Universal Service Administrative Co. (USAC)
RFP IT-26-148 – Enterprise Data Platform
Questions & Answers – 1st Revision

Q#	Question	Answer
1.	Whether a cloud-hosted data platform delivered together with managed data engineering services is within the intended scope of this RFP?	Yes. CLIN 0001 covers the cloud platform, and CLINs 0002 and 0003 cover implementation, migration, hypercare, and operations and maintenance services (Section B.1).
2.	For Volume 3, may an offeror use subcontract delivery references? If so, should total contract value mean NM2TECH's subcontract value, the prime contract value, or both? For a completed time-and-materials subcontract without a fixed ceiling, may final accepted invoiced value be used with an explanation of its basis?	The offeror may use its subcontract past performance with the subcontract value. The final accepted invoiced value may be used for a T&M subcontract without a ceiling.
3.	Section B.11 expresses a preference that Key Personnel be Contractor employees with three years of tenure, while Section C.1.N defines Key Personnel as full-time employees of Contractor. May proposed subcontractor employees fill named Key Personnel roles, and may newly hired prime employees qualify? Please distinguish eligibility requirements from evaluation preferences.	Under Section B.11, Key Personnel being employee of the contractor is a preference rather than a hard requirement. Therefore, offerors can propose personnel who meet the required qualification and experience for the designated role, irrespective of their exact tenure with the firm.
4.	Where roles overlap, may one qualified individual cover multiple named Key Personnel roles if the proposal demonstrates sufficient availability and workload capacity, or are distinct individuals required for all nine roles?	Yes. One individual may hold more than one Key Personnel role, and roles may be proposed at less than full time or by phase, as long as the proposal shows enough capacity and continuity.
5.	Volume 2 requests resumes as Attachment 3, while the published attachment list also labels the Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms as Attachment 3. Please confirm the required naming and packaging of these documents.	Submit resumes as a separate attachment labeled "Attachment 4: Key Personnel Resumes." Attachment 3 remains the Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms.
6.	Does USAC impose any minimum number of years in business, annual revenue, full-time employee count, or company size as a threshold for a prime Offeror? If not, please confirm that a recently established firm may compete as prime and that revenue, headcount, and operational capacity are evaluated as responsibility/risk factors rather than automatic pass/fail eligibility thresholds.	The RFP sets no numeric minimum for years in business, revenue, headcount or company size. USAC considers corporate metrics in the responsibility determination (Sections E.7.A.6 and E.12). A recently established firm may compete as prime, subject to the requirement for three prime past performance references (answer 10).
7.	Must the prime Offeror have an active SAM.gov registration and UEI at initial proposal submission, or may registration be completed prior to award? If the prime is undergoing registration, what evidence should it include with its proposal?	Each volume cover page must include the Offeror's Unique Entity ID (Section E.5), and an active SAM.gov registration is part of the responsibility determination (Section E.12).

Q#	Question	Answer
8.	In evaluating a prime Offeror's financial and operational capability, will USAC consider binding or award-contingent commitments from named subcontractors, a proposed platform OEM, available credit facilities, and a documented delivery/staffing plan? Please identify which evidence is acceptable and whether any financial guarantees are required.	See RFP section E.7 for proposal content, Section E.8 for proposal evaluation, and Section E.12 for additional capability requirements.
9.	May a small-business prime serve as a single accountable contracting entity while an authorized SaaS platform provider supplies CLIN 0001 and one or more specialist subcontractors perform CLIN 0002/0003? Are there any restrictions on this structure beyond the stated evaluation of subcontracting complexity, and should the proposed OEM or integrator be direct subcontractors?	Yes. A prime may serve as the single contracting party, with a platform provider supplying CLIN 0001 and subcontractors performing CLIN 0002 and CLIN 0003 services. All partners must be identified (Section E.7.A.2) and platform relationships disclosed (Section E.7.A.5). An OEM or provider/reseller that only supplies licenses does not count toward the two-subcontractor threshold.
10.	May a prime Offeror satisfy or strengthen the requested three comparable contract references with projects performed by specifically identified and committed subcontractors or joint-venture members? If so, how will USAC distinguish prime versus teammate performance and what commitment documentation is required?	Three past performance references are mandatory, and they must be the prime Offeror's own contracts. Contracts performed by subcontractors, teaming partners or the platform provider do not count toward the three. Proposals without three qualifying references will not be considered for further evaluation.
11.	For a newly formed prime without three corporate contract references, is providing fewer than three qualifying corporate references a proposal responsiveness failure or an evaluated past-performance risk? May the Offeror provide predecessor-entity or founder/key-personnel projects in a separately identified personnel-experience section without representing them as the Offeror's own contracts?	Three prime past performance references are mandatory. A proposal with fewer than three will not be considered for further evaluation. Founder or Key Personnel experience belongs in the resumes (Attachment 4) and does not count as the Offeror's organizational past performance.
12.	Will a reference for a comparable data-engineering, cloud migration, or platform operations work package be accepted as relevant even if that prior contract did not encompass the entire end-to-end Enterprise Data Platform scope? Please clarify whether multiple team-member references can collectively demonstrate coverage.	USAC evaluates relevance under Section E.8.2, so describe clearly how each reference relates to this scope (Section E.7.C.3.a). References from multiple team members cannot be combined, because all three must be the prime Offeror's own contracts.

Q#	Question	Answer
13.	May all nine required Key Personnel positions be staffed by named, committed subcontractor personnel or proposed award-contingent hires, rather than current employees of the prime Offeror? Please confirm that the preference for at least three years of employment with the Contractor is not a mandatory eligibility condition.	Please refer to answer 3.
14.	Will USAC accept key-personnel commitment letters or contingent employment/subcontract agreements at proposal time, with personnel beginning work at award? What minimum documentation is required to establish each named person's availability and enforceable commitment?	Yes, commitment letters or contingent employment or subcontract agreements are acceptable at proposal time, and the offeror may submit commitment letters or subcontract agreements to establish each named person's availability and enforceable commitment.
15.	How does USAC evaluate the "or equivalent" alternative to PMP, CISSP, and the example DevSecOps certifications? May offerors propose documented equivalent credentials and experience, or must these exact certifications be held by the named individual?	Section B.11.1 permits "or equivalent." Offerors may propose documented equivalent credentials and experience, and USAC will assess them under Section E.8.1.C.
16.	May a highly qualified individual fill more than one Key Personnel role where proposed level of effort, separation of duties, and backup coverage demonstrate no conflict? Must all additional labor-category personnel be individually named and have resumes at proposal submission, or only the nine Key Personnel?	Yes. One individual may hold more than one Key Personnel role, and roles may be proposed at less than full time or by phase, as long as the proposal shows enough capacity and continuity. Resumes are required only for the nine Key Personnel (Section E.7.B.15). Other personnel should be identified with their roles.
17.	Which positions, if any, must be physically present in Washington, DC at least two days per week rather than performing virtually? Will USAC accept a geographically distributed prime/subcontractor team with designated on-site personnel and a documented P1 escalation/on-call model?	The two-day-per-week onsite requirement applies to all Contractor Staff. USAC is willing to consider alternate staffing proposals, which offerors should describe in the technical proposal. A distributed team with designated onsite personnel may be proposed as an alternate staffing approach, provided it meets the P1 on-call and escalation requirements in Section B.9.1.
18.	The RFP requires identification of proposed partners and flags teams with more than two subcontractors for heightened review. Is this an evaluation concern rather than a categorical prohibition, and may an Offeror count the SaaS OEM as a supplier/licensor rather than a delivery subcontractor when the OEM is not performing services?	More than two subcontractors is allowed. Such proposals must include a coordination, management and risk mitigation plan (Section E.7.A.2) and will be closely reviewed (Section E.8.1.B). A SaaS OEM that only supplies licenses does not count as a subcontractor for this threshold.

Q#	Question	Answer
19.	Please confirm that an Offeror acting as prime need not itself be the FedRAMP-authorized cloud service provider, provided that the specific OEM-supplied platform offered under CLIN 0001 holds the required FedRAMP Moderate-or-higher authorization under the stipulated single authorization boundary at award and the prime contractually assumes responsibility for delivery.	Confirmed. The prime need not be the FedRAMP-authorized provider itself, provided the platform offered under CLIN 0001 meets Section B.6.1 and the prime takes contractual responsibility for delivery. Refer to answer 21 for the USAC-tenant option.
20.	The RFP requires authorization at the time of award but also requests a signed mandatory-compliance certification in the initial proposal. May an Offeror certify an OEM platform based on documented current authorized status and binding OEM assurances? How should an Offeror treat a requirement that is fully supported by the platform but only via a licensed native module or vendor-supported configuration?	Yes. The Mandatory Requirements Certification may rely on the platform's documented current authorization status, with supporting evidence cross-referenced for each requirement (Section E.7.B.3). A requirement met through a licensed native module or vendor-supported configuration is acceptable; identify it as separately licensed in the compliance matrix and Volume 4 (Sections B.7.1.6, E.7.B.4 and E.7.D.5).
21.	Please clarify which functions must reside within the single FedRAMP authorization boundary, versus which documented integrations may connect to USAC's existing Okta, Collibra, ESRI/ArcGIS, Tableau, Socrata, and other enterprise systems without causing the proposed core platform to be nonresponsive.	Collibra, Tableau, ArcGIS, Posit, Socrata and LLM endpoints may operate outside the core platform's authorization boundary as integrations. A vendor-managed SaaS offering must meet the FedRAMP Moderate (or higher) requirement in Sections B.6.1 and B.8.1.
22.	For native Change Data Capture, metadata lineage, geospatial analysis, and other mandatory capabilities, does "native platform functionality or vendor-supported configuration" include first-party OEM add-ons or OEM-supported integrations delivered as part of the same authorized offering? Please identify any mandatory functions that may not be met through such configurations.	Yes, if they are delivered within the same authorization boundary as the proposed offering (Section B.6).
23.	Do requirements that all USAC Data remain hosted in the United States and that certain individuals be "United States persons" apply to all proposed delivery staff, or only to personnel with access to specified production data, systems, or the POC live-data validation round? Please state any additional location or personnel eligibility rules for the prime and its subcontractors.	Yes. All contract services must be performed from within the United States and all contractor staff, including subcontractor staff and platform provider staff working under this contract including but not limited to primary, backup, and disaster recovery must be based in the United States.

Q#	Question	Answer
24.	May the prime use its platform OEM and named specialist subcontractors to execute the pre-award POC under the prime's management, including required secure-enclave access? Must the platform OEM be a party to a separate agreement with USAC for POC access?	Yes, the prime may use its platform OEM and named specialist subcontractors to execute the pre-award POC under the prime's management. However, USAC prefers to have contract relationship only with the prime and not separate agreements with each teaming partner.
25.	When will selected Offerors receive the POC environment, dataset, numeric pass thresholds, detailed test scenarios, and execution window? Will USAC make the POC enclave/infrastructure and test dataset available without charge, and what OEM platform license or consumption costs must Offerors bear?	USAC will share the numeric pass thresholds with all participating offerors before the POC starts. The same thresholds apply to every participant (Section E.9). The POC is performed at no cost to USAC (Section E.2). Offerors bear platform licensing and their own labor and support costs. If the POC runs in a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, USAC pays for that infrastructure. If it runs in the offeror's own tenant, the offeror bears those costs. The POC environment, dataset, detailed test scenarios and other reading room materials will be made available after NDA signatures, tentatively the first week of January 2027
26.	May a prospective prime request Reading Room access immediately upon returning a signed Attachment 2, and can specifically named prospective OEM/teaming partners obtain access under their own confidentiality agreements before the proposal deadline? What is the process and expected access turnaround?	USAC grants Virtual Reading Room access about one week after receiving the signed Attachment 2. Each teaming partner, including subcontractors and the platform provider, must sign and submit its own Attachment 2. Access may be requested as soon as the signed Attachment 2 is submitted (Section B.13).
27.	The Reading Room appears to contain the sizing and inventory data needed for technical and firm-fixed-price estimates. If access is delayed or if datasets are incomplete, how should Offerors state assumptions and would USAC consider clarification or additional time to provide an equitable pricing basis?	USAC is extending the proposal due date to November 30, 2026 (answer 35), and Reading Room access is granted about one week after USAC receives a signed Attachment 2. There will be no second round of questions. Offerors should state their pricing assumptions in Volume 4.
28.	CLIN 0002 is fixed-price, while the POC and discovery are intended to refine the implementation scope and ceilings. Which values in the initial Attachment 1 are binding versus preliminary, and will all shortlisted Offerors have the same opportunity to revise CLIN 0002 scope and pricing after POC before award?	The CLIN 0002 price in the initial proposal is an estimate. It will be definitized through the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) and Best and Final Offer (BAFO) after the POC (Section E.9), and every offeror selected for the POC will have the same opportunity to revise. Pricing may be revised through the FPR and BAFO after the POC (Section E.9).

Q#	Question	Answer
29.	Where a requirement, dependency, or data condition was not reasonably discoverable from the materials and access USAC provided during pre-award/discovery activities, how will USAC distinguish an authorized change from an uncompensated missed requirement? Will an agreed requirements baseline and written change-control process govern these determinations?	Attachment 3 governs. Information that was not reasonably available during discovery does not create a Missed Requirement (Attachment 3, Section 2.2.2), and an addition resulting from such information is a USAC-directed change (Section 3.1.3). The requirements baseline and Requirements Traceability Matrix are the authoritative record (Section 6), and every scope change needs a written Change Order (Section 3.3).
30.	Does USAC expect the 90-day minimum parallel run before each cutover and 60-day minimum hypercare afterward to be completed within the one-year base term for every in-scope domain, or may staged migration and support legitimately extend into option periods under the approved schedule?	Section B.7.2.3 requires at least 90 days of parallel operation before each production cutover, and Section B.7.3.1 requires at least 60 days of hypercare after each cutover. If the Offeror thinks that the base period for deployment is more than a year then they can put that in their response.
31.	Will USAC provide any milestone-based acceptance/payment schedule for CLIN 0002, or may Offerors propose one? Can CLIN 0001 SaaS subscriptions and third-party license costs be invoiced according to OEM subscription commencement dates, subject to the contract's terms?	Offerors may propose a milestone-based acceptance/payment schedule for CLIN 0002. Yes, CLIN 0001 SaaS subscriptions and third-party license costs can be invoiced according to OEM subscription commencement dates, subject to the contract's terms.
32.	When a prime proposes an authorized OEM subscription through a reseller or channel partner, is this structure permitted if all OEM, referral, rebate and reseller compensation is fully disclosed? Should both gross customer price and partner compensation be stated in Volume 4, and will disclosure alone create any conflict-of-interest restriction?	Yes, reseller arrangements are permitted if fully disclosed under Section E.7.A.5 and the entitlements are held in USAC's name or assignable to USAC (Section B.7.1.3).
33.	The RFP requests separate pricing scenarios with and without AI used to perform the services while also mandating AI enablement as a platform feature. Please confirm that mandatory platform AI capability may be proposed and priced even if actual AI-tool usage in contract performance remains subject to separate prior written USAC approval. Please specify the required price-sheet format for both scenarios.	Both versions of the Bid Sheet must include the platform AI capability required by Section B.6.7. The two versions differ only in the Contractor's use of AI to perform the Services. USAC will consider both the AI and non-AI prices in evaluation. Submit two versions of the revised Attachment 1 (Section E.7.B.16). Mandatory platform AI capability may be proposed and priced even though its use in contract performance needs prior written USAC approval.

Q#	Question	Answer
34.	Section D identifies Attachment 3 as “Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms,” while Section E.7.B.15 also refers to mandatory key-personnel resumes as Attachment 3. Should resumes be submitted as a separately labeled attachment, and is a signed acknowledgment or execution of the Design Responsibility document required with the initial proposal or only at contract award?	Submit resumes as a separate attachment labeled "Attachment 4: Key Personnel Resumes." Attachment 3 remains the Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms. Attachment 3 will be executed at contract award, after the POC. It does not need to be signed and returned with the proposal.
35.	Please confirm that the controlling proposal deadline is Monday, November 23, 2026 at 11:00 AM Eastern Time, as stated on the cover page and Section E.1.B, rather than the apparent “November 23, 2025” typographical error in the Section E.1.C schedule.	Section E.1.C has a typo, a redlined RFP is posted, and the proposal submission due date is extended to Monday, November 30, 2026, 11:00 AM ET.
36.	May an offeror include a specialist third-party audit-verification component within the required single authorized platform boundary? If so, how should the offeror document that component's authorization coverage, integration and responsibility allocation while satisfying the requirements for core native platform capabilities?	Section B.6 allows additional authorized services operating within the same authorization boundary as the proposed offering.
37.	Does USAC require exported audit records to carry cryptographic evidence that a reviewer can verify independently of the platform, or are platform-native tamper-evident controls and readable exports sufficient? If independent export verification is required, please identify any prescribed format or verification standard. This question does not propose hashing as a substitute for controls preventing modification or deletion.	Section B.8.4 requires immutable, tamper-evident audit logs that no role can modify or delete, and export to a readable, analyzable format. It does not prescribe independent cryptographic verification of exported records or a specific verification format.
38.	May a selected offeror include a specialist component provider on its proof-of-concept team, with the offeror retaining full delivery and compliance responsibility? Please clarify any restrictions on component-provider participation or separate evidence-verification test cases within the offeror's demonstration.	Refer to answer 24. Section B.20.2 sets the minimum test cases; offerors may include additional evidence in their POC Test Plan.
39.	The cover and Section E.1.B identify November 23, 2026 as the proposal due date, with Section E.1.B specifying 11:00 a.m. ET. The schedule on page 80 instead lists November 23, 2025. Please confirm that the proposal deadline is November 23, 2026 at 11:00 a.m. ET and correct the schedule entry.	Please refer to answer 35.

Q#	Question	Answer
40.	May the three required comparable contracts include documented contracts performed by a named proposed teaming partner or subcontractor, with the performing entity and its proposed delivery responsibilities clearly attributed? Please clarify whether a minimum number of the three contracts must have been performed by the prime offeror itself.	Three past performance references are mandatory, and they must be the prime Offeror's own contracts. Contracts performed by subcontractors, teaming partners or the platform provider do not count toward the three. Proposals without three qualifying references will not be considered for further evaluation. There is no minimum split; all three must be performed by the prime.
41.	May one named individual fill more than one listed Key Personnel role when that individual demonstrably meets every qualification for each role and the proposed allocation provides sufficient capacity and continuity? If so, please identify any roles that must be held by separate individuals.	Yes. One individual may hold more than one Key Personnel role, and roles may be proposed at less than full time or by phase, as long as the proposal shows enough capacity and continuity. If project timelines are missed due to the key personnel taking concurrent roles, the vendor should be prepared to mitigate the risk with other key personnel that meet the role qualifications.
42.	Will the Government accept, or can a RMF ATO with reciprocity be substituted for the FedRAMP Moderate requirement?	A vendor-managed SaaS offering must hold FedRAMP Moderate or higher (Sections B.6.1 and B.8.1). Deployment in a USAC-managed AWS or Azure tenant under USAC's FISMA ATO is also acceptable, with the ATO obtained before production (see answer #21 and #140FedRAMP Moderate authorization is required at award.
43.	Bid Sheet CLIN0001 item 9 prices active storage for six-year retention, while Section B.6.9 requires ten years in the active analytical schema. Which retention period governs pricing?	Ten (10) years governs for design, sizing and pricing (Section B.6.9). The "6-year" wording in Attachment 1 is an error and will be corrected in the revised Bid Sheet.
44.	Section B.11 refers to a labor category description tab on the Bid Sheet, but Attachment 1 has no such tab or hourly labor rate table. Will USAC issue a revised Bid Sheet with them?	USAC will issue a revised Attachment 1 that adds the labor category descriptions tab and a CLIN 0003 labor rate table and corrects the CLIN 0003 subtotal formula.
45.	Is there an incumbent contract number for this requirement, and would the Government share it?	There is no incumbent. This is a new requirement, so there is no prior contract number, contract value or incumbent performance history.

