Universal Service Administrative Co. (USAC)

RFP IT-26-113 – Lifeline NV O&M Support

Questions & Answers

Q#	Question	Answer
1.	Could you please confirm whether there is an incumbent contractor for this requirement? If yes, kindly provide the incumbent contractor's name and contract number.	USAC does not disclose information regarding incumbent contractors, contract, and financial details.
2.	Question 1: FedRAMP Authorization *Reference: Section 5.13 IT Security Requirements (p. 20) & CLIN 0002 (p. 6)* The RFP states that cloud services leveraged by the Contractor must be FedRAMP Authorized at a moderate risk level or higher. Since our firm's primary focus is providing the required staffing for the DME and O&M services under CLIN 0001, could USAC confirm if providing a FedRAMP Moderate authorized cloud platform is a mandatory requirement for all bidding vendors, or if there is flexibility for vendors proposing solely on the staffing/SDLC scope?	FedRAMP for cloud services is mandatory for all USAC systems that process/store USF data in a cloud platform. For this contract, the Contractor will maintain systems that use FedRAMP authorized cloud services from ServiceNow and Amazon Web Services.
3.	Question 2: On-Site Presence *Reference: Section B.4.A Place of Performance (p. 7) & Section C.1.G Definitions (p. 34)* The solicitation notes a hybrid work approach requiring "Contractor Staff" to be on-site at the USAC office in Washington, DC, at least two (2) days per week. Could USAC please clarify if this mandatory on-site requirement applies to *all* proposed personnel (including non-key developers and testers) or if it applies exclusively to the designated Key Personnel?	The mandatory on-site requirement applies to all proposed personnel providing services under the contract, including both Key Personnel and non-key staff (such as developers and testers).

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
4.	USAC states the Question Due Date is August 10, 2026, and the Proposal Due Date is August 31, 2026. Given the breadth and technical complexity of the Statement of Work (three CLINs spanning DME, O&M, and a separate Discovery/Modernization work stream), would USAC consider extending the Proposal Due Date by at least fifteen (15) additional calendar days to allow Offerors to prepare a fully responsive technical and price proposal?	The proposal submission deadline is extended to September 7, 2026, by 11:00 AM ET.
5.	In Section B.4.A, USAC states Contractor Staff must be in the USAC office "at least two (2) days per week." Would USAC clarify whether this in-person requirement applies to all Contractor Staff, only to Key Personnel, or only to specific workstreams/roles?	See answer to question # 3.
6.	Does the Contract Manager's two-business hour availability requirement apply during core business hours only or on a 24x7 basis?	The Contract Manager's requirement to be available within two (2) business hours applies strictly during core support hours. Per the Required Resources table in Section R, the Contract Manager must be available within two (2) business hours of USAC contact. As specified in Section B.5.G, USAC's core support hours are Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. ET, excluding federal holidays. Please note that outside of these core hours, the contractor is required to maintain an on-call capability specifically for Priority 1 (P1) critical incidents, which must be worked on a 24x7 basis until service is restored.

Universal Service
Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
7.	In Section B.5.6, USAC states that baseline artifacts (Interface Control Documents, security control documentation, Disaster Recovery Plan, and architecture diagrams) "exist today…they are not attached to this RFP" and "will be provided to the Contractor afterward." Can USAC please make these documents available to all Offerors during the proposal period (e.g., via a reading room or NDA-gated distribution) to support proposal preparation?	Pursuant to Section B.5.6, USAC will provide a secure reading room containing baseline artifacts for proposal development. Interested offerors may request access by submitting signed RFP Attachment 2 - Non-Disclosure Agreement to procurement@usac.org, copying Mustafa.Kamal@usac.org. Team access will be provisioned upon successful verification of the document.
8.	The Lifeline Program Level 0 Diagram provided is dated July 2023 and sourced from the "Lucid Repository." Would USAC confirm whether this diagram and the related architecture diagrams in Section B.5.1 (pp. 9–13) reflect the current, as-of-2026 production environment, and if not, whether updated versions are available, and can be provided to Offerors during the proposal period?	The document provided is the latest available.
9.	Would USAC provide Offerors end-to-end business process flows, technical and solution architecture diagrams, system integration and data-flow diagrams, and production-environment/infrastructure details, to support proposal development and pricing?	Architecture and integration diagrams – YES Detailed production infrastructure configuration – maybe post-award
10.	The architecture and integration diagrams provided in Section B.5.1 are difficult to fully interpret due to their low resolution in the RFP. Please provide higher-resolution or native-format versions (e.g., Visio/Lucidchart) of these diagrams as USAC-Furnished Information to support accurate technical and pricing proposals.	Yes. Higher resolution versions will be made available in a PDF format

Q#	Question	Answer
11.	Two business capabilities in the diagram, "Program/Income Eligibility Determination (?)" and "Consumer Geocode Coordinates Confirmation (?)", are marked with a parenthetical question mark. Would USAC clarify what this notation indicates (e.g., capability status to-be-determined, ownership open question, scope not yet finalized, etc.), and confirm whether these two capabilities are within the scope of CLIN 0001 DME services and how Offeror's should address technically and financially (i.e., pricing) if these capabilities have such open questions?	Both "Program/Income Eligibility Determination" and "Consumer Geocode Coordinates Confirmation" are existing National Verifier capabilities within CLIN 0001 DME scope.
12.	The Discovery Phase scope references a current Business Process Outsourcing (BPO) provider supporting manual review and contact-center volumes. Please provide how this BPO provider's processes and systems interface with NV/EIE today in detail (as there is only brief call out of the BPO in the process flows shared), so Offerors may appropriately scope the BPO volume/cost analysis required under CLIN 0003.	USAC will not provide additional technical or system specifications for the BPO environment during the solicitation period. Per Section B.5.C, the National Verifier (NV) portal natively routes exception cases to a Dispute Resolution BPO flow running within ServiceNow, and all back-office operations interface via internal BPO APIs within ServiceNow platform boundaries. Per Sections B.5.6 and B.5.K, detailed baseline documentation (including Interface Control Documents) will be shared exclusively with the awarded Contractor during the formal Discovery Phase (program months 7–10). Offerors must scope their CLIN 0003 proposals using the Level 0 Process Flow, High-Level Architecture drawings, and functional descriptions already provided in Section B.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
13.	The RFP references a "current systems backlog and gaps" that Contractor is expected to become familiar with during Discovery. Would USAC provide a general characterization of the current product backlog being inherited (e.g., approximate size, age, or major themes) to help Offerors size DME effort for the base year?	Yes, USAC uses Agile/Scrum processes, and the product roadmap/backlog will be available to the vendor.
14.	The RFP identifies combating fraud, waste, and abuse ("FWA") as a program priority and includes FWA-related recommendations within CLIN 0003's Discovery scope. Would USAC describe any FWA-specific initiatives, tools, or workstreams currently underway (e.g., under the incumbent contract, another contract, etc.) that the awarded Contractor would need to inherit, coordinate with, or account for in its technical approach?	The system the awarded Contractor will inherit is already integrated with a tool that supports how applications are routed for review. The Contractor will need to account for this existing integration, as part of CLIN 0003's Discovery scope. Specific integration requirements will be addressed during contract onboarding and transition.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

<table>
<tr><th>Q#</th><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th></tr>
<tr><td>15.</td><td>To ensure a level playing field and enable Offerors to accurately price transition requirements, will USAC provide all Offerors, during the solicitation period, the knowledge-transfer materials, system documentation, and environment/access information referenced in Section B.5? If not, please identify the specific information that will be made available only after award under the Transition-In process described in Section B.5.10.</td><td>No. USAC will not provide knowledge-transfer materials, detailed system documentation, or environment access information during the solicitation period due to security and confidentiality protocols.

Per Section B.5.6, baseline artifacts (including Interface Control Documents, security documentation, and Disaster Recovery Plans) will be provided exclusively to the awarded Contractor during the Transition-In period.

Per Section B.5.10, the specific information and assets made available only after award include:
• Access to USAC systems, code repositories, and testing environments.

• Current operational documentation, SOPs, and asset inventories.

• Knowledge-transfer sessions with incumbent personnel and USAC experts.

• GFE and onboarding clearances for Contractor Staff.

Offerors must utilize the High-Level Architecture drawings, Level 0 Process Flows, and system descriptions provided in Section B to price their Transition-In proposals.</td></tr>
</table>

Q#	Question	Answer
16.	Under the Technical Approach sub-factor (Section E.7.1.1.a), how will USAC evaluate the risk associated with an Offeror proposing minimal or zero transition-in effort against the full knowledge-transfer, onboarding, and system-verification requirements in Section B.5.10, particularly given that transition-in costs are billed at Attachment 1 rates within the base-year NTE rather than priced as a distinct, comparable line item that USAC could evaluate directly?	USAC will evaluate the adequacy and realism of each Offeror's transition-in strategy within the Technical Approach sub-factor by measuring the proposal against the full operational mandates of Section B.5.10. Per Section E.7.1.1.a, proposals must demonstrate a comprehensive, low-risk approach to executing all required knowledge-transfer, staff onboarding, and system-verification activities. Proposing minimal or zero effort to meet these complex mandates will be evaluated as a technical risk, an operational deficiency, or a failure to understand the requirement, which will negatively impact on the Offeror's technical score. While transition-in costs are billed under base-year Not-To-Exceed (NTE) labor rates in Attachment 1 rather than a standalone line item, USAC will cross-reference the labor hours, categories, and level of effort detailed in the Technical Volume against the Price Volume to ensure the proposed approach is fully viable and properly resourced.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
17.	Section B.14 requires Contractor Staff to use USAC-issued technology to create, send, and store all USAC documents for work purposes, and prohibits use of external/non-USAC-approved technologies. Given the Managed Service construct described in Section B.1 contemplates Contractor-run DevSecOps delivery, would USAC clarify whether this requirement extends to Contractor's own development tooling, code repositories, and CI/CD pipeline (which Section B.5.3 separately directs Contractor to establish and manage), or is limited to general business correspondence and document sharing? Specifically, may Contractor host and administer its own DevOps tooling and repositories outside USAC-issued systems, provided USAC Data itself remains properly secured?	The requirement in Section B.14 applies to all project assets, including the DevSecOps environment, toolchains, and source code repositories. While Section B.1 and Section B.5.3 direct the Contractor to establish and manage the DevSecOps delivery and CI/CD pipeline, the Contractor may not host or administer these systems externally on non-USAC-approved environments. Per Section B.14, all code, configurations, and documentation created for work purposes are considered USAC documents and must reside strictly within USAC-issued or USAC-approved enterprise cloud environments and technology infrastructure. The Contractor will be granted access to managed cloud spaces and designated tools within the USAC security boundary to configure, manage, and run the development tooling and repositories.
18.	Section A.3 states the Confidentiality Agreement (Attachment 2) “must be executed by Offeror and submitted along with any proposal,” and Section D lists it as “Attached Separately.” Would USAC confirm that Attachment 2 should be submitted as a separate signed PDF that does not count against the Volume 1–4 page limits, consistent with Section E.6.E.1.g?	Confirmed. The Executed Confidentiality Agreement (Attachment 2) must be submitted as a separate signed PDF file. Per Section E.6.E.1.g, required attachments, corporate certifications, and legal disclosures submitted as separate files do not count against the established page limitations for Volumes 1 through 4. Offerors should include the signed agreement alongside their formal proposal submission files to Procurement@usac.org copying Mustafa.Kamal@usac.org by the submission deadline to ensure compliance.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
19.	The Bid Sheet's CLIN 0001 labor category list includes “BPM Engineer IV (Appian Lead Developer)” and “BPM Engineer III (Appian Developer),” while Section B of the RFP describes the NV platform as built on ServiceNow throughout and does not otherwise mention Appian. Would USAC confirm whether these Appian-titled labor categories are a Bid Sheet template error that should be replaced with ServiceNow-equivalent roles, or whether an Appian-based component exists within scope that is not otherwise described in the RFP?	The previously noted contradiction has been corrected. In the revised version of Attachment 1 - Bid Sheet, the Appian-titled positions have been removed. The labor category list for CLIN 0001 now correctly features ServiceNow Senior Developer IV and ServiceNow Senior Developer III to match the ServiceNow-based National Verifier architecture detailed throughout Section B of the RFP. Offerors must use this finalized Bid Sheet for their Volume 4 price submissions.
20.	The Bid Sheet's CLIN 0001 tab lists eleven (11) labor categories, while Section B.7's Key Personnel table identifies seven (7) distinct roles (Contract Manager, Technical Development Manager, ServiceNow Senior Developer IV, ServiceNow Senior Developer III, Senior Java Developer IV, Automation Tester IV, Functional Lead IV). Several Bid Sheet categories (e.g., Database Specialist III (DBA), Java Developer III, Java Developer II, and a second “Technical Manager (Production Support Lead)”) do not appear in the Section B.7 table. Would USAC confirm the final, authoritative labor category list Offerors should price on the Bid Sheet, and reconcile it against the Section B.7 Key Personnel descriptions?	The labor categories listed on the revised Attachment 1 - Bid Sheet are for your price proposal. The Bid Sheet includes seven (7) specific roles that match the exact titles in the Section B.7 Required Resources table: Contract Manager, Technical Development Manager, ServiceNow Senior Developer IV, ServiceNow Senior Developer III, Senior Java Developer IV, Automation Tester IV, and Functional Lead IV. The other categories mentioned in your inquiry (such as Database Specialist or Java Developer II/III) do not appear on this finalized Bid Sheet template. Offerors must calculate and price their CLIN 0001 Time-and-Materials (T&M) proposal using only the seven (7) labor categories explicitly provided in the active Bid Sheet artifact.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
21.	Beyond the 400 Fulfiller (Service Portal) licenses stated on page 14, would USAC provide, as USAC-Furnished Information, a complete inventory of the ServiceNow applications, plugins, modules, and scoped/store applications currently active in the NV instance—including the specific products that comprise the NV portal (e.g., Service Portal, ITSM, CSM, App Engine, Virtual Agent, Performance Analytics, Predictive Intelligence, Discovery/ITOM, Now Assist, or other applications)? Additionally, would USAC provide an estimate of the proportion of current NV functionality delivered through out-of-the-box configuration versus custom-built application logic, so Offerors can accurately scope DME effort?	USAC will provide a summary inventory of the licensed ServiceNow products and active applications comprising NV instances. The National Verifier currently leverages Service Portal and ITSM with a combination of both out of the box and custom application logic. Vendor resources should be able to support both OOTB and custom development.
22.	USAC states “up to two (2) additional ServiceNow-based systems may be added during the Contract Term.” Would USAC identify any known candidate systems or anticipated timing for this potential expansion, for consideration in Offerors' technical approach (even if not separately priced)?	USAC has not designated additional candidate systems yet. This option gives USAC the flexibility to bring fit for two additional SNOW based systems during the contract term.
23.	USAC provides current ServiceNow Fulfiller license counts (400) and server counts. Would USAC share current license utilization/consumption data (e.g., actual active users versus licensed seats) as USAC-Furnished Information, to help Offerors validate whether 400 Fulfiller licenses is the appropriate basis for CLIN 0002 pricing going forward?	USAC is currently using 335 Fulfiller licenses as of 8/1/2026. USAC does not anticipate material growth in Fulfiller count (400) at this time.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
24.	Would USAC provide the details of its technical stack and service architecture as USAC-Furnished Information during the solicitation period, sufficiently in advance of proposal submission, so that all Offerors can accurately assess requirements and price their proposed approach on an equal basis? If not, please identify which technical-stack and architecture details will be provided only after award, and explain how Offerors should account for those unknowns in their proposals.	The tech stack and service architecture are described in Section B.5.1. We will provide higher resolution diagrams. Additional details including detailed interface specifications, environment configuration and infrastructure details will be provided to the awarded contractor.
25.	Will USAC provide the incumbent's current ServiceNow subscription/contract terms (tier, unit pricing, term dates) to Offerors as USAC-Furnished Information for benchmarking CLIN 0002 pricing, or should Offerors assume they must independently negotiate an entirely new agreement directly with ServiceNow that may differ in pricing/terms from the incumbent's current agreement?	USAC will not provide the incumbent's current ServiceNow subscription tier, contract terms, or unit pricing. Per Section C.16, financial and commercial information regarding existing agreements is strictly confidential and proprietary. Offerors must assume responsibility for independently negotiating their own agreement or licensing partnerships directly with ServiceNow (or an authorized reseller) to fulfill the 400-fulfiller license and infrastructure requirements outlined in CLIN 0002. Offerors should assume they must independently negotiate an entirely new agreement directly with ServiceNow (or an authorized reseller) that may differ in pricing and terms from the incumbent's current agreement. Proposals must be scoped and priced to independently satisfy the 400-fulfiller license and platform infrastructure requirements detailed under CLIN 0002.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
26.	The current environment lists 400 Fulfiller licenses, seven high-availability servers, and six terabytes of additional storage across Dev/Test/Integration/Pre-Prod/Production environments. Are these figures the exact minimum Contractor must replicate, or may Offerors propose a right-sized environment (e.g., fewer licenses or servers) if functionally is equivalent and approved by USAC?	The figures on page 14 describe the current environment and are the basis for CLIN 0002 pricing. Offerors may propose an alternative configuration that delivers equivalent capability and performance, with the rationale described in Volume 2. Any change requires USAC approval.
27.	The EIE components table shows major pending version upgrades (Java 1.8 → 25; Spring Framework 5 → 7; Spring Data/Security/Batch/Boot all moving to Framework 7), but the DME Scope section addresses only the ServiceNow “family release” upgrade cadence (two per year) without an explicit timeline for the Java/Spring framework migration. Is this upgrade expected to be completed within the base year (and priced within the base-year NTE), or phased across option years? Is there a target completion date?	Completing the Java and Spring upgrades are not within CLIN 0001 scope. The upgrades are expected to be completed prior to the start date of the Contractor CLIN 0001 start date, thus should not be accounted for in the base-year NTE .
28.	Given that the scope, complexity, and onboarding requirements for the potential “up to two (2) additional ServiceNow-based systems” in Section B.5.9 have not yet been defined, would USAC confirm that any onboarding and associated services for such systems will be priced separately when the requirements are known—through the Section 38 “Added Services” mechanism or a formal contract modification—rather than included in CLIN 0001 NTE or CLIN 0002 FFP?	The references in Section B.5.9 to the potential onboarding and operational support for up to two additional ServiceNow-based systems are included solely for informational awareness at this stage. Any future capacity, onboarding, or associated services required for these additional systems will be addressed, as appropriate, through a formal contract modification at the time those requirements are defined. No action is required from Offerors regarding these systems during the current proposal period.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
29.	Section 5.1 requires Contractor to take “complete responsibility” for two ServiceNow platform upgrades (“family releases”) per year, but the RFP does not state which ServiceNow release/version the NV instance currently runs. Would USAC identify the current release (e.g., the specific family-release name and patch/hot-fix level) in production today, so Offerors can scope the first year's upgrade path and any release-support gap?	The NV instance currently runs on ServiceNow Yokohama but will be upgraded to ServiceNow Australia by EOY.
30.	Would USAC provide a complete inventory of all current ServiceNow subscription SKUs/entitlements, not limited to the 400 Fulfiller licenses already stated, including any App Engine, ITSM Professional/Enterprise-tier, Now Assist consumption-unit, or other add-on entitlements, so Offerors can accurately price the full CLIN 0002 licensing scope rather than the Fulfiller count alone?	USAC is not releasing SKU level subscription details during the solicitation period. Price CLIN 0002 using the environment and license counts shown on page 14 of the RFP. Full entitlement detail will be shared with the awarded Contractor. See response to Question 26
31.	Section 5.1 references “refactoring and performance optimization” of existing NV applications, and Section 5.2 references coordination with ARB/ERB reviews. Would USAC provide a summary inventory of the current customization footprint (e.g., number of custom scoped applications, business rules, client scripts, UI policies, ACLs, and REST/SOAP integration endpoints) within the NV ServiceNow instance, to help Offerors size DME and technical-debt-remediation effort for the base year?	USAC will provide a summary inventory for the NV ServiceNow instance that includes custom applications, tables, and flows. The system currently does not include any scoped applications, but includes business rules, client scripts, UI policies, ACLs and API integration endpoints. Vendor resources should have knowledge across all areas. USAC does not provide additional system or environment documentation during the solicitation period. Offerors should base their proposals on the information in the RFP. The baseline artifacts described in Section B.5.6 will be provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
32.	Given the AI governance and prior-written-approval requirements in Sections 5.11 and 3.3, would USAC confirm whether any ServiceNow Now Assist or other native ServiceNow AI/GenAI capability is already licensed or provisioned within the current NV instance (even if not yet enabled for production use), so Offerors can account for any existing entitlement in their technical approach and CLIN 0002 pricing?	No AI capability may be built into, trained on USAC Data within, or deployed to any production system or decision-making process without USAC's prior written approval. ServiceNow Now Assist or other native AI entitlements are currently not turned on for NV instance.
33.	Would USAC confirm whether the NV ServiceNow instance uses domain separation (and if so, describe the domain structure/purpose), or whether it is a single-domain, single-tenant instance? This affects Offerors' approach to environment administration and the CLIN 0002 hosting/licensing model.	NV ServiceNow instance is single domain and single tenant instance
34.	Would USAC share the current environment's actual historical uptime and incident-resolution performance (e.g., trailing 12 months) for the NV ServiceNow instance, measured against metrics comparable to the SLA targets in Section 5.8, so Offerors can calibrate their proposed support model and staffing plan against a real performance baseline rather than the stated targets alone?	National Verifier uptime is 99.99% excluding planned downtimes. Over the past year there have been 1 P1, 1 P2, 6 P3 and 31 P4 incidents that have been resolved within target SLAs.

