should plan for AI capability deployment as a post-award activity rather than a Day-1 dependency.



Q#	Question	Answer
192.	Section B.11 lists both the Program Manager and Contracts Administrator as TBD. These are the contractor's primary escalation paths for all technical, contractual, and schedule decisions. Can USAC confirm these roles will be filled and formally introduced at the Kick-Off Meeting, and clarify the decision authority each holds — specifically, who has authority to approve scope changes at the task order level versus the contract level, and what the expected response SLA is for contractor-submitted decision requests?	PM and CA roles will be filled and formally introduced at or before the Kick-Off Meeting per Section B.8. The CA holds contractual authority (scope changes, modifications); the PM holds technical and task order authority. Response SLAs for decision requests are aligned with the SLAs in Section B.5.F and may be refined at kickoff.
193.	The RFP requires EVM reporting (PV, EV, CPI/SPI) in monthly status reports, but the contract vehicle is Time and Materials. In a T&M structure, how does USAC define the planned value baseline against which earned value will be measured — by approved task order hours, sprint velocity, or another mechanism? Who establishes and approves the Performance Measurement Baseline, and what triggers a formal re-baseline event?	The planned value baseline is established by approved task order hours (PV = authorized hours x rates). Earned value is measured against sprint/release deliverables completed and accepted. The Performance Measurement Baseline is approved by USAC PM. Re-baseline events are triggered by formal scope changes, task order modifications, or other material schedule changes mutually agreed by USAC PM and the Contractor.
194.	Section B.5.H requires the contractor to maintain parallel operations with the incumbent during transition. What constitutes 'parallel operations' in USAC's view — does this mean the contractor shadows incumbent staff, co-delivers sprints, or independently replicates incumbent capability before handover? What formal criteria does USAC use to declare transition complete beyond PM approval, and what recourse does the incoming contractor have if the incumbent is uncooperative during knowledge transfer sessions?	Parallel operations mean the incoming Contractor maintains sufficient staffing to co-deliver during transition-in, including shadowing, joint working sessions, and progressive responsibility transfer. Completion criteria are defined in the Transition-In Plan and approved by USAC PM. USAC will mediate any cooperation issues identified by the incoming Contractor.



Q#	Question	Answer
195.	Section B.6 requires a Transition-Out Plan no later than 60 calendar days before end of period of performance. However, Section B.3 permits USAC to exercise an option year with only 30 days' prior written notice. If USAC exercises an option year 30 days before expiration, how does the contractor reconcile the obligation to have a Transition-Out Plan completed 60 days before period end when option year notification may arrive only half that time in advance?	USAC intends to provide reasonable notice of option year exercise so as not to compromise the 60-day Transition-Out Plan timeline. In the event of timing conflict, USAC will work with the Contractor in good faith to align Transition-Out activities.
196.	The RFP requires a written task order to authorize all billable work. In active Agile delivery, sprint planning commitments must be confirmed 1–2 weeks in advance to maintain cadence. Can USAC clarify: (a) the expected turnaround time from contractor task order proposal submission to USAC written authorization; (b) whether verbal or email confirmation is permissible as a bridge pending formal written authorization; and (c) how USAC intends to handle sprint work that begins before formal authorization is issued to avoid delivery disruption?	(a) USAC will issue written task order authorization aligned to sprint planning cycles, with task orders issued in advance of sprint commitments. (b) Verbal or email confirmation may bridge pending formal written authorization with USAC PM approval but is not a substitute for written task order authorization. (c) Sprint work begun in anticipation of formal authorization is at Contractor risk; no retroactive billing is permitted without an executed task order per Section B.2.
197.	Can USAC confirm the exact Appian Cloud version currently running in each of the four in-scope systems (CAMP, HC Apps, RHC, S&L)? SAIL constructs, Record Type capabilities, Connected System behaviors, and process model compatibility differ materially across Appian 23.x and 24.x releases. Without version confirmation, offerors cannot accurately assess refactoring risk, estimate platform upgrade effort, or validate that proposed Lead Developer certifications align to the production environment.	Refer to response for Question #125. Version-specific details will be shared during onboarding and transition-in.