Q#	Question	Answer
46.	May an Offeror propose a two-entity delivery team consisting of a prime contractor that provides the required FedRAMP Moderate or higher enterprise data platform and one disclosed implementation and migration subcontractor? If so, may Volume 3 include the subcontractor's recent, relevant past performance, and will USAC consider that experience in the Experience and Past Performance evaluation when the proposal clearly identifies each party's roles and responsibilities?	Yes, that team structure is acceptable if both parties and their roles are identified. Past performance must be the prime Offeror's own contracts, so the subcontractor's past performance will not count toward the three required references (answer 10).
47.	What access methods, credentials, network connectivity, and source-system owner support will USAC provide for discovery, development, testing, and migration?	USAC will provide any necessary access methods, credentials, network connectivity and source-system owner support for discovery, development, testing and migration.
48.	For source systems with undocumented interfaces or limited technical documentation, who will be responsible for resolving integration dependencies and obtaining vendor or system-owner support?	USAC IT will provide system point of contact to resolve any integration issues for any USAC systems. responsibility for resolving undocumented interface dependencies and obtaining vendor or system-owner support.
49.	What is the process for provisioning representative, de-identified, and production data for the POC, migration validation, and performance testing, including any restrictions on copying sensitive data?	For the POC, USAC supplies a de-identified or synthetic dataset of at least 20 million subscriber records. Live production data is used only in the final validation round, subject to the conditions in Section B.20.1, and USAC Data may not be copied outside the enclave.
50.	What are the anticipated dates, duration, environment arrangements, and access prerequisites for the POC, and how much time will selected offerors have to complete it?	USAC will decide the number of POC participants based on the proposals received. USAC will run no more than one POC per technology platform, and POCs will run concurrently. The POC can be performed fully remotely. Access prerequisites for the live-data round are listed in Section B.20.1. PoC will run not longer than 90 days, tentatively starting the first week of January 2027
51.	When will USAC provide the final numeric pass thresholds and any test data or test-case clarifications needed to prepare the POC Test Plan?	USAC will share the numeric pass thresholds with all participating offerors before the POC starts. The same thresholds apply to every participant (Section E.9).
52.	How will USAC finalize the report and semantic-model migration inventory after the POC, including the treatment of duplicate, obsolete, unused, and overlapping reports?	Report and semantic-model migration scope, including consolidation and the treatment of duplicate, obsolete and unused reports, is defined during the POC and discovery (Sections B.7.2.2 and B.20.3) and locked during detailed discovery in CLIN 0002.

Q#	Question	Answer
53.	Who will approve the target analytical modeling pattern after the required POC comparison, and what governance process will be used to resolve differences between program-domain requirements?	USAC will provide approval POCs and governance process at the time of award.
54.	What versions, deployment models, API access, and technical support arrangements are available for the existing Collibra environment and its integration with the proposed platform?	USAC will keep Collibra as its enterprise catalog of record. The platform must integrate with Collibra and feed it technical metadata and lineage, and the Contractor will make the updates to existing Collibra content needed to reflect the new platform. If the proposed platform has a native governance capability comparable to Collibra, USAC is open to considering it for future releases. Collibra licensing stays USAC-funded, outside CLIN 0001.
55.	What Tableau Server/Desktop versions, authentication configuration, extensions, and workbook dependencies must be retained, and will USAC provide the required Tableau administration support during migration?	USAC is deploying version 2026.2.2 on 11/6. Server access is managed via okta SSO and Active Directory. USAC will provide any administrative support required.
56.	What ArcGIS Enterprise and ArcGIS Pro versions, connection requirements, licensing constraints, and GIS administrator support must be accommodated for direct connectivity to the target platform?	ArcGIS Enterprise 12.1. Additional information for ArcGIS will be provided via Reading Room.
57.	What Okta integration standards, group and role mappings, provisioning processes, and approval responsibilities will USAC require beyond the stated SSO and access-control requirements?	Nothing additional beyond the SSO and access requirements.
58.	Who will provision and approve the network paths, firewall rules, DNS, certificates, private connectivity, and other USAC-controlled infrastructure dependencies required by the selected platform?	USAC IT will provision USAC-controlled infrastructure.
59.	What evidence, review lead times, and approval workflow will USAC require for platform security design, control implementation, vulnerability findings, and production authorization?	Pease refer to # 154
60.	What is the approval process, expected review timeline, and required evidence for proposed AI capabilities, given that AI tools and services cannot be used or deployed without prior written approval?	AI capabilities go through USAC's established AI governance framework for approval. The use of AI in supporting this deployment will be approved under the contract in the event that USAC selects the bid option with AI enablement. No further approval would then be needed.

Q#	Question	Answer
61.	Who will supply the authoritative retention schedules and data-disposition rules for each data domain, and who will approve archival eligibility and retrieval requests?	Retention follows USAC's records retention policy and applicable NARA schedules, and no USAC Data may be destroyed without USAC's written approval (Section B.6.9). Requests to retrieve archived data should not require special approvals.
62.	Who within USAC will own business-rule definitions, critical-data-element classification, acceptable quality thresholds, exception resolution, and source-data remediation?	USAC program areas own these as represented by each program area's data steward
63.	Who will identify the protected FCC reporting and audit windows, and how far in advance will USAC confirm approved cutover windows for each data domain?	USAC will identify the FCC reporting and audit windows (Section B.7.2.3). When the implementation start is confirmed, USAC PMO Staff will work with the selectee to roadmap and prioritize data domains based on Program 2027 plans.
64.	What support and coordination commitments are available from the incumbent platform, Tableau, Collibra, GIS, and source-system vendors during migration and parallel operations?	USAC has internal staff to support and coordinate legacy platforms, Tableau, Collibra, and GIS and will establish those resources during kick-off and planning.
65.	What operational responsibilities, administrator privileges, and knowledge-transfer expectations does USAC intend to retain internally versus delegate to the contractor during steady-state operations?	Offerors should propose the division of work and USAC staffing per Sections B.11.4 and B.20.3. Documentation and knowledge transfer must be kept current so USAC can assume operation if required (Section B.7.3.3). Roles during CLIN 0003 for O&M will require a transition plan from implementor to USAC as detailed in the CLIN 0003 deliverables.
66.	Will USAC provide an inventory of existing licenses and subscriptions for the current data platform, ETL tools, reporting tools, data governance, GIS, and related components that may be reused for the proposed solution?	Tableau, Collibra, Posit, ArcGIS and Socrata licenses stay USAC-funded and are outside CLIN 0001. Vertica and Pentaho Data Integration are being replaced. USAC will share an inventory of existing licenses and subscriptions during the discovery.
67.	For the proposed platform, are there any USAC procurement, enterprise agreement, or approved-vendor constraints that the offeror must consider when proposing subscription, capacity-based, consumption-based, or perpetual licensing?	No, offerors must identify in their proposal anything that will be needed for their proposed platform when proposing subscription, capacity-based, consumption-based, or perpetual licensing.
68.	Can USAC provide the anticipated number and types of users requiring platform access, including data engineers, data analysts, data scientists, report developers, administrators, and business consumers, to support accurate license sizing?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13).

Q#	Question	Answer
69.	Are there expected workload patterns, processing windows, or peak compute requirements that should be used to estimate consumption-based platform licensing and processing costs?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13). Section B.5.2 describes the current processing window and peak CPU period.
70.	Does USAC expect the proposed platform license to include all required data ingestion, transformation, orchestration, scheduling, monitoring, and metadata capabilities, or may these require separately licensed components?	Section B.6 requires the core platform capability in a single authorized offering, and allows additional authorized services within the same boundary. Identify any capability that needs separate licensing (Sections B.7.1.6 and E.7.D.5). CLIN 0001 must cover all platform licensing, hosting, disaster recovery, compute and storage for the four environments (Section B.7.1.1).
71.	What existing Tableau licenses and editions are available, and should the offeror include any additional licenses, subscriptions, or components needed to support the proposed reporting architecture and migrated reports?	Tableau, Collibra, Posit, ArcGIS and Socrata licenses stay USAC-funded and are outside CLIN 0001.
72.	What Collibra license edition, modules, user entitlements, and integration rights are currently available, and are additional licenses expected for the proposed platform integration?	Tableau, Collibra, Posit, ArcGIS and Socrata licenses stay USAC-funded and are outside CLIN 0001.
73.	Should vendor support, software maintenance, premium support, and subscription renewals be included in the proposed annual platform pricing?	Yes. Pricing must include all direct and indirect costs, including product support (Section B.2), and CLIN 0001 is priced annually for the base and each option year (Section B.7.1).
74.	Are there any required assumptions regarding annual license renewals, subscription price increases, or multi-year price commitments that offerors should use in their pricing?	USAC does not have specific assumption requirements. Offerors may include any assumptions regarding annual license renewals, subscription price increases, or multi-year price commitments in their pricing.
75.	During the required parallel operation of the legacy and new platforms, will USAC maintain the existing licenses, or should the proposal account for additional or extended licensing costs for the legacy platform?	USAC will maintain legacy platform licenses during parallel operation.
76.	Would USAC consider Microsoft Power BI as an alternative to Tableau for enterprise reporting and visualization as part of the cloud modernization initiative, given its integration with the Microsoft ecosystem?	Offerors may propose Power BI as a separately priced alternate to the Tableau-based approach.

Q#	Question	Answer
77.	If USAC is open to Power BI, may AQL propose a Power BI-based reporting solution as an alternative to the Tableau-based approach, including the associated migration effort, licensing, and implementation costs?	Offerors may propose Power BI as a separately priced alternate to the Tableau-based approach. Include the associated migration effort, licensing and implementation costs in the separately priced alternate.
78.	Would USAC consider a comparative assessment of Tableau and Power BI covering functional fit, integration, security, governance, total cost of ownership, and long-term maintainability?	Offerors may include a comparative assessment as part of the Business Intelligence Approach (Section E.7.B.7).
79.	Can USAC provide an inventory of existing Tableau dashboards, workbooks, reports, data sources, extracts, and calculated fields to estimate the effort required to migrate them to Power BI?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the Tableau workbook inventory and usage statistics (Section B.13). Report and semantic-model migration scope will be defined during the POC (Section B.7.2.2) and locked during detailed discovery in CLIN 0002.
80.	If Power BI is accepted, would USAC expect all existing Tableau reports to be migrated, or would migration be limited to the reports identified as mandatory or prioritized during discovery?	Report migration scope is defined during the POC and discovery (Section B.7.2.2). USAC would expect that any reports tied to an in-scope tableau data source would be migrated. This is approximately 1,200 workbooks.
81.	Does USAC currently have Microsoft Power BI licenses or Microsoft Fabric capacity entitlements that could be leveraged, or should AQL include the required Power BI licensing and capacity costs in its proposed pricing?	USAC has Power BI licenses.
82.	Can USAC provide the estimated number of report creators, developers, administrators, and report consumers, together with expected concurrent usage, to determine the appropriate Power BI licensing and capacity model?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13).
83.	If Power BI is considered, are there specific requirements for integration with USAC's identity provider, role-based access, row-level security, audit logging, data governance, and report access controls that must be addressed?	Yes. Any proposed BI tool must meet Section B.8, including Okta single sign-on, individual user identity, role-based and row-level security, and audit logging.
84.	Would USAC require Power BI reports to connect directly to the proposed cloud data platform, and what data refresh frequency, refresh-window, and near-real-time reporting requirements should be considered?	Freshness targets are in Section B.9.2: 300 seconds for near-real-time and CDC tiers, and the batch schedule agreed at CLIN 0002 design acceptance.
85.	If USAC approves a transition to Power BI, would it require Tableau and Power BI to operate in parallel during a defined transition period, and are there existing Tableau licensing commitments that could affect the transition?	Yes, USAC would require parallel operation during a defined transition cutover period. Tableau licenses are on a yearly basis beginning in February.

Q#	Question	Answer
86.	If Power BI is proposed as an alternative, may the POC demonstrate representative reports in Power BI, and how would USAC evaluate this approach against the RFP's stated Tableau integration and reporting demonstration requirements?	Section B.20.2 requires demonstration of Tableau integration. **T**he POC may demonstrate Power BI reports and USAC would evaluate that against the Tableau requirement.
87.	Would USAC accept a separately priced Power BI alternative that identifies migration services, licenses, capacity, ongoing support, and any potential Tableau license savings, while retaining the RFP-compliant approach as the baseline?	Offerors may propose Power BI as a separately priced alternate to the Tableau-based approach. The RFP-compliant approach remains the baseline.
88.	Can USAC provide the current inventory of Tableau dashboards, workbooks, reports, and semantic models, including the total number of each?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the Tableau workbook inventory and usage statistics (Section B.13). Report and semantic-model migration scope will be defined during the POC (Section B.7.2.2) and locked during detailed discovery in CLIN 0002.
89.	Can USAC classify the existing reports as simple, medium, or complex based on calculations, data sources, transformations, parameters, interactivity, and visualization requirements?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the Tableau data source inventory and usage statistics (Section B.13). Report and semantic-model migration scope will be defined during the POC (Section B.7.2.2) and locked during detailed discovery in CLIN 0002.
90.	What proportion of the existing reports must be migrated, consolidated, redesigned, retired, or retained without modification?	This will be determined during the POC and discovery (Sections B.7.2.2 and B.20.3).
91.	Can USAC identify the mandatory reports and dashboards that must be available and validated before each production cutover?	The reports and data products that must be validated before each cutover form part of the MVP, which will be defined during the POC and discovery (answer 141).
92.	Can USAC provide details of dependencies such as Tableau extracts, published data sources, calculated fields, custom SQL, embedded content, and external data connections?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the Tableau data source inventory, and usage statistics (Section B.13).
93.	What criteria will USAC use to accept migrated reports, including data reconciliation, calculation accuracy, visual consistency, performance, and business-user validation?	Cutover requires reconciliation within the tolerances in the approved test plan, successful user acceptance testing and performance testing against Section B.9 (Section B.7.2.3). Offerors propose tolerances and acceptance criteria in the test plan for USAC approval (Deliverable 10).

Q#	Question	Answer
94.	Will USAC provide a prioritized migration schedule for reports based on business criticality, regulatory reporting needs, usage, and planned cutover by data domain?	Cutover is phased by data domain (Section B.7.2.3). All data sources provided in the reading room are expected to be deployed but USAC can provide the preferred order. If an alternative other than Tableau is selected for BI report generation, USAC can also provide a report schedule. There are approximately 1,200 reports currently generated off of the certified data source list provided in the reading room.
95.	Would USAC agree to host the proposed platform and all associated services within its own Microsoft/Azure tenant, with AQL assisting in the procurement of required licenses and subscriptions and providing implementation, maintenance, and operational support within the USAC tenant for the contractually specified period?	Deployment in a USAC-managed tenant under USAC's FISMA ATO is acceptable (answer 21), within AWS Commercial Cloud (US) or Microsoft Azure (answer 110). Licenses must be held in USAC's name (Section B.1).
96.	Will USAC be responsible for data cleansing activities, including correcting inaccurate records, removing duplicates, resolving data inconsistencies, and addressing data quality issues in the source systems before migration?	USAC is responsible for remediation of its source system data. We do not expect the vendor to fix any data quality issues.
97.	Does USAC currently have any licensed third-party data migration tools available for use in the proposed migration?	Offerors should not assume USAC-provided migration tools. The Contractor furnishes all tooling (Section B.1).
98.	If required due to the high volume of data, would USAC agree to purchase a suitable third-party migration tool, if recommended by AQL, subject to USAC's security, compliance, and procurement approval?	The Contractor furnishes all tooling needed for the work (Section B.1), so any recommended migration tool should be included in the proposal and pricing.
99.	Section B.6.9 requires ten (10) years of data to remain in the active analytical schema, while the Bid Sheet prices Production storage as a 6-year active analytical layer and archive storage as beyond 6 years. Please confirm whether the required active retention period is six (6) years or ten (10) years, and confirm the storage basis Offerors should use for CLIN 0001 pricing.	Ten (10) years governs for design, sizing and pricing (Section B.6.9). The "6-year" wording in Attachment 1 is an error and will be corrected in the revised Bid Sheet.
100.	Section B.2 identifies CLIN 0002 as Firm-Fixed-Price, while Section B.7.2 states that CLIN 0002 is FFP with an annual not-to-exceed ceiling to be definitized. Please clarify whether CLIN 0002 is a single FFP amount, an FFP amount subject to an NTE ceiling, or another pricing structure.	CLIN 0002 is FFP. A redlined RFP is posted to reflect the change.

Q#	Question	Answer
101.	The RFP states that the target-state architecture, migration scope, and implementation plan will be developed during the pre-award POC, yet Offerors must submit CLIN 0002 pricing with the initial proposal. Will USAC permit selected Offerors to revise and definitize CLIN 0002 pricing after the POC through a Final Proposal Revision or BAFO?	The CLIN 0002 price in the initial proposal is an estimate. It will be definitized through the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) and Best and Final Offer (BAFO) after the POC (Section E.9), and every offeror selected for the POC will have the same opportunity to revise.
102.	Attachment 3 states that the Contractor conducted a formal pre-design Discovery and Design phase within CLIN 0002 and must certify that the resulting requirements baseline is complete. Please clarify when this discovery occurs relative to the pre-award POC, contract award, and execution of the FFP amendment, and identify the exact point at which the Contractor assumes the missed-requirement accountability described in Attachment 3.	Preliminary discovery and scoping under Section B.20.3 is done during the POC, and USAC prefers it at no cost. Offerors may include additional time in CLIN 0002 for detailed discovery and to lock the MVP scope at the start of implementation. Attachment 3 will be executed at contract award, after the POC. It does not need to be signed and returned with the proposal. Attachment 3 obligations apply from its execution at contract award.
103.	Please confirm that requirements dependent on information, systems, documentation, stakeholders, or access that USAC does not make reasonably available during discovery will not be classified as a Missed Requirement and will instead be addressed through the applicable change-control process.	Confirmed. Under Attachment 3, a requirement is not a Missed Requirement if the information needed to identify it was not reasonably available during discovery (Section 2.2.2). Such items are handled as USAC-directed changes through a written Change Order (Sections 3.1.3 and 3.3).
104.	Attachment 3 states that clarifications and refinements of requirements already within project objectives are not new scope. Please clarify how material increases in quantities discovered after baseline approval, such as additional data sources, interfaces, reports, pipelines, datasets, users, or data volumes, will be treated when those quantities were not reasonably identifiable during discovery.	Attachment 3, Section 3.1 governs. Attachment #3, Section 3.3 clearly defines the process that will be followed for any True New-Net Scope.
105.	Section 2 permits good-faith negotiation of a schedule adjustment for a Missed Requirement, while Section 8 states that defect remediation shall not result in schedule extensions. Please clarify which provision governs when remediation of a missed requirement or design defect affects a critical-path milestone.	Section 8.3 schedule extension limitation applies specifically to remediation of identified defects only.