Q#	Question	Answer
35.	The RFP requires prior written USAC approval before an AI tool, service, or code may be used, while Section E.6.B.2 requires Offerors to submit separate versions of Attachment 1 – Bid Sheet reflecting scenarios with and without AI. Would USAC clarify the anticipated process and timeline for reviewing and approving or declining an Offeror's proposed AI use during the proposal and evaluation phase, and explain how the two Bid Sheets will be evaluated—for example, whether one will serve as the basis for award or both will be evaluated as alternatives? Additionally, does submission of an AI-inclusive Bid Sheet commit the awarded Contractor to seek the written AI-use approval required by Section 5.11 immediately upon award?	Per Section E.6.B.2, the requirement to submit separate versions of Attachment 1 (with and without AI) provides a baseline for USAC to evaluate the potential cost and technical impacts of AI integration. USAC will review and evaluate both scenarios as part of its source selection process, but the final basis for award remains at USAC's sole discretion based on the best value determination. Submission of an AI-inclusive Bid Sheet does not constitute automatic approval. The awarded Contractor remains fully bound by Section 5.11 and Section 3.3 to submit a formal request and secure prior written USAC approval before any AI tools, services, or code are deployed in the environment, and that review occurs after award, not during evaluation.
36.	USAC requires submission of Contractor's insider threat program within ninety (90) days of the Effective Date. Would USAC confirm that Offerors need only describe their insider threat program at a high level (if at all) in the Volume 2 technical proposal, with the full program submitted post-award per the stated 90-day timeline?	The level of information needed for insider threat needs to be adequate to support your assertion that you have an established, documented, and routinely managed insider threat program.
37.	USAC reserves the right to conduct or facilitate third-party penetration testing (including under USAC's separate PTaaS contract IT-26-027), while CLIN 0002 makes Contractor the owner/administrator of the ServiceNow subscription and licenses. Would USAC clarify how USAC-directed penetration testing activity will be reconciled with Contractor's ServiceNow license and subscription terms, and confirm which party bears responsibility for any license-related consequences of USAC-directed (rather than Contractor-directed) testing?	USAC will be responsible for the penetration testing which has been performed for the ServiceNow component of the system several times. No license impact is likely.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
38.	The Insurance clause requires coverage "in amounts required by law or appropriate for the industry" without specifying minimum limits. Would USAC identify specific minimum per-occurrence/aggregate limits it expects for each listed coverage type (e.g., commercial general liability, professional liability, cyber liability), so Offerors can confirm compliance and price accordingly?	USAC does not specify fixed minimum per-occurrence or aggregate dollar limits for insurance coverage within the solicitation. Offerors are responsible for independently determining, procuring, and maintaining insurance coverage in amounts required by law and standard for the IT and cybersecurity industries for a project of this scope. Your proposal should reflect an approach that mitigates risk appropriately, and any associated premium costs must be absorbed within your proposed labor rates and fixed pricing.
39.	Section 7 states that a background check is required "for all Contractor Staff accessing USAC systems that do not contain federal system of data records," which appears inconsistent with Section B.4.D, which identifies NV and NLAD specifically as "federal system[s] of records" requiring Role-Based Privacy Act Training. As written, staff accessing the more sensitive NV/EIE systems would not require background checks while staff on less-sensitive systems would. Would USAC confirm whether this is a drafting error (i.e., should read "systems that DO contain federal system of records") and clarify the actual background-check scope?	The background check requirement applies to all Contractor Staff providing services under this contract, regardless of the classification of the systems they access The language in Section 7 is intended to establish a baseline requirement and does not exempt personnel working on the National Verifier (NV) or National Lifeline Accountability Database (NLAD). Because NV and NLAD are federal systems of records, staff assigned to these systems must complete both the mandatory background check and the Role-Based Privacy Act Training specified in Section B.4.D before receiving system access or reporting on-site. The gist of this is that only a background check is needed for systems that do not contain federal system of records, while the subsystems/applications that do contain federal system of records (SORN) require the Contractor staff to complete Role-Based Privacy Act Training to access. Check further because all Contractor staff should have a background check.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
40.	Both sections require FedRAMP Authorization at Moderate risk or higher for cloud services. Would USAC confirm whether the current/incumbent ServiceNow environment already holds an active FedRAMP Moderate Authorization that would transfer to a new subscription, or whether the awarded Contractor must obtain a new FedRAMP authorization package for the ServiceNow instance procured under CLIN 0002, and if so, the expected timeline?	The ServiceNow tenant operates on a FedRAMP Moderate offering. The FedRAMP authorization is not separately procured, and the contractor does not have to "obtain" it.
41.	Section 7 requires that certifications for Key Personnel with pending ServiceNow credentials be "verified within sixty (60) days of Contract award." What is the process/remedy if a proposed Key Person's certification is not verified within that window — is it treated as a Key Personnel change requiring USAC's prior written approval under Section C.20, subject to a cure period, or grounds for other corrective action?	If a proposed Key Person's pending ServiceNow certification is not verified within the sixty (60) day post-award window, it will be treated as an unapproved personnel change and a failure to meet mandatory contract requirements. Per Section C.20, the Contractor is required to maintain fully certified Key Personnel throughout the life of the contract. A failure to secure the required credentials within the 60-day period will trigger the formal Key Personnel replacement process, requiring you to immediately propose an alternate candidate who meets or exceeds all solicitation requirements for USAC's prior written approval. Additionally, failing to provide qualified, certified staff within the designated timeframe may result in USAC issuing a formal cure notice or taking other contract performance remedies.

Q#	Question	Answer
42.	Deliverable #9 references facilitating third-party penetration testing access "under USAC's PTaaS contract (IT-26-027) or successor." Would USAC confirm whether USAC or the awarded Contractor is expected to lead coordination with the separate PTaaS vendor, and whether there are specific SLAs, lead times, or points of contact Offerors should account for in scheduling annual security assessments?	The USAC IT Security department will coordinate with the Contractor to schedule and plan the penetration testing performed by another USAC contractor. There is not much effort needed by the Contractor to support the penetration testing. Annually, USAC will perform FISMA compliance assessment that will require the Contractor to gather evidence, provide documentation, and to participate in a few interviews. USAC will provide an ISSO to support and write the security plans and for annual contingency plan training.
43.	USAC states it (USAC) and Contractor "will jointly define" specific performance standards and AQLs. Would USAC clarify when this joint definition process will occur (e.g., at proposal evaluation, at Kickoff, or during base-year delivery), and whether any draft AQLs exist today that could be shared as USAC-Furnished Information?	Performance standards, metrics, and AQLs will be defined jointly after award and confirmed at or shortly after the Kick-Off Meeting. USAC does not have draft AQLs to release during the solicitation period. Price to the SLA targets in Section B.5.8 and the AQL categories in Section B.5.16.
44.	USAC requires Earned Value Management (PV/EV/CPI/SPI) reporting in the Monthly Status Report, while CLIN 0001 is priced on a Time-and-Materials basis with an annual Not-to-Exceed ceiling rather than a Firm-Fixed-Price. Please provide how USAC and its current NV/EIE provider are using EVM today, and how it has been baselined and calculated for a T&M CLIN (e.g., Planned Value measured against the NTE ceiling, or against sprint/story-point burndown). Please provide any open USAC requests, if any, related to the current setup.	The requirement to provide Earned Value Management (EVM) reporting includes Planned Value (PV), Earned Value (EV), Cost Performance Index (CPI), and Schedule Performance Index (SPI) within the Monthly Status Report is a mandatory delivery standard for this contract. For the purposes of this solicitation, Offerors must assume that EVM metrics for the Time-and-Materials (T&M) CLIN 0001 tasks will be baselined against the specific operational milestones, sprint schedules, and staffing plans proposed in your technical approach, rather than simply tracking linear spend against the annual Not-to-Exceed (NTE) ceiling. The exact reporting formats, baseline allocations, and integration with sprint burndown data will be finalized with the selected vendor during the Transition-In period.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
45.	Core support hours are Monday–Friday, 9:00 a.m.–6:00 p.m. ET, with 24x7 on-call coverage required only for Priority 1 incidents. Would USAC confirm that after-hours/weekend on-call coverage for P1 incidents is expected to be included within the CLIN 0001 T&M NTE ceiling as currently scoped, rather than treated as an additional cost consideration?	After-hours and weekend on-call coverage for Priority 1 incidents is within the CLIN 0001 scope and should be priced within the CLIN 0001 T&M NTE ceiling.
46.	The Quality Control Plan is listed as due "one-time and as changes warrant" with no specific submission date. Please confirm a target due date for the initial QCP submission (e.g., concurrent with the Kickoff Meeting or the Transition-In Plan).	Submit the initial Quality Control Plan with the Transition-In Plan, within fifteen (15) business days of award, and update it as changes warrant.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
47.	Section B.2 describes a hybrid Firm-Fixed-Price/T&M contract (CLIN 0001 T&M with NTE; CLINs 0002–0003 FFP), while Section C.8 of the Standard Terms and Conditions describes payment on a "fixed-price, service category rate basis," which reads as FFP-specific boilerplate. Please confirm which Standard Terms and Conditions provisions (e.g., Sections 3 and 8) are intended to apply differently, or with modification, across the T&M and FFP CLINs.	The pricing, invoice, and payment structures outlined in Section B.2 are final and take precedence for the respective CLINs. The language in Section C.8 establishes the overarching payment framework but will be applied distinctly to each CLIN structure as follows: • CLIN 0001 (Time-and-Materials): Invoicing and payment will be processed on a labor-hour basis using the final, fully burdened hourly rates populated in Attachment 1, up to the annual Not-to-Exceed (NTE) ceiling. Section C.8 provisions regarding fixed total pricing do not limit the T&M billing mechanics for these specific tasks. • CLINs 0002 and 0003 (Firm-Fixed-Price): Payment will be made on a flat, monthly or milestone-based fixed-price basis as defined in the contract, strictly adhering to the standard fixed-price terms. The standard terms in Section 3 (Scope of Services) apply uniformly across all CLINs, ensuring that all delivered services meet USAC's technical and operational requirements regardless of the billing method. No formal modifications to the Standard Terms and Conditions text are required, as Section B explicitly establishes the hybrid execution rules.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
48.	Section B.1 states that under the Managed Service construct, “Contractor is responsible for delivery of the services, deliverables, and outcomes for the NV system, while USAC defines and prioritizes the scope of work on an on-going basis.” Would USAC clarify what specific “outcomes” Contractor will be held accountable for — for example, whether this refers solely to the SLA/AQL performance standards in Sections 5.8 and 5.16, or whether there are additional program-level outcome metrics (e.g., eligibility-processing accuracy, fraud reduction, application throughput) for which Contractor bears responsibility despite USAC directing priorities and scope on a T&M basis?	Contractor accountability runs to the SLA targets in Section B.5.8, the AQL categories in Section B.5.16, and the commitments in the Contractor Quality Control Plan. USAC retains responsibility for program level outcomes such as eligibility processing policy and sets priorities and scope.
49.	Section B.2 describes CLIN 0001 as “T&M pricing with an NTE ceiling,” implying payment for actual hours worked against fixed labor rates up to the ceiling. Section C.8, however, states Contractor “shall be paid for Services performed on a fixed-price, service category rate basis using the service categories and fixed rates set forth in Attachment 1.” Please clarify whether CLIN 0001 is billed on actual hours worked (true T&M) or a fixed rate per service category regardless of hours performed, as this affects how Offerors should build Attachment 1 pricing.	CLIN 0001 is billed on actual hours worked up to the annual ceiling, making it a true Time-and-Materials (T&M) line item. The language in Section C.8 simply confirms that the hourly labor rates you provide on your Bid Sheet must be fixed, fully burdened rates. It does not mean you are paid a flat rate regardless of hours worked. When invoicing CLIN 0001, you will multiply the actual hours your staff worked by those fixed hourly rates, staying under the annual Not-to-Exceed (NTE) cap.