Q#	Question	Answer
198.	<p>Section B.5.D states USAC does not currently maintain a contractor-accessible CI/CD pipeline and places full establishment responsibility on the contractor. Three clarifications are required: (a) Will USAC prescribe a preferred tool chain, or does the contractor propose one subject to USAC approval? (b) Where will pipeline infrastructure be hosted — within Appian Cloud, USAC's cloud tenant, or contractor-managed infrastructure? (c) At contract end or transition, who owns and operates the pipeline — does it transfer to USAC or the successor contractor, and must it meet specific handover documentation standards?</p>	<p>Refer to response for Question #124. (a) USAC has existing licensed tooling; Contractor proposals to use additional tools require USAC approval. (b) Pipeline infrastructure is hosted within USAC's cloud tenant. (c) At contract end, the pipeline and supporting documentation transfer to USAC or its successor Contractor, with handover standards defined in the Transition-Out Plan.</p>
199.	<p>Section B.5.D requires a USAC-approved secrets management solution such as CyberArk. Is CyberArk already deployed in USAC's environment and available for contractor integration, or is the contractor expected to procure, implement, and operate a secrets management platform independently? If contractor-procured, what is the expected USAC approval and procurement timeline, and does this activity fall within the 60-day transition window — or is it treated as a base year deliverable with its own milestone?</p>	<p>CyberArk is already deployed in USAC's environment for password rotation. The Contractor will integrate with the existing CyberArk solution; no independent procurement is required.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
200.	Section B.5.D mandates SAST, DAST, software composition analysis, and dependency scanning integrated into the CI/CD pipeline. Does USAC have existing licensed tooling for any of these functions (e.g., Veracode, Checkmarx, Snyk, OWASP ZAP), or is the contractor responsible for procuring the full scanning tool chain? If contractor-procured, do these tools require independent FedRAMP authorization before integration into the pipeline, and must USAC approve specific tool selections prior to deployment?	USAC has existing licensed tooling including Veracode. The Contractor integrates with USAC-licensed tools; any additional contractor-proposed scanning tools require USAC approval per the Privacy and Security Addendum and may require FedRAMP authorization depending on USAC Data exposure.
201.	Section B.5.E references MariaDB as the primary data store underpinning Appian applications. Are all four systems using MariaDB exclusively, or are there additional data stores in use (e.g., Appian Data Fabric, AWS RDS, SQL Server, external REST data sources)? Does the contractor have direct database access for DBA-level work, or is all data interaction expected to flow through Appian's native Data Store and CDT layer? Understanding this is critical to accurately scoping the Database Specialist III role and estimating DBA effort.	MariaDB is the primary Appian data store. Other data stores and integration patterns vary by system and will be reviewed during onboarding. The Database Specialist III role supports database administration, stored procedure development, and performance tuning consistent with Section B.5.O.
202.	The RFP requires IaC practices for environment configuration and provisioning. Does USAC have an existing IaC framework in use (e.g., Terraform, Ansible, CloudFormation), and do the Appian Cloud environments support IaC provisioning through Appian's APIs or a separate orchestration layer? If Appian Cloud is managed solely through Appian's native admin console, can USAC clarify how IaC is expected to be applied in practice, and which specific environment configurations are in scope for IaC management?	IaC practices apply where supported by the underlying platform. Appian Cloud environment provisioning is managed through Appian's native administration; IaC applies to ancillary infrastructure (e.g., integration components, pipeline configuration). Specific IaC scope will be reviewed during onboarding.