Q#	Question	Answer
106.	Please confirm whether all costs associated with the pre-award POC, including platform consumption, temporary licensing, Contractor labor, OEM support, and travel if required, are to be borne by the Offeror, or whether any POC costs will be reimbursed by USAC.	The POC is performed at no cost to USAC (Section E.2). Offerors bear platform licensing and their own labor and support costs. If the POC runs in a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, USAC pays for that infrastructure. If it runs in the offeror's own tenant, the offeror bears those costs. USAC will not reimburse POC costs.
107.	USAC will provide and own the secure POC enclave. Please identify which responsibilities USAC will perform before POC start, including tenant/subscription provisioning, network connectivity, identity integration, customer-managed keys, source-system connectivity, test-data loading, and required security approvals.	USAC will consider both models: a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, or the offeror's vendor tenant connected to USAC over private networking.
108.	In addition to the synthetic/de-identified dataset containing at least 20 million subscriber records, please provide the expected size, schema count, table count, spatial dataset size, file-based data volume, and historical depth that will be used during the POC.	USAC will supply a de-identified or synthetic dataset with at least 20 million subscriber records that preserves the production characteristics described in Section B.20.1.
109.	Please clarify whether separately licensed services or add-ons are acceptable when they operate within the same FedRAMP Moderate-or-higher authorization boundary as the proposed core platform, and identify any functions that USAC considers part of the non-severable 'core platform capability.'	Yes, separately licensed services are acceptable if they operate within the same authorization boundary as the proposed offering (Section B.6). Identify them as separately licensed (Section B.7.1.6).
110.	Section B.7.1.2 requires the platform to be provided within AWS Commercial Cloud (US) or Microsoft Azure. For a vendor-managed FedRAMP SaaS offering, please confirm whether the underlying authorized SaaS infrastructure must specifically be hosted on AWS Commercial (US) or Azure, or whether another FedRAMP-authorized U.S. cloud infrastructure is acceptable.	Section B.7.1.2 governs. The platform must be provided within AWS Commercial Cloud (US) or Microsoft Azure, with all primary, backup and disaster recovery copies of USAC Data hosted in the United States. Other cloud providers are not acceptable. The AWS GovCloud (US) and Azure Government reference in Section B.8.1 will be corrected in the redlined RFP.
111.	Please provide or confirm the sizing basis for each required environment (Production, Pre-Production, Test/QA, and Development), including expected storage, compute, concurrency, workload patterns, and annual growth assumptions to be used for CLIN 0001 FFP pricing.	The Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13). Pre-Production must be able to hold production-representative volumes (Section B.6.11).

Q#	Question	Answer
112.	Please confirm the projected annual growth rate for active and archived data and whether CLIN 0001 FFP pricing must absorb growth above the current 10–13 TB baseline throughout each contract year, or whether defined capacity bands/thresholds will apply.	The Virtual Reading Room materials include the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13).
113.	Please provide the authoritative counts for in-scope source systems, tables/objects, Pentaho jobs/pipelines, Tableau workbooks/data sources, Collibra assets, Socrata datasets, R/Python analytical assets, and other code artifacts that must be migrated under CLIN 0002.	The Virtual Reading Room includes the source system inventory (platform, integration pattern and volumetrics for each in-scope source) and interface control documentation (Section B.13). The Virtual Reading Room includes the Tableau workbook inventory and usage statistics (Section B.13). Report and semantic-model migration scope will be defined during the POC (Section B.7.2.2) and locked during detailed discovery in CLIN 0002.
114.	The RFP states that report and semantic-model migration scope will be defined during the POC. What minimum report/BI migration quantity or baseline should Offerors include in the initial CLIN 0002 FFP price before the POC is completed?	The CLIN 0002 price in the initial proposal is an estimate (answer 101). State report migration assumptions in Volume 4. Scope is defined during the POC and locked in detailed discovery.
115.	For the two Business Intelligence structures described in Section B.6.6, should Offerors provide a single recommended approach and price only that approach, or provide separately priced alternatives for both structures?	Structure 1 is retention of Tableau as the enterprise BI tool, integrated with the proposed platform. Structure 2 is consolidation of reporting onto the proposed platform's native capability. Offerors should address both and recommend one, with the basis, per Section E.7.B.7.
116.	For Governance Option A and Option B, should Offerors provide a single recommended approach and price only the recommended option, or provide separately priced alternatives for both options?	Option A is retention of Collibra as USAC's enterprise catalog of record, with the platform feeding it technical metadata and lineage. Option B is use of the platform's native catalog in place of Collibra. Offerors should address both and recommend one, with the basis, per Section E.7.B.8. USAC currently intends to keep Collibra as the catalog of record and is open to considering a comparable native governance capability in future releases.

Q#	Question	Answer
117.	Please clarify the intended end state for Collibra. Is the selected Contractor expected to migrate existing Collibra content and retire Collibra, preserve Collibra as the enterprise governance tool and integrate it with the new platform, or support either model based on the selected governance option?	USAC will keep Collibra as its enterprise catalog of record. The platform must integrate with Collibra and feed it technical metadata and lineage, and the Contractor will make the updates to existing Collibra content needed to reflect the new platform. If the proposed platform has a native governance capability comparable to Collibra, USAC is open to considering it for future releases. Collibra licensing stays USAC-funded, outside CLIN 0001.
118.	For archived data older than the active-retention period, please specify the anticipated frequency and number of concurrent restore requests, whether the five-business-day restoration requirement applies per dataset or per request, and whether restored data must remain available for a defined period after retrieval.	Archived data must be restorable to a queryable state within five business days for any dataset up to one terabyte (Section B.6.9).
119.	Please confirm the historical period for which point-in-time/as-of reporting must be reproducible without backup restoration and whether this requirement applies only to the active analytical retention period or also to data that has been moved to archive.	Point-in-time reporting must be reproducible without restoring from backup (Section B.6.3).
120.	Please provide the expected initial number of data-quality rules, critical data elements, scorecards, and exception workflows to be implemented under CLIN 0002, or confirm that these quantities will be baselined during discovery/POC and then used to definitize CLIN 0002.	See also question 477. USAC anticipates about two dozen tables and 28 fields as in-scope for the initial production deployment.
121.	Please provide the required reconciliation tolerances for record counts, financial/control totals, field-level comparisons, and report outputs during parallel operation and cutover, or confirm that Offerors should propose these tolerances for USAC approval.	Offerors propose reconciliation tolerances in the test plan for USAC approval (Section B.7.2.3 and Deliverable 10).
122.	Please provide target response-time thresholds and expected concurrent-user levels by persona/workload for interactive analytics, semantic-model queries, batch processing, geospatial queries, and data-science workloads.	The Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13).
123.	For the requirement for direct ArcGIS Pro connection to the cloud database, please identify the ArcGIS Pro and ArcGIS Enterprise versions currently in use and confirm whether a standards-based/native database connector is acceptable if the proposed platform is not listed as an ArcGIS enterprise geodatabase.	ArcGIS Enterprise 12.1. Additional information for ArcGIS will be provided via Reading Room.

Q#	Question	Answer
124.	Please clarify whether USAC will retain its existing Socrata subscription and endpoint, and identify whether the Contractor is responsible only for rebuilding the upstream publication datasets/feeds or also for redesigning Socrata configurations, APIs, metadata, and public-facing datasets.	USAC will keep its Socrata license, and Socrata remains the baseline publication path (Section B.6.6). The Contractor migrates and re-establishes the datasets published to opendata.usac.org (Section B.7.2.2).Responsibility for Socrata configurations, APIs, metadata and public-facing datasets remains with USAC.
125.	The RFP excludes rebuilding or re-engineering UNIFi interfaces but requires the Contractor to deliver and maintain data products that source those interfaces and to migrate the disbursement/payment feed sourcing UNIFi. Please clarify the exact handoff point between Contractor and USAC responsibilities, including testing and defect ownership.	USAC is responsible for any changes to UNIFi interfaces using internal resources, and the Contractor delivers and maintains the data products that source them (Section B.5.5). Interface control documentation is in the Reading Room.
126.	Please confirm whether the requirement that all Services be performed in the United States and that USAC have visibility into personnel interacting with USAC Data prohibits any non-U.S.-based OEM/SaaS support administrator from accessing USAC Data, metadata, logs, or platform configurations.	Yes. "United States persons" in Section B.8.7 has the meaning in 22 C.F.R. 120.62. The requirement applies to all Contractor Staff, including subcontractor staff and platform provider staff with administrative access to the platform holding USAC Data. All Services must be performed in the United States (Section B.4.1); offshore resources are not permitted.
127.	Please identify USAC's preferred or required customer-managed key service and ownership model (for example, AWS KMS or Azure Key Vault), and confirm whether USAC will own and administer the keys in Production as well as the POC enclave.	The platform must support customer-managed keys and let USAC revoke access through key control (Sections B.8.3 and B.20.1).
128.	The RFP states that USAC presently requires Contractor Staff to be in the USAC office at least two days per week. Please identify which roles are expected onsite, whether the requirement applies to all Contractor Staff or only designated personnel, and whether it applies throughout CLINs 0002 and 0003.	The two-day-per-week onsite requirement applies to all Contractor Staff. USAC is willing to consider alternate staffing proposals, which offerors should describe in the technical proposal. It applies throughout the Contract Term, including CLIN 0002 and CLIN 0003.
129.	Please provide USAC's anticipated roles, skill sets, approximate FTE availability, and decision/approval responsibilities during design, migration, testing, UAT, security review, cutover, and O&M transition.	Offerors must propose the USAC roles and effort they assume (Sections B.11.4 and B.20.3 USAC Team will work with Offeror during each phase to identify internal resources, standard internal roles include: Executive Sponsors, Project/Program Manager, Product Owners, Data Governance, Data Stewards, Source System and Program SMEs, IT Security, Change Management Support, IT Ops, IT Dev, IT Architecture and Standards.

Q#	Question	Answer
130.	USAC states that delivery frameworks using more than two subcontractors will be heavily scrutinized. Please confirm that use of more than two subcontractors is not prohibited and that Key Personnel may be employees of approved subcontractors or teaming partners.	Yes. More than two subcontractors is permitted, with a coordination and risk mitigation plan (Section E.7.A.2) and closer review (Section E.8.1.B). Key Personnel may be employees of the Offeror or of a subcontractor identified in the proposal.
131.	The RFP refers to mandatory formal resumes submitted in 'Attachment 3,' while the solicitation's Attachment 3 is the Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms. Please confirm whether a separate Key Personnel resume template/attachment is missing, or whether Offerors should provide resumes in their own format within Volume 2.	Submit resumes as a separate attachment labeled "Attachment 4: Key Personnel Resumes." Attachment 3 remains the Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms.
132.	Please provide the anticipated transition-out duration, required overlap with a successor contractor or USAC staff, expected deliverables/data export formats, and whether transition-out effort must be included within the CLIN 0003 annual NTE ceiling.	Transition-out is part of CLIN 0003 and falls within its annual NTE ceiling (Section B.2). The Transition-Out Plan is due 90 days and the Support Package 60 days before Contract expiration, and USAC Data is returned in a format USAC specifies (Section B.7.3.4).
133.	Section B.7.1.5 requires confirmation that no egress, extract, or transfer charge will be applied to return USAC Data at transition. If the underlying cloud/platform provider imposes unavoidable egress charges, may the Offeror include those costs within the CLIN 0001 FFP rather than charging them separately at transition?	No egress, extract or transfer charge may be applied to returning USAC Data at transition (Sections B.7.1.5 and B.7.3.4).
134.	Please confirm whether the ten-business-day USAC review period and five-business-day Contractor correction period in Section B.9.5 apply to all deliverables governed by Attachment 3, and whether the correction period may be adjusted by mutual agreement for complex remediation that cannot reasonably be completed within five business days.	Yes. Section B.9.5 applies: ten business days for USAC review and five business days for correction.
135.	USAC retains final authority to classify defect severity. Please clarify whether the Contractor will have an opportunity to provide technical evidence before final severity classification and whether agreed severity definitions, workaround availability, and business impact will be documented in the project test/acceptance plan.	USAC retains final authority over defect severity (Section B.9.1 and Attachment 3, Section 8.2).
136.	If an Offeror submits an executed Attachment 2 to obtain Virtual Reading Room access, must the same agreement be executed and submitted again with the proposal, or may the previously executed copy be included as evidence of compliance?	Previously executed copy of attachment 2 as part of proposal compliance is acceptable.

Q#	Question	Answer
137.	The cover page states the Proposal Due Date is Monday, November 23, 2026, while the proposal schedule table contains 'Monday, November 23, 2025.' Please confirm that the correct proposal due date is Monday, November 23, 2026 at 11:00 AM ET.	Please refer to answer #35.
138.	Section B.7.1.2 requires the platform within AWS Commercial Cloud (US) or Microsoft Azure, while Section B.8.1 requires primary, backup and disaster recovery hosting within AWS GovCloud (US) or Microsoft Azure Government. Which governs? Is a FedRAMP Moderate authorized offering in AWS Commercial US or Azure Commercial US regions acceptable?	Refer to answer 110. A FedRAMP Moderate authorized offering in AWS Commercial (US) or Microsoft Azure US regions is acceptable.
139.	Section B.8.1 states the Contractor shall hold and maintain a SOC 2 Type II report, and Addendum 2.20 requires the Contractor's SOC 2 Type II and ISO 27001 certificate within ten days of the Effective Date. Where the Offeror is a systems integrator and USAC Data resides only within the platform provider's FedRAMP authorization boundary, does the platform provider's SOC 2 Type II and ISO 27001 satisfy these requirements? If not, will USAC accept an integrator's SOC 1 Type 2 and FISMA Moderate ATO, with SOC 2 Type II delivered by a set date after award?	For development on USAC FedRAMP tenants using USAC equipment and network, there is no requirement for SOC 2 Type II or ISO 27001.
140.	Addendum 2.3 and 2.10 require a Contractor ATO for systems housing USAC Data. If Contractor staff use only USAC-issued equipment and email (B.17) and all data stays within the platform boundary, is the platform's FedRAMP authorization sufficient?	If all development is performed on USAC's FedRAMP tenant using USAC equipment and network, the contractor does not need to pursue or present any further FedRAMP or FISMA authorization. The FISMA authorization of a completed system is performed by USAC. See #154

Q#	Question	Answer
141.	Sections B.7.2.3 and E.7.B.6 to E.7.B.8 reference a "mandatory floor," "Structure 1/Structure 2" (B.6.6) and "Option A/Option B" (B.6.4). That text does not appear in the RFP. Please publish it.	USAC will replace the term "mandatory floor" with "Minimum Viable Product (MVP)" by amendment. The MVP will be defined during the POC and discovery. Offerors may include time in CLIN 0002 for detailed discovery and to lock the MVP scope at the start of implementation. Structure 1 is retention of Tableau as the enterprise BI tool, integrated with the proposed platform. Structure 2 is consolidation of reporting onto the proposed platform's native capability. Offerors should address both and recommend one, with the basis, per Section E.7.B.7. Option A is retention of Collibra as USAC's enterprise catalog of record, with the platform feeding it technical metadata and lineage. Option B is use of the platform's native catalog in place of Collibra. Offerors should address both and recommend one, with the basis, per Section E.7.B.8. USAC currently intends to keep Collibra as the catalog of record and is open to considering a comparable native governance capability in future releases.
142.	B.2 lists CLIN 0002 as firm fixed price, B.7.2 describes FFP with an annual not-to-exceed ceiling, and B.20 refers to "CLIN 0002 NTE ceilings." Please confirm the pricing structure for CLINs 0002 and 0003, and whether CLIN 0002 prices may be revised in final proposal revisions after the Proof of Concept.	Refer to answers 100 and 101. CLIN 0003 is T&M with an annual NTE ceiling (Section B.2).
143.	Please confirm the proposal due date is Monday, November 23, 2026, 11:00 AM ET. The table in E.1.C shows 2025.	Refer to answer 35.
144.	"Attachment 3" refers both to resumes (E.6.2, E.7.B.15) and to the Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms (Section D). Please confirm the resume label and whether the Attachment 3 terms must be signed. Attachment 3 also cites a Section 10 Dispute Resolution that is not included.	Submit resumes as a separate attachment labeled "Attachment 4: Key Personnel Resumes." Attachment 3 remains the Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms. Attachment 3 will be executed at contract award, after the POC. It does not need to be signed and returned with the proposal. The dispute provisions are in Attachment 3, Section 9, items 4 through 7. The reference to "Section 10 (Dispute Resolution)" in Section 4.3 is an error.

Q#	Question	Answer
145.	For the Proof of Concept: how many offerors will be selected, what is the expected duration, and who bears platform licensing and compute costs inside the USAC environment?	USAC will decide the number of POC participants based on the proposals received. USAC will run no more than one POC per technology platform, and POCs will run concurrently. The POC is performed at no cost to USAC (Section E.2). Offerors bear platform licensing and their own labor and support costs. If the POC runs in a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, USAC pays for that infrastructure. If it runs in the offeror's own tenant, the offeror bears those costs. See question 50 for duration
146.	Can USAC share an estimated budget range or the sizing basis for CLIN 0001 before proposals are due?	USAC will not share budget or cost estimate information. The sizing basis is in the Reading Room (Section B.13).
147.	C.1.N defines Key Personnel as full-time employees of the Contractor, while B.11 only states a preference. May Key Personnel be employees of a named subcontractor or the platform provider's professional services organization?	Key Personnel must be employees of the Offeror or of a subcontractor identified in the proposal. The three-year tenure in Section B.11 is a preference, not a pass/fail requirement. Platform provider staff qualify if the platform provider is identified in the proposal as a subcontractor.
148.	May past performance of a proposed subcontractor or teaming partner count toward the three required contracts?	Three past performance references are mandatory, and they must be the prime Offeror's own contracts. Contracts performed by subcontractors, teaming partners or the platform provider do not count toward the three. Proposals without three qualifying references will not be considered for further evaluation.
149.	Does a platform provider or reseller supplying licenses only count as a "subcontractor" for the two-subcontractor threshold?	No. A platform OEM or reseller that only supplies licenses does not count toward the two-subcontractor threshold. The relationship must still be disclosed under Section E.7.A.5.
150.	Does the two-day-per-week onsite requirement apply to all Contractor staff or only to designated roles?	The two-day-per-week onsite requirement applies to all Contractor Staff. USAC is willing to consider alternate staffing proposals, which offerors should describe in the technical proposal.
151.	How will CLIN 0001 annual subscription fees be invoiced, given C.6.C limits invoices to accepted work?	Annual subscription fees can be invoiced as one annual payment.
152.	Please reconcile the option exercise notice periods in B.3 (30 days) and C.2 (10 days).	The 30-day notice in Section B.3 governs, with two one-year renewal options. Section C.2 will be corrected.

Q#	Question	Answer
153.	For the two Bid Sheets (with and without AI), does "use of AI in performance" include the platform's native AI-assisted features used during migration?	Section B.6.7 requires prior written approval for AI tools, services or code of any type used in performing the Contract. AI native to platform are approved, anything outside of the platform for SDLC would be approved separately through AI Governance which requires a written request to USAC Procurement and approved by the AI Executive Committee.
154.	B.6.1 and B.8.1 require that the core platform be delivered through a single FedRAMP Moderate or higher authorized offering at the time of award. Will USAC accept a commercial software platform deployed in a USAC-owned AWS GovCloud (US) or Azure Government tenant (FedRAMP High infrastructure), operated by the Contractor as a vendor-managed service and authorized under USAC's own FISMA authorization to operate (ATO), as meeting this requirement? If so: (a) who is the authorizing official; (b) is the ATO required at award or before production use; and (c) which artifacts must the Contractor provide (for example the SSP, POA&M and continuous monitoring reports)?	Collibra, Tableau, ArcGIS, Posit, Socrata and LLM endpoints may operate outside the core platform's authorization boundary as integrations. A vendor-managed SaaS offering must meet the FedRAMP Moderate (or higher) requirement in Sections B.6.1 and B.8.1. Deployment in a USAC-managed AWS or Azure tenant under USAC's FISMA ATO is also acceptable. In that model the ATO is needed before production, not at award, and the Contractor will support the USAC IT Security team who will conduct a FISMA (Moderate) assessment to attain compliance and an ATO before go-live the contractor will provide artifacts as evidence to the USAC IT Security team of the compliance with FISMA controls that are built into the system. The contractor will support the Information System Security Officers (ISSOs) who will develop the SSP, identify POA&Ms, provide an assessment team, request and collect artifacts, plan the security and privacy assessment, organize the assessment, and report on the outcome which may also include POA&Ms to be fixed after go live.