Q#	Question	Answer
50.	Section C.6.B states periodic invoices may be submitted "once every thirty (30) days," but the three CLINs use different pricing methods (CLIN 0001 T&M/NTE, CLIN 0002 Annual FFP, CLIN 0003 FFP tied to Discovery-phase milestones). Would USAC confirm the intended invoicing cadence for each CLIN individually — for example, is CLIN 0002 invoiced as a single annual payment, and is CLIN 0003 invoiced upon USAC's acceptance (via Deliverable Acceptance Form) of each Discovery-phase deliverable rather than monthly?	The 30-day rule sets the general monthly billing cycle, but the payment triggers vary by CLIN based on how they are structured: • CLIN 0001 (Time-and-Materials): Invoiced monthly for the actual hours worked during the previous 30-day period, using the fixed rates from your Bid Sheet. • CLIN 0002 (Annual FFP): Invoiced monthly as a prorated, recurring 1/12th share of the annual fixed price, rather than a single lump sum at the end of the year. CLIN 0003 (Discovery FFP): Invoiced strictly upon USAC's formal sign-off (via a Deliverable Acceptance Form) for each specific Discovery-phase milestone, following the milestone schedule in Section B.5.K. If multiple milestones are approved within the same 30-day window, they can be grouped onto that month's invoice.
51.	Deliverable #15 ("Lifeline Application Future State Recommended Executive Presentation") is listed with Frequency "One-time" and no specific due month, whereas Section B.6 states the executive findings and recommendation presentation is due in "month four (4)" of the Discovery phase — consistent with Deliverables #23 and #24, which explicitly say "Discovery month 4." Please confirm Deliverable #15 is also due in Discovery month 4, or if other timing, then please provide such timing.	Deliverable 15 is due in Discovery month 4, consistent with Section B.6 and Deliverables 23 and 24.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
52.	USAC states it (USAC) and Contractor "will jointly define" specific performance standards and AQLs. Would USAC clarify when this joint definition process will occur (e.g., at proposal evaluation, at Kickoff, or during base-year delivery), and whether any draft AQLs exist today that could be shared as USAC-Furnished Information?	Refer to Question 43
53.	USAC may terminate the Contract on one (1) day's written notice, paying only for Services performed to date "plus reasonable charges that USAC, in its sole discretion, agrees in writing have resulted directly from the termination." Does this also apply to licenses? If so, given CLIN 0002 requires Contractor to procure ServiceNow subscription commitments (typically committed in annual or multi-month terms) in USAC's name, would USAC clarify how unrecovered, pre-committed subscription costs for the remaining committed license term would be treated in a termination-for-convenience scenario?	The termination provisions in Section 6 apply uniformly to all elements of the contract, including the software subscriptions procured under CLIN 0002. USAC recognizes that licensing agreements with third-party software providers often require upfront or multi-month commitments. In the event of a termination for convenience, any unrecovered, pre-committed subscription costs incurred directly to satisfy the contract requirements would be evaluated under the "reasonable charges" provision. The Contractor would need to submit documented proof of these non-cancelable commitments for USAC to review and verify during the contract closeout and settlement process.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
54.	CLIN 0003 is priced as Firm Fixed Price at proposal submission, but this workstream does not begin until program month 7 (after six months of DME services), and its scope depends on discovery findings not yet known. Will USAC consider an equitable price adjustment mechanism if the as-discovered scope/complexity of NLAD, RAD, and LDS materially differs from what can reasonably be assumed at the proposal stage?	No. CLIN 0003 is a Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) workstream, and the price proposed at submission is considered final. USAC will not build an equitable price adjustment mechanism into the solicitation for this phase. Offerors are expected to use the historical data, system descriptions, and high-level architecture provided in Section B to gauge the complexity of NLAD, RAD, and LDS and build that risk into their FFP bids If the deep-dive discoveries during months 7 through 10 reveal a massive shift in scope that falls entirely outside the framework described in this RFP, any changes would be handled down the road through USAC's formal contract modification process.
55.	CLIN 0002 is priced as a single line item per contract year. Would USAC prefer Offerors present ServiceNow hosting costs and Fulfiller user-license costs as a single blended annual FFP figure, or itemize hosting and per-user licensing separately within that CLIN?	You should present your pricing as a single, blended annual Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) figure on the Bid Sheet to match the template structure However, to help us evaluate your proposal, please provide a detailed breakdown within your Volume 4 Price Narrative. In that narrative, you should itemize your hosting infrastructure costs separately from the per-user licensing costs so we can clearly see how you built your total annual figure.

Q#	Question	Answer
56.	Would USAC share a budgetary not-to-exceed range, or the approximate value of the current/incumbent contract for comparable NV DME/O&M services, to help Offerors appropriately bound their CLIN 0001 T&M NTE and CLIN 0002/0003 FFP pricing?	No. USAC does not disclose information regarding incumbent contractors, contracts, and financial details. Offerors must independently determine the appropriate levels of effort, staffing mixes, and software infrastructure costs required to successfully execute the scope of work based on the technical parameters provided throughout Section B of the RFP. Your proposed pricing should reflect your independent commercial estimation and competitive approach to meeting USAC's requirements.
57.	To ensure a fair evaluation and a level playing field among all Offerors, including non-incumbents who may require materially more transition effort than an incumbent would, will USAC establish a standardized, USAC-furnished estimate for Transition-In labor hours (or a fixed "plug" number) that all Offerors must incorporate into their Attachment 1 Bid Sheet and Volume 4 Price Proposal? Alternatively, if USAC does not furnish a standardized Transition-In labor estimate, will USAC evaluate proposed transition-in costs/hours separately from the base-year production/O&M pricing baseline as part of its price realism and reasonableness review under Section E.7.1.3, so that an Offeror proposing insufficient transition effort is not scored more favorably on price than one proposing an adequate, fully-resourced transition?	No. USAC will not provide a standardized labor estimate or a fixed "plug" number for the Transition-In phase. Offerors must independently calculate the necessary hours, and staffing mix required to meet the full operational mandates outlined in Section B.5.10. Regarding the price evaluation, transition-in costs will not be carved out or evaluated separately from the base-year production baseline. They are built directly into the base-year Not-To-Exceed (NTE) labor rates within Attachment 1. However, to ensure a fair playing field, USAC cross-references the hours and strategy detailed in your Volume 2 Technical Approach against your Volume 4 Price Proposal. Under Section E.7.1.3, an Offeror who proposes insufficient hours or lowball rates that do not realistically support the transition workload will be flagged for high-performance risk or a lack of understanding, which will negatively impact their technical score.

Q#	Question	Answer
58.	Section E.6.E.2.a–b states Volume 1 "may not exceed four (5) pages" and Volume 2 "may not thirty (25) pages." Both provisions appear to contain a typographical inconsistency between the numeral and the spelled-out number. Offerors assume the intended limits are five (5) pages for Volume 1 and twenty-five (25) pages for Volume 2, but ask USAC to confirm both, given proposals exceeding stated limits are deemed technically unacceptable. Additionally, given the breadth of the Statement of Work in Section B — spanning DME, O&M/production support, the ServiceNow platform assumption, security/AI governance, SLA and EVM reporting, the CLIN 0003 Discovery Phase, transition-in, Capabilities, and Key Personnel — combined with Section E.6.B.2's instruction that proposals merely restating the requirements will be deemed technically unacceptable, would USAC consider increasing the Volume 2 (Technical Capability) page limit from twenty-five (25) to thirty-five (35) pages to allow Offerors to address each area with sufficient technical depth?	The page limit inconsistencies are clarified as follows: The page limit for Volume 1 is five (5) pages. To accommodate the breadth and technical complexity of the Statement of Work across all workstreams, USAC has approved the request to increase the Volume 2 (Technical Capability) page limit to thirty-five (35) pages. A redlined RFP reflecting this change will be issued alongside the formal Q&A amendment. Please note that the page limits for Volume 1, Volume 3 (Past Performance), and Volume 4 (Price) remain completely unchanged

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
59.	Section E.1.A allows Offerors to identify deviations, revisions, exceptions, or additional terms in a separate "Exceptions to RFP Terms" attachment, while Section B.2 NOTE states that offers with exceptions to any RFP requirement, term and conditions are technically unacceptable and ineligible for award. Would USAC confirm whether Offerors may submit an "Exceptions to RFP Terms" attachment without being deemed technically unacceptable or ineligible for award?	No. In line with the explicit Note in Section B.2, any proposal that makes exception to any RFP requirement, term, or condition will be deemed technically unacceptable and completely ineligible for award. While Section E.1.A provides a standard template mechanism to note deviations, this does not override the firm's performance and legal mandates of this specific procurement. The "Exceptions to RFP Terms" attachment should only be used if you are confirming full compliance or raising minor administrative clarifications that do not alter the required terms. Any material exception or rewrite of USAC's terms and conditions will result in immediate disqualification.
60.	USAC states it may conduct a down-select based primarily on price and may exclude proposals with prices that are significantly higher than the median or unrealistically low in terms of sufficiency to perform the Contract. Would USAC clarify the down-select methodology, the comparison population and basis for the median calculation, how differing staffing assumptions will be normalized, and whether Offerors will have an opportunity to explain any pricing outliers before exclusion?	USAC will not provide the specific internal statistical models or formulas used for the down-select evaluation. The comparison population for the median calculation will consist of all compliant proposals received by the submission deadline. To normalize differing staffing assumptions, USAC will cross-reference each Offeror's technical staffing plan against their proposed pricing to evaluate price realism and resource sufficiency. Per Section E, the down select is a competitive tool based on the initial submissions. Offerors will not be guaranteed an opportunity to clarify or explain pricing outliers prior to exclusion, so you must ensure your initial proposal contains your most competitive and realistic pricing.

Q#	Question	Answer
61.	The cover page and Section E of the RFP identify this solicitation as “IT-26-113,” but the running footer appearing on every page of the RFP (including the Statement of Work and Section E) reads “IT-26-131.” Section E.1.B instructs Offerors to use only “RFP IT-26-113” in the email subject line and warns that USAC's mail server will automatically reject emails with an incorrect or lengthy subject line. Would USAC confirm the correct, single solicitation number Offerors should use for all correspondence and proposal submission?	The correct solicitation number is IT-26-113. The "IT-26-131" reference in the running footer is a typographical error. A redlined RFP with the corrected solicitation number will be posted alongside this Q&A amendment. Please make sure to use RFP IT-26-113 in your email subject line for all correspondence and your final proposal submission. As stated in Section E.1.B, using the incorrect number or altering the format may cause our mail server to automatically reject your email
62.	Section 5.4 (O&M and Production Support) refers twice to SLA targets “in Section 5.F,” but the Statement of Work is numbered 5.1–5.16 and the SLA table actually appears under Section 5.8. Would USAC confirm the SLA table in Section 5.8 is the intended reference?	Yes, the SLA table located under Section B.5.8 is the intended reference. The references to "Section B.5.F" are typographical cross-reference discrepancies. Additionally, a redlined RFP has been officially posted alongside the Q&A responses to correct these structural numbers and errors.
63.	The Systems in Scope table lists EIE infrastructure as “Various (See Section 5.C),” but there is no Section “5.C” in the Statement of Work. Would USAC confirm whether the intended reference is the unlabeled “Eligibility and Integration Engine components” table on page 12, and consider adding an explicit section number to that table in any RFP amendment?	Yes. The intended reference is the Eligibility and Integration Engine components table on page 12.
64.	Section B.5.13 directs readers to “see Section 5.G table” for NIST SP 800-53 controls by FISMA impact level, but there is no Section “5.G” in the document. Would USAC confirm whether the FISMA impact-level table under Section 5.9 (Systems in Scope) is the intended reference?	Yes. The intended reference is the Systems in Scope table in Section B.5.9.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
65.	Section B.10 states Contractor's team must be staffed with "the Key Personnel identified in section R," but there is no "Section R" anywhere in the RFP; the Key Personnel table actually appears in Section 7 (Required Resources). Would USAC confirm this reference should read "Section 7," and given this and the three preceding cross-reference discrepancies, would USAC consider a global reference check (related to resources/staffing) in any RFP amendment?	Yes. The intended reference is Section B.7, Required Resources.
66.	Who is the incumbent and percentage performed by the incumbent for each task ?	Refer to Question #1
67.	Can USAC extend the proposal submission due date beyond August 31, 2026, at 11:00 AM ET?	Yes. The proposal due date is extended to September 7, 2026, by 11:00 AM ET.
68.	Page 1 identifies the Solicitation Number as IT-26-113, while the document footer throughout the RFP identifies IT-26-131. Please confirm that IT-26-113 is the correct solicitation number to be used for proposal submission, correspondence, proposal volumes, attachments, and pricing documents.	IT-26-113 is the correct solicitation number. Use only "RFP IT-26-113" in the email subject line. The IT-26-131 reference in the page footer is a typographical error.
69.	Section E.6.E.2(a) states that Volume 1 – Corporate Information "may not exceed four (5) pages." Please confirm whether the Volume 1 page limit is four (4) pages or five (5) pages.	Volume 1 is limited to five (5) pages, including the cover page. USAC does not require table of content.
70.	Section E.6.E.2(b) states that Volume 2 – Technical "may not thirty (25) pages." Please confirm whether the Technical Volume page limit is twenty-five (25) pages or thirty (30) pages, excluding Attachment A resumes.	The Technical Volume page limit is thirty-five (35) pages, excluding Attachment A resumes. A revised, redlined version of the RFP has been posted to clarify this requirement and correct the typographical text.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
71.	The RFP contains multiple internal cross-references to Sections 5.C, 5.D, 5.F, 5.G, 5.K, 5.R, and Section R that do not correspond to the numbered structure of Section B. Please provide the corrected cross-references so Offerors can accurately trace requirements for hosting, SLAs, systems in scope, transition, and staffing.	The corrected cross-references are Section 5.C means the Eligibility and Integration Engine components table on page 12; Section 5.D means the ServiceNow Current Infrastructure subsection on page 14; Section 5.F means Section B.5.8 (SLA); Section 5.G means Section B.5.9 (Systems in Scope); Section 5.K means Section B.5.10 (Transition-In Requirements); and Section 5.R and Section R mean Section B.7 (Required Resources).
72.	Section E.1.A permits Offerors to identify exceptions in a separate "Exceptions to RFP Terms" attachment and states that material exceptions may render a proposal unacceptable. Section E.6.B.2 states that offers containing exceptions to any requirement, term, or condition shall be technically unacceptable and ineligible for award. Please confirm whether any exception makes an Offeror ineligible for award or whether non-material exceptions may be considered under Section E.1.A.	Offerors may identify exceptions in a separate "Exceptions to RFP Terms" attachment under Section E.1.A. Material exceptions may be considered unacceptable and may render the Offeror ineligible for award. Non-material exceptions will be reviewed at USAC's discretion.
73.	Section B.2 establishes a hybrid contract with CLIN 0001 priced T&M with an annual NTE and CLINs 0002 and 0003 priced FFP. Section E.7.1.3 states that price will be evaluated based on the "firm fixed price" listed in Attachment 1. Please confirm the evaluated-price methodology, including whether USAC will evaluate the aggregate Base and Option Year value of CLIN 0001 NTE amounts plus CLINs 0002 and 0003.	USAC will evaluate the total proposed price for the Base Year and all four Option Years, comprising the extended CLIN 0001 labor pricing on Attachment 1, the annual CLIN 0002 fixed price, and the one-time CLIN 0003 fixed price.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
74.	CLIN 0003 is described as a one-time four-month FFP Discovery effort occurring during program months seven through ten, while Section B.9 requires pricing for the Base Year and each Option Year. Please confirm whether CLIN 0003 is priced and performed only once during the Base Year or whether Offerors must price CLIN 0003 in each Option Year.	CLIN 0003 is a one-time effort performed in program months seven through ten of the Base Year and is priced once. Do not price CLIN 0003 in the Option Years.
75.	Section B.3 states that USAC may exercise an Option Year by written notice no less than thirty (30) days before expiration, while Sections C.2 and C.31 refer to notice within ten (10) days before expiration. Please confirm the applicable option-exercise notice period.	The thirty (30) day notice period in Section B.3 governs for this Contract.
76.	Section C.2 contains blank fields for the Initial Term end date and the number of Optional Renewal Terms, while Section B.3 states one Base Year and four Option Years. Please confirm that the blanks in Section C.2 will be completed consistently with Section B.3.	Yes. Section C.2 will be completed at award consistent with Section B.3, one (1) base year and four (4) one-year Optional Renewal Terms.
77.	Section C.8 states that Contractor will be paid on a "fixed-price, service category rate basis," while Section B.2 establishes CLIN 0001 as T&M with an annual NTE and CLINs 0002 and 0003 as FFP. Please clarify how Section C.8 applies to each CLIN and confirm the invoicing/payment basis for CLIN 0001.	CLIN 0001 is invoiced at actual hours worked and authorized at the Attachment 1 rates, up to the annual NTE. CLINs 0002 and 0003 are firm fixed price. The Section C.8 reference to a fixed-price service category rate basis is standard language and does not change the CLIN 0001 method.
78.	For CLIN 0002, please provide the exact ServiceNow product editions, subscription/SKU names, licensed modules, applications, add-ons, and plugins that the Contractor must acquire, provision, fund, and administer for the National Verifier.	USAC is not releasing SKU level subscription details during the solicitation period. Price CLIN 0002 using the environment and license counts shown on page 14 of the RFP. Full entitlement detail will be shared with the awarded Contractor.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
79.	The RFP identifies 400 ServiceNow Fulfiller licenses. Please confirm the exact Fulfiller license SKU/product entitlement, current assigned-user count, approximate active-user count, anticipated growth, and whether any additional ServiceNow user/license types must be included in CLIN 0002.	USAC currently has 400 Fulfiller licenses, of which 335 were assigned as of August 1, 2026. USAC does not anticipate material growth beyond the 400 counts. SKU level detail is not being released during the solicitation period.
80.	Please clarify whether the 6 TB of "Additional Storage" represents currently provisioned capacity, current consumed capacity, or capacity in addition to the standard ServiceNow subscription entitlement. Please also provide current storage consumption and anticipated annual growth for pricing purposes.	The 6 TB shown on page 14 is storage in addition to the base subscription entitlement.
81.	The ServiceNow infrastructure table identifies seven "High Availability Servers" consisting of Development 2, Test 2, Integration 1, Pre-Prod 1, and Production 1. Please clarify whether these represent separate ServiceNow instances/environments or another ServiceNow infrastructure construct and identify the exact hosting configuration to be priced under CLIN 0002.	The seven entries represent separate ServiceNow instances by environment: two Development, two Test, one Integration, one Pre-Production, and one Production. Price CLIN 0002 to that configuration.
82.	Page 14 identifies Development, Test, Integration, Pre-Prod, and Production environments, while Section 5.2 references development, test, staging, and production and Section 5.8 applies SLAs to production and staging. Please provide the authoritative environment topology and identify which environment is considered "staging" for SLA purposes.	The environment topology on page 14 is authoritative. Pre-Production is the environment treated as staging for SLA purposes.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
83.	Please clarify the required commercial and technical mechanism for transferring the current ServiceNow environment from the incumbent. Does USAC expect the successful Offeror to assume or receive assignment of the incumbent subscription, establish a new subscription in USAC's name, or use another ServiceNow-approved transfer process?	Under CLIN 0002 the Contractor acquires, provisions, funds, and administers the ServiceNow instance and Fulfiller licenses and bills USAC the annual fixed price. The subscription must be held in USAC's name or be fully assignable to USAC, so that ownership of the instance, data, configurations, and licenses, together with the right to administer them, transfers to USAC or its designee on expiration, termination, or transition. USAC expects an administrative transfer of the existing instance rather than a technical migration where ServiceNow permits it, and USAC will support the transfer activities during transition-in.
84.	Does USAC currently maintain a ServiceNow customer/account relationship to which the instance and licenses can be transferred, and will USAC and the incumbent facilitate all necessary ServiceNow contractual, administrative, and technical transfer activities during transition-in?	USAC holds a ServiceNow customer account today for ITSM. USAC will facilitate the contractual, administrative, and technical transfer activities with the incumbent and with ServiceNow during transition-in.
85.	Please identify any ServiceNow OEM transfer, migration, professional-services, subscription-conversion, or administrative fees that Offerors should include in CLIN 0002 and confirm whether USAC anticipates a technical migration of the instance or only an administrative transfer of ownership/administration.	Include any ServiceNow transfer, subscription conversion, or administrative fees you anticipate within the CLIN 0002 price and state the assumption in Volume 4. USAC expects an administrative transfer of ownership and administration rather than a technical migration of the instance, where ServiceNow permits it.
86.	Please identify the current ServiceNow family release used by the National Verifier and the anticipated family-release upgrade schedule during the Base Year, given the Contractor's responsibility for two ServiceNow platform upgrades per year.	The NV instance currently runs on ServiceNow Yokohama and will be upgraded to ServiceNow Australia by the end of the calendar year. The Contractor is responsible for two family release upgrades per contract year thereafter, planned with USAC.