Q#	Question	Answer
203.	<p>The RFP identifies modernization of legacy non-Appian systems into Appian-based solutions as a core work stream. For each legacy system currently in the modernization pipeline, can USAC confirm: (a) how many systems are actively in scope; (b) the current state of each — concept, requirements-defined, in-flight development, or stalled; (c) whether current-state process maps, data dictionaries, and business requirements documents exist and will be handed over during transition; and (d) whether any modernization effort is tied to a regulatory or FCC-mandated delivery deadline that the incoming contractor must honor from day one?</p>	<p>Legacy modernization candidates will be triaged and scoped through the task order process. Available current-state artifacts (process maps, requirements documents) will be shared at task order initiation. Any regulatory or FCC-mandated deadlines will be identified at the task order level.</p>
204.	<p>Section B.13 designates PM@USAC as the required project management framework for all project teams. Can USAC share or provide a reference link to the PM@USAC documentation, required templates, artifact standards, and governance procedures? Offerors need to assess alignment between PM@USAC's tailored PMBOK methodology and their proposed delivery approach and identify any areas where process adaptation or tool integration will be required before proposal submission.</p>	<p>PM@USAC documentation, templates, and governance procedures will be shared during onboarding. Inquiries during the proposal window may be directed to PM@USAC.com per Section B.13.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
205.	<p>Section B.12.L specifies two-week sprint cycles as the standard cadence, confirmed at the task order level. In practice, are business stakeholders — specifically product owners from FRG, AAD, OGC, High-Cost, RHC, and E-Rate programs — committed and available for sprint ceremonies (planning, review, backlog grooming) on a predictable, recurring basis? What is the formal escalation path when a product owner is unavailable, and sprint commitments cannot be confirmed within the planning window?</p>	<p>Yes. USAC product owners across FRG, AAD, OGC, High-Cost, RHC, and E-Rate programs participate in sprint ceremonies on a predictable cadence. Escalation for unavailability is to the USAC PM, who will identify alternates or adjust sprint commitments as needed.</p>
206.	<p>The RFP references SAFe practice include PI Planning, daily standup, sprint review, and retrospective. Can USAC confirm: (a) how frequently PI Planning events are conducted (e.g., quarterly); (b) how many Agile Release Trains (ARTs) are currently operating that the contractor would need to integrate with; and (c) how many of the four in-scope systems are coordinated within a single PI cadence versus operating on independent delivery tracks? This directly affects how the contractor structures its team and aligns inter-system dependencies.</p>	<p>PI Planning and ART structures vary by program and task order. Specific cadence details will be confirmed at the task order level. Inter-system dependencies are coordinated through USAC PM and the enterprise architecture function.</p>
207.	<p>Section B.5.N states that USAC and the contractor will jointly define AQLs post-award. Can USAC share existing AQLs, performance scorecards, or quality metrics from current or prior contracts for similar Appian services? Without baseline, offerors cannot determine whether proposed staffing levels and tooling are calibrated to meet USAC's actual quality expectations — and this ambiguity also prevents offerors from pricing realistically for the effort required to achieve and sustain target quality levels.</p>	<p>AQLs will be jointly defined post-award per Section B.5.N. Historical quality scorecards will be reviewed during onboarding.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
208.	<p>The RFP describes continuous enhancement of existing Appian applications including business rule updates, UI/UX improvements, and workflow modifications. What is the current mechanism for capturing, prioritizing, and approving enhancement requests? Does USAC maintain a groomed product backlog per system, and will the contractor inherit an existing backlog at transition? If so, can USAC provide an approximate size and age profile of the current backlog across all four in-scope systems so offerors can plan initial sprint capacity accordingly?</p>	<p>Enhancement requests are captured and prioritized through USAC PM and business product owners using Jira. The Contractor will inherit existing backlogs at transition-in. Refer to response for Question #149.</p>
209.	<p>The Definition of Done requires a minimum 80%-unit test coverage threshold and SAST scan passage with no new Critical/High findings. Can USAC confirm the current test coverage baseline for each of the four in-scope systems? If existing systems are significantly below 80%, is the contractor expected to remediate legacy coverage gaps as part of base year delivery, or does the 80% threshold apply only to net-new code produced under this contract? This is a significant scoping variable that directly affects resource estimates and sprint velocity projections.</p>	<p>The 80%-unit test coverage threshold per the Definition of Done applies to net-new code produced under this Contract. Remediation of legacy coverage gaps will be planned through the task order process where needed.</p>