Q#	Question	Answer
155.	B.6 states that solutions assembled from multiple separately authorized third-party components are not responsive, and that additional authorized services within the same boundary are permitted. If multiple software components, including open-source and commercial components, are deployed together in a single USAC-owned tenant under one authorization boundary, with the prime Contractor providing single-point support and accountability, will USAC treat them as a single offering? Please confirm that the exclusion applies to components that each hold their own separate authorization outside a shared boundary.	This exclusion is intended to ensure that there is one boundary and not two or more FedRAMP cloud providers. Additional software components must work together and can form a single security boundary.
156.	B.7.1.2 allows hosting in AWS Commercial Cloud (US) or Microsoft Azure, while B.8.1 requires AWS GovCloud (US) or Azure Government. Please confirm which hosting environment USAC intends.	Refer to answer 110.
157.	USAC will provide and own the POC enclave in a dedicated public sector tenancy. Please confirm whether offerors will deploy their platform inside that enclave, and which cloud environment it will use.	USAC will consider both models: a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, or the offeror's vendor tenant connected to USAC over private networking.
158.	Is there a preferred format for the POC Test Plan submission?	USAC does not prescribe a format. The POC Test Plan should cover the elements in Section E.7.B.5 and the test cases in Section B.20.2. It is excluded from the 40-page limit.
159.	Will USAC acknowledge receipt of proposal submissions?	Yes.
160.	Is there a maximum email size limit for proposal submission to Procurement@usac.org?	25 MB.
161.	Should subcontractor company profiles be included within the 5-page Volume 1 limit?	Yes. Volume 1 content, including subcontractor information, counts toward the five-page limit (Section E.6.2).
162.	Are solution screenshots permitted and excluded from page limits?	Per Section E.6.1.d All diagrams, tables, Gantt charts, and charts must be incorporated into the proposal using the native program from which it was created to eliminate distortion of text by inserting images and pictures which must be included in the page limit

Q#	Question	Answer
163.	Can subcontractor past performance be submitted if the prime contractor lacks directly comparable experience?	Three past performance references are mandatory, and they must be the prime Offeror's own contracts. Contracts performed by subcontractors, teaming partners or the platform provider do not count toward the three. Proposals without three qualifying references will not be considered for further evaluation.
164.	Will contracts currently in progress be considered valid past-performance references?	Yes. Section E.7.C.3 allows current or recently completed contracts.
165.	Can multiple references be provided for a single project?	Each of the three references must be a distinct contract with a primary and backup point of contact (Section E.7.C.3).
166.	Are commercial-sector references acceptable, or is government experience preferred?	Commercial references are acceptable. USAC is looking for verified industry experience, and no more than one of the three may be a USAC contract (Section E.7.C.3).
167.	Must the signed Confidentiality Agreement be submitted within the proposal package, or as a separate email/document?	Submit it as a separate PDF attachment in the proposal email (Section E.6.1.g). It does not count toward the page limits.
168.	Please provide a complete checklist of all mandatory forms, certifications, signed documents, disclosures, and attachments required for proposal submission, including those required from subcontractors and teaming partners.	The proposal package includes: Volumes 1 through 4, each with a cover page (Section E.5); two versions of Attachment 1, with and without AI; the signed Attachment 2 from the Offeror and each teaming partner; Attachment 4: Key Personnel Resumes; the Mandatory Requirements Certification; the Platform Capability Compliance Matrix; the POC Test Plan; the general counsel review statement (Section E.1.A); the Exceptions to RFP Terms attachment, if any; the conflict of interest statement and Platform Relationship Disclosure (Sections E.7.A.4 and E.7.A.5); and corporate metrics (Section E.7.A.6). Attachment 3 is executed at award.
169.	Please confirm whether all work performed under this contract, including implementation, operations, maintenance, engineering support, and subcontractor activities, must be performed by U.S.-based U.S. persons located within the United States, and identify any exceptions permitted for offshore or non-U.S.-person resources.	"United States persons" in Section B.8.7 has the meaning in 22 C.F.R. 120.62. The requirement applies to all Contractor Staff, including subcontractor staff and platform provider staff with administrative access to the platform holding USAC Data. All Services must be performed in the United States (Section B.4.1); offshore resources are not permitted.

Q#	Question	Answer
170.	Can USAC clarify whether the proposed enterprise data platform must be a single commercially available product providing all mandatory capabilities natively, or whether an integrated solution using multiple commercially available products is acceptable, provided the core platform satisfies the single FedRAMP authorization-boundary requirement?	Section B.6 requires the core platform capability through a single authorized offering under a single authorization boundary. Additional authorized services within the same boundary, and integrations with USAC's existing tools, are allowed. Solutions assembled from multiple separately authorized third-party components to satisfy the core capability are not responsive.
171.	Section B.7.1.2 identifies AWS Commercial Cloud (US) or Microsoft Azure, whereas Section B.8.1 identifies AWS GovCloud (US) or Microsoft Azure Government. Could USAC clarify the acceptable hosting environments and the specific FedRAMP authorization boundary that the proposed platform must satisfy at the time of award?	Refer to answer 110. A vendor-managed SaaS offering must be FedRAMP Moderate or higher at award; a USAC-tenant deployment needs USAC's ATO before production (answer 21).
172.	Can USAC provide an inventory of existing data sources, database sizes, ETL jobs, reports, dashboards, analytical scripts, data models, and interfaces in scope for migration, including their complexity and usage	The Virtual Reading Room includes the source system inventory (platform, integration pattern and volumetrics for each in-scope source) and interface control documentation (Section B.13). The Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13). The Virtual Reading Room includes the Tableau workbook inventory and usage statistics (Section B.13). Report and semantic-model migration scope will be defined during the POC (Section B.7.2.2) and locked during detailed discovery in CLIN 0002.
173.	Could USAC clarify the anticipated duration, number of participating offerors, expected level of implementation effort, and deliverables for the POC	USAC will decide the number of POC participants based on the proposals received. USAC will run no more than one POC per technology platform, and POCs will run concurrently. The required test cases are in Section B.20.2, and the POC is performed at no cost to USAC (Section E.2). See question 50 for duration.

Q#	Question	Answer
174.	Can USAC provide the expected storage volumes, daily ingestion volumes, historical data retention requirements, concurrent user counts, query workload characteristics, and projected growth for each environment?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13).
175.	For the required CDC capabilities, can USAC confirm the source database versions, connectivity constraints, replication permissions, and whether the proposed platform must support CDC natively without a separate licensed ingestion product	The Virtual Reading Room includes the source system inventory (platform, integration pattern and volumetrics for each in-scope source) and interface control documentation (Section B.13). Refer to answer 265.
176.	Can USAC provide the expected volumes and complexity of geospatial datasets, required ArcGIS integrations, spatial processing workloads, and performance acceptance thresholds	The Virtual Reading Room includes the source system inventory (platform, integration pattern and volumetrics for each in-scope source) and interface control documentation (Section B.13).
177.	Can USAC provide the number and types of existing reports, dashboards, and semantic models to be migrated, including the BI technologies currently in use and the expected level of redesign versus like-for-like migration	The Virtual Reading Room includes the Tableau workbook inventory and usage statistics (Section B.13). Report and semantic-model migration scope will be defined during the POC (Section B.7.2.2) and locked during detailed discovery in CLIN 0002. Tableau is the current BI tool. Redesign versus like-for-like migration is defined during the POC and discovery.
178.	Can USAC identify the mandatory AI use cases expected from the platform and clarify whether AI functionality must be included in the core platform license or may be provided through separately licensed, authorized components	Section B.6.7 lists the required AI capabilities. Production use and deployment need USAC's prior written approval. Identify any AI capability that requires separate licensing (Section B.7.1.6).
179.	Can USAC clarify the required metadata catalog, lineage, data quality, and governance capabilities, including whether existing governance tools or configurations must be retained or migrated?	Requirements are in Sections B.6.1, B.6.4 and B.6.5. Refer to answer 117.
180.	Section B.6.6 references Socrata and permits a separately priced platform-native alternative. Can USAC clarify the existing public data publication environment, required integration, and expected scope for migrating or replacing	Refer to answer 124.
181.	Can USAC clarify whether the CLIN 0001 annual firm-fixed price must cover all platform licenses, consumption, storage, compute, disaster recovery, and required third-party licenses, including the four environments	Yes. CLIN 0001 must cover all platform licensing, subscription entitlements, hosting, disaster recovery, compute and storage for the four environments (Section B.7.1.1). Tableau, Collibra, Posit, ArcGIS and Socrata are excluded.

Q#	Question	Answer
182.	Can USAC provide the anticipated contract award date, implementation start date, target production cutover dates, and required completion date for the migration	The proposal schedule lists the award date as TBD, 2026 (Section E.1.C). USAC will tentatively seek to sign the contract in mid to late 2Q27 and begin implementation planning immediately thereafter.
183.	Can USAC confirm whether references from subcontractors or the proposed platform manufacturer may be used to demonstrate relevant experience, and how such references will be evaluated against the prime offeror's own past performance	Three past performance references are mandatory, and they must be the prime Offeror's own contracts. Contracts performed by subcontractors, teaming partners or the platform provider do not count toward the three. Proposals without three qualifying references will not be considered for further evaluation. Platform provider references do not count toward the three.
184.	Are there any minimum qualifications, clearance requirements, or on-site presence requirements beyond those explicitly specified for key personnel and contractor staff?	No security clearance is required. Requirements beyond Key Personnel qualifications include the U.S. person and background investigation requirements (Section B.8.7), USAC security training and Rules of Behavior (Section B.4.4), and the onsite requirement (answer 128).
185.	Does the bid sheet count toward the Volume 4-page limit?	No. Bid Sheet is attachment 1.
186.	Please clarify:E.2 cites “Section B.23,” which does not exist (Section B ends at B.20). E.7.B.11 cites “Section B.14.4.” The division-of-work requirement is B.11.4. E.8.1.C cites “Section B.14.1.” Key Personnel is B.11.1. B.9.7 cites “Section B.12.1” for P1 treatment. The P1 definition is B.9.1. B.10.1 deliverable 5 cites “Section B.12” for the escalation register. It should be B.9.1. E.11 cites “Section E.6.1” for the platform relationship disclosure. It is E.7.A.5. E.7.A.4.b cites “Section E.6.A.4.b.” It should be E.7.A.4.b.	hese references are corrected and a redlined RFP is posted to reflect the change..
187.	B.7.1.2 says, “AWS Commercial Cloud (US) or Microsoft Azure.” B.8.1 says “AWS GovCloud (US) or Microsoft Azure Government.” B.20.1 says a “dedicated public sector tenancy.” Which is required?	Refer to answers 110 and 157.

Q#	Question	Answer
188.	B.2 says hybrid FFP and T&M. C.8 says, “fixed-price, service category rate basis.” Attachment 3 calls the contract a “Firm-Fixed-Price Amendment.” CLIN 0002 is FFP with an “annual NTE” (B.7.2) but shown as a single FFP (B.2 and bid sheet). Which governs?	Section B.2 governs. The Contract is a hybrid: CLIN 0001 is annual FFP, CLIN 0002 is FFP with the initial price treated as an estimate definitized after the POC (answer 101), and CLIN 0003 is T&M with an annual NTE ceiling (Section B.2). A redlined RFP is posted to reflect the changes.
189.	C.1.N defines Key Personnel as “full-time employees.” B.11 says USAC “strongly prefers” employees of at least three years. Is employment mandatory?	Key Personnel must be employees of the Offeror or of a subcontractor identified in the proposal. The three-year tenure in Section B.11 is a preference, not a pass/fail requirement. Employment by the Offeror or an identified subcontractor is mandatory.
190.	B.6.9 requires 10 years in the active schema. The bid sheet (CLIN0001 row 13) says “6-year retention.” B.5.4 notes 25+ years currently in active storage. Which is correct?	Ten (10) years governs for design, sizing and pricing (Section B.6.9). The "6-year" wording in Attachment 1 is an error and will be corrected in the revised Bid Sheet. More than 25 years currently sit in active storage (Section B.5.2); data older than ten years moves to archive (Section B.6.9).
191.	B.9.2 requires the daily batch to finish by 6:00 AM ET. B.5.2 says the current ETL window runs to 10:00 AM and peak CPU is 3–10 AM. Does the 6:00 AM target apply from day one?	Yes, but can be negotiated with proper planning.
192.	B.9.1 requires a 1-hour initial response for P1 and 24x7 work. Support hours are 9–6 ET, Monday–Friday. Does the 1-hour response apply outside support hours?	P1 incidents are worked 24x7 until service is restored (Section B.9.1).
193.	Are the nine roles in B.11.1 the full Key Personnel list? Does E.7.B.15’s “all Key Personnel” include the additional labor categories in B.11.2?	Yes. The nine roles in Section B.11.1 are the full Key Personnel list. Resumes are required for Key Personnel only; the additional labor categories in Section B.11.2 do not need resumes.
194.	Does the 3-year employee preference apply to every role, or only Key Personnel?	The preference applies to Key Personnel (Section B.11), and it is a preference only.
195.	Will USAC publish its current vendor list for conflict disclosure (E.7.A.4.b)?	No.
196.	Does “similar scope” mean the same platform, or any comparable data platform?	Section E.7.C.3 asks for services similar in scope to Section B. Experience with the proposed platform is assessed separately under Section E.8.1.B.
197.	Does the three-year recency limit run from October 12, 2026, issue date or the proposal date?	Recency is measured from the solicitation issue date, October 12, 2026 (Section E.8.2).

Q#	Question	Answer
198.	Can a subcontractor’s contracts count toward our past performance?	Three past performance references are mandatory, and they must be the prime Offeror's own contracts. Contracts performed by subcontractors, teaming partners or the platform provider do not count toward the three. Proposals without three qualifying references will not be considered for further evaluation.
199.	Are government references acceptable if they lack a corporate email?	Government references are acceptable with an official government email address. Personal email domains are not (Section E.7.C.3).
200.	Section B.2 identifies CLIN 0002 as Firm-Fixed Price, while Section B.7.2 describes it as FFP with an annual not-to-exceed ceiling, and Section B.20 states that the ceiling and implementation plan will be definitized based on POC results. Please clarify: (a) whether the CLIN 0002 price submitted with the initial proposal is binding or an initial estimate to be definitized; (b) whether Offerors may revise CLIN 0002 pricing and scope assumptions in the FPR/BAFO following the POC; (c) how USAC will evaluate CLIN 0002 price during initial evaluation and any down-select under Section E.10; (d) whether the discovery and scoping activities in Section B.20.3 are performed pre-award by POC participants or post-award by the Contractor under CLIN 0002; and (e) that "CLIN 0002 and CLIN 0002 NTE ceilings" in Section B.20 is intended to read "CLIN 0002 and CLIN 0003."	(a) The CLIN 0002 price in the initial proposal is an estimate. It will be definitized through the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) and Best and Final Offer (BAFO) after the POC (Section E.9), and every offeror selected for the POC will have the same opportunity to revise. (b) Yes, through the FPR and BAFO. (c) Price is evaluated under Sections E.8.3 and E.10. (d) Preliminary discovery and scoping under Section B.20.3 is done during the POC, and USAC prefers it at no cost. Offerors may include additional time in CLIN 0002 for detailed discovery and to lock the MVP scope at the start of implementation. (e) Yes. Section B.20 should read "CLIN 0002 and CLIN 0003 NTE ceilings." This will be corrected in the redlined RFP.
201.	Section B.2 does not describe a definitization process for the CLIN 0003 NTE ceiling. Please describe how and when the CLIN 0003 NTE ceiling will be definitized, and confirm whether the Overall NTE should be calculated across the base period and both option years. Please also state whether the Bid Sheet will prescribe estimated hours by labor category for CLIN 0003, or whether Offerors should propose their own labor mix and hours; if the latter, please explain how USAC will normalize differing labor mixes when evaluating price.	The CLIN 0003 NTE ceiling is definitized after the POC together with CLIN 0002 (answer to question # 308). The overall NTE covers all three CLINs across the base period and both option years (Sections B.2 and E.8.3). The revised Attachment 1 adds a CLIN 0003 labor rate table.

Q#	Question	Answer
202.	Given a maximum three-year Contract Term, phased cutovers by domain, a minimum 90-day parallel run before each cutover, and a minimum 60-day hypercare period after each cutover, does USAC have a target date (e.g., end of the base year, or a legacy Vertica or Pentaho license or support expiration date) by which migration should be complete and the legacy EDW decommissioned? If so, can USAC provide the date?	Legacy system constraints will be discussed during planning and discovery after the contract is signed.
203.	Please confirm the two-day on-site requirement applies to Key Personnel and staff based in the Washington, D.C. area, and whether USAC will approve virtual performance for any roles.	The two-day-per-week onsite requirement applies to all Contractor Staff. USAC is willing to consider alternate staffing proposals, which offerors should describe in the technical proposal.
204.	The Virtual Reading Room (VRR) contains the sizing basis, source inventories, and user counts that drive pricing, but access requires an executed Confidentiality Agreement and questions are due October 20, 2026. Will USAC will accept a second round of questions limited to VRR content?	No. USAC will not hold a second round of questions.
205.	Please confirm that a platform holding its own FedRAMP Moderate or High authorization, which inherits controls from an underlying FedRAMP-authorized infrastructure provider, satisfies the single authorization boundary requirement. Please also clarify whether services authorized under the underlying infrastructure provider's separate boundary (e.g., GPU compute, large language model services, vector search) may be used to satisfy Sections B.6.7 and B.6.12, or whether such use would be considered assembling the core platform from multiple separately authorized components.	A solution may inherit controls from an underlying IaaS FedRAMP provider for the controls that are provided by the infrastructure provider. A solution merely operating on a FedRAMP IaaS does not make the solution FedRAMP. The core platform may require separate components that need to work together and the entire new boundary will be subject to FISMA Assessment to achieve ATO. See #154
206.	Please identify the enterprise content management repositories in use, the approximate volume and document types of unstructured content, and whether ingestion of unstructured content is in scope for CLIN 0002 or is a capability to be demonstrated for future use.	Repositories in use, content volumes and types Will be provided during Virtual Reading Room.
207.	Sections B.6.4 and B.6.6 do not describe Structure 1, Structure 2, Option A, or Option B. Please provide the descriptions of these alternatives, along with any criteria USAC will use to compare them. Please also clarify whether Collibra is expected to remain USAC's enterprise catalog of record.	Refer to answer 141. USAC will keep Collibra as its enterprise catalog of record (answer 117).

Q#	Question	Answer
208.	Multiple sections reference the "mandatory floor" items in Section B.6.6 (cutover reconciliation criteria, the P1 incident definition, the Parallel Run Reconciliation Report, and the migration approach), but Section B.6.6 does not define them. Can USAC please clarify the items included in the "mandatory floor"?	Refer to answer 141.
209.	The POC requires demonstration of natural language query and other AI-enabled capabilities. Please confirm whether AI-enabled platform features used within the USAC-provided POC enclave are pre-approved for POC purposes, or describe the process and timing for obtaining approval before POC execution.	Yes. Platform-native AI capabilities used for the POC test cases are approved for POC use. Any other AI tools still need prior written approval under Section B.6.7.
210.	Please clarify whether USAC expects the platform to host ArcGIS Pro sessions (e.g., GPU-enabled virtual desktops) for GIS users, or only to support direct database connections from USAC-managed ArcGIS Pro clients. If hosting is expected, please provide the number of named and concurrent GIS users.	USAC will host ArcGIS.
211.	Please specify the reserved or guaranteed GPU capacity USAC expects (e.g., number and class of GPUs), the intended workloads (e.g., model training, inference, geospatial processing), and whether reserved GPU capacity should be priced within the CLIN 0001 annual FFP.	Volume and workload details will be provided during Virtual Reading Room.
212.	Sections B.7.1.2 and B.8.1 state different hosting requirements. Please clarify the hosting requirement and whether the same requirement applies to the POC enclave.	Refer to answers 110 and 157.
213.	Each of the nine Key Personnel roles requires a minimum of twelve (12) years of experience. Many capabilities central to this effort, including cloud-native data platform and lakehouse architecture, log-based CDC into cloud platforms, enterprise semantic layers, and AI/LLM enablement, have matured commercially within roughly the last five years. Total years of experience may therefore be a weaker indicator of qualification than recent, directly relevant delivery experience. Would USAC consider reducing the minimum experience requirement for Key Personnel roles?	The twelve-year minimum in Section B.11.1 is USAC's preference. USAC will consider individuals with fewer years who bring directly relevant experience.