Q#	Question	Answer
87.	Please provide the approximate current inventory of National Verifier ServiceNow custom applications, scoped applications, custom tables, workflows/flows, scripts, integrations, business rules, UI components, and other material customizations that the Contractor will inherit and maintain.	USAC does not provide additional system or environment documentation during the solicitation period. Offerors should base their proposals on the information in the RFP. The baseline artifacts described in Section B.5.6 will be provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in.
88.	Please confirm whether an existing ServiceNow Automated Test Framework or other automated regression suite is available to the incoming Contractor and, if so, provide approximate current automated-test coverage and the primary test tools/frameworks in use.	Existing automated test assets transfer to the incoming Contractor at transition-in. USAC is not providing current coverage figures or the tool inventory during the solicitation period.
89.	Please confirm that the architecture diagrams and technology tables on pages 9 through 14 represent the current production baseline as of the solicitation date and identify any known material changes, planned migrations, or deprecations not reflected in those diagrams.	The diagrams and technology tables on pages 9 through 14 are the latest versions available. Two known changes are in progress: the ServiceNow family release upgrade from Yokohama to Australia, and the EIE Java and Spring Framework upgrades identified in the page 12 table.
90.	Page 12 states "Sprint Framework 5 -> Upgrading to Framework 7," along with upgrades to Spring Data, Spring Security, Spring Batch, Spring Boot, and Java 1.8 to Java 25. Please confirm the correct current and target versions for each EIE technology and the current status of each upgrade.	Completing the Java and Spring upgrades are not within CLIN 0001 scope. The upgrades are expected to be completed prior to the start of the Contractor CLIN 0001 start date, thus should not be accounted for in the base year NTE.
91.	Please confirm whether completion of the identified Java/Spring technology-stack upgrades is included in the incoming Contractor's CLIN 0001 scope and, if so, identify any required completion dates, sequencing priorities, or work already completed by the incumbent.	Completing the Java and Spring upgrades are not within CLIN 0001 scope. The upgrades are expected to be completed prior to the start of the Contractor CLIN 0001 start date, thus should not be accounted for in the base year NTE.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
92.	For the EIE hosted in USAC AWS, please define the responsibility boundary between USAC and the Contractor for EC2, RDS/PostgreSQL, S3, networking, load balancers, auto scaling, IAM, operating-system patching, database patching, backups, monitoring, and infrastructure configuration.	The EIE runs in a USAC AWS account. USAC, IT retains the AWS account, networking, and underlying platform services. The Contractor is responsible for the application and integration tiers, application configuration, database administration for the EIE PostgreSQL databases, application monitoring, and application level patching, working with USAC IT. The detailed responsibility matrix will be confirmed at kickoff.
93.	Please provide the approximate current AWS inventory and sizing by environment for EIE, including EC2 instance counts/types, RDS configuration and storage, S3 data volume, auto-scaling ranges, and the number and purpose of non-production environments.	Production sizing is shown in the Current National Verifier Technical Architecture diagram and the NV Server Architecture diagram in Section B.5.1, including instance types, RDS configuration, auto scaling range, and the two availability zone designs. USAC is not providing a further environment by environment inventory during the solicitation period.
94.	Page 11 places the NV ServiceNow portal and EIE within the DME scope boundary and identifies other applications as USAC IT responsibilities, while CLIN 0003 includes NV, EIE, NLAD, RAD, and LDS. Please confirm that NLAD, RAD, LDS, and other external systems are outside CLIN 0001 O&M/DME scope except for maintenance of NV/EIE interfaces, but are included as discovery subjects under CLIN 0003.	Confirmed. CLIN 0001 covers the NV ServiceNow portal and the Eligibility and Integration Engine, shown inside the red boundary on page 11, including maintenance of the NV and EIE interfaces to other systems. NLAD, RAD, LDS, and the other identified applications are the direct responsibility of USAC IT under CLIN 0001 and are in scope as Discovery subjects under CLIN 0003.
95.	Please provide the approximate size and composition of the current NV/EIE backlog, including open epics/features/user stories, defects, technical-debt items, accessibility issues, and known modernization priorities expected to drive Base Year work.	USAC uses an Agile/Scrum process, and the product roadmap and backlog will be made available to the Contractor. USAC is not providing backlog counts or composition during the solicitation period.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
96.	Please provide historical or approximate release frequency, sprint velocity/throughput, and planned major FCC/Lifeline initiatives expected to drive material development demand during the Base Year.	USAC does not provide additional system or environment documentation during the solicitation period. Offerors should base their proposals on the information in the RFP. The baseline artifacts described in Section B.5.6 will be provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in.
97.	USAC states that it does not currently maintain a Contractor-accessible CI/CD pipeline. Please clarify where USAC expects the successful Offeror to host and operate the required DevSecOps pipeline—within USAC AWS, a USAC-managed platform, a Contractor-provided FedRAMP-authorized environment, or another approved environment.	USAC provides the tool chain and licensing. The Contractor builds and operates the NV and EIE pipeline on that toolchain in coordination with USAC's Information Systems division. Hosting location and access model will be confirmed at kickoff.
98.	Please identify the existing or preferred tools for source control, artifact management, CI/CD, SAST, DAST, software composition analysis, dependency scanning, secrets scanning, test automation, Infrastructure as Code, monitoring, logging/SIEM, and project tracking, and identify which licenses USAC provides versus those the Contractor must furnish.	USAC will provide licensing and operational support for the tools identified.
99.	Please identify the current code-repository platform and confirm whether the Contractor will receive administrative rights sufficient to implement mandatory branch protections, pull-request reviews, signed commits for production releases, and automated code-quality gates.	USAC provides the source control platform. The Contractor will receive the access needed to implement branch protection, mandatory pull request review, signed commits for production releases, and automated quality gates on its repositories.
100.	The Definition of Done requires minimum 80% unit-test coverage. Please clarify whether this threshold applies separately to Java/EIE code and ServiceNow code/configuration and how USAC expects test coverage to be measured for low-code/configuration components.	The 80 percent threshold applies to custom code, which includes EIE Java code and scripted ServiceNow logic. Configuration delivered without custom code is validated through automated functional and regression testing rather than unit test coverage.

Q#	Question	Answer
101.	Please provide or identify the PM@USAC framework, required templates/artifacts, SAFe implementation expectations, and Architecture Review Board/Enterprise Review Board processes that the Contractor must follow in developing its management and technical approach.	PM@USAC templates and artifacts, the SAFe cadence expectations, and the ARB and ERB review process will be provided to the Contractor at kickoff. PM@USAC is a tailored version of the PMI PMBOK methodology, as described in Section B.15.
102.	Please provide historical monthly production incident volumes by P1, P2, P3, and P4, including average MTTR and the approximate number of P1 incidents requiring after-hours/on-call support during the prior twelve months.	Over the past year there have been 1 P1, 1 P2, 6 P3 and 31 P4 incidents that have been resolved within target SLAs. No P1 incidents over the past year have required after hours support.
103.	The SLA table defines a separate P4-Low category for cosmetic issues/minor enhancement requests, while the following narrative describes P3 as including medium- or low-impact incidents and minor or cosmetic issues. Please confirm the intended distinction between P3 and P4 incidents.	The SLA table in Section B.5.8 governs. P3 is a medium impact incident for which a reasonable workaround exists. P4 covers cosmetic issues and minor enhancement requests, which are worked on the sprint schedule. USAC makes the final determination of incident priority.
104.	For a P1 incident detected outside core support hours, please clarify whether the four (4) "business hour" resolution target is calculated only during business hours or as four continuous elapsed hours, given the requirement to work P1 incidents on a 24x7 basis until service is restored or an acceptable workaround is in place.	For P1 incidents the resolution target runs as elapsed time from detection, consistent with the requirement to work P1 incidents on a 24x7 basis until service is restored. Business hour measurement applies to P2, P3, and P4 incidents.
105.	Please confirm whether implementation of an acceptable workaround within the P1 resolution period constitutes satisfaction of the P1 resolution SLA or whether the SLA clock continues until permanent service restoration.	An acceptable workaround that restores service satisfies the P1 resolution target. The permanent fix is tracked as a separate item with a P2 target. Acceptability of the workaround is determined by USAC. The Contractor continues to permanent resolution and documents it in the After-Action Report.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
106.	The Contractor must provide a monthly System-Uptime Report measured against SLA targets, but the RFP does not state a numerical system-availability/uptime target. Please provide the required uptime percentage(s) and calculation methodology, including treatment of scheduled maintenance, approved outages, and external-provider outages.	USAC requires contractors to meet 99.9% availability. Scheduled maintenance approved by USAC in advance is excluded from the availability calculation.
107.	The SLA targets apply to both production and staging environments, but the priority definitions are primarily written around production-user impacts. Please clarify how P1-P4 classifications and resolution targets are to be applied to staging incidents.	P1 and P2 classifications apply in staging where the condition blocks release activity or testing. Response and resolution targets are the same as production. USAC makes the final determination.
108.	Please identify standard maintenance windows, production change windows, release blackout periods, and any known peak Lifeline operating periods that Offerors should account for in the upgrade, release, and production-support approach.	Maintenance windows, production change windows, and release blackout periods will be agreed with the USAC Program Manager at kickoff.
109.	Please clarify whether the production-support “hotline” requires the Contractor to provide and fund a dedicated telephony/contact-center solution or whether incidents will be received through an existing USAC service-management platform and USAC-provided contact channel.	The Contractor provides the production support hotline staffed during core hours, with on-call coverage for P1 outside core hours. Incidents are also raised through USAC's service management process. The Contractor is not required to fund a consumer facing contact center solution.
110.	Please specify the required submission deadline, required template, and approval process for the P1 After-Action Report, as the RFP identifies the AAR as a deliverable but does not state how soon after incident resolution it must be submitted.	Submit the After-Action Report within five (5) business days of P1 resolution, using a template agreed with the USAC Program Manager.
111.	Please provide USAC’s required remediation timeframes for Critical, High, Medium, and Low vulnerabilities, including any release-blocking or production-deployment criteria, rather than only the general reference to NIST-recommended timeframes.	Patching of vulnerabilities will be subject to CISA's Binding Operational Directive 26-04, "Prioritizing Security Updates Based on Risk." Most will require patching within 3 days, some will allow 2 weeks, and most Low vulnerabilities will allow 2 months.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
112.	The ServiceNow Senior Developer IV and III qualifications reference "ServiceNow SAIL Code" and, for the Senior Developer IV, Records, Reports, Tasks, Sites, CDTs, Process Models, Connected Systems, and Data Stores. Please confirm the intended ServiceNow-specific technical competencies for these positions and whether the listed terminology is correct.	The National Verifier portal is configured and hosted on ServiceNow. The Appian labor category titles on Attachment 1, and the Appian specific terminology in the Section B.7 qualifications (SAIL, CDTs, Sites, Process Models, Connected Systems, Data Stores), are legacy text carried over in error. Read them as the equivalent ServiceNow competencies and price the ServiceNow roles described in Section B.7.
113.	Please clarify the specific certifications represented by "CMA/CTA," "CAD," and any other required or desired ServiceNow certification references in the Key Personnel qualification table.	The references are to ServiceNow credentials: CMA is Certified Master Architect, CTA is Certified Technical Architect, and CAD is Certified Application Developer. These are preferred or desired, not mandatory minimum qualifications.
114.	The RFP states that ServiceNow certifications for all Key Personnel must be verified within sixty (60) days of award when pending. Please confirm which Key Personnel positions are required to obtain/verify a ServiceNow certification within sixty days versus positions for which a ServiceNow certification is only preferred, desired, or not applicable.	ServiceNow certifications in Section B.7 are stated as preferred or desired and are not mandatory minimum qualifications. Where an Offeror proposes personnel who hold or are pursuing a certification, that certification must be verified and provided to USAC within sixty (60) calendar days of award.
115.	The RFP identifies seven positions, all marked as Key Personnel, and states that one integrated Scrum team typically consists of seven to nine resources while quantities are estimates only. Please confirm whether the seven identified positions represent the minimum mandatory team that must be staffed at Contract start and maintained throughout performance.	The seven positions in Section B.7 are the Key Personnel roles USAC expects to be staffed at contract start and maintained throughout performance. The quantities shown are estimates for pricing only and are not guaranteed minimums.
116.	Section C.1.N defines Key Personnel as full-time employees of the Contractor, while the proposal instructions allow use of subcontractors/partners. Please clarify whether employees of proposed subcontractors may serve in Key Personnel positions.	Key Personnel may be employees of a proposed subcontractor, provided they meet the published minimum qualifications and are identified and committed to the proposal. Section C.20 applies to their replacement.