210.	<p>How many Appian environments are maintained per in-scope system (e.g., development, SIT, UAT, staging, production)? Are all non-production environments contractors-accessible from contract award, or are environment provisioning and access requests processed through a separate USAC IT intake queue with associated lead times? Environment access delays directly constrain sprint velocity, test cycle throughput, and the contractor's ability to meet the 60-day transition completion target.</p>	<p>Standard non-production environments (development, test, staging) and production are maintained for each in-scope system. Access provisioning follows USAC standard intake processes; the Transition-In Plan should account for typical lead times.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
211.	<p>Section B.5.F defines P1 response within one hour and resolution within four business hours. Three clarifications are required: (a) Is the SLA clock measured from initial monitoring alert, USAC ticket creation, or contractor acknowledgement? (b) Does USAC have an existing ITSM/ticketing platform (e.g., ServiceNow, Jira Service Management) that the contractor will operate within, or must the contractor establish an incident management workflow? (c) Given P1 is defined as complete production system outage, does USAC expect 24/7 on-call coverage for P1 incidents, and if so, is this billable under the T&M rates or embedded in overhead?</p>	<p>(a) The SLA clock begins at USAC ticket creation or contractor acknowledgement, whichever is earlier. (b) USAC uses ServiceNow for ITSM and Jira for development tracking; refer to response for Question #43. (c) Refer to responses for Questions #165 and #166. 24/7 on-call is not required; P1 after-hours support is on a call-out basis and billable under T&M rates with PM authorization.</p>
212.	<p>Section B.5.C lists User Acceptance Testing (UAT) as a required phase within each release cycle. Can USAC confirm: (a) who owns UAT execution — USAC business users, the contractor, or a shared responsibility model; (b) what the contractually defined UAT entry and exit criteria are per release; (c) what the expected UAT window is within a two-week sprint cadence; and (d) if USAC-side UAT participants are unavailable within the sprint window, what is the agreed process for managing UAT carry-over without triggering a Deliverable Acceptance Form rejection?</p>	<p>(a) UAT is a shared responsibility model with USAC business users leading execution and the Contractor providing test artifacts and support. (b) UAT entry/exit criteria are defined per release in coordination with USAC PM. (c) UAT windows align with the sprint cadence and release plan. (d) UAT carry-over due to USAC participant unavailability does not trigger DAF rejection; the deliverable acceptance window is adjusted by mutual agreement.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
213.	<p>The RFP requires development and maintenance of a CI/CD-integrated test automation framework including regression suites. Are existing regression suites available for any of the four in-scope systems that will be transferred during transition, or is the contractor expected to build regression coverage from scratch across all systems simultaneously? If building from scratch, does USAC have a phased timeline expectation for achieving defined regression coverage thresholds within the base year, and will USAC accept a Test Automation Roadmap as a deliverable to manage this incrementally?</p>	<p>Existing regression suites for in-scope systems will be transferred during transition-in to the extent they exist. The Contractor is expected to extend and maintain test automation per Section B.5.C. A Test Automation Roadmap is acceptable as a planning artifact within the IMS.</p>
214.	<p>Section B.5.B references integration development using REST, SOAP, Connected Systems, data stores, and middleware linking Appian to USAC backend and legacy systems. Can USAC provide a current integration catalogue or high-level architecture diagram showing: (a) all external systems the four Appian applications interface with; (b) the protocols and authentication mechanisms per integration (e.g., OAuth 2.0, API keys, mutual TLS, SAML); and (c) which integrations are considered stable and outside scope versus active candidates for re-engineering or enhancement under this contract?</p>	<p>Integration of catalogues, protocols, and authentication mechanisms will be shared during onboarding and transition-in. Scope of integration re-engineering vs. stable integrations will be defined per task order.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