Q#	Question	Answer
214.	Please provide the anticipated number of Offerors to be selected for the POC, the anticipated start date and duration.	USAC will decide the number of POC participants based on the proposals received. USAC will run no more than one POC per technology platform, and POCs will run concurrently. See question 50 for duration.
215.	Please describe the USAC-provided POC enclave, including the cloud provider and region type (e.g., commercial or government region), and whether the Offeror's platform is expected to be deployed within USAC's enclave account or whether a vendor-managed SaaS tenancy connected to the enclave over private networking satisfies the requirement. Please also confirm that Offerors are responsible for platform licensing during the POC, and whether USAC or the Offeror bears cloud compute and storage consumption costs are within the USAC enclave.	USAC will consider both models: a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, or the offeror's vendor tenant connected to USAC over private networking. The POC is performed at no cost to USAC (Section E.2). Offerors bear platform licensing and their own labor and support costs. If the POC runs in a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, USAC pays for that infrastructure. If it runs in the offeror's own tenant, the offeror bears those costs.
216.	Please confirm which items are excluded from the Volume 2 forty (40) page limit, specifically: the Mandatory Requirements Certification (E.7.B.3), the Platform Capability Compliance Matrix (E.7.B.4), the POC Test Plan (E.7.B.5), the "Exceptions to RFP Terms" attachment (E.1.A), and the general counsel review certification (E.1.A). Please also confirm whether "technical appendices" are subject to any page limit or content restrictions.	The Platform Capability Compliance Matrix, Mandatory Requirements Certification, POC Test Plan and Exceptions to RFP Terms attachment are excluded from the 40-page Volume 2 limit.
217.	Please confirm (a) which scenario will be used to calculate the total evaluated price, and how USAC will evaluate the difference between the two scenarios; and (b) that the cost for "use of AI in performance of the Services" (e.g., AI-assisted code conversion, testing, or documentation) must be accounted for in CLIN 0001.	Both versions of the Bid Sheet must include the platform AI capability required by Section B.6.7. The two versions differ only in the Contractor's use of AI to perform the Services. USAC will consider both the AI and non-AI prices in evaluation. Refer to question 153 for more information about use of AI.
218.	Please state the relative importance of the evaluation factors (Technical, Experience & Past Performance, and Price), whether all non-price factors combined are more important than price, and how POC results will be considered (e.g., as a pass/fail gate, within the Technical factor, or as a separate factor).	Section E.8.1 lists the technical sub-factors in descending order of importance. POC results are considered in the award decision (Section E.8).

Q#	Question	Answer
219.	How many Pentaho (PDI) jobs and transformations exist today (with schedules and a simple / moderate / complex breakdown), and how many are expected to be re-implemented versus retired? Should the ~1,282 tables currently on daily full truncate-and-load be redesigned as incremental/CDC loads or migrated as-is?	Pentaho will be fully replaced, and the disposition of existing jobs is defined during discovery (Sections B.6.2 and B.20.3). The Reading Room includes the table and object inventory and load profile
220.	Please provide the in-scope source inventory: the number of source systems and interfaces by technology and version (PostgreSQL, SQL Server, MariaDB, Oracle EBS, Dynamics 365, files, external feeds, APIs), where each runs (AWS RDS or on-premises), and, for the ~9,750 tables loaded daily, how many use each load pattern (log-based CDC, incremental batch, full reload, event-driven)? Also, will Oracle EBS (UNiFi) and Dynamics 365 data be ingested using CDC, given that the mandatory CDC source list names only PostgreSQL, SQL Server and MariaDB?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the source system inventory (platform, integration pattern and volumetrics for each in-scope source) and interface control documentation (Section B.13).
221.	The RFP requires the core platform to be delivered within a single FedRAMP-authorized offering and authorization boundary. Please define which capabilities are considered part of the core platform (for example: storage/compute, ingestion/CDC, orchestration, transformation, catalog/lineage, data quality, semantic layer, notebooks/ML, AI) and which may be delivered by separately authorized services (for example: Collibra, Tableau, ArcGIS Enterprise, Posit, Socrata, a CDC/replication tool, an LLM service).	Refer to answer 21.
222.	What sources from the Source System List are geospatial, and how many geospatial tables are currently in the Enterprise Data Warehouse today?	Currently, there is no geospatial data in the data warehouse.
223.	Which of the required AI capabilities must be implemented and operational at go-live, and which only need to be available for future enablement? Does the implementation scope include configuring natural-language query, vector search/RAG and agent workflows?	Platform AI capability is required. USAC expects all platform capability to be operational, although this can be achieved via a phased deployment approach.

Q#	Question	Answer
224.	The role of Collibra is described differently in different places: as metadata to be migrated, as something the platform must integrate with, and as something the platform's own enterprise catalog must replace. Is Collibra to be (a) retained as the enterprise catalog with the platform feeding it metadata and lineage, or (b) replaced by the platform-native catalog with existing Collibra content migrated? If migrated, approximately how much content (assets, domains, workflows, glossary terms) is in scope?	Refer to answer 117.
225.	Section B.7.1.2 permits hosting in AWS Commercial Cloud (US) or Microsoft Azure, while Section B.8.1 requires AWS GovCloud (US) or Microsoft Azure Government for all copies of USAC Data. Which requirement governs? Is a FedRAMP Moderate offering hosted in AWS Commercial US regions compliant?	Refer to answers 110 and 138.
226.	The RFP refers to 'performance standards' for cutover acceptance and stress testing, but defines only incident, availability, freshness and batch SLAs. What numeric performance targets (query latency by tier, concurrent users, concurrent queries, batch durations) apply to cutover acceptance?	Numeric performance targets for cutover acceptance (query latency by tier, concurrent users and queries, batch durations) will be provided during Virtual Reading Room.
227.	According to the GSA labor category pricing tool (buy.gsa.gov Pricing Intelligence Suite), the average rate on the GSA Schedule for an IT professional with 12+ years of experience for a business with the bench size required to support this requirement is $230+ per hour. 9 Key Personnel with 12+ years of experience required will result in a rather costly team. Can USAC A) share the budget for this effort and/or B) consider lowering the Key Personnel requirements to alleviate cost concerns?	USAC will not share budget or cost estimate information. The twelve-year minimum in Section B.11.1 is USAC's preference. USAC will consider individuals with fewer years who bring directly relevant experience.
228.	Is USAC open to offerors proposing Key Personnel that have less years of experience but still demonstrate significant proficiency with the proposed technology?	The twelve-year minimum in Section B.11.1 is USAC's preference. USAC will consider individuals with fewer years who bring directly relevant experience.
229.	Will USAC consider reducing the years of experience requested for the Data Modeling Lead, Migration Lead and Security Lead to 8 years of experience, the Change Management Lead and Senior Business Intelligence Architect to 6 years of experience and the Senior DevSecOps Engineer and Senior Data Warehouse QA/Test Engineer to 5 years of experience?	The twelve-year minimum in Section B.11.1 is USAC's preference. USAC will consider individuals with fewer years who bring directly relevant experience.

Q#	Question	Answer
230.	The requirement that Key Personnel have at least 3 years at the offeror's company will preclude many companies from forming teams/utilizing subcontractors for this effort. This will greatly reduce the competition pool. To ensure fair competition, will USAC consider removing this requirement?	The three-year tenure is a preference, and Key Personnel may be employees of a subcontractor identified in the proposal (answer 3).
231.	Is report migration expected to be a like-for-like rebuild or a re-pointing of existing workbooks to the new platform, and what is the expected scope of 'report rationalization'?	Refer to answer 52.
232.	Per section B.11.2, there should be a labor category description tab on the bid sheet. Can USAC please add this to provide more clarity on expectations around non-key personnel LCATs?	USAC will issue a revised Attachment 1 that adds the labor category descriptions tab and a CLIN 0003 labor rate table, and corrects the CLIN 0003 subtotal formula.
233.	In section B.20, USAC indicates that select offerors may be asked to provide a POC. Additionally, in section E.1.C USAC indicates that USAC plans to make an award for this opportunity in 2026. Can USAC clarify how much time vendors will be given to prepare their POC?	See question 50 for PoC durations
234.	Can USAC confirm if the POC environment that vendors set up should be customer owned or contractor owned?	USAC will consider both models: a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, or the offeror's vendor tenant connected to USAC over private networking.
235.	Can USAC confirm if the vendor is supposed to use their own platform licenses for the POC?	Yes. Offerors use their own platform licenses for the POC (answer 106).
236.	Section B.20 states that the POC will be used to select the hosting model. That being said, offerors will need to understand the hosting and tenancy model in order to provide accurate pricing in the bid sheet to USAC. Can USAC please clarify this statement?	Offerors should price the hosting and tenancy model they propose (Section E.7.B.2). The POC informs USAC's final selection, and pricing may be revised in the FPR and BAFO (Section E.9).
237.	Section 20.3 states that discovery should occur concurrent with the POC, however Section B.20 states that the POC will occur before contract award. A discovery period requires access to data and key SMEs and will not be able to be conducted effectively prior to contract award. Can USAC clarify the timing of the discovery period and confirm that it will occur after an offeror is awarded the contract?	Preliminary discovery and scoping under Section B.20.3 is done during the POC, and USAC prefers it at no cost. Offerors may include additional time in CLIN 0002 for detailed discovery and to lock the MVP scope at the start of implementation.
238.	Will USAC allow offerors to include diagrams and charts as images as long as the text is not distorted, and aligns with the required text size no smaller than 9-point Times New Roman as outlined in the RFP?	Diagrams and charts must be built in their native program; images of diagrams are not acceptable (Section E.6.1.d). Text in diagrams, tables and charts may be no smaller than 9-point Times New Roman.

Q#	Question	Answer
239.	The RFP refers to 'Structure 1' and 'Structure 2' (business intelligence) and 'Option A' and 'Option B' (data governance) as if previously described, but no definitions appear in the document. Please provide these definitions.	Refer to answer 141.
240.	The RFP refers to 'mandatory floor' items and data products as defined elsewhere, but no list is provided. Please provide the list of mandatory floor items and data products, including the source system, refresh frequency and consumers for each.	Refer to answer 141. There is no predefined list; it will be set during discovery.
241.	Given the language in Attachment 3, offerors and USAC will need to agree to a formal scope and technical architecture before proceeding with implementation, in order to ensure USAC and the contractor are aligned on requirements and what is "reasonably discoverable." That being said, there are no formal deliverables associated with this aspect of the project. Can USAC clarify when they expect this alignment to occur and how it will be documented?	Alignment happens through discovery: preliminary discovery during the POC, then detailed discovery at the start of CLIN 0002 to lock the MVP scope (answer 102). The requirements baseline, Technical Design Document and Requirements Traceability Matrix document it (Attachment 3, Sections 1 and 6).
242.	Given the language in Attachment 3, offerors will need to take a Waterfall, instead of Agile, approach to delivery based on the scope agreed to during the discovery period. Can USAC clarify that this is expected?	USAC does not prescribe a delivery method. Offerors must use PM@USAC (Section B.18), and the agreed requirements baseline governs scope under Attachment 3.
243.	The requirement for no-cost remediation of defects and missing requirements for an indefinite period, including after the close of the project, presents an undefined amount of risk to the contractor, which may limit the competition pool only to offerors who can afford to take on undefined and unbound financial risk. To ensure open competition and to enable offerors to bid their most competitive pricing, will USAC consider removing or bounding the requirements in Attachment 3 to clearly defined warranty periods, as well as incorporating a milestone for documented requirement alignment between USAC and the Contractor to serve as the source of truth for missed requirements/defects?	The requirement for no-cost remediation of defects and missing requirements applies through the conclusion and acceptance of all deliverables defined within and through CLIN 0002.
244.	Can USAC proved an architecture diagram of the current (Vertica) solution?	Current L1, L2 and L3 data models and current-state assessment materials are in the Reading Room (Section B.13).

Q#	Question	Answer
245.	Can USAC provide guidance on scope and duration of CLIN0003? For example should the Offeror assume 'Hypercare' for post implementation until the end of the second renewal option year?	CLIN 0003 covers hypercare of at least 60 days after each cutover, followed by operations and maintenance, and transition-out (Section B.7.3). Hypercare is expected for 60 days following each Production deployment.
246.	Can all of the implementation staff be virtual (i.e., remote, but residing in the US)? Is there a preferred percentage that would be local to USAC headquarters?	The two-day-per-week onsite requirement applies to all Contractor Staff. USAC is willing to consider alternate staffing proposals, which offerors should describe in the technical proposal. All work must be performed within the United States.
247.	Implies COOP (DR) plans will be provided on USAC request. Does this also mean a COOP (DR) implementation is not put in place until requested by USAC? This appears to be in conflict with Section 10.1 (page 31), Table row 13 requesting test results measuring RTO/RPO?	Disaster recovery meeting Section B.9.3 is required and must be tested before the first cutover (Sections B.7.2.1, B.8.5 and Deliverable 13). The COOP plan in Section B.4.6 is a document provided on USAC's request.
248.	Ending paragraph states 'use and deployment are seperately gated'. Section 6.12 requests reserved or guaranteed GPU capacity etc. Can USAC provide clarity from on requirements to enable fidelity for CLIN 0001?	AI use and deployment are gated by prior written approval (Section B.6.7).
249.	Does the 'ability for an administrator to create and manage separate project workspaces, sandboxes,…' a requirement for the Development environment -or- is this a separate infrastructure/environment?	Contractors should explain flexibility and constraints around the ability for an administrator to create and manage project workspaces and/or sandboxes pertaining to their proposed solution.
250.	This section makes specific mention of AWS and Azure, can the offeror propose solutions from other Hyperscalers (e.g., Google, Oracle)?	Refer to answer 110. Google Cloud and Oracle Cloud are not acceptable.
251.	Is there a desired timeframe for USAC to assume operation of the platform? Will this be done on a functional, environment or alternate method	See answer to question 65.
252.	Who is responsible for funding the SOC 2 Type II report? Please confirm that this is required annually?	See # 140 – a SOC 2 Type II is not required.
253.	How much notice will be provided to Offers that are selected for POC? Will datasets and other supporting details be made available prior to the POC?	USAC supplies the POC dataset (Section B.20.1). See answer to question 50
254.	Could USAC please confirm the procedure and expected turnaround time for granting access to the Virtual Reading Room after the required executed Attachment 2 (USAC Confidentiality Agreement) and employee details have been submitted?	USAC grants Virtual Reading Room access about one week after receiving the signed Attachment 2. Each teaming partner, including subcontractors and the platform provider, must sign and submit its own Attachment 2.

Q#	Question	Answer
255.	Could USAC provide the available data inventories, estimated data volumes, existing database/data warehouse specifications, storage requirements, and concurrency-sizing assumptions (including peak concurrent query counts, user personas, and schema counts) needed to prepare an accurate cost estimate under CLIN 0001?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13). The Virtual Reading Room includes the source system inventory (platform, integration pattern and volumetrics for each in-scope source) and interface control documentation (Section B.13). Current L1, L2 and L3 data models are also included.
256.	Could USAC confirm the required quantities or sizing baselines for platform licensing, compute resources, and storage across the Development, Test/QA, Pre-Production, and Production environments? In particular, must all offerors price against a prescribed baseline, such as the 26 TB licensed capacity, to ensure a consistent price evaluation?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13). CLIN 0001 is priced at the capacity levels set by the Reading Room sizing basis (Section B.7.1.1).
257.	Where exact quantities are not specified in the Bid Sheet, may offerors propose their own resource sizing, architectural scaling models, and supporting assumptions? Also, will USAC accept a dedicated "Pricing Assumptions & Sizing Methodology" appendix in Volume 4?	CLIN 0001 is priced at the Reading Room sizing basis (Section B.7.1.1). Offerors may state sizing assumptions and methodology in Volume 4.
258.	May platform-native AI capabilities (such as natural-language querying or AI-assisted data discovery) be demonstrated during the mandatory Proof of Concept (POC) without prior written pre-approval, or must an AI-use disclosure be submitted and approved before POC execution?	Yes. Platform-native AI capabilities used for the POC test cases are approved for POC use. Any other AI tools still need prior written approval under Section B.6.7.
259.	Could USAC provide the anticipated schedule and duration for the POC, the expected secure-enclave provisioning window, and the timeline for shortlisted offerors to receive access to the synthetic/de-identified dataset for test-case execution?	USAC will decide the number of POC participants based on the proposals received. USAC will run no more than one POC per technology platform, and POCs will run concurrently. answer to question 50

Q#	Question	Answer
260.	Section B.7.1.2 states the platform shall be provided within *"AWS Commercial Cloud (US) or Microsoft Azure,"* while Section B.8.1 states all hosting shall be within *"AWS GovCloud (US) or Microsoft Azure Government."* These are distinct environments with different service availability, authorization boundaries, and cost structures. Please clarify which cloud region(s) are acceptable for the production environment and whether USAC requires GovCloud/Government-region hosting or will accept Commercial-region hosting within a FedRAMP Moderate authorized boundary.	Refer to answers 110 and 138.
261.	Section B.6 states that *"solutions assembled from multiple separately authorized third-party components to satisfy the core platform capability are not responsive."* Please clarify the intended scope of "core platform capability" in two dimensions: (a) Storage architecture: Would a platform architecture in which the vendor provides a managed compute and query service under its own FedRAMP authorization, but requires the customer to separately provision, authorize, and manage the underlying cloud object storage (e.g., S3 buckets or ADLS containers) and associated cloud-provider services outside the vendor's authorization boundary, be considered "assembled from multiple separately authorized third-party components" and therefore non-responsive? (b) Data ingestion and CDC: Would a platform that satisfies the native CDC requirements of Section B.6.2 through fully managed, vendor-supported connectors or partner-provided connectors operating within the same FedRAMP authorization boundary — rather than through a CDC engine architecturally embedded in the platform's core processing kernel — be considered "assembled from multiple separately authorized third-party components"? This distinction is material because no major cloud data platform embeds CDC engines for PostgreSQL, MariaDB, and SQL Server within its core kernel; CDC is universally delivered through managed connectors within the platform ecosystem.	Section B.6 allows additional authorized services within the same authorization boundary.

Q#	Question	Answer
262.	Section B.5.2 identifies a reporting query that scans 26.5 billion rows to produce 88 rows of output. To accurately size the proposed platform: (a) how frequently do queries of this scale execute (daily, weekly, ad hoc)? (b) What is the acceptable response time for this query class? (c) Given that Section B.5.4 identifies the current normalized data model as a documented limitation, does USAC expect the new platform to materially improve the performance of such queries through re-modeling (e.g., pre-aggregation, clustering, materialized views), or must the existing query pattern be preserved as-is?	The example here is an edge case specific query performance issues will need to be addressed case by case as they are identified during the implementation.
263.	Section B.6.11 requires four isolated environments. To accurately price CLIN 0001: (a) must the Pre-Production environment hold full production-representative data volumes continuously, or only during designated testing windows? (b) What are the expected utilization patterns for the Development and Test/QA environments — are they continuously active with always-on compute, or provisioned and active on demand? (c) Are there specific uptime or availability requirements for non-production environments? (d) Will USAC accept zero-copy clone technology that instantiates production-representative environments without duplicating physical storage, provided all isolation, security, and access control requirements in Section B.8 are met?	Pre-Production must be able to hold production-representative volumes (Section B.6.11).
264.	Section E.9 references the POC process but does not specify key logistics. Please provide: (a) the anticipated number of Offerors that will be selected for POC execution, (b) the maximum duration allotted for POC execution, (c) whether POCs will run concurrently or sequentially across selected Offerors, and (d) the anticipated start date for POC execution.	USAC will decide the number of POC participants based on the proposals received. USAC will run no more than one POC per technology platform, and POCs will run concurrently. See answer to question 50
265.	Section B.6.2 requires *"native CDC capability against PostgreSQL, SQL Server, and MariaDB sources through vendor-supported configuration or graphical interfaces, without requiring extensive custom development."* Please clarify whether a fully managed, vendor-supported CDC connector that is included in or available as part of the platform subscription — and configurable through the platform's interface without custom code — satisfies the "native" requirement, or whether USAC requires the CDC engine to be architecturally embedded within the platform's core processing engine itself.	Open to recommendation.