Q#	Question	Answer
117.	Please clarify whether "full-time" Key Personnel means the individual must be 100% dedicated to this Contract or means that the individual must be a full-time employee of the Contractor while performing the level of effort authorized by USAC.	Full-time refers to the individual's employment status with the Contractor or its proposed subcontractor. It does not by itself require one hundred percent allocation to this Contract, although USAC expects Key Personnel to be dedicated at the level needed to perform the role.
118.	Please confirm whether one individual may serve in more than one listed Key Personnel role if the individual independently meets all minimum qualifications, or whether each listed Key Personnel position must be staffed by a separate individual.	Each Key Personnel position should be staffed by a separate individual. The Contract Manager role may be combined with another role where the individual meets both sets of qualifications and the arrangement is described in Volume 2.
119.	The RFP states that background checks are required for Contractor Staff accessing USAC systems that do not contain federal systems of records, while NV and NLAD are identified as federal systems of records. Please provide the required background investigation/suitability requirements for personnel accessing NV or other federal systems of records, including any citizenship/residency requirements, reciprocity rules, and expected adjudication timelines.	All Contractor Staff receive a background check. Staff accessing systems designated as federal systems of records, which include the National Verifier and NLAD, must also complete Role-Based Privacy Act Training before access is granted. No federal suitability determination, PIV or CAC credential, or security clearance is required for this Contract.
120.	Section B.4.A states that USAC presently has a hybrid work approach requiring Contractor Staff to be in the USAC office at least two days per week, while also referring to Contractors "that are required to report in person." Please clarify which labor categories or personnel are subject to the two-day onsite requirement and whether remote work is otherwise permitted.	All work must be performed in the United States by personnel authorized to work in the United States, and all Contractor Staff are subject to a background check. USAC is willing to review all reasonable staffing models proposed by Offerors.
121.	Please identify the anticipated Contract effective/start date and, if available, the incumbent contract end date so Offerors can develop a realistic transition schedule within the required maximum sixty (60) calendar-day transition-in period.	The anticipated award date is November 2026, as shown in Section E.1.C. Regardless of the actual start date or end date of the existing contract, offerors must proposal realistic transition schedule within the required maximum sixty (60) calendar-day transition-in period.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
122.	Please identify the expected duration and level of incumbent participation USAC will make available during transition-in, including availability for joint working sessions, code walkthroughs, documentation reviews, shadowing, and production-support knowledge transfer.	USAC will facilitate reasonable coordination with the incumbent during the transition period, as stated in Section B.1. Transition-in must be completed within sixty (60) calendar days of award, and its costs are included in the base year NTE ceiling. Source code, repositories, documentation, runbooks, backlog, and security artifacts are provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in, not before award.
123.	Section 5.6 states that existing baseline artifacts, including Interface Control Documents, security-control documentation, the Disaster Recovery Plan, architecture diagrams, runbooks, SOPs, and release documentation, will be provided to the Contractor after award. Will any of these artifacts be made available to Offerors before proposal submission under the Confidentiality Agreement to support a more specific technical and transition approach?	USAC does not provide additional system or environment documentation during the solicitation period. Offerors should base their proposals on the information in the RFP. The baseline artifacts described in Section B.5.6 will be provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in.
124.	Please clarify the minimum criteria USAC expects to use to declare transition-in complete, including production-support responsibility, knowledge-transfer completion, documentation acceptance, access readiness, and operational-readiness criteria.	The Contractor proposes the completion criteria in its Transition-In Plan under Section B.5.10. USAC expects them to cover staff onboarding and access provisioning, knowledge transfer completion, documentation handover, assumption of production support, and demonstrated operational readiness. The USAC Program Manager approves completion.
125.	Section 5.9 states that up to two additional ServiceNow-based systems may be added during the Contract Term. Please clarify whether support for such systems must be absorbed within the existing CLIN 0001 NTE and CLIN 0002 FFP or will be handled through a contract modification/Added Services action with corresponding staffing and pricing adjustments.	USAC has not identified specific candidate systems or timing. If systems are added, the scope, staffing, and pricing will be handled through a contract modification or the Added Services process in Section C.38. Do not include this work in base pricing.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
126.	If currently available, please provide the approximate size, complexity, user/license requirements, interfaces, and anticipated timing for the up to two additional ServiceNow-based systems that may be added during the Contract Term.	USAC has not identified specific candidate systems or timing. If systems are added, the scope, staffing, and pricing will be handled through a contract modification or the Added Services process in Section C.38. Do not include this work in base pricing.
127.	For CLIN 0003, please identify the anticipated availability and expected participation of Lifeline Program, USAC IT, security, enterprise architecture, operations, BPO/contact-center, data, and system-owner stakeholders during the four-month Discovery effort.	USAC will identify and make available Lifeline Program, IT, security, enterprise architecture, operations, data, and system owner stakeholders for the Discovery engagement. The Contractor schedules and runs the sessions under the approved Discovery Project Plan.
128.	Please identify the current documentation that USAC expects to provide for NV, EIE, NLAD, RAD, and LDS during CLIN 0003, including architecture diagrams, interface documentation, business requirements, process flows, data models, backlogs, technical-debt inventories, and operational documentation.	As stated in Section B.6, USAC will provide the current application architecture diagrams, business requirements, workflow documentation, and data models it holds for NV, EIE, NLAD, RAD, and LDS to support the Discovery phase.
129.	For the required BPO volume/cost analysis, will USAC provide the historical manual-review volumes, contact-center volumes, unit costs, staffing/capacity information, SLA information, and BPO contract/cost data necessary to establish the current-state baseline and measurable reduction targets?	USAC will provide the manual review and contact center volume and cost data it holds to support the CLIN 0003 analysis. The Contractor supplements that data through stakeholder interviews and workshops.
130.	Does USAC have a preferred future-state application/platform direction for CLIN 0003, such as continued ServiceNow and AWS use, or should the Contractor perform a platform-neutral modernization alternatives analysis before recommending the target-state architecture?	USAC expects a platform neutral alternatives analysis. Recommendations must align with USAC's enterprise architecture standards, security requirements, and cloud strategy, and should account for the current ServiceNow and AWS investments. Majority of USAC systems are built on Appian platform hosted on AWS.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
131.	Please provide or identify the current USAC enterprise architecture standards, technical stack, approved cloud strategy, integration/API standards, data standards, and security architecture standards that the CLIN 0003 target-state recommendation must follow.	USAC requires compliance with NIST 800-53 including all cross-referenced NIST found therein, and Zero Trust Architecture.
132.	For the Future-State Cost Model, please specify the required level of estimating fidelity and cost elements. Should the estimate include DME labor, software/platform licensing, cloud/infrastructure, data migration, integrations, security/ATO, testing, training, transition, O&M, and multi-year lifecycle costs?	The Level of Effort cost model should be a rough order of magnitude estimate covering DME labor, software and platform licensing, cloud and infrastructure, data migration, integration, security and ATO activity, testing, training, transition, and multi-year O&M.
133.	Please confirm whether the Application Realization Matrix should assess alternatives such as retain, modernize, replace, consolidate, and retire for NV, EIE, NLAD, RAD, and LDS, rather than assume all five systems must be combined into a single application/platform.	Yes. The Application Realization Matrix should evaluate, retain, modernize, replace, consolidate, and retire dispositions for each system. Combining the five systems is one option to be assessed, not a predetermined outcome.
134.	May personnel supporting CLIN 0001 also perform CLIN 0003 activities, and if so, what timekeeping, cost-accounting, and billing segregation does USAC require between the T&M CLIN 0001 and FFP CLIN 0003 efforts?	Yes, the same personnel may support both. CLIN 0003 hours must be recorded and invoiced separately from CLIN 0001 and may not be billed against the CLIN 0001 NTE.
135.	Please confirm that the Discovery Project Plan is due in Discovery Month 1 and that the executive findings/recommendation presentation is due in Discovery Month 4, as described in the CLIN 0003 narrative, because Deliverables 13 and 15 use less specific timing language.	Confirmed. The Discovery Project Plan is due on Discovery month 1 and the executive findings and recommendation presentation is due in Discovery month 4.
136.	Section E requires separate Attachment 1 Bid Sheets for scenarios with and without the use of AI, while all AI use remains subject to USAC's prior written approval. Please clarify which AI/no-AI pricing scenario will be used for the primary evaluated price and source-selection decision.	USAC will use the Bid Sheet version that matches the Offeror's proposed technical approach as the basis for the evaluated price.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
137.	If an Offeror proposes no operational AI use under CLIN 0001 but performs the mandatory design-only AI/ML, OCR/document-extraction, and NLP assessment under CLIN 0003, does USAC still require two distinct Attachment 1 Bid Sheets?	No. If the Offeror proposes no operational AI use, submit the non-AI Bid Sheet and state that clearly in Volume 2. The design-only AI/ML, OCR, and NLP assessment required under CLIN 0003 is required of all Offerors and does not by itself constitute AI use.
138.	Please identify the pricing assumptions Offerors should use for the "with AI" scenario, including whether Offerors should include AI product/license costs, implementation effort, security/authorization activities, governance approval, testing, monitoring, and ongoing operations.	Price the AI scenario to include AI product and license costs, implementation effort, security and authorization activity, governance and approval effort, testing, monitoring, and ongoing operations. State the assumptions in Volume 2 and Volume 4.
139.	For CLIN 0003's design-only AI/ML, OCR/document-extraction, and NLP assessment, will USAC permit the Contractor to examine appropriately controlled sample, masked, or anonymized documents and transaction data, subject to USAC approval, to assess feasibility and expected accuracy?	Yes, subject to USAC approval and appropriate controls. Any use of USAC Data, including masked or anonymized samples, for that purpose must follow Privacy and Security Addendum Section 3.3.1 and requires prior written authorization.
140.	Privacy and Security Addendum Sections 2.10, 2.17, and 2.20 are marked as applicable to contracts for procuring new information technology systems/tools only. Please confirm whether these provisions apply to this NV DME/O&M procurement and, if so, identify the specific CLINs and Contractor systems/tools to which they apply.	Contractor will maintain USAC system and support maintaining FISMA compliance using FedRAMP certified infrastructure and platforms. The referenced sections apply only for engagements wherein the Contractor will process USF data on platforms or infrastructure not owned or acquired by USAC.
141.	Section 5.13 requires FedRAMP Moderate or higher for all cloud services leveraged by the Contractor, while the Privacy and Security Addendum focuses FedRAMP requirements on cloud services that access, store, or process USAC Data/PII. Please confirm whether FedRAMP authorization is required for every Contractor cloud/SaaS tool used in contract performance or only tools that access, store, process, or transmit USAC Data.	FedRAMP for cloud services is mandatory for all USAC systems that process/store USF data in a cloud platform. Exceptions may be obtained when certain cloud services are not offered as FedRAMP and are necessary for operations, with FCC approval of any deviation. Auxiliary cloud tools and services supporting management, development and maintenance are not subject to this requirement unless processing/storing USF data.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
142.	If Privacy and Security Addendum Section 2.20 applies, please confirm whether the Offeror/Contractor itself must hold a current ISO 27001 certification and SOC 2 Type II report, or whether applicable certifications/reports from the underlying ServiceNow, AWS, or other cloud service providers satisfy these requirements.	Since FISMA compliance has already been achieved for the system that operates on FedRAMP PaaS and IaaS environments, there is no further requirement for ISO 27001 or SOC 2 Type II.
143.	Section 2.3 requires the Contractor to demonstrate that its system is FISMA/NIST SP 800-53 Rev. 5 compliant and has an ATO before delivering Services or enabling interoperability with USAC. Please clarify whether this requirement applies only to Contractor IT that stores/processes USAC Data or directly interoperates with USAC systems, rather than the Contractor's general corporate IT environment.	This requirement is technically not required for this contract since the Contractor will maintain the systems in compliance already achieved in accordance with FISMA/NIST. The administrative systems of the Contractor are not relevant to this requirement.
144.	Please provide the current ATO status and anticipated assessment/renewal dates for NV and EIE and identify the Contractor's expected responsibility for control ownership, inherited controls, SSP maintenance, POA&M remediation, annual assessment evidence, and continuous monitoring.	The System Boundary is NV (including EIE) that is FISMA authorized and under continuous monitoring by the USAC IT Security department which will continue to oversee compliance with the systems maintained by the Contractor.
145.	Please provide the approximate current baseline of open Critical/High vulnerabilities and material POA&M items attributable to NV and EIE that the incoming Contractor should anticipate inheriting at transition.	USAC does not provide additional system or environment documentation during the solicitation period. Offerors should base their proposals on the information in the RFP. The baseline artifacts described in Section B.5.6 will be provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in.
146.	Please identify the existing vulnerability-scanning and security-monitoring tools and clarify whether USAC performs the scans and provides the results or whether the Contractor must procure, operate, and license the scanning tools required to produce the monthly Vulnerability-Scan Report.	USAC performs infrastructure and platform scanning and provides the results. The Contractor integrates application security scanning into the pipeline using USAC provided tooling and compiles the monthly Vulnerability-Scan Report.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
147.	Please provide the current required Recovery Time Objective (RTO) and Recovery Point Objective (RPO) for NV and EIE, expected backup retention periods, and required disaster-recovery/failover testing frequency.	NV RTO is 72 hours and RPO is 24 hours. DR testing is annual and not on a fixed date.
148.	Please specify the required retention period, storage destination, and technical requirements for the “immutable audit logging” required under the Zero Trust provisions and identify whether relevant logs must be forwarded to an existing USAC SIEM.	Logs are retained in accordance with USAC's records retention policy and forwarded to USAC's enterprise logging and monitoring platform, as reflected in the architecture diagram in Section B.5.1. Retention periods and forwarding requirements will be confirmed at kickoff.
149.	Deliverable 7 states that all technical artifacts, software releases, code commits, configuration items, test results, and documentation per sprint are subject to the Deliverable Acceptance Form process. Please clarify whether USAC expects one consolidated DAF per sprint/release or a separate DAF for each individual technical artifact/configuration item/code deliverable.	One consolidated Deliverable Acceptance Form per sprint or release is sufficient. Individual artifacts are itemized on that form.
150.	Section B.8 requires rejected deliverables to be corrected and resubmitted within ten (10) business days, while Section C.3 discusses curing rejected/nonconforming Services or Deliverables within thirty (30) calendar days. Please confirm which timeframe governs correction and resubmission of rejected deliverables under this Contract.	Section B.8 governs. Rejected deliverables must be corrected and resubmitted within ten (10) business days at no additional cost. Section C.3 addresses the outer limit for curing nonconforming Services or Deliverables before USAC may terminate for cause.
151.	For CLIN 0001 T&M invoicing, please confirm whether authorized labor hours may be invoiced monthly based on hours performed and approved, independent of DAF acceptance, or whether payment for T&M labor is contingent upon formal acceptance of associated sprint deliverables.	Authorized labor hours are invoiced monthly based on hours performed and approved by the USAC Program Manager. Payment for CLIN 0001 labor is not contingent on formal acceptance of individual sprint artifacts.

Q#	Question	Answer
152.	The RFP requires EVM reporting of PV, EV, CPI, and SPI within the Monthly Status Report. Please clarify USAC's expected EVM methodology for a T&M Agile managed-service CLIN, including whether the performance baseline should be established at the task-order, PI, release, sprint, or IMS level.	USAC expects EVM reporting against the Contractor's Integrated Master Schedule, and the release and sprint plan agreed with the USAC Program Manager. The performance baseline will be established at the release and sprint level within the IMS and confirmed at kickoff.
153.	Section 5.15 describes the Quality Control Plan as ensuring performance under "this T&M single-award contract," while the RFP establishes a hybrid T&M/FFP contract. Please confirm that the QCP is intended to apply to all three CLINs, including FFP CLINs 0002 and 0003.	The Quality Control Plan applies to all three CLINs. The reference to a T&M single-award contract in Section B.5.15 reflects the CLIN 0001 pricing method and does not limit the scope of the plan.
154.	Section 5.16 states that USAC and the Contractor will jointly define specific performance standards, metrics, and AQLs after award. Does USAC have any minimum quantitative AQL thresholds or target performance levels that Offerors should incorporate into the technical approach and pricing assumptions?	USAC does not have minimum quantitative AQL thresholds to publish at this time. Price to the SLA targets in Section B.5.8 and describe the quality objectives and measures you propose against the AQL categories in Section B.5.16.
155.	The RFP requires both a Bi-Weekly Status Report and a Monthly Status Report. Please confirm whether these are two separate recurring deliverables and provide the required template/content distinction to avoid duplicative reporting.	They are two separate recurring deliverables. The Bi-Weekly Status Report covers delivery progress, IMS variance, DevSecOps pipeline health, automated test coverage, and vulnerability status. The Monthly Status Report adds EVM reporting and SLA compliance. Templates will be agreed at kickoff.
156.	Deliverable 6 is bi-weekly but requires planned activities for the "subsequent month." Please confirm whether USAC intends the Bi-Weekly Status Report to cover planned activities for the next two weeks or for the full subsequent month.	The Bi-Weekly Status Report should cover planned activities for the next reporting period, that is, the following two weeks.