215.	<p>Section 3.1.1 requires all software to utilize USAC's OKTA instance for user authentication and provisioning. Is OKTA SSO already configured and operational for all four in-scope Appian systems, or will the contractor be responsible for configuring SAML/OIDC federation between Appian and OKTA as part of transition or base year work? Additionally, does USAC's OKTA instance support group-based role provisioning directly into Appian, or is role and permission management handled separately within Appian's native user administration layer?</p>	<p>OKTA SSO is the USAC standard identity provider; Appian SSO federation is in place for the in-scope systems. Specific role and permission provisioning patterns will be reviewed during onboarding.</p>
216.	<p>RHC and S&L are designated FISMA Moderate while CAMP and HC Apps are FISMA Low. Do the Moderate and Low systems share a common Appian Cloud tenant, or are they hosted in separate tenants with independent ATOs? If hosted in a shared tenant, how are FISMA boundaries enforced at the data, process model, and user access level? Specifically, what technical and administrative controls prevent FISMA Low and Moderate data from commingling within the same Appian instance, and will the contractor be responsible for maintaining or auditing these controls?</p>	<p>FISMA boundary, tenancy, and control details will be shared with the awarded Contractor during onboarding under appropriate confidentiality and access controls.</p>
217.	<p>Section 2.1 requires FedRAMP Authorization at Moderate risk level for all cloud services used by the contractor. Does this requirement apply to all contractor development tooling and CI/CD infrastructure, or only to systems that directly process, transmit, or store USAC Data? Specifically, if the contractor uses commercially available SaaS tools (e.g., GitHub Enterprise, Confluence, Slack) for internal team collaboration that do not interact with USAC Data, is FedRAMP authorization still required for those tools under USAC's interpretation of this provision?</p>	<p>Privacy and Security Addendum Section 2.1 applies to cloud services that access, store, or otherwise process USAC Data and/or PII. Internal team collaboration tools that do not interact with USAC Data are evaluated case-by-case; USAC reserves the right to require FedRAMP authorization for any tool used in the performance of the Services.</p>



Q#	Question	Answer
218.	The RFP requires continuous monitoring of application health, performance, and security posture across all environments. Does USAC have an existing APM or SIEM platform (e.g., Splunk, Datadog, Elastic, Microsoft Sentinel) that the contractor will integrate with and operate within, or is the contractor expected to establish monitoring infrastructure independently? If contractor-established, must the monitoring solution reside within USAC's existing FedRAMP boundary, and who assumes ownership at contract end or transition to a successor contractor?	USAC maintains enterprise monitoring and SIEM capabilities and a dedicated SOC. Refer to response for Question #58. The Contractor will integrate with USAC's existing monitoring infrastructure rather than establishing an independent platform.
219.	Given the four in-scope systems span two FISMA impact levels and serve distinct USF program stakeholders, does USAC foresee any requirement for cross-system data sharing, unified reporting, or consolidated analytics within the Appian portfolio during the contract term? If so, is there an enterprise data model, canonical data layer, or Appian Data Fabric implementation in place or planned that the contractor should account for? Understanding this is critical to defining integration of architecture boundaries and avoiding design decisions that create technical debt or FISMA compliance risk across system boundaries.	Cross-system data sharing, unified reporting, and Data Fabric considerations are part of USAC's broader modernization strategy. Specific scope will be defined through the task order process; the Contractor is expected to follow USAC enterprise architecture guidance.
220.	Please confirm whether contractor personnel are required to be U.S. citizens, U.S. persons, lawful permanent residents, or simply authorized to work within the United States.	Contractor personnel must be authorized to work within the United States. Refer to response for Question #9.
221.	Please clarify whether all contractor personnel must be physically located within the United States at all times while performing contract work, including development, QA, support, and DevSecOps activities.	Yes. All work, including development, QA, support, and DevSecOps activities, must be performed by Contractor Staff physically located within the United States. Refer to response for Question #9.



Q#	Question	Answer
222.	Please clarify whether offshore resources are prohibited from accessing USAC systems, repositories, environments, or data in any capacity.	Offshore resources are prohibited from performing work under this Contract and from accessing USAC systems, repositories, environments, or data in any capacity. Refer to response for Question #9.