Q#	Question	Answer
266.	Section B.6.8 requires *"Direct ArcGIS Pro connection to the cloud database."* Please clarify whether this means: (a) ArcGIS Pro connecting to the platform via standard ODBC/JDBC or a vendor-provided connector to query and visualize spatial data, or (b) the platform registering as a full Esri enterprise geodatabase supporting versioned editing, topology, and geometric networks. If (b), please note that full enterprise geodatabase registration is an Esri-proprietary capability not natively supported by any cloud-native data platform, and that on-premises-only solutions are expressly out of scope per Section B.5.5.	ArcGIS is hosted separately. Expect to integrate with existing ArcGIS solution.
267.	Section B.6.8 and B.20.2 require point-in-polygon spatial joins intersecting broadband deployment coordinates against federal eligibility boundary polygons at production-representative scale, but do not specify the dataset dimensions. Please provide: (a) the approximate number of broadband deployment coordinate points (order of magnitude), (b) the approximate number and geometric complexity of federal eligibility boundary polygons, and (c) whether USAC has a target execution time for a full-scale spatial intersect. This information does not appear to be included in the Virtual Reading Room materials listed in Section B.13.	Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13)
268.	Section E.7.B.7 requires Offerors to address the *"Treatment of Structure 1 and Structure 2 as described in Section B.6.6."* Multiple sections reference a *"mandatory floor"* for report migration (Sections B.7.2.2, B.7.2.3, B.10.1). These terms do not appear to be defined in the publicly available sections of this RFP. Please confirm whether these definitions are available in the Virtual Reading Room, or provide them through the Q&A response.	Refer to answer 141.
269.	Section E.7.B.8 requires Offerors to address the *"Treatment of Option A and Option B as described in Section B.6.4."* These options do not appear to be defined in the publicly available sections of this RFP. Please confirm whether these definitions are available in the Virtual Reading Room, or provide them through the Q&A response.	Refer to answer 141.

Q#	Question	Answer
270.	Section B.2 designates CLIN 0001 (platform licensing, hosting, and storage) as Annual Firm-Fixed Price. Will USAC be amenable to an Annual FFP that includes a set amount of platform capacity sized to meet the stated requirements, with no additional charges to USAC during the year? To help Offerors size that capacity accurately, can USAC share any additional workload information (e.g., expected usage patterns or peak demand), or should Offerors rely on the volumetrics in Section B.5.2 and the Virtual Reading Room?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13). CLIN 0001 is annual FFP at the Reading Room sizing basis (Section B.7.1.1).
271.	Section B.13 states that "concurrency figures and user counts by persona" are available in the Virtual Reading Room, but Section B.5.2 provides no user counts in the public RFP. Concurrent user load is the primary driver of compute sizing and cost for cloud-native data platforms. Will USAC provide concurrent user counts by persona (non-technical business user, program analyst, data engineer, security administrator) and peak concurrent query volumes in the Q&A response, or only through the Virtual Reading Room? Additionally, does USAC anticipate growth in the analytical user population during the Contract Term?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13). USAC does not anticipate growth in the analytical user population during the contract term. However, USAC does expect that non-analytical users will adopt the platform to utilize NLQ capabilities.
272.	Section B.5.2 establishes a current data footprint of approximately 10–13 TB with 50–100 GB of daily ingest. However, the RFP does not provide a projected annual data growth rate. (a) What is USAC's estimated annual data growth rate over the 3-year Contract Term and 5-year planning horizon referenced in Section B.20.3? (b) Does USAC anticipate onboarding material new data sources, programs, or data types (e.g., unstructured content, streaming data) during the Contract Term that would materially alter the current volumetrics?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13).
273.	Section B.7.2.3 requires parallel operation of "not less than ninety (90) calendar days prior to each production cutover." Section B.7.2.3 also directs a "phased cutover sequenced by data domain." Please clarify: (a) Does the 90-day minimum apply independently to each data domain being cut over, or is it a single 90-day parallel window encompassing the entire migration? (b) If per-domain, may the parallel periods for successive domains overlap, or must they run sequentially? This distinction has material implications for the duration, staffing, and cost of CLIN 0002.	Section B.7.2.3 requires at least 90 days of parallel operation before each production cutover.

Q#	Question	Answer
274.	Section B.6.6 permits Offerors to "propose platform-native external publication as a separately priced and separately evaluated alternate" to Socrata. For Offerors proposing this alternate: (a) Would USAC consider a governed, live data-sharing model that allows authorized external consumers to query governed data products directly — without file-based publication or batch data export — as responsive to this alternate? (b) What is the expected number of external consumer organizations and approximate query volume against the public data currently served through opendata.usac.org? (c) What API or access patterns do current external consumers rely on (e.g., Socrata SODA API, bulk download, OData)?	Socrata remains the baseline; a platform-native alternate is separately priced and evaluated (Section B.6.6).
275.	Section B.6.12 requires reserved or guaranteed GPU capacity and autoscaling GPU clusters. Does USAC have a current or projected GPU workload (model types, training frequency, inference volume) that Offerors should size against, or is this requirement forward-looking to support future AI/ML adoption? If forward-looking, should Offerors price GPU capacity as an optional, separately priced line item, or include a baseline GPU allocation in the CLIN 0001 FFP?	Access to Virtual Reading Room will be available until proposal deadline. VRR includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13)
276.	Existing platform version and SQL conversion: Section B.5.1 identifies the current environment as an on-premises Vertica EDW. Please state the Vertica version in scope and confirm whether CLIN 0002 migration includes conversion of Vertica-specific SQL and stored procedures, or whether USAC will own that remediation.	Contractor should plan to provide Vertica replacement solution.
277.	Pentaho inventory: Section B.7.2.1 directs retirement of the Pentaho Data Integration jobs and a native rebuild, so retention is not in question. Please confirm the Virtual Reading Room includes a Pentaho job and transformation inventory with complexity indicators sufficient to size the rebuild or provide the counts.	Confirmed. The Virtual Reading Room has all the required material.
278.	Tableau inventory: Section B.5.2 identifies 59 certified Tableau data sources. Please provide the total Tableau workbook and dashboard count in scope and confirm whether migration is limited to connection re-pointing and functional validation or includes redesign for the mandatory-floor reports.	The Virtual Reading Room includes the Tableau workbook inventory and usage statistics (Section B.13).If the Offeror is proposing to use Tableau then the scope is limited to connection re-pointing. If the Offeror is proposing another BI solution then the scope must also include re-building mandatory-floor reports.

Q#	Question	Answer
279.	Source database versions and initial load: CDC latency (300 seconds), automatic schema propagation, and transaction-log access are already specified. Please provide the engine versions of the in-scope SQL Server, PostgreSQL, and MariaDB sources, and state any required initial full-load completion window.	The Virtual Reading Room includes the source system inventory (platform, integration pattern and volumetrics for each in-scope source) and interface control documentation (Section B.13).
280.	Performance acceptance thresholds: The service levels in B.9.2 are understood. Please state the target query-response percentiles and concurrent-user levels that will constitute acceptance and confirm whether the numeric POC pass thresholds will be published before the proposal due date or only at down-select.	USAC will share the numeric pass thresholds with all participating offerors before the POC starts. The same thresholds apply to every participant (Section E.9).
281.	Collibra licenses and access: Lineage requirements are specified in B.6.4. Please confirm USAC will provide the Collibra licenses and API/integration access needed to connect the platform and migrate existing Collibra content, and whether lineage must capture legacy custom-SQL transformations during migration.	Tableau, Collibra, Posit, ArcGIS and Socrata licenses stay USAC-funded and are outside CLIN 0001. .
282.	Identity attribute catalog: The role-, row-, and attribute-based enforcement model is specified in B.8.2. Please confirm whether the Okta group and attribute catalog used to drive row- and attribute-level policies will be provided in the Virtual Reading Room or defined at CLIN 0002 design.	Okta information will be defined at CLIN 0002 and will be aligned to the USAC Okta and access control policies and procedures.
283.	Masking and tokenization behavior: Section B.8.3 specifies dynamic masking and tokenization at query time and names Lifeline PII. Please confirm whether tokenization must be reversible and must preserve consistent (deterministic) values across tables to retain referential integrity for analytics.	Tokenization does not have to be reversible since there is an original source for the data.
284.	AI and natural-language query constraints: The required AI capabilities are enumerated in B.6.7. Please confirm whether platform-generated and natural-language queries must be read-only; whether USAC will provide approved in-boundary LLM endpoints or the Contractor must supply them; and whether USAC will define numeric accuracy and auditability acceptance criteria for NLQ beyond the POC test.	LLM endpoints may operate outside the core platform boundary (answer 21).
285.	Reconciliation tolerances and cutover outage: Cutover gates are set in B.7.2.3. Please confirm whether reconciliation tolerances and any maximum allowable cutover outage or rollback window are offeror-proposed in the approved test plan or prescribed by USAC.	Refer to answer 121.

Q#	Question	Answer
286.	Disaster recovery scope: Do the 4-hour RTO and 1-hour RPO in B.9.3 apply to the complete service, including the ingestion and integration tiers, and must they be demonstrated for a full cloud-region outage or only to the production database environment as written?	The RTO is four hours and the RPO is one hour for the production environment (Section B.9.3).
287.	Hypercare exit criteria: Section B.7.3.1 sets a hypercare period of not less than 60 days, exited by USAC written acceptance. Please state the objective criteria (e.g., defect backlog, stability and SLA attainment) USAC will apply in granting that acceptance.	Exit requires USAC's written acceptance (Section B.7.3.1) and a Hypercare Exit Report (Deliverable 17).
288.	Migration access and responsibility: Please confirm USAC will provide access to non-production instances of the in-scope source systems during CLIN 0002 (not only the POC enclave); that existing PDI pipeline configurations and Tableau/report definitions are available in the Virtual Reading Room; and beyond UNIFi, which USAC owns per B.5.5 where responsibility sits for upstream source-schema changes required by the migration.	USAC will provide necessary access.
289.	Past-performance references: For the three required past-performance references, may references from proposed subcontractors or teaming partners be counted, or must all three be the prime Offeror's own contracts?	Three past performance references are mandatory, and they must be the prime Offeror's own contracts. Contracts performed by subcontractors, teaming partners or the platform provider do not count toward the three. Proposals without three qualifying references will not be considered for further evaluation.
290.	Subcontractor threshold and platform vendor: Section E.6.A.2 requires a coordination, management, and risk-mitigation plan where more than two subcontractors are proposed. Please confirm whether the platform OEM/vendor a licensor/reseller relationship rather than a services subcontractor counts toward that threshold.	No. A platform OEM or reseller that only supplies licenses does not count toward the two-subcontractor threshold. The relationship must still be disclosed under Section E.7.A.5.
291.	Hosting clause conflict: Section B.7.1.2 requires AWS Commercial Cloud (US) or Microsoft Azure, while B.8.1 requires AWS GovCloud (US) or Microsoft Azure Government for primary, backup, and disaster-recovery copies of USAC Data. These provisions conflict; please confirm which governs.	Refer to answer 110.

Q#	Question	Answer
292.	Authorization-boundary scope: Please confirm that only the core platform capability must reside within the single FedRAMP authorization boundary, and that authorized integrations with USAC's existing Collibra, Tableau, Okta, and ArcGIS Enterprise and any approved external LLM endpoints may operate outside that boundary.	Refer to answer 21.
293.	SOC 2 attestation: Section B.8.1 requires the Contractor to hold and maintain a SOC 2 Type II report. Where the platform is a third-party SaaS offering, does the platform vendor's SOC 2 Type II satisfy this requirement, or must the prime Contractor independently hold its own?	See #140 and #21 – a SOC 2 Type II is not required.
294.	Reseller license path: Please confirm that platform entitlements may be acquired through an authorized reseller or distributor, provided they are held in or assignable to USAC's name per B.7.1.3 and the arrangement is disclosed per E.6.A.5.	Refer to answer 32.
295.	Key Personnel employment: May any Key Personnel be employees of a proposed subcontractor, and does the three-year employment preference in B.11 apply to tenure with the prime Contractor or with the subcontractor that employs them?	Key Personnel may be employees of the Offeror or of a subcontractor identified in the proposal. The three-year tenure in Section B.11 is a preference, not a pass/fail requirement.
296.	Personnel security standard: Section B.8.7 requires all Contractor Staff to be U.S. persons and subject to background investigation. Please state the specific investigation tier/adjudication standard and expected timeline, and confirm it applies identically to subcontractor and platform-vendor staff accessing USAC systems or the POC enclave.	Yes, all contractor, and subcontractor staff that requires to access USAC's systems must go through employment background check. For more information refer to Section B.8.7 for more information.
297.	Organizational conflict of interest: Section E.11 bars firms that performed the prior EDW and data-maturity assessments from using the same resources to compete. Will USAC identify those firms, and is the restriction at the firm level or limited to the specific individuals who performed the assessments?	USAC will not name the firms. Any Offeror or proposed subcontractor that performed those assessments must disclose it and propose mitigation under Sections E.7.A.4 and E.11.
298.	Exceptions to terms: Will USAC entertain exceptions submitted per E.1.A to the Section C Standard Terms, Attachment 2 (Confidentiality Agreement), and Attachment 3 (Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms), or are these non-negotiable as a condition of award?	Offerors may submit exceptions in a separate "Exceptions to RFP Terms" attachment. For more information refer to Section E.1.A.

Q#	Question	Answer
299.	CLIN 0002 pricing basis: CLIN 0002 scope is defined during the POC, and it's not-to-exceed ceiling is definitized afterward (B.7.2), yet a firm Bid Sheet price is due with the proposal. On what basis should Offerors price CLIN 0002 at proposal time, and how will the proposal price reconcile with post-POC defeminization?	Refer to answer 101. State CLIN 0002 pricing assumptions in Volume 4.
300.	Contract-type inconsistency: The B.2 pricing table lists CLIN 0002 as "FFP," while B.7.2 describes it as "FFP with an annual not-to-exceed ceiling." Please confirm which governs and confirm that only CLIN 0003 is T&M under the hybrid FFP/T&M contract type.	Refer to answer 188.
301.	AI bid-sheet handling: Section E.7.B.16 requires separate Bid Sheets for performance with and without AI. Please confirm how the two versions will be evaluated and which becomes the contract price.	Both versions of the Bid Sheet must include the platform AI capability required by Section B.6.7. The two versions differ only in the Contractor's use of AI to perform the Services. USAC will consider both the AI and non-AI prices in evaluation.
302.	Offer-acceptance period: Proposals must remain firm for 120 days (E.1.B), but the POC and award dates are to be determined and may fall outside that window. Will USAC extend the acceptance period accordingly, and is time spent on the unpaid POC compensable?	he proposal validity is changed to one hundred eighty (180) days. A redlined RFP is posted to reflect the change.
303.	Evaluation factors and weighting: Please publish the evaluation factors and their relative order of importance (e.g., best-value tradeoff versus lowest-price technically acceptable) beyond the down-select's stated focus on proposal completeness and price.	For proposal evaluation factors and their relative order, please refer to Section E.8, 9, and 10.

Q#	Question	Answer
304.	POC notice, duration, and readiness: The POC scope (the eight B.20.2 test cases), the USAC-provided secure enclave, and the 20-million-record dataset are specified. The following logistics remain open: (a) How many business days of notice will a down-selected Offeror receive between USAC's request for the Final POC Test Plan and the start of the POC window, and what is the planned duration of that window? (b) When, relative to POC start, will USAC provision the secure enclave, Okta integration, private connectivity, and the 20-million-record dataset, and does the window begin only once all are available? (c) The live-production validation round is conditioned on Privacy Officer/OGC approval, training, Rules-of-Behavior execution, a PIA, and completed U.S.-person background investigations, with no schedule relief (B.20.1). Will USAC initiate these early enough that they do not consume the POC window, and may background investigations begin at down-select? (d) Please confirm all participating Offerors receive equivalent enclave resources, identical workloads and datasets, and identical pass thresholds, and whether those numeric thresholds will be shared before or only at the POC stage.	(c) Offerors conduct background investigations of their own staff, and Section B.20.1 provides no schedule relief for meeting the live-data conditions. (d) USAC will share the numeric pass thresholds with all participating offerors before the POC starts. The same thresholds apply to every participant (Section E.9). **See question 50 for PoC timelines**
305.	Section E.7.B.7 requires Offerors to address Structure 1 and Structure 2 as described in Section B.6.6. However, Section B.6.6 does not define these structures. Can USAC clarify the intended definitions of Structure 1 and Structure 2 and the associated requirements?	Refer to answer 141.
306.	Section E.7.B.8 requires Offerors to address Option A and Option B as described in Section B.6.4. However, Section B.6.4 does not define these options. Can USAC clarify the intended governance alternatives and associated requirements?	Refer to answer 141.
307.	Section B.2 establishes CLIN 0002 as Firm-Fixed Price (FFP), while Section B.7.2 describes it as FFP with an annual not-to-exceed ceiling. Can USAC clarify whether CLIN 0002 is intended to be a single FFP amount or an annually established FFP amount subject to an NTE ceiling?	Refer to answers 100 and 101.
308.	Section B.20 references the definitization of "CLIN 0002 and CLIN 0002 NTE ceilings," while Section B.2 establishes an annual NTE ceiling for CLIN 0003. Can USAC confirm whether the second reference to CLIN 0002 was intended to refer to CLIN 0003?	Yes. Section B.20 should read "CLIN 0002 and CLIN 0003 NTE ceilings." This will be corrected in the redlined RFP.

Q#	Question	Answer
309.	The solicitation cover page identifies November 23, 2026, as the proposal due date, while the Proposal Schedule identifies November 23, 2025. Can USAC confirm that the correct proposal submission deadline is November 23, 2026, at 11:00 AM ET?	Please refer to answer 35.
310.	Section B.7.2.3 requires reconciliation against the mandatory floor items identified in Section B.6.6 as a condition of production cutover. However, Section B.6.6 does not explicitly identify these items. Can USAC clarify which reports, datasets, or data products constitute the mandatory floor?	Refer to answer 141.
311.	Section B.4.1 states that USAC presently requires Contractor Staff to be on-site at least two (2) days per week. Given the nature of the services under this RFP, would USAC consider allowing Contractor Staff to perform their work remotely, with on-site attendance as needed for key meetings, workshops, and other activities requiring in-person collaboration?	The two-day-per-week onsite requirement applies to all Contractor Staff. USAC is willing to consider alternate staffing proposals, which offerors should describe in the technical proposal.
312.	Section B.7.2 states that CLIN 0002 will be performed on a Firm-Fixed-Price basis, while Sections B.20 and B.20.3 contemplate that the POC and associated discovery activities will define the implementation and migration scope and support definitization of CLIN 0002. Please confirm whether Offerors' initial CLIN 0002 pricing is expected to be binding prior to completion of the POC/discovery activities, or whether CLIN 0002 scope and pricing may be revised through the Final Proposal Revision/BAFO process based on the results of those activities.	Refer to answer 101.
313.	Please confirm that the mutually accepted Requirements Traceability Matrix, Technical Design Document, source/pipeline inventory, report migration scope, integration scope, and other discovery outputs developed during the POC/discovery period will collectively establish the authoritative CLIN 0002 implementation baseline against which subsequent Missed Requirements and True Net-New Scope will be evaluated.	Yes. Under Attachment 3, the requirements baseline, Technical Design Document and Requirements Traceability Matrix produced through discovery are the baseline for Missed Requirements and True Net-New Scope, with the RTM as the primary evidentiary record (Sections 1, 2 and 6).