Q#	Question	Answer
157.	Section E requires at least three current or recently completed similar contracts and states that past performance is considered recent if no older than three years from the solicitation date. Please clarify whether an ongoing contract that began more than three years ago but includes performance within the last three years qualifies as recent.	Yes. An ongoing contract that began more than three years ago qualifies as recently as where performance occurred within the last three years. Describe the recent performance period in the reference.
158.	May the required minimum three past-performance references include contracts performed by proposed teaming partners or subcontractors, or must the Offeror/prime provide at least three qualifying references independently?	Yes. Past performance from proposed team partners or subcontractors may be included and will be evaluated under Section E.7.1.2, which expressly contemplates references for teaming partners and subcontractors. USAC expects at least three qualifying references in total and expects the prime Offeror's own relevant experience to be represented among them.
159.	Section E.6.E.1(d) requires diagrams, tables, Gantt charts, and charts to be incorporated into the proposal using the native program from which they were created, while each proposal volume must be submitted in PDF format. Please clarify whether embedding editable/native objects within the source document before PDF conversion satisfies this requirement or whether separate native files must also be submitted.	Embedding the native object in the source document before converting the volume to PDF satisfies the requirement. Separate native files are not required.
160.	Please confirm whether appendices or attachments other than Attachment A resumes and the separately submitted Confidentiality Agreement count toward the stated volume page limits, including the separate "Exceptions to RFP Terms" attachment if submitted.	Attachment A resumes, the signed Confidentiality Agreement, and the separate "Exceptions to RFP Terms" attachment are excluded from the page limits. All other appendices and attachments count toward the applicable volume limit.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
161.	Attachment 1 – Bid Sheet identifies the Key Personnel developer labor categories as Appian Developers, while Section B.7 of the RFP identifies the corresponding required Key Personnel as ServiceNow Senior Developer IV and ServiceNow Senior Developer III for the National Verifier effort. Please confirm that the references to Appian Developer in Attachment 1 are typographical errors and that Offerors should price the ServiceNow developer labor categories identified in Section B.7.	The National Verifier portal is configured and hosted on ServiceNow. The Appian labor category titles on Attachment 1, and the Appian specific terminology in the Section B.7 qualifications (SAIL, CDTs, Sites, Process Models, Connected Systems, Data Stores), are legacy text carried over in error. Read them as the equivalent ServiceNow competencies and price the ServiceNow roles described in Section B.7.
162.	Can key personnel and additional vendor staff work remotely instead of being in office two days a week to allow vendors more flexibility with staffing?	All work must be performed in the United States by personnel authorized to work in the United States, and all Contractor Staff are subject to a background check. USAC is willing to review all reasonable staffing models proposed by Offerors.
163.	Will USAC consider removing the ServiceNow years of experience and certification requirements for the Technical Development Manager. As NV includes both ServiceNow and AWS components, a Technical Manager that can provide more hollistic leadership across both technologies will be beneficial to USAC for both managing NV in its current state and for planning for any future modernization effort.	USAC is not changing the minimum qualifications in Section B.7. Offerors may propose an equivalent labor category under the substitution provision in Section B.7 where the proposed individual meets or exceeds the published minimum qualifications, with the justification stated in Volume 2. Substitutions are evaluated against the published minimums.
164.	Will USAC consider removing or reducing the years of experience requirements for the Automation Tester IV so that offerors are able to propose junior resources who are able to fulfill automation testing requirements?	USAC is not changing the minimum qualifications in Section B.7. Offerors may propose an equivalent labor category under the substitution provision in Section B.7 where the proposed individual meets or exceeds the published minimum qualifications, with the justification stated in Volume 2. Substitutions are evaluated against the published minimums.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
165.	Can USAC clarify if ServiceNow certifications are required for the Automation Tester IV and if so what ServiceNow automation testing tools are currently being used?	ServiceNow certification is not a mandatory minimum for the Automation Tester IV role. Where the proposed individual holds or is pursuing a certification, it must be verified within sixty (60) calendar days of award. USAC provides test automation tooling and licensing, and the specific tools will be confirmed at kickoff.
166.	Is ISO 27001 certification required for this opportunity?	No. FISMA compliance has been achieved for the system, which operates on FedRAMP authorized PaaS and IaaS environments, so an ISO 27001 certification and a SOC 2 Type II report are not required for this procurement.
167.	Is a current SOC 2 Type II report required for this opportunity?	No. FISMA compliance has been achieved for the system, which operates on FedRAMP authorized PaaS and IaaS environments, so an ISO 27001 certification and a SOC 2 Type II report are not required for this procurement.
168.	Can USAC please confirm page limintations for both the Corporate Information and Technical volumes? Currently instructions list that Coportate Information should not exceed four (5) pages and the technical volume should not exceed thrity (25) pages?	The Technical Volume page limit is thirty-five (35) pages, excluding Attachment A resumes. A revised, redlined version of the RFP has been posted to clarify this requirement and correct the typographical text.
169.	Can offerors add additional Labor Categories (LCATs) to the bid sheet for CLIN0001 based on the current understanding of National Verifier staffing needs?	Price every labor category listed on Attachment 1. The seven roles in Section B.7 are the Key Personnel positions that must be staffed and maintained throughout performance. Offerors may propose additional non-Key labor categories where their staffing model requires them, with the rationale described in Volume 2.
170.	In the CLIN0001 Tab of the Bid Sheet, USAC lists Labor Categories for a BPM Engineer IV (Appian Lead Developer) and BPM Enginer III (Appian Developer) whereas the RFP requires a ServiceNow Senior Developer IV and a ServiceNow Senior Developer III. Can USAC please amend the Bid Sheet to align the bid sheet labor categories with the labor categories requested in the RFP?	The National Verifier portal is configured and hosted on ServiceNow. The Appian labor category titles on Attachment 1, and the Appian specific terminology in the Section B.7 qualifications (SAIL, CDTs, Sites, Process Models, Connected Systems, Data Stores), are legacy text carried over in error. Read them as the equivalent ServiceNow competencies and price the ServiceNow roles described in Section B.7.

Q#	Question	Answer
171.	Is this solicitation a recompete of an existing contract? If so, could you please confirm the incumbent contractor(s)?	See response to Question 1.
172.	What is the current or historical contract value associated with this work?	USAC is not disclosing the current or historical contract value.
173.	Will the Statement of Work (SOW) remain unchanged from the current contract, or have there been any updates or revisions?	The Statement of Work in this RFP reflects USAC's current requirements. CLIN 0002, the ServiceNow platform hosting and license assumption, and CLIN 0003, the Lifeline application Discovery and modernized architecture recommendation, are new. Respond to this RFP as written.
174.	Could you please provide the current or prior contract number associated with this requirement?	USAC is not providing the current contract number.
175.	Is it possible to obtain the Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPAR) or other performance evaluations related to the incumbent contract?	USAC does not issue Contractor Performance Assessment Reports. USAC is not a federal agency and CPARS does not apply to its contracts.
176.	How has the incumbent performed on the current contract, particularly with regard to meeting performance objectives, deliverables, and timelines?	USAC is not providing an assessment of the incumbent's performance.
177.	Has the incumbent been permitted to bid on this opportunity?	This is a full and open competition Procurement to all interested offerors.
178.	Would USAC consider granting an extension to the proposal submission deadline?	Yes. The proposal due date is extended to September 7, 2026, by 11:00 AM ET.
179.	Are the cover page and table of contents excluded from the overall page count limit?	Yes. Section E.6.E.2 excludes the cover page and table of contents from the page count for each volume.
180.	May we include additional pages for abbreviations and references, and will those be excluded from the stated page limit?	No. Only the exclusions identified in Section E.6.E apply. An acronym list or reference list counts toward the applicable volume limit.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
181.	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.)?	All Services must be performed within the United States. As stated in Privacy and Security Addendum Section 2.13, this includes work performed by all Contract Staff and the storage and processing of data and other virtual services. No portion of the scope may be performed offshore.
182.	Are there any anticipated major program initiatives or FCC regulatory changes expected during the first year that may significantly affect the scope of work?	USAC is not identifying specific initiatives in this solicitation. Work is prioritized by USAC through the product backlog, and FCC directives are accommodated within the CLIN 0001 scope.
183.	The solicitation number on the cover page is IT-26-113, but the footer throughout the document references IT-26-131. Can USAC confirm the correct solicitation number?	IT-26-113 is the correct solicitation number. Use only "RFP IT-26-113" in the email subject line. The IT-26-131 reference in the page footer is a typographical error.
184.	The RFP references an incumbent Contractor supporting the NV system. Can USAC confirm the identity of the incumbent and the current contract number to help Offerors calibrate their transition-in plans?	See response to Question 1.
185.	The transition-in period shall not exceed 60 calendar days. During this period, will the incumbent Contractor be contractually obligated to participate in knowledge transfer sessions, or is USAC requesting the new Contractor to plan for a self-directed transition?	USAC will facilitate reasonable coordination with the incumbent during the transition period, as stated in Section B.1. Transition-in must be completed within sixty (60) calendar days of award, and its costs are included in the base year NTE ceiling. Source code, repositories, documentation, runbooks, backlog, and security artifacts are provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in, not before award.
186.	Can USAC confirm whether complete source code repositories, technical documentation, runbooks, and architecture artifacts from the incumbent will be made available to the new Contractor at or before contract award?	No. Source code repositories, technical documentation, runbooks, and architecture artifacts are provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in, not at or before award.
187.	Will USAC provide existing SSPs, POA&Ms, ATO documentation, and prior security assessment reports to the new Contractor during the transition-in period?	Yes. USAC will provide the current System Security Plan, POA&M, and ATO documentation to the Contractor during transition-in. USAC IT Security retains ownership of these artifacts and continues to oversee compliance.

Q#	Question	Answer
188.	The RFP specifies a team of 7-9 resources. The labor categories listed total 7 Key Personnel. Can USAC clarify whether Offerors may propose additional non-Key Personnel roles (e.g., Junior Developers, additional QA resources) beyond the 7 specified categories?	Price every labor category listed on Attachment 1. The seven roles in Section B.7 are the Key Personnel positions that must be staffed and maintained throughout performance. Offerors may propose additional non-Key labor categories where their staffing model requires them, with the rationale described in Volume 2.
189.	Several roles require ServiceNow certifications to be verified within 60 days of award. If a proposed candidate's certification is pending at proposal submission, will USAC accept a certification plan in lieu of completed certification evidence?	Yes. A certification plan is acceptable where a proposed candidate's certification is pending at submission. The certification must be verified and provided to USAC within sixty (60) calendar days of award.
190.	The Senior Java Developer IV role specifies 'Experience developing and maintaining the Eligibility and Integration Engine (EIE) or comparable AWS-hosted back-end services.' Does USAC consider experience with comparable AWS-hosted Java/Spring Boot back-end services fully equivalent to direct EIE experience, or will direct EIE experience be scored higher?	Comparable AWS hosted Java and Spring Boot back-end experience meets the stated qualification. USAC will evaluate the depth and relevance of the experience described rather than crediting direct EIE experience alone.
191.	The RFP requires background checks for all Contractor Staff. Can USAC specify the required level of investigation (e.g., NACI, MBI, BI) and the expected timeline for adjudication?	All Contractor Staff receive a background check. Staff accessing systems designated as federal systems of records, which include the National Verifier and NLAD, must also complete Role-Based Privacy Act Training before access is granted. No federal suitability determination, PIV or CAC credential, or security clearance is required for this Contract.
192.	Are all proposed Key Personnel required to be available at contract award, or may they be hired after award within a specified onboarding window?	Identify Key Personnel by name in the proposal and plan for them to be available at contract start. Any change before or after award is governed by Section C.20.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
193.	Is there an anticipated average staffing level or historical labor-hour utilization for CLIN 0001 that USAC can share?	USAC does not provide historical labor hours or an estimated annual hours basis. The quantities in Section B.7 are estimates for pricing only and do not constitute guaranteed minimums. Offerors should propose the hours their staffing model requires and state the annual hours assumption used on Attachment 1.
194.	Can USAC provide historical annual labor hours by labor category under the current contract to support accurate pricing?	USAC does not provide historical labor hours or an estimated annual hours basis. The quantities in Section B.7 are estimates for pricing only and do not constitute guaranteed minimums. Offerors should propose the hours their staffing model requires and state the annual hours assumption used on Attachment 1.
195.	Are commitment letters required for proposed Key Personnel?	Commitment letters are not required. Resumes for all Key Personnel are required as Attachment A to Volume 2, no longer than two (2) pages each.
196.	Can USAC clarify whether the two-day per week in-office requirement applies from Day 1 of the contract, or only after the transition-in period is complete?	All work must be performed in the United States by personnel authorized to work in the United States, and all Contractor Staff are subject to a background check. USAC is willing to review all reasonable staffing models proposed by Offerors.
197.	Are there any labor categories that may perform work fully remotely?	All work must be performed in the United States by personnel authorized to work in the United States, and all Contractor Staff are subject to a background check. USAC is willing to review all reasonable staffing models proposed by Offerors.
198.	Can USAC provide the current ServiceNow version/release running in production and the target version for the first family upgrade?	The NV instance currently runs on ServiceNow Yokohama and will be upgraded to ServiceNow Australia by the end of the calendar year.
199.	The current ServiceNow infrastructure includes 7 High Availability servers, 400 Fulfiller licenses, and 6 TB of additional storage. Is USAC expecting the new Contractor to maintain this exact infrastructure footprint, or may the Contractor propose an optimized configuration under CLIN 0002?	The page 14 figures describe the current environment and are the basis for CLIN 0002 pricing. Offerors may propose an optimized configuration that delivers equivalent capability and performance, with the rationale stated in Volume 2. Any change requires USAC approval.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
200.	For CLIN 0002 (ServiceNow Platform Hosting & Licenses), can USAC confirm the current annual cost of the ServiceNow subscription and hosting to help Offerors develop accurate FFP pricing?	USAC is not disclosing the current annual ServiceNow subscription or hosting cost.
201.	Will USAC provide current ServiceNow subscription details, licensing model, and renewal dates to support CLIN 0002 pricing?	USAC is not disclosing the incumbent's subscription details, licensing model, or renewal dates.
202.	Will USAC provide current ServiceNow product SKUs, modules, and plugin inventory to support CLIN 0002 pricing?	USAC is not releasing SKU level subscription details during the solicitation period. Price CLIN 0002 using the environment and license counts shown on page 14 of the RFP. Full entitlement detail will be shared with the awarded Contractor.
203.	Are there any planned ServiceNow family upgrades already scheduled during the first contract year?	The Contractor is responsible for two ServiceNow family release upgrades per contract year. The current release is Yokohama, with an upgrade to Australia planned by the end of the calendar year. Upgrade timing in the base year will be planned with USAC after award.
204.	Should Offerors assume the entire ServiceNow hosting and licensing cost beginning on Day 1 of contract performance, or will there be a phased assumption from the incumbent?	Price CLIN 0002 as a full annual cost beginning at contract start. If the transfer from the incumbent occurs partway through the base year, USAC and the Contractor will reconcile the base year amount.
205.	Can USAC clarify the current size of the NV application in terms of approximate number of custom ServiceNow applications, integrations, and active users to help Offerors accurately scope their teams?	USAC does not provide additional system or environment documentation during the solicitation period. Offerors should base their proposals on the information in the RFP. The baseline artifacts described in Section B.5.6 will be provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in.
206.	The architecture diagrams on pages 9-14 reference several systems (NLAD, LCS, UNIFI, EDS). Can USAC clarify which of these systems the Contractor will need to integrate with, versus which are managed entirely by USAC IT?	The Contractor maintains the NV and EIE interfaces to NLAD, LCS, UNIFI, and EDS. Those systems themselves are managed by USAC IT and sit outside the CLIN 0001 scope boundary shown in red on page 11.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
207.	The EIE components table indicates Java 1.8 is being upgraded to Version 25 and Spring Framework 5 to Framework 7. Are these upgrades currently in progress under the incumbent contract, or will the new Contractor be responsible for completing them?	Completing the Java and Spring upgrades are not within CLIN 0001 scope. The upgrades are expected to be completed prior to the start of the Contractor CLIN 0001 start date, thus should not be accounted for in the base year NTE.
208.	The RFP references USAC's designated project tracking tool (to be identified at kickoff). Can USAC share which tool is currently in use (e.g., Jira, Azure DevOps, ServiceNow ITSM) so Offerors can plan for integration?	USAC currently uses JIRA for agile delivery tracking.
209.	The RFP states USAC does not currently maintain a Contractor-accessible CI/CD pipeline. Can USAC confirm whether the Contractor will need to build the pipeline from scratch, or will the incumbent's pipeline infrastructure be transitioned?	USAC provides the tool chain and licensing. The Contractor builds and operates the NV and EIE pipeline on that toolchain in coordination with USAC's Information Systems division. The incumbent's pipeline infrastructure does not transfer.
210.	Can USAC specify which SAST/DAST tools are currently approved or preferred within the USAC environment (e.g., Fortify, SonarQube, Checkmarx, Veracode)?	USAC provides the approved security scanning tooling and the associated licensing and operational support. The specific tools will be identified at kickoff.
211.	Can USAC provide the current application inventory, interface inventory, and API documentation for both NV and EIE?	USAC does not provide additional system or environment documentation during the solicitation period. Offerors should base their proposals on the information in the RFP. The baseline artifacts described in Section B.5.6 will be provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in.
212.	What is the approximate size of the existing application codebase and repository (e.g., lines of code, number of ServiceNow update sets, number of Java modules)?	USAC does not provide additional system or environment documentation during the solicitation period. Offerors should base their proposals on the information in the RFP. The baseline artifacts described in Section B.5.6 will be provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in.
213.	Does USAC currently use a preferred source code repository (e.g., Azure DevOps, GitHub Enterprise, GitLab, Bitbucket)?	USAC provides the source control platform and the associated licensing. The specific platform and access model will be confirmed at kickoff.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
214.	Will USAC provide existing security scanning tools, or is the Contractor expected to procure all DevSecOps tooling independently?	USAC provides security scanning tools and licensing. The Contractor is not expected to procure the DevSecOps toolchain independently.
215.	Will the Contractor receive administrative access to the AWS environment supporting the EIE, or will access be limited to specific roles/permissions managed by USAC IT?	AWS access is role based and managed by USAC IT. The Contractor receives the permissions needed to operate and support the EIE application and integration tiers. Full account administrative rights are not granted.
216.	Are lower environments (Dev/Test/UAT) currently synchronized through automated deployment pipelines or manual processes?	Current lower environment refresh and deployment practices will be covered in knowledge transfer during transition-in. Establishing automated deployment across environments is part of the DevSecOps scope in Section B.5.3.
217.	For P1 incidents requiring 24x7 support, does USAC expect dedicated on-call staffing, or is an on-call rotation with pager/phone escalation acceptable? Will on-call hours outside core business hours be billable under the T&M NTE ceiling?	An on-call rotation with pager or phone escalation is acceptable. Dedicated after hours staffing is not required. On-call hours worked outside core business hours are billable at the Attachment 1 rates within the annual NTE.
218.	Can USAC provide the historical volume of P1 and P2 incidents over the past 12 months to help Offerors right-size their production support team?	USAC does not provide additional system or environment documentation during the solicitation period. Offerors should base their proposals on the information in the RFP. The baseline artifacts described in Section B.5.6 will be provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in.
219.	Can USAC provide historical SLA performance metrics and incident volumes for the last 12 months?	USAC does not provide additional system or environment documentation during the solicitation period. Offerors should base their proposals on the information in the RFP. The baseline artifacts described in Section B.5.6 will be provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
220.	Approximately how many P1, P2, P3, and P4 incidents are reported annually?	USAC does not provide additional system or environment documentation during the solicitation period. Offerors should base their proposals on the information in the RFP. The baseline artifacts described in Section B.5.6 will be provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in.
221.	The RFP notes that up to two (2) additional ServiceNow-based systems may be added during the Contract Term. Will the addition of new systems result in an adjustment to the annual NTE ceiling for CLIN 0001, or are Offerors expected to absorb this scope within the proposed pricing?	USAC has not identified specific candidate systems or timing. If systems are added, the scope, staffing, and pricing will be handled through a contract modification or the Added Services process in Section C.38. Do not include this work in base pricing.
222.	The RFP references SAFe (Scaled Agile Framework) including PI Planning. Can USAC clarify how many Agile Release Trains (ARTs) or teams are involved in the broader Lifeline portfolio, and how the NV scrum team integrates into the SAFe structure?	The NV team participates in PI planning and the SAFe ceremonies described in Section B.5.14, with USAC Program Manager participation in reviews and planning sessions. The broader Lifeline portfolio currently comprises one Agile Release Train (ART) with two teams, including the NV team.
223.	The Definition of Done requires minimum 80% unit test coverage. Does this threshold apply to both ServiceNow (SAIL/JavaScript) code and Java/Spring Boot code in the EIE, or only to one platform?	The 80 percent threshold applies to custom code, which includes EIE Java and Spring Boot code and scripted ServiceNow logic. Configuration delivered without custom code is validated through automated functional and regression testing.
224.	What is the average sprint cadence and average story throughput under the current Agile delivery model?	USAC does not provide additional system or environment documentation during the solicitation period. Offerors should base their proposals on the information in the RFP. The baseline artifacts described in Section B.5.6 will be provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in.