223.	Will the selected vendor be expected to provide fully dedicated resources, or may resources be shared across multiple engagements provided SLA obligations are met?	Refer to response for Question #161. Resources may be shared with USAC prior approval, provided performance obligations and SLAs are met.
224.	What incumbent vendors are currently supporting the Appian environments, and what portions of the work are they responsible for today?	Refer to response to question #1
225.	Will incumbent transition support and knowledge transfer be provided, including access to repositories, documentation, architecture diagrams, and operational procedures?	Refer to responses for Questions #1, #51, and #122.
226.	How many Appian applications, environments, and integrations are currently in scope, including any anticipated additions during the contract term?	Refer to responses for Questions #47, #103, and #142. Four (4) Appian Cloud systems are in scope at contract start, with up to two (2) additional Appian-based systems potentially added during the Contract Term per Section B.5.G.
227.	Please provide approximate current application complexity metrics, including user counts, process volumes, and integration counts where available.	Refer to response for Question #27. Detailed complexity metrics will be shared during onboarding and transition-in.
228.	Please provide approximate monthly volumes for enhancement requests, production incidents, emergency fixes, and releases across the current Appian portfolio.	Refer to responses for Questions #44, #45, and #145. Operational volumes will be reviewed during onboarding.
229.	Is 24x7 production support expected for Priority 1 incidents, and are there formal after-hours or on-call support requirements?	Refer to responses for Questions #165 and #166.
230.	What DevSecOps tooling is currently in place today for source control, CI/CD, automated testing, vulnerability scanning, and monitoring?	Refer to responses for Questions #37, #56, and #124.



Q#	Question	Answer
231.	Is the selected vendor expected to procure, configure, host, and manage the CI/CD and DevSecOps toolchain?	No. USAC provides licensed CI/CD and DevSecOps tooling. The Contractor configures the Appian-specific CI/CD pipeline integration on USAC infrastructure. Refer to response for Question #5.
232.	Please confirm whether FedRAMP-authorized tooling is required for all contractor-provided platforms and services used in delivery.	Refer to Privacy and Security Addendum Section 2.1 and the response for Question #217.
233.	Will the contractor be expected to directly support ATO-related activities such as SSP updates, POA&M management, audit evidence collection, and remediation tracking?	Yes. Refer to responses for Questions #60 and #132 and Section B.5.K.
234.	What security scanning and vulnerability management tools are currently mandated or preferred by USAC?	Veracode is the current SAST/SCA tool standard. Additional vulnerability management tools used by USAC will be reviewed during onboarding. Refer to response for Question #37.
235.	Are there established performance, scalability, or availability SLAs currently defined for the Appian applications beyond the incident response SLAs listed in the RFP?	Refer to Section B.5.F for the SLA targets that apply to production and staging environments for all in-scope systems. Additional performance, scalability, and availability targets will be defined at the task order level where applicable.
236.	What level of automated testing coverage currently exists across the Appian portfolio, and what testing frameworks or tools are currently used?	Existing test automation coverage and tools (including Cucumber-based regression suites) will be reviewed during onboarding. Refer to response for Question #37.
237.	Are there preferred enterprise integration standards, middleware platforms, or API management technologies currently used within the USAC ecosystem?	USAC uses Appian Connected Systems, REST/SOAP integration patterns, and standard Appian data store mechanisms. Specific enterprise integration and API management standards will be reviewed during onboarding.
238.	What restrictions, approval processes, or compliance requirements apply to the use of AI-assisted development tools, code generation tools, or generative AI technologies?	Refer to responses for Questions #53, # 54, 55, 117, and #191. AI-assisted development tools, code generation tools, and generative AI capabilities all require prior written approval per Section B.5.I and Privacy and Security Addendum Section 3.3.



Q#	Question	Answer
239.	Does USAC expect the selected vendor to provide strategic modernization guidance and architecture leadership, or primarily execute against requirements provided by USAC teams?	USAC expects strategic modernization guidance and architecture leadership from the Contractor, in coordination with USAC enterprise architecture and the Contractor's Technical Manager and BPM Engineer IV (Appian Lead Developer) roles. Specific direction will flow through task orders.