Q#	Question	Answer
314.	Section B.7.1.2 states that the platform shall be provided within AWS Commercial Cloud (US) or Microsoft Azure, while Section B.8.1 states that all hosting shall be within AWS GovCloud (US) or Microsoft Azure Government. Please clarify the required hosting environment for the production Enterprise Data Platform, whether a FedRAMP Moderate commercial-region offering is acceptable, and identify which requirement governs for purposes of proposal compliance and evaluation.	Refer to answer 110.
315.	Section B.7.2.3 requires the new platform to operate in parallel with the legacy EDW for not less than 90 calendar days prior to "each production cutover," or longer as USAC directs, while also requiring a phased cutover by data domain. Please clarify whether the 90-day parallel-operation requirement applies once to the overall production transition, separately to each data-domain cutover, or to another USAC-defined grouping, and whether any USAC-directed extension beyond 90 days would result in a corresponding adjustment to the implementation schedule and/or applicable contract ceiling.	Refer to answer 273.
316.	Please clarify the expected extent of data-model redesign under CLIN 0002. Should Offerors plan to migrate existing EDW L2/L3 structures substantially as-is, implement a redesigned common data model and reporting layer, or determine the target approach through the alternative data model benchmarking required during the POC? If the approach will be determined following the POC, please confirm that the resulting redesign scope will be incorporated into the mutually agreed CLIN 0002 implementation baseline.	The POC's alternative data model comparison informs the target approach (Section B.20.2), and CLIN 0002 includes designing the standardized common data model and analytical reporting layer (Section B.7.2.1). The resulting scope becomes part of the CLIN 0002 baseline locked during detailed discovery.
317.	Section B.6.2 requires replacement of Pentaho Data Integration with native platform ingestion capabilities. Please clarify whether CLIN 0002 also requires redevelopment of the existing Node.js ERP APIs, ERP Schema interfaces, and downstream integrations currently dependent on Vertica, or whether those components may be retained and repointed to the new platform. Please also identify whether the scope includes all existing scheduled pipelines and data-domain transformations or only the pipelines and interfaces identified during POC discovery."	Pentaho is fully replaced (Section B.6.2).

Q#	Question	Answer
318.	Please clarify how the results of the 20-million-record POC dataset will be extrapolated to production-scale sizing and pricing, including the forecast 32–36 TB raw data footprint and 200–300 concurrent sessions identified in the supporting sizing documentation. Will USAC prescribe a common extrapolation methodology and workload assumptions for storage, compute, concurrency, and ingestion, or may each Offeror propose a documented, evidence-based approach?	Offeror can propose.
319.	Does the 80%-of-capacity notification threshold in B.7.1.4 apply against forecasted or measured consumption, and what remedy follows notification?	Applies against both forecasted and measured. Please refer to Section B.7.1.4 for more information.
320.	Must EBS-bound ERP extracts comply with the field-level Data Classification Framework (March 2026), given the ERP schema TDDs state no masking is applied today?	No. Field level classification framework is in progress. Classification, when implemented, should derive from source into EDP.
321.	Is field-level classification tagging of the POC dataset complete, or is tagging a CLIN 0002 deliverable?	At POC we want to see the functionality to do this. Any additional tagging will be done on deployment. However, USAC anticipates applying tags at the source which will be outside of the scope of this contract. We will want to see that the platform can properly bring in the tags and apply them.
322.	For CDC test cases, will USAC provide the RDS PostgreSQL source with logical replication enabled, the SQL Server and MariaDB sources, and network connectivity within the enclave, and on what date relative to POC start?	Necessary access will be provided before POC start.
323.	What are the RTO/RPO targets in B.9.3, and must DR be a vendor-managed capability or may it be an architected cross-region pattern?	The RTO is four hours and the RPO is one hour for the production environment (Section B.9.3). Vendor may propose.
324.	Which ArcGIS Enterprise version and Socrata/Open Data integration pattern does USAC run, and is direct database connection or published service the expected pattern?	ArcGIS Enterprise remains the spatial system of record (Section B.6.8), and Socrata remains the baseline publication path (Section B.6.6).

Q#	Question	Answer
325.	Section B.6.9 requires ten years of data in the active analytical schema with older data archived to lower-cost storage. Please confirm that these requirements supersede any differing retention or archival recommendations in prior EDW assessments. For purposes of CLIN 0002 migration sizing, must all historical data currently maintained in the legacy EDW be migrated into the new platform's active or archival storage tiers, or may USAC approve exclusion of obsolete, redundant, or otherwise nonrequired datasets during discovery?	Yes, this requirement supersedes any differing retention or archival recommendations in prior EDW assessments. All data must be in either active or archival storage tiers.
326.	Please clarify the required scope of Tableau workbook migration and remediation under CLIN 0002. Is the Contractor responsible for repointing, modifying, testing, and validating all existing Tableau workbooks that rely on the current EDW, or only the certified data sources, semantic models, and reports identified in the agreed discovery baseline? Please also clarify whether USAC will identify and approve the inventory of active, business-critical workbooks to be migrated and whether USAC business owners will perform functional acceptance testing.	Refer to answer 52. USAC conducts user acceptance testing (Attachment 3, Section 9.3.4).
327.	Section B.2 requires annual Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) pricing for CLIN 0001, including platform licensing, hosting, and storage. Given that cloud data platforms commonly use consumption-based pricing for compute, storage, and related services, would USAC consider a consumption-based pricing model with an annual not-to-exceed (NTE) ceiling? If annual FFP pricing must be retained, please clarify how USAC expects Offerors to address consumption that exceeds the agreed sizing baseline, including changes in data volume, concurrency, workload intensity, or additional capacity requested by USAC. Would such increases be eligible for an authorized contract adjustment?	CLIN 0001 is FFP (Section B.2) and offerors may include their assumptions.

Q#	Question	Answer
328.	Section B.6 requires core platform capabilities to be delivered under a single FedRAMP Moderate or higher authorization boundary while also permitting integration with existing enterprise tooling. Please clarify whether mandatory capabilities such as data ingestion and CDC, governance and lineage, semantic modeling, geospatial processing, and AI enablement must be provided natively within the platform's single authorization boundary, or whether Offerors may satisfy these requirements through documented integrations with separately FedRAMP-authorized services. Where integrated services are permitted, please identify any requirements for authorization boundary documentation, data movement restrictions, and shared security responsibilities.	Refer to answers 21 and 109.
329.	Section E.8.2 requires Offerors to provide three relevant past performance references. In evaluating an Offeror's demonstrated experience with enterprise data platform modernization and large-scale data warehouse migrations, how will USAC consider the combined experience of the Prime Offeror and its proposed subcontractors or teaming partners, particularly where those partners will perform substantive portions of the implementation and provide key technical personnel? Please clarify how Offerors should present these qualifications and references to demonstrate the collective team's ability to successfully perform the required scope.	Three past performance references are mandatory, and they must be the prime Offeror's own contracts. Contracts performed by subcontractors, teaming partners or the platform provider do not count toward the three. Proposals without three qualifying references will not be considered for further evaluation. Describe how subcontractors and partners will be used under Capabilities (Section E.7.B.14).
330.	Attachment 3 assigns the Contractor responsibility for requirements reasonably discoverable during the discovery period. Please clarify how USAC will address requirements, dependencies, or constraints that could not reasonably be identified because necessary system access, technical documentation, source data, stakeholder availability, or third-party information was not provided during discovery. Will such items be eligible for review as changes to the agreed scope, schedule, and pricing rather than automatically classified as Missed Requirements?	Refer to answer 103.

Q#	Question	Answer
331.	Please clarify whether the CLIN 0002 implementation schedule and milestone commitments will be adjusted for delays attributable to USAC-controlled dependencies, including source-system access, network connectivity, security approvals, stakeholder decisions, data remediation, and acceptance testing. Where such delays require the Contractor to maintain personnel or environments beyond the agreed implementation period, will USAC consider corresponding equitable adjustments to schedule and price?	Offerors must state the USAC dependencies they assume. nstated assumptions are not a basis for schedule relief or additional compensation (Section B.11.4).
332.	Section B.1 states that platform licenses shall be held in USAC's name. Please clarify whether USAC will permit the platform OEM to contract directly with USAC for consumption-based licensing, with the implementation contractor separately providing configuration, migration, and operational support, or whether the selected prime Contractor must procure, administer, and financially guarantee all platform consumption under CLIN 0001. If the latter, please clarify whether USAC will accept direct OEM billing or equivalent arrangements that preserve USAC's license ownership while limiting the prime Contractor's exposure to consumption outside its operational control.	Licenses must be held in USAC's name (Section B.1).
333.	Will USAC establish an agreed workload and consumption baseline for CLIN 0001 pricing that distinguishes current production workloads from forecast growth and new analytical capabilities? Please clarify which storage, compute, query volume, concurrency, refresh frequency, and workload-growth assumptions Offerors should use for annual pricing, and whether USAC expects bidders to include the full five-year forecast capacity within the initial Contract Term pricing or to price future growth through separately identified assumptions or capacity tiers.	The Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13). Discovery includes a capacity assessment over the Contract Term and a five-year horizon (Section B.20.3).

Q#	Question	Answer
334.	Section B.20.1 states that USAC will provide and own the secure enclave for the pre-award POC. Please clarify which infrastructure, cloud environments, network connectivity, source-system access, test datasets, and supporting resources USAC will provision within the enclave, versus those the Offeror is responsible for furnishing at its own expense.	USAC will consider both models: a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, or the offeror's vendor tenant connected to USAC over private networking. The POC is performed at no cost to USAC (Section E.2). Offerors bear platform licensing and their own labor and support costs. If the POC runs in a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, USAC pays for that infrastructure. If it runs in the offeror's own tenant, the offeror bears those costs.
335.	What is the anticipated duration of the pre-award POC and concurrent discovery period, including the expected start date, testing window, and time allocated for preparing revised scope and pricing? Will USAC establish a common POC schedule and provide all Offerors with equivalent access to test environments, source systems, USAC subject matter experts, and supporting documentation?	USAC will decide the number of POC participants based on the proposals received. USAC will run no more than one POC per technology platform, and POCs will run concurrently. USAC will share the numeric pass thresholds with all participating offerors before the POC starts. The same thresholds apply to every participant (Section E.9). |Refer to question 50 for timelines
336.	To help Offerors develop relevant POC Test Plans and avoid duplicating prior evaluation efforts, can USAC clarify whether Vertica Eon, Amazon Redshift, Databricks, or Snowflake have previously undergone POC testing or formal technical validation, and whether any findings or limitations from those evaluations should be considered when selecting a platform for the required POC?	Current-state assessment materials are in the Reading Room (Section B.13).
337.	Core Platform Definition: Which capabilities does USAC consider part of the “core platform capability” subject to the single authorization boundary requirement?	Refer to answer 21.
338.	Third-Party Tools: Will Collibra, Tableau, ArcGIS, Posit, Socrata, and other approved enterprise tools operate outside the core platform authorization boundary while securely integrating with the EDP?	Refer to answer 21.
339.	Section B.6.8 identifies ArcGIS Enterprise as the authoritative spatial system of record. Please confirm that specialized GIS capabilities, including raster processing and WMS/WFS/WCS services, will remain in the existing ArcGIS environment, with the proposed enterprise data platform ingesting spatial data for governed analytics, spatial joins, and reporting, rather than duplicating those GIS capabilities.	ArcGIS will continue to be hosted separately. WMS/WFS/WCS services will be handled by ArcGIS enterprise. There will not be duplication of those GIS capabilities.

Q#	Question	Answer
340.	Section B.6.9 requires ten (10) years of data in the active analytical schema and archive of data older than ten years. Attachment 1, CLIN 0001 references a six-year active analytical retention period and archive beyond six years. Please confirm the retention periods Offerors should use for technical design, sizing, and pricing.	Ten (10) years governs for design, sizing and pricing (Section B.6.9). The "6-year" wording in Attachment 1 is an error and will be corrected in the revised Bid Sheet.
341.	Section E requires the Governance Approach to address "Option A and Option B" described in Section B.6.4. Please identify the definitions of Option A and Option B, or confirm whether additional guidance will be provided in the Virtual Reading Room or by amendment.	Refer to answer 141.
342.	Section E requires the Business Intelligence Approach to address "Structure 1 and Structure 2" described in Section B.6.6. Please identify the definitions of Structure 1 and Structure 2, or confirm where those definitions are provided.	Refer to answer 141.
343.	Section B.6.10 states that master data management implementation is not required but the platform must provide the capability for future use and identify whether additional licensing is required. If the capability requires separate licensing, should that license be included in the CLIN 0001 base price, priced as an optional component, or disclosed without pricing unless exercised?	Identify MDM licensing as an optional component, priced separately (Sections B.6.10 and E.7.D.7).
344.	Section E requires separate versions of Attachment 1 for scenarios with and without the use of AI in performance of the Services. Please confirm whether all CLINs should be duplicated in both versions even where AI use does not affect a CLIN, and whether the platform AI capability required under Section B.6.7 should remain priced identically in both scenarios.	Both versions of the Bid Sheet must include the platform AI capability required by Section B.6.7. The two versions differ only in the Contractor's use of AI to perform the Services. USAC will consider both the AI and non-AI prices in evaluation.
345.	The description of the Technical Volume's Geospatial Approach appears to be cut off. Are there additional considerations USAC would like Offerors to address beyond geospatial ingestion and processing?	No.
346.	Section B.6.9 requires archived data to reside within the platform's managed storage but permits an alternative archival architecture as a separately priced alternate. Please confirm that the base proposal should price platform-managed archive storage and that any external or tiered alternative should be presented only as an alternate.	Confirmed. Price platform-managed archive storage in the base proposal and present any alternative archival architecture as a separately priced alternate (Sections B.6.9 and E.7.D.4).

Q#	Question	Answer
347.	For selected Offerors, could USAC please clarify the anticipated POC duration and when the POC execution period is expected to begin relative to availability of the secure enclave, required source connectivity, access credentials, documentation, and POC acceptance criteria?	USAC will share the numeric pass thresholds with all participating offerors before the POC starts. The same thresholds apply to every participant (Section E.9). Refer to Question 50 for PoC timelines
348.	For the POC validation round using live production data, please confirm whether background investigation and training prerequisites must be completed before the initial POC begins, or only before personnel are granted access to the live-data validation environment.	Section B.20.1 conditions are conditions precedent to the live-data validation round. Section B.8.7 also requires background investigation before access to USAC IT Systems.
349.	For Section B.6.3, does the requirement for "intuitive graphical interfaces, including drag-and-drop mapping" require literal drag-and-drop authoring functionality, or may equivalent guided graphical or conversational semantic-model authoring satisfy the requirement?	Vendor can propose.
350.	After execution of the Confidentiality Agreement, will USAC provide a change log or notification mechanism for additions or revisions to Virtual Reading Room materials during the solicitation period?	USAC has a standard Change Control Log in the reading room which the vendor may adopt.
351.	For the unstructured and semi-structured content requirement in Section B.6.2, should Offerors assume that in-scope documents already exist in electronic form within USAC source systems or content repositories, or is digitization of paper-based records, including scanning, OCR, or document extraction, expected to be within scope?	Documents already exist in electronic form.
352.	Volume 2 is limited to 40 pages "excluding Attachment 3 (Resumes) and technical appendices." Please confirm the Section B.6 capability compliance matrix, the POC Test Plan and the Mandatory Requirements Certification may be submitted as appendices outside the 40-page limit.	The Platform Capability Compliance Matrix, Mandatory Requirements Certification, POC Test Plan and Exceptions to RFP Terms attachment are excluded from the 40-page Volume 2 limit.
353.	Given that POC scoping and FFP migration pricing both depend on Reading Room materials and on definitions not yet published (mandatory floor, Structure 1 and 2, Option A and B), will USAC hold a pre-proposal industry day or a second written question round after those materials and definitions are issued?	No. USAC will not hold a second round of questions. MVP, Structure 1/2 and Option A/B are addressed in answer 141.

Q#	Question	Answer
354.	The Q&A responses (October 26), the Virtual Reading Room materials, and any amendment issuing the omitted Section B.6.4 and B.6.6 content will reach offerors with roughly four weeks remaining before the November 23 due date, which falls in Thanksgiving week. Proposals must also include a POC Test Plan, a complete Section B.6 compliance matrix, nine formal Key Personnel resumes and two priced bid sheets. Will USAC extend the proposal due date by at least two weeks (for example, to Monday, December 7, 2026)?	Yes. USAC is extending the proposal due date by one week, to Monday, November 30, 2026, 11:00 AM ET. Refer to answer 35.
355.	Sections B.7.2.3, B.9.1, B.10.1, B.11.1, B.20.3, E.7.B.6 through E.7.B.8 and E.8.1.A refer to a "mandatory floor" and to "Structure 1 and Structure 2" described in Section B.6.6, and to "Option A and Option B" described in Section B.6.4. These items do not appear in the RFP as issued, and several cross-references point to sections that are not present or do not match (B.12.1, B.14.1, B.14.4 and B.23, the reference to Section B.12 in Section B.10.1 item 5, and the reference to Section E.6.1 in Section E.11). Please issue the omitted text by amendment, identifying any portion that resides only in the Virtual Reading Room, and allow offerors at least 21 calendar days after its release to submit proposals.	Refer to answers 141 and 186. USAC is extending the due date by one week (answer 35).
356.	Section B.7.1.2 requires the platform to be provided within AWS Commercial Cloud (US) or Microsoft Azure, while Section B.8.1 requires all hosting, including backup and disaster recovery copies, within AWS GovCloud (US) or Microsoft Azure Government. Sections B.6.1 and B.8.1 both set the authorization standard at FedRAMP Moderate or higher, and many FedRAMP Moderate SaaS offerings are authorized in AWS US commercial regions. Please confirm that Section B.7.1.2 governs, and that a core platform holding a current FedRAMP Moderate authorization in AWS US commercial regions (or Microsoft Azure US regions), with all primary, backup and disaster recovery copies of USAC Data in the United States, satisfies Sections B.6.1, B.7.1.2 and B.8.1. If USAC intends Section B.8.1 to govern, please state whether a FedRAMP Moderate commercial-region deployment may be offered as a separately priced alternate.	Refer to answers 110 and 138.

Q#	Question	Answer
357.	Please (a) confirm the date Virtual Reading Room materials will be available after an offeror submits the signed Attachment 2; (b) confirm that the proposal team of an offeror's platform vendor may access the materials once it has signed Attachment 2; and (c) confirm that USAC will issue an amendment if Reading Room content materially changes the scope, sizing or volumetrics summarized in Section B.5.	(a) USAC grants Virtual Reading Room access about one week after receiving the signed Attachment 2. Each teaming partner, including subcontractors and the platform provider, must sign and submit its own Attachment 2. (b) Yes, once it signs its own Attachment 2. (c) Yes, if reading room content materially changes scope
358.	To support change data capture design and the POC, please provide (or confirm the Reading Room will include): (a) the engine and version of each in-scope PostgreSQL, SQL Server and MariaDB source, including the AWS RDS PostgreSQL read replica named in Section B.20.2; (b) whether replicated tables have primary keys or unique indexes; (c) whether any source system issues TRUNCATE operations; and (d) whether any MariaDB source stores spatial column types. Because logical decoding from a PostgreSQL standby requires PostgreSQL 16 or later, please also confirm that, if the POC read replica runs an earlier version, offerors may bind to the primary instance or to a logical replica instead.	The Virtual Reading Room includes the source system inventory (platform, integration pattern and volumetrics for each in-scope source) and interface control documentation (Section B.13).
359.	(a) Sections B.6.1 and B.8.3 require dynamic masking and tokenization applied at query time without duplicating datasets. Please confirm whether deterministic tokenization applied natively by the platform satisfies this requirement, or whether USAC requires reversible, vaulted or format-preserving tokenization for specific attributes and, if so, identify those attributes. (b) Please identify the Okta user attributes USAC expects to drive attribute-based access decisions, and confirm that synchronizing those attributes to the platform through SCIM provisioning or federated identity claims, for evaluation at query time, satisfies Sections B.6.1 and B.8.2.	Deterministic tokenization applied natively would address the requirement. Any required attributes to synchronize through SCIM or federation will be addressed post-award.