Q#	Question	Answer
225.	Are there any planned FISMA audits or security assessments during the base period that the Contractor should plan for?	Yes. USAC performs an annual FISMA compliance assessment that requires the Contractor to gather evidence, provide documentation, and participate in interviews. USAC also conducts periodic penetration testing through a separate contract. USAC provides an ISSO to write the security plans, with Contractor support, and to run annual contingency plan training.
226.	CLIN 0003 is a 4-month FFP effort commencing after 6 months of DME services. Can USAC confirm whether the CLIN 0003 team will be drawn from the same CLIN 0001 scrum team, or whether Offerors should plan for a separate, dedicated Discovery team?	Offerors may draw the Discovery team from the CLIN 0001 team, add dedicated Discovery resources, or use a combination. CLIN 0003 effort must be priced and billed separately from CLIN 0001.
227.	The Discovery scope includes NLAD, RAD, and LDS — systems not within the CLIN 0001 DME scope. Will USAC provide Contractor access to these systems, their codebases, and their respective development/operations teams during the Discovery phase?	USAC will provide access, documentation, and stakeholder support for NLAD, RAD, and LDS as needed to meet the Discovery objectives, consistent with USAC security policy. Access to production data is not part of the Discovery scope.
228.	The RFP asks the Contractor to assess and recommend AI/ML, OCR, and NLP capabilities on a design-only basis. Should the Offeror's technical proposal include a preliminary AI/ML strategy, or is USAC expecting this to be developed entirely during the CLIN 0003 Discovery phase?	Describe your approach, methodology, and relevant experience in Volume 2. The detailed assessment and recommendations are developed during the CLIN 0003 Discovery phase.
229.	The BPO volume/cost analysis requires data on current manual-review and contact-center volumes and costs. Will USAC provide this operational data to the Contractor, or is the Contractor expected to gather it independently through stakeholder interviews?	USAC will provide the manual review and contact center volume and cost data it holds. The Contractor supplements that data through stakeholder interviews and workshops.
230.	Will USAC identify and make available business stakeholders for workshops and discovery sessions, or is the Contractor responsible for identifying and scheduling these engagements?	USAC will identify and make available the business stakeholders for workshops and discovery sessions. The Contractor is responsible for scheduling and running them under the approved Discovery Project Plan.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
231.	Are any modernization recommendations expected to include cloud migration beyond the current ServiceNow and AWS platforms (e.g., Azure, GCP)?	USAC expects a platform neutral alternatives analysis. Recommendations must align with USAC's enterprise architecture standards, security requirements, and cloud strategy, and should account for the current ServiceNow and AWS investments.
232.	Is there an established approval process or governance board for evaluating AI/ML recommendations produced under CLIN 0003?	AI and ML recommendations produced under CLIN 0003 are reviewed through USAC's ARB and ERB process and against USAC's Secure and Trustworthy Artificial Intelligence Policy. Any production use requires USAC's prior written approval.
233.	Deliverable #12 (Monthly Status Report) requires EVM reporting with PV, EV, and CPI/SPI metrics. For a T&M contract, can USAC clarify the EVM baseline — will USAC provide a performance measurement baseline, or is the Contractor expected to establish one based on sprint commitments?	USAC will not provide a performance measurement baseline. The Contractor establishes the baseline in its Integrated Master Schedule, at the release and sprint level, and agrees it with the USAC Program Manager at kickoff.
234.	The RFP states all rates shall be fully loaded. Can USAC confirm whether the fully loaded rates should include the cost of ServiceNow certifications, secure coding training, and USAC-required security training, or whether those costs are borne separately?	Yes. All rates are fully loaded and include ServiceNow certification costs, secure coding training, and USAC required security and privacy training. USAC will not reimburse these separately.
235.	For the Bid Sheet, can USAC provide the estimated annual hours per labor category for the base year and each option year to ensure pricing consistency across Offerors?	USAC does not provide historical labor hours or an estimated annual hours basis. The quantities in Section B.7 are estimates for pricing only and do not constitute guaranteed minimums. Offerors should propose the hours their staffing model requires and state the annual hours assumption used on Attachment 1.
236.	For CLIN 0001 (T&M with annual NTE), can USAC provide the estimated annual NTE ceiling amount or a range for the base year to help Offerors develop realistic pricing?	USAC is not providing an estimated NTE ceiling or range for the base year.

Q#	Question	Answer
237.	Is any data migration or historical data conversion anticipated under this contract?	No data migration or historical data conversion is anticipated under CLIN 0001 or CLIN 0002 beyond any activity required to transfer the ServiceNow instance under CLIN 0002. Migration associated with a future modernized solution is an estimating item within the CLIN 0003 cost model, not work performed under this Contract.
238.	Is USAC open to Offerors proposing teaming arrangements or subcontractor partnerships for specialized capabilities (e.g., ServiceNow platform expertise, AWS DevSecOps engineering), provided the prime contractor maintains overall management responsibility?	Yes. Subcontracting and teaming are permitted and require USAC's prior written consent under Section C.9. Describe the arrangement, the firms involved, and how subcontractor rates are determined in Volume 2.
239.	The RFP asks Offerors to submit separate Bid Sheets for scenarios with and without AI. Should the Technical Approach narrative also include separate sections addressing the with-AI and without-AI scenarios, or is a single narrative with an AI subsection sufficient?	A single technical narrative with a clearly identified AI section is sufficient. Separate with-AI and without-AI narratives are not required.
240.	The RFP requires at least 3 current or recently completed contracts no older than 3 years. Can contracts currently in their option years that originated more than 3 years ago but have active option year performance within the 3-year window be considered?	Yes. A contract in its option years that originated more than three years ago qualifies where performance occurred within the last three years. Describe the recent performance period in the reference.
241.	Will USAC accept past performance references from subcontractors or teaming partners proposed for this effort, in addition to references from the prime Offeror?	Yes. Past performance from proposed subcontractors or teaming partners may be submitted in addition to the prime Offeror's references and will be evaluated under Section E.7.1.2.
242.	USAC plans to post Q&A responses by August 14, 2026. Will Offerors be notified when the Q&A document is published, and where on the USAC website will it be posted?	The Q&A responses and if required a revised RFP will be posted on USAC’s Procurement page. Here is the link to the Procurement page: https://www.usac.org/about/procurement. USAC does not issue individual notifications.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
243.	Are resumes required only for Key Personnel, or for all proposed labor categories?	Resumes are required only for Key Personnel. Submit them as Attachment A to Volume 2, no longer than two (2) pages each. Resumes are excluded from the Volume 2 page limit.
244.	Are customer references limited to projects of similar size and complexity, or will broader IT modernization experience be considered relevant?	References should be for services similar in scope to the work in Section B. Broader IT modernization experience may be included, and USAC will assess its relevance, recency, and quality under Section E.7.1.2.
245.	Attachment 1 (Bid Sheet) and Attachment 2 (Confidentiality Agreement) are noted as 'Attached Separately.' Can USAC confirm these documents are available for download, and if so, where? We have not located them with the RFP document.	Attachment 1, the Bid Sheet, and Attachment 2, the USAC Confidentiality Agreement, are posted with the RFP on the USAC procurement page at usac.org/about/procurement.
246.	The RFP states that Volume 1 "may not exceed four (5) pages." Please confirm whether the maximum page limit for Volume 1 – Corporate Information is four (4) pages or five (5) pages.	The maximum page limit for Volume 1 – Corporate Information is five (5) pages. A revised RFP has been posted to correct the typographical text.
247.	The RFP states that Volume 2 "may not thirty (25) pages." Please confirm that the intended maximum page limit for Volume 2 – Technical Capability is twenty-five (25) pages, excluding Attachment A – Resumes.	The Technical Volume page limit is thirty-five (35) pages, excluding Attachment A resumes. A revised, redlined version of the RFP has been posted to clarify this requirement and correct the typographical text.
248.	Section E.1.A permits Offerors to identify exceptions in a separate "Exceptions to RFP Terms" attachment and states that material exceptions *may* render an Offeror ineligible for award. Section E.6.B.2 states that offers containing exceptions to any requirement, term, or condition will be technically unacceptable and ineligible for award. Please clarify whether any exceptions may be submitted and considered, or whether Offerors must accept all RFP requirements, terms, and conditions without exception to remain eligible for award.	Offerors may submit a separate "Exceptions to RFP Terms" attachment under Section E.1.A. Material exceptions may be considered unacceptable and may render the Offeror ineligible for award. Offerors are encouraged to take no exceptions.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
249.	The minimum qualifications for the ServiceNow Senior Developer IV and III reference “ServiceNow SAIL Code,” and the Senior Developer IV qualifications reference “Records, Reports, Tasks, Sites, CDTs, Process Models, Integrations, Connected Systems, [and] Data Stores.” Please confirm whether these terms are intended to describe ServiceNow technologies/capabilities, and if so, please clarify the specific ServiceNow technologies or competencies USAC intends Offerors to demonstrate.	The National Verifier portal is configured and hosted on ServiceNow. The Appian labor category titles on Attachment 1, and the Appian specific terminology in the Section B.7 qualifications (SAIL, CDTs, Sites, Process Models, Connected Systems, Data Stores), are legacy text carried over in error. Read them as the equivalent ServiceNow competencies and price the ServiceNow roles described in Section B.7.
250.	The RFP identifies certain ServiceNow certifications as “strongly preferred” or “desired” while also stating that certifications for proposed personnel whose certifications are pending must be verified and provided within sixty (60) calendar days of Contract award. Please clarify which ServiceNow certifications, if any, are mandatory for each Key Personnel position within sixty (60) calendar days of award, as opposed to certifications that are solely preferred or desired.	No. ServiceNow certification is a mandatory minimum qualification. Certifications are stated as preferred, desired, or strongly preferred. Where an Offeror proposes personnel who hold or are pursuing a certification, it must be verified within sixty (60) calendar days of award.
251.	The RFP states that USAC presently has a hybrid work approach requiring Contractor Staff to be in the USAC office at least two (2) days per week. Please clarify whether this requirement applies to all Contractor Staff assigned to the Contract, only Key Personnel, or only personnel specifically designated by USAC as requiring onsite presence.	All work must be performed in the United States by personnel authorized to work in the United States, and all Contractor Staff are subject to a background check. USAC is willing to review all reasonable staffing models proposed by Offerors.
252.	For purposes of staffing and pricing, please confirm whether the two-day-per-week onsite requirement is expected to remain in effect throughout the full Contract term, including option years, or whether USAC anticipates allowing particular roles or workstreams to be performed fully remotely.	All work must be performed in the United States by personnel authorized to work in the United States, and all Contractor Staff are subject to a background check. USAC is willing to review all reasonable staffing models proposed by Offerors.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
253.	Will USAC require the incumbent Contractor to participate in the identified joint working sessions, code walkthroughs, documentation reviews, and shadowing activities, and will USAC provide the selected Contractor with access to the incumbent's existing technical, operational, and system documentation at the start of transition?	USAC will facilitate reasonable coordination with the incumbent during the transition period, as stated in Section B.1. Transition-in must be completed within sixty (60) calendar days of award, and its costs are included in the base year NTE ceiling. Source code, repositories, documentation, runbooks, backlog, and security artifacts are provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in, not before award.
254.	The RFP states that up to two (2) additional ServiceNow-based systems may be added during the Contract Term. Please clarify how the addition of these systems would be scoped, staffed, and priced, including whether work associated with them would remain within the existing CLIN 0001 annual NTE ceiling or result in an adjustment to the Contract/NTE ceiling.	USAC has not identified specific candidate systems or timing. If systems are added, the scope, staffing, and pricing will be handled through a contract modification or the Added Services process in Section C.38. Do not include this work in base pricing.
255.	For CLIN 0002, please provide the specific ServiceNow product/SKU and license types associated with the required 400 Fulfiller licenses and confirm whether any additional ServiceNow subscription products, modules, or license types are currently used by the National Verifier environment and must be included in the Offeror's pricing.	USAC is not releasing SKU level subscription details during the solicitation period. Price CLIN 0002 using the environment and license counts shown on page 14 of the RFP. Full entitlement detail will be shared with the awarded Contractor.
256.	The RFP requires ownership of the ServiceNow instance and licenses to be held in, or transferable to, USAC's name. Please clarify the anticipated contractual/licensing relationship among USAC, the selected Contractor, and ServiceNow, including whether USAC expects the selected Contractor to act as the reseller of record for the ServiceNow licenses.	Under CLIN 0002 the Contractor acquires, provisions, funds, and administers the ServiceNow instance and Fulfiller licenses and bills USAC the annual fixed price. The subscription must be held in USAC's name or be fully assignable to USAC, so that ownership of the instance, data, configurations, and licenses, together with the right to administer them, transfers to USAC or its designee on expiration, termination, or transition. USAC expects an administrative transfer of the existing instance rather than a technical migration where ServiceNow permits it, and USAC will support the transfer activities during transition-in.

Q#	Question	Answer
257.	Please provide the current ServiceNow subscription/renewal dates, existing license term, and any other information Offerors should use to account for the transition of ServiceNow hosting and licenses from the incumbent Contractor when pricing CLIN 0002.	USAC does not disclose the incumbent's subscription or renewal dates. Under CLIN 0002 the Contractor acquires, provisions, funds, and administers the ServiceNow instance and Fulfiller licenses and bills USAC the annual fixed price. The subscription must be held in USAC's name or be fully assignable to USAC, so that ownership of the instance, data, configurations, and licenses, together with the right to administer them, transfers to USAC or its designee on expiration, termination, or transition. USAC expects an administrative transfer of the existing instance rather than a technical migration where ServiceNow permits it, and USAC will support the transfer activities during transition-in.
258.	Please confirm whether USAC will consider past performance involving comparable ServiceNow/AWS, eligibility, or regulated/FISMA environments even when the project did not specifically support the Lifeline Program or National Verifier.	Yes. Comparable ServiceNow, AWS, eligibility determination, or FISMA regulated environment experience will be considered. Direct Lifeline or National Verifier experience is not required.
259.	The RFP states that the proposal should include separate versions of Attachment 1 – Bid Sheet for scenarios with and without the use of AI. If an Offeror proposes no use of AI in performing the Services, please confirm whether the Offeror is required to submit only the non-AI Bid Sheet or must still submit two versions of Attachment 1.	If the Offeror proposes no use of AI, submit only the non-AI Bid Sheet and state that clearly in Volume 2. Two versions are not required.
260.	Please clarify whether commercially available AI capabilities embedded within the ServiceNow platform but not enabled or used by the Contractor need to be identified as proposed AI use or priced separately in the AI version of Attachment 1.	Commercially available AI capabilities embedded in the ServiceNow platform that are not enabled or used do not need to be identified or priced. Identify and price any capability the Offeror intends to enable or use.

Q#	Question	Answer
261.	Section C.22 requires Contractor to maintain insurance in amounts required by law or appropriate for the industry but does not specify minimum coverage limits. Please identify the minimum required coverage limits for workers' compensation/employer's liability, commercial general liability, commercial crime, automobile liability, professional/errors and omissions liability, cyber liability, and excess/umbrella insurance that the successful Contractor will be required to maintain.	USAC is not prescribing minimum limits in this RFP. Contractors shall maintain coverage in amounts required by law or appropriate for industry, whichever is greater, as stated in Section C.22.
262.	Please confirm that qualifications identified as "strongly preferred," "desired," or "preferred" in the Key Personnel minimum-qualification table are evaluation preferences rather than mandatory minimum qualifications that must be met for an Offeror to be considered technically acceptable.	Confirmed. Qualifications identified as strongly preferred, desired, or preferred are evaluation preferences, not mandatory minimum qualifications.
263.	Please identify the specific background investigation requirements applicable to Contractor Staff accessing the National Verifier, NLAD, or other USAC systems designated as federal systems of records, including any citizenship, residency, personnel-security, or clearance requirements that Offerors should consider when proposing personnel.	All Contractor Staff receive a background check. Staff accessing systems designated as federal systems of records, which include the National Verifier and NLAD, must also complete Role-Based Privacy Act Training before access is granted. No federal suitability determination, PIV or CAC credential, or security clearance is required for this Contract.
264.	Please confirm that the correct solicitation number is IT-26-113 and that the repeated reference to IT-26-131 in the RFP page footers is a typographical error.	IT-26-113 is the correct solicitation number. Use only "RFP IT-26-113" in the email subject line. The IT-26-131 reference in the page footer was a typographical error. A revised RFP is posted.
265.	Please confirm the applicable page limits for Volume 1 and Volume 2. The RFP states that Volume 1 may not exceed "four (5)" pages and Volume 2 "may not thirty (25)" pages.	The applicable page limits are five (5) pages for Volume 1 and thirty-five (35) pages for Volume 2, excluding resumes. A revised, redlined RFP has been posted to officially correct these typographical errors.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
266.	Section E allows Offerors to identify deviations or exceptions in a separate attachment, while the RFP also states that offers containing exceptions will be technically unacceptable. Please confirm whether any exceptions are permitted and, if so, how they will be evaluated.	Offerors may submit a separate "Exceptions to RFP Terms" attachment under Section E.1.A. Material exceptions may be considered unacceptable and may render the Offeror ineligible for award. USAC will review non-material exceptions at its discretion.
267.	The RFP requests separate versions of Attachment 1 – Bid Sheet for scenarios with and without AI, while AI implementation or deployment requires prior written USAC approval. Please clarify what AI scope and assumptions Offerors should price in the "with AI" scenario.	Price the AI scenario to include AI product and license costs, implementation effort, security and authorization activity, governance and approval effort, testing, monitoring, and ongoing operations. State the assumptions in Volume 2 and Volume 4. USAC will use the Bid Sheet that matches the proposed technical approach as the basis for the evaluated price.
268.	Please confirm whether the National Verifier portal is implemented entirely on ServiceNow. The RFP includes Appian-specific terminology such as SAIL, CDTs, Sites, Process Models, Connected Systems, and BPM/Appian labor categories.	The National Verifier portal is configured and hosted on ServiceNow. The Appian labor category titles on Attachment 1, and the Appian specific terminology in the Section B.7 qualifications (SAIL, CDTs, Sites, Process Models, Connected Systems, Data Stores), are legacy text carried over in error. Read them as the equivalent ServiceNow competencies and price the ServiceNow roles described in Section B.7.
269.	Please clarify which labor categories must be proposed and priced. Section B identifies seven Key Personnel roles and notes a typical Scrum team of seven to nine resources, while Attachment 1 lists eleven labor categories.	Price every labor category listed on Attachment 1. The seven roles in Section B.7 are the Key Personnel positions that must be staffed and maintained throughout performance. Offerors may propose additional non-Key labor categories where their staffing model requires them, with the rationale described in Volume 2.
270.	Please provide the estimated annual hours by labor category that USAC intends to use for price evaluation, or confirm that Offerors are expected to independently propose the hours for each labor category in Attachment 1.	USAC does not provide historical labor hours or an estimated annual hours basis. The quantities in Section B.7 are estimates for pricing only and do not constitute guaranteed minimums. Offerors should propose the hours their staffing model requires and state the annual hours assumption used on Attachment 1.

Q#	Question	Answer
271.	Please clarify how the two Technical Manager labor categories in Attachment 1—Production Support Lead and Development Manager—map to the Technical Development Manager role identified in the RFP.	The two Technical Manager entries on Attachment 1 correspond to the single Technical Development Manager role in Section B.7 and to a production support lead position that is not designated Key Personnel. Price both as listed on Attachment 1.
272.	Please confirm whether all listed labor categories are expected to be continuously staffed during the Base Year and Option Years, or whether staffing levels will vary based on authorized task demand within the annual NTE.	Staff will vary with authorized task demand within the annual NTE. USAC expects the Key Personnel roles in Section B.7 to be staffed continuously throughout the Base Year and each Option Year exercised.
273.	Please confirm whether the successful Contractor is expected to assume or transfer the existing ServiceNow subscription and instance currently provided by the incumbent, or procure a new dedicated ServiceNow subscription and instance for USAC.	Under CLIN 0002 the Contractor acquires, provisions, funds, and administers the ServiceNow instance and Fulfiller licenses and bills USAC the annual fixed price. The subscription must be held in USAC's name or be fully assignable to USAC, so that ownership of the instance, data, configurations, and licenses, together with the right to administer them, transfers to USAC or its designee on expiration, termination, or transition. USAC expects an administrative transfer of the existing instance rather than a technical migration where ServiceNow permits it, and USAC will support the transfer activities during transition-in.
274.	Please confirm that CLIN 0002 requires a dedicated USAC ServiceNow instance/subscription rather than use of a Contractor-owned shared tenant, and clarify whether the subscription must be established directly in USAC's name or may initially be held by the Contractor provided it is fully assignable to USAC.	CLIN 0002 requires a dedicated USAC ServiceNow instance and subscription. A Contractor owned shared tenant is not acceptable. The subscription may be established directly in USAC's name or held by the Contractor provided it is fully assignable to USAC without restriction.
275.	Please provide the current ServiceNow product/edition, applicable subscription SKUs, and licensed capabilities supporting the National Verifier, including any entitlements in addition to the 400 Fulfiller licenses identified in the RFP.	USAC is not releasing SKU level subscription details during the solicitation period. Price CLIN 0002 using the environment and license counts shown on page 14 of the RFP. Full entitlement detail will be shared with the awarded Contractor.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
276.	Please clarify whether the listed Development, Test, Integration, Pre-Production, and Production entries represent separate ServiceNow instances/environments, and explain how the seven "High Availability Servers" relate to these environments.	The seven entries represent separate ServiceNow instances by environment: two Development, two Test, one Integration, one Pre-Production, and one Production.
277.	Please confirm whether the stated 6 TB is additional storage above standard ServiceNow subscription storage and provide the current storage utilization and expected annual growth, if available.	The 6 TB shown on page 14 is storage in addition to the base subscription entitlement. See response to Question 80
278.	If a new ServiceNow subscription or instance must be provisioned, please confirm whether migration of the existing National Verifier application, data, configurations, integrations, and security settings is included within the transition scope and Base Year NTE.	If a new subscription or instance must be provisioned, the associated migration of the National Verifier application, data, configurations, integrations, and security settings is within the transition scope and the base year NTE ceiling.
279.	For estimation purposes, please provide approximate counts for the current National Verifier ServiceNow implementation, including custom tables, workflows/flows, business rules/scripts, integrations/interfaces, scheduled jobs, reports/dashboards, and automated test cases that are in scope for ongoing support.	USAC does not provide additional system or environment documentation during the solicitation period. Offerors should base their proposals on the information in the RFP. The baseline artifacts described in Section B.5.6 will be provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in.
280.	Please provide the approximate current backlog size and typical monthly or quarterly volume of user stories, enhancements, defects, and regulatory/FCC-driven changes expected under CLIN 0001.	USAC does not provide additional system or environment documentation during the solicitation period. Offerors should base their proposals on the information in the RFP. The baseline artifacts described in Section B.5.6 will be provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in.
281.	Please provide historical production incident volumes by priority (P1–P4), including the approximate number of P1 and P2 incidents during the most recent 12 months.	USAC does not provide additional system or environment documentation during the solicitation period. Offerors should base their proposals on the information in the RFP. The baseline artifacts described in Section B.5.6 will be provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
282.	Please provide the approximate number of active interfaces/integrations currently supported by the National Verifier and EIE, including state/federal eligibility sources, NLAD, S3/attachments, reporting systems, and other internal or external systems. Detailed interface documentation may be provided post-award if restricted.	USAC does not provide additional system or environment documentation during the solicitation period. Offerors should base their proposals on the information in the RFP. The baseline artifacts described in Section B.5.6 will be provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in.
283.	Please clarify the operational responsibility split between USAC and the Contractor for the AWS-hosted Eligibility and Integration Engine, including responsibility for EC2, RDS, S3, networking, load balancers, operating systems, middleware, database administration, backups, monitoring, patching, and capacity management.	The EIE runs in a USAC AWS account. USAC, IT retains the AWS account, networking, and underlying platform services. The Contractor is responsible for the application and integration tiers, middleware, application configuration, database administration for the EIE PostgreSQL databases, application monitoring, and application level patching, working with USAC IT. The detailed responsibility matrix will be confirmed at kickoff.
284.	Please provide the current status and expected completion dates of the identified Java/Spring upgrades, including Spring Framework 5 to 7 and Java 1.8 to Java 25, and clarify which remaining upgrade activities will be the responsibility of the successful Contractor.	Completing the Java and Spring upgrades are not within CLIN 0001 scope. The upgrades are expected to be completed prior to the start of the Contractor CLIN 0001 start date, thus should not be accounted for in the base year NTE.
285.	Please identify the source-code repository, CI/CD, SAST, DAST, software-composition analysis, dependency-scanning, secrets-management, artifact-management, and monitoring tools currently approved or used by USAC, and clarify which tool licenses the Contractor is expected to provide at its own cost.	USAC provides the DevSecOps toolchain along with licensing and operational support for those tools. The Contractor is responsible for building and operating the NV and EIE pipeline on that toolchain in coordination with USAC's Information Systems division. Specific tools and access will be confirmed at kickoff.
286.	Please provide the current level of automated regression coverage for the ServiceNow and EIE applications and identify the existing testing tools/frameworks that the successful Contractor will inherit and maintain.	Existing automated test assets and frameworks transfer to the incoming Contractor at transition-in. USAC does not provide current regression coverage figures during the solicitation period.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
287.	Please provide the current ATO status for the National Verifier and EIE, including the next planned assessment/renewal date and, at a summary level, the number of open POA&M items or Critical/High vulnerabilities expected to transfer to the successful Contractor.	The System Boundary is NV, which includes the EIE. NV is FISMA authorized and under continuous monitoring by USAC IT Security. USAC does not provide open POA&M or vulnerability counts during the solicitation period.
288.	Please clarify the personnel screening or background-investigation requirements for Contractor Staff who will access the National Verifier and NLAD, which are identified as federal systems of records, including whether any federal suitability, PIV/CAC, or other clearance requirement applies.	All Contractor Staff receive a background check. Staff accessing systems designated as federal systems of records, which include the National Verifier and NLAD, must also complete Role-Based Privacy Act Training before access is granted. No federal suitability determination, PIV or CAC credential, or security clearance is required for this Contract.
289.	Please clarify which Contractor roles are expected to work at USAC Headquarters at least two days per week. Does the hybrid requirement apply to the full delivery team or only designated Key Personnel/roles?	All work must be performed in the United States by personnel authorized to work in the United States, and all Contractor Staff are subject to a background check. USAC is willing to review all reasonable staffing models proposed by Offerors.
290.	Please confirm the level of incumbent support USAC expects to make available during the 60-day transition-in period, including access to source code, repositories, existing documentation, architecture/security artifacts, runbooks, backlog, ServiceNow administration, and scheduled knowledge-transfer sessions.	USAC will facilitate reasonable coordination with the incumbent during the transition period, as stated in Section B.1. Transition-in must be completed within sixty (60) calendar days of award, and its costs are included in the base year NTE ceiling. Source code, repositories, documentation, runbooks, backlog, and security artifacts are provided to the awarded Contractor during transition-in, not before award.
291.	The RFP states that up to two additional ServiceNow-based systems may be added during the Contract Term. Please confirm whether support for such additional systems would be added through a contract modification/task authorization with corresponding NTE adjustment, rather than absorbed within the original CLIN 0001 ceiling.	USAC has not identified specific candidate systems or timing. If systems are added, the scope, staffing, and pricing will be handled through a contract modification or the Added Services process in Section C.38. Do not include this work in base pricing.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
292.	For the fixed-price CLIN 0003 Discovery effort, please provide approximate counts of expected stakeholder groups/interviews/workshops and confirm that USAC will provide available architecture, requirements, process, volume, and cost documentation for NV, EIE, NLAD, RAD, LDS, and BPO operations.	USAC will provide the architecture, requirements, process, volume, and cost documentation it holds for NV, EIE, NLAD, RAD, LDS, and BPO operations. The number of stakeholder groups, interviews, and workshops is proposed by the Contractor in the Discovery Project Plan and agreed with USAC.
293.	Attachment 1 provides a single price field for CLIN 0003. Please confirm whether CLIN 0003 should be priced as a one-time fixed-price effort in the Base Year only, with no separate Option Year pricing.	Confirmed. CLIN 0003 is priced once as a one-time fixed price effort performed during the Base Year. Do not price it in the Option Years.
294.	Please clarify how USAC will evaluate the total price for award given that CLIN 0001 is T&M with an annual NTE while CLINs 0002 and 0003 are fixed price. Specifically, please confirm the evaluated quantity/hours and pricing basis that will be used for CLIN 0001.	USAC will evaluate the total proposed price for the Base Year and all four Option Years, comprising the extended CLIN 0001 labor pricing on Attachment 1 at the quantities and hours proposed, the annual CLIN 0002 fixed price, and the one-time CLIN 0003 fixed price.
295.	The Standard Terms require insurance appropriate for the industry but do not specify minimum coverage limits. Please provide the minimum required limits for general liability, professional/errors and omissions, cyber liability, automobile liability, crime coverage, and excess/umbrella insurance.	USAC is not prescribing minimum limits in this RFP. Contractors shall maintain coverage in amounts required by law or appropriate for industry, whichever is greater, as stated in Section C.22.

Q#	Question	Answer
296.	There is conflicting language in the RFP where some paragraphs reference “Managed Service”, while Paragraph 1 of Page 6 references “with ownership of such hosting infrastructure and user licenses to be held in … USAC’s name…” Can you confirm, is USAC requesting to own the licenses directly as GFE, or through a Managed Service where the winning entity owns the licenses and bills USAC for them? The current contract structure is via a Managed Service where the incumbent owns the licenses and associated configurations, etc.	Under CLIN 0002 the Contractor acquires, provisions, funds, and administers the ServiceNow instance and Fulfiller licenses and bills USAC the annual fixed price. The subscription must be held in USAC's name or be fully assignable to USAC, so that ownership of the instance, data, configurations, and licenses, together with the right to administer them, transfers to USAC or its designee on expiration, termination, or transition. USAC expects an administrative transfer of the existing instance rather than a technical migration where ServiceNow permits it, and USAC will support the transfer activities during transition-in.

Universal Service Administrative Co.

Q#	Question	Answer
297.	We noticed a few inconsistencies between Section B.5 through B.7 (Statement of Work) and Section 7 (Required Resources), on one hand, and Attachment 1, Tab 1 (CLIN0001 labor category pricing table), on the other: 1. Section 7 describes two ServiceNow developer roles (Senior Developer IV and Senior Developer III) as requiring the ability to "write complex ServiceNow SAIL Code." SAIL is a scripting language associated with the Appian platform; ServiceNow does not use SAIL. We assume this refers to ServiceNow's native scripting capabilities (Glide/JavaScript, Flow Designer) and will price and staff accordingly unless USAC advises otherwise. 2. Attachment 1, Tab 1 includes two labor categories labeled "BPM Engineer IV (Appian Lead Developer)" and "BPM Engineer III (Appian Developer)," along with a Database Specialist III (DBA), Java Developer III, and Java Developer II — none of which appear in the Section 7 Key Personnel table. Conversely, Section 7's ServiceNow Senior Developer IV and III roles do not appear on the Bid Sheet by name. Given the SOW's clear ServiceNow/Java/AWS technical scope, we plan to map our proposed labor categories to the Section 7 qualifications rather than the Attachment 1 titles and will identify this mapping explicitly as a labor category substitution in our technical proposal per the RFP's stated substitution provision.	1. Scripting Language: USAC confirms that the reference to "SAIL" was an error. The requirement refers to ServiceNow's native scripting capabilities, including JavaScript, Glide API, and Flow Designer. Bidders should price and staff based on native ServiceNow expertise. 2. Labor Category and Bid Sheet Alignment: The discrepancies between Section 7 and Attachment 1 are recognized. A revised Attachment 1 (Bid Sheet) has been posted to align exactly with the ServiceNow, Java, and AWS categories detailed in Section 7. Please download the updated Bid Sheet for your pricing volume. 3. Labor Category Substitution: Your approach to explicitly mapping your proposed labor categories to the Section 7 qualification standards is correct. Per the RFP's substitution provision, ensure this mapping is clearly identified and justified within your Volume 2 Technical Proposal.