Q#	Question	Answer
360.	Given USAC's current Collibra investment, the requirement in Section B.7.2.2 to migrate existing Collibra content, and the requirement in Section B.20.2 to demonstrate a connection to Collibra, please confirm that offerors may propose retaining Collibra as USAC's enterprise business glossary and stewardship system of record, with the platform natively capturing technical metadata, classification and column-level lineage and synchronizing them to Collibra, and that this approach satisfies Sections B.6.1 and B.6.4. If so, please confirm that "migrate existing Collibra content" means re-pointing existing Collibra assets, glossary terms and lineage to the new platform's data structures rather than moving that content into a different catalog product.	Yes. USAC will keep Collibra as its enterprise catalog of record, and the platform should synchronize technical metadata, classification and lineage to it. "Migrate existing Collibra content" means updating existing Collibra content to reflect the new platform. Refer to answer 117.
361.	Please confirm that business-user no-code or low-code data quality rule authoring may be delivered through a documented integration between the platform's native data quality capability and USAC's existing enterprise governance tooling, with rule execution, scorecards, alerting and audit history maintained in the platform.	Open to recommendation.
362.	Pending issuance of the Structure 1 and Structure 2 definitions, please confirm that (a) a proposal retaining Tableau Server, which Section B.6.6 permits, with individual user identity propagated to the platform as Section B.8.2 requires, will be evaluated on an equal basis with consolidation onto platform-native reporting; (b) the usability evaluation will consider the full proposed consumption stack, including a retained BI tool already familiar to USAC users; and (c) scheduled distribution and per-recipient row-filtered report bursting may be delivered through the retained BI tool or a documented integration rather than natively by the core platform.	Refer to answer 141. Yes, USAC will evaluate the option to retain Tableau on an equal basis to platform native reporting; usability will account for the end-to-end consumption; and yes, scheduled distribution may be delivered through the retained BI tool.

Q#	Question	Answer
363.	Section B.6.6 permits offerors to propose platform-native external publication as a separately priced and separately evaluated alternate to Socrata. To support that alternate, please (a) provide the approximate number of external consumers and the query and download volume currently served through opendata.usac.org; (b) identify the access patterns current external consumers rely on (for example, the Socrata SODA API, bulk download or OData); and (c) confirm whether governed, query-based access to published data products by authorized external consumers, in addition to or in place of file-based publication, is responsive to the alternate.	Refer to answer 274.
364.	Section B.6.8 designates ESRI ArcGIS Enterprise as the authoritative system of record for spatial data. Please confirm that (a) OGC services (WMS, WFS and WCS) and raster/imagery services may be published by USAC's ArcGIS Enterprise over data stored in the platform; (b) the platform's obligations under Section B.6.8 are met by storing, governing, indexing and processing vector data at enterprise scale, storing and cataloging raster datasets, and enforcing role-based and row-level security on spatial data; and (c) the requirement in Section B.6.8 for a "direct ArcGIS Pro connection to the cloud database" is met by ArcGIS Pro connecting to the platform as a supported cloud data warehouse, through ODBC/JDBC or a vendor-provided connector, to query, visualize and analyze spatial data, and does not require the platform to operate as an Esri enterprise geodatabase supporting versioned editing.	ArcGIS will continue to be hosted separately.
365.	To size the geospatial workload and the geospatial test case in Section B.20.2, please provide (a) the approximate number of broadband deployment location points; (b) the approximate number and geometric complexity (for example, average vertex count) of the federal eligibility boundary polygons; (c) how often full point-in-polygon intersections are run; and (d) any target execution time for a full-scale intersection.	See Virtual Reading Room.

Q#	Question	Answer
366.	The items in Section B.6.12 (reserved GPU capacity, GPU/CPU/vRAM scaling for ArcGIS Pro upgrades, autoscaling GPU clusters, and custom-container Python, R and Jupyter environments) are not among the Section B.6.1 mandatory requirements. Please (a) identify the current or planned USAC workloads that require GPU capacity; (b) confirm that provisioning GPU, vRAM or virtual desktop capacity for ArcGIS Pro end-user workstations is not a platform requirement; and (c) confirm that Section B.6.12 may be satisfied through documented integration with USAC's existing Posit environment or additional FedRAMP-authorized services, without these capabilities residing within the core platform's single authorization boundary.	See Virtual Reading Room.
367.	Section B.7.1.1 sets CLIN 0001 capacity at the sizing basis provided in the Virtual Reading Room, Section B.7.1.4 refers to contracted capacity thresholds, and Attachment 1 prices storage per 10 TB or 5 TB unit. Please confirm (a) that offerors may state unit rates for compute consumption above the contracted capacity, applied by contract modification, so that the annual firm-fixed price covers a defined contracted capacity rather than unlimited consumption; and (b) for the largest observed reporting query in Section B.5.2 (26.5 billion rows scanned to produce 88 rows), how often queries of that scale run and the response-time target USAC expects for that query class.	Yes. Offerors can state unit rates for compute consumption above contracted capacity. Any overage will be billed separately with appropriate contract modifications. The 26 billion row query is not a scenario we see often. This can be treated as edge case.
368.	Section B.6.11 requires four isolated environments, with Pre-Production capable of holding production-representative data volumes. To price CLIN 0001, please confirm (a) whether Pre-Production must hold production-representative volumes continuously or only during designated test windows; (b) whether Development and Test/QA compute is expected to run continuously or on demand; (c) any availability targets for Development and Test/QA, noting that Section B.9.1 applies incident service levels to production and pre-production; and (d) whether non-production environments may be instantiated from production through storage-efficient cloning, provided the isolation, security and access control requirements of Section B.8 are met.	Refer to answer 263.

Q#	Question	Answer
369.	CLIN 0001 is an annual firm-fixed price for platform subscriptions held in USAC's name. If USAC terminates for convenience under Section C.11 during a contract year, please confirm that USAC will pay for non-cancellable subscription commitments already made on its behalf for the then-current annual term, with the remaining entitlement transferring to USAC under Section B.7.1.3.	CLIN0001 is FFP. A redlined RFP is posted to reflect the change. Also, under Section C.11, if USAC exercise the right to terminate for convenience during current contract year where non-cancelable subscriptions and commitments has already been made, the contract clause under section B.7.1.3 will be in effect and USAC will bear the payment responsibility.
370.	Section B.20 states that the POC informs definitization of the CLIN 0002 ceiling, and Attachment 3 refers to a later "Firm-Fixed-Price Amendment." Section B.20.3 requires discovery and scoping concurrent with the POC, which Section E.2 states is performed at no cost to USAC, while Attachment 3 Section 1 places the discovery and design phase within the scope of CLIN 0002. Please confirm (a) whether the CLIN 0002 price in the initial proposal is treated as a not-to-exceed estimate to be definitized after the POC; (b) that Attachment 3 obligations attach upon execution of the CLIN 0002 firm-fixed-price amendment rather than at initial award; and (c) whether discovery and scoping is performed during the unpaid POC or as a paid phase of CLIN 0002.	(a) Refer to answer 101. (b) Attachment 3 will be executed at contract award, after the POC. It does not need to be signed and returned with the proposal. (c) Preliminary discovery and scoping under Section B.20.3 is done during the POC, and USAC prefers it at no cost. Offerors may include additional time in CLIN 0002 for detailed discovery and to lock the MVP scope at the start of implementation.
371.	Please confirm that "reasonably discoverable" requirements under Attachment 3 Section 2 are limited to information USAC makes available in the Reading Room and during discovery, and that the following are treated as USAC-directed change or True Net-New Scope rather than Missed Requirements or Contractor defects under Attachment 3 Sections 2, 5 and 8: (a) inaccuracies or omissions in USAC-provided documentation or data; (b) defects originating in USAC source systems or in third-party products outside the Contractor's control; and (c) delays caused by USAC dependencies identified in the Contractor's division of work under Section B.11.4.	Refer to answer 103.

Q#	Question	Answer
372.	Section B.7.2.3 requires parallel operation of not less than 90 calendar days before each production cutover "or such longer period as USAC directs." Under a firm-fixed-price CLIN 0002, please confirm that (a) parallel operation extended at USAC's direction beyond the approved plan, for reasons not attributable to the Contractor, will be compensated by change order or under CLIN 0003; (b) USAC will continue to operate and support the legacy Vertica EDW and Pentaho Data Integration jobs during parallel operation; (c) decommissioning legacy hardware and licenses remains USAC's responsibility; and (d) parallel operation periods for successive data domains may overlap.	USAC will operate and support the legacy EDW and Pentaho during parallel operation and is responsible for decommissioning which will happen on a rolling bases as data domains are implemented Vendor should expect to collaborate with transition readiness of the new Platform production deployments.
373.	Section B.7.2.3 requires a phased cutover sequenced by data domain, and Section B.7.3.1 requires hypercare of not less than 60 calendar days after each cutover. Please (a) indicate the number of data domains USAC anticipates, or confirm that this will be included in the Virtual Reading Room; (b) confirm whether hypercare periods for successive cutovers may run concurrently; and (c) provide the FCC regulatory reporting cycles and audit windows during which cutovers may not be scheduled.	USAC will identify the FCC reporting and audit windows (Section B.7.2.3).
374.	Please confirm that the SOC 2 Type II requirement in Section B.8.1 is satisfied by the platform vendor's current SOC 2 Type II report for the hosted service together with the Contractor's own current SOC 2 Type II report for its corporate controls, and that the ISO/IEC 27001 certification referenced in Privacy and Security Addendum Section 2.20 may be provided by the platform vendor for the hosted service.	SOC 2 Type II is not required. See #139, #140
375.	Please confirm whether the requirement to be on site at USAC Headquarters at least two days per week applies to all Contractor Staff or only to Key Personnel and staff USAC designates, and whether POC activities within the USAC enclave may be performed entirely remotely.	The two-day-per-week onsite requirement applies to all Contractor Staff. USAC is willing to consider alternate staffing proposals, which offerors should describe in the technical proposal. The POC can be performed fully remotely.

Q#	Question	Answer
376.	Section C.1.N defines Key Personnel as full-time employees of the Contractor, while Section B.11 states that USAC "strongly prefers" Key Personnel be Contractor employees of at least three years. Please confirm that (a) full-time employees of a proposed subcontractor may serve as Key Personnel, subject to USAC approval; (b) the three-year tenure preference is evaluated as a preference rather than a pass/fail requirement, measured as of contract award; and (c) one individual may hold two Key Personnel roles where the combined responsibilities are manageable.	Key Personnel must be employees of the Offeror or of a subcontractor identified in the proposal. The three-year tenure in Section B.11 is a preference, not a pass/fail requirement. Yes. One individual may hold more than one Key Personnel role, and roles may be proposed at less than full time or by phase, as long as the proposal shows enough capacity and continuity.
377.	Section C.20 requires Key Personnel to remain in their positions throughout the Contract Term and requires USAC approval for changes to their time commitment. Please confirm whether offerors may propose, in the initial proposal, a time commitment for each Key Personnel role that varies by phase (for example, reduced allocation of the Migration Lead and Change Management Lead during CLIN 0003 operations).	Yes. One individual may hold more than one Key Personnel role, and roles may be proposed at less than full time or by phase, as long as the proposal shows enough capacity and continuity.
378.	For Key Personnel roles requiring a minimum of twelve years of experience, will USAC accept an equivalent combination of directly relevant experience and current professional certification (for example, ten years of DevSecOps or platform engineering experience together with a current AWS Certified DevOps Engineer - Professional or Certified Kubernetes Administrator credential)?	The twelve-year minimum in Section B.11.1 is USAC's preference. USAC will consider individuals with fewer years who bring directly relevant experience. Refer to answer 15.
379.	Section B.11 refers to a labor category description tab on the bid sheet, and Section E.8.3 evaluates labor rates, but Attachment 1 contains no labor category or rate schedule. Please issue the labor category descriptions and a rate table format for CLIN 0003, and confirm whether rates may escalate for option years. Please also confirm that the active retention basis for CLIN 0001 Items 9 and 13 is ten years, consistent with Section B.6.9 (the bid sheet states six years).	A revised Attachment 1 with labor category tab is posted. The retention years for item 9 and 13 of CLIN0001 is updated to Ten (10) years governs for design, sizing and pricing (Section B.6.9).
380.	To support the division of work required by Section B.11.4, please describe the current USAC EDW, ETL, BI and GIS team (roles and approximate headcount) expected to participate in CLIN 0002 and to assume operational responsibilities in steady state.	USAC has internal SMEs and backups in each of these competency areas

Q#	Question	Answer
381.	Please state (a) the maximum number of offerors USAC expects to invite to the POC; (b) the planned start date and duration of enclave access, and, given nine test cases and the conditions precedent for the live-data round, whether USAC will allow at least six weeks; (c) whether the platform vendor's U.S.-person engineers may participate as members of the offeror's POC team; (d) when USAC will share the numeric pass thresholds described in Section E.9, and whether they will be provided before the POC begins; and (e) whether POCs for multiple offerors will run concurrently or sequentially.	USAC will decide the number of POC participants based on the proposals received. USAC will run no more than one POC per technology platform, and POCs will run concurrently. USAC will share the numeric pass thresholds with all participating offerors before the POC starts. The same thresholds apply to every participant (Section E.9). Refer to question 50 for PoC timelines
382.	Please confirm that the platform vendor (providing subscriptions, support and engineering assistance) and a licensing reseller do not count toward the "more than two subcontractors" threshold in Sections E.7.A.2 and E.8.1.B, provided those relationships are disclosed under Section E.7.A.5.	No. A platform OEM or reseller that only supplies licenses does not count toward the two-subcontractor threshold. The relationship must still be disclosed under Section E.7.A.5.
383.	Please confirm that no minimum annual revenue or employee headcount applies under Sections E.7.A.6 and E.12, and that USAC's assessment of financial and operational scale will consider committed platform-vendor support and the proposed teaming structure in addition to the prime offeror's corporate metrics.	Refer to answer 6.

Q#	Question	Answer
384.	Section E.7.B.16 requires bid sheets with and without AI use in performing the Services. Please confirm (a) which version USAC will use for total evaluated price and for any down-select under Section E.10; (b) that the with-AI version may assume USAC's written approval of the specific AI uses described in the technical proposal; and (c) that AI used in performing the Services may include AI capabilities native to the proposed platform and operating within its FedRAMP authorization boundary (for example, AI-assisted conversion of legacy pipeline code and metadata enrichment), with no USAC Data processed outside that boundary. If an offeror use only the platform's native AI features to support migration services, and no outside AI tools, should the offeror price that on the AI Bid Sheet or the non-AI Bid Sheet?	(a) USAC will use both versions of the bid sheet for evaluation. (b) USAC will review the specific AI uses described in the technical proposal and will provide written approval during contract award if USAC decides to proceed with with-AI version of proposed pricing. ~~offerors can submit their request to use their AI for USAC's review and approval.~~ (c) That is correct. Submission may ~~must~~ include AI capabilities native to the platform and within the approved boundaries of FedRAMP. USAC's understanding is that the pricing impact due to use of AI capabilities native to the platform may be included in both pricing options. For clarity, the without AI pricing option should specifically explain the use of AI capabilities native to the platform. ~~Both versions of the Bid Sheet must include the platform AI capability required by Section B.6.7. The two versions differ only in the Contractor's use of AI to perform the Services. USAC will consider both the AI and non-AI prices in evaluation.~~
385.	Please confirm that (a) contracts performed as a subcontractor are acceptable past performance, with the value stated as the subcontract value; and (b) a contract performed by a proposed subcontractor may be submitted as one of the three references where that subcontractor will perform comparable work under this Contract.	Refer to answer 2.
386.	Given the firm-fixed-price and no-cost remediation obligations in Attachment 3, will USAC consider a limitation of the Contractor's aggregate liability, excluding gross negligence, willful misconduct and breach of confidentiality or data protection obligations, at an amount tied to fees paid under the Contract, comparable to USAC's own limitation in Section C.14?	Per Section E.1.A "Offeror's proposal may identify deviations from, or revisions, exceptions or additional terms (collectively "exceptions") to the RFP, but only if such exceptions are clearly identified in a separate Attachment to the proposal, "Exceptions to RFP Terms."

Q#	Question	Answer
387.	Please clarify: (a) the option exercise notice period, as Section B.3 states no less than 30 days and Section C.2 states within 10 days; (b) whether P1 resolution "within four (4) business hours" in Section B.9.1 is measured in business hours or elapsed hours, given that P1 incidents are worked on a 24x7 basis; (c) the attachment designation for Key Personnel resumes, as Sections E.6.2 and E.7.B.15 refer to "Attachment 3" while Section D designates Attachment 3 as the Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms; and (d) the proposal due year in Section E.1.C, which shows November 23, 2025, while the cover page and Section E.1.B show November 23, 2026.	(a) The 30-day notice in Section B.3 governs, with two one-year renewal options. Section C.2 will be corrected. (c) Submit resumes as a separate attachment labeled "Attachment 4: Key Personnel Resumes." Attachment 3 remains the Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms. (d) Refer to answer 35.
388.	Is this solicitation a recompete of an existing contract? If so, could you please confirm the incumbent contractor (s)?	This is a new requirement.
389.	What is the current or historical contract value associated with this work?	efer to answer 388.
390.	Will the Statement of Work (SOW) remain unchanged from the current contract, or have there been any updates or revisions?	efer to answer 388.
391.	Could you please provide the current or prior contract number associated with this requirement?	efer to answer 388.
392.	How has the incumbent performed on the current contract, particularly with regard to meeting performance objectives, deliverables, and timelines?	Refer to answer 388.
393.	Would the USAC consider granting an extension to the proposal submission deadline?	Yes. USAC is extending the proposal due date by one week, to Monday, November 30, 2026, 11:00 AM ET. Refer to answer 35.
394.	Are the cover page and table of contents excluded from the overall page count limit?	USAC does not require table of content, if added will be counted toward the page limit. Cover page is included in page count.
395.	May we include additional pages for abbreviations and references, and will those be excluded from the stated page limit?	USAC does not require an additional page for abbreviations or references, however, if offeror choose to add, they will be counted toward page limit.
396.	Section B.7.1.2 states that Contractor shall provide the platform within “AWS Commercial Cloud (US) or Microsoft Azure,” while Section B.8.1 states that all hosting shall be “within AWS GovCloud (US) or Microsoft Azure Government.” These are different authorization boundaries with materially different service availability and pricing. Please confirm which requirement governs for purposes of the proposed solution and CLIN 0001 pricing.	Refer to answer 110.

Q#	Question	Answer
397.	Section B.6 states that solutions assembled from multiple separately authorized third-party components are not responsive, but permits "additional authorized services operating within the same authorization boundary." Please confirm whether a data platform that is authorized as a service within a cloud service provider's FedRAMP authorization boundary satisfies the requirement for a single FedRAMP Moderate or higher authorized offering under a single authorization boundary, and whether a FedRAMP Marketplace listing is acceptable evidence of authorization at the time of award.	Refer to answer 21.
398.	The term "mandatory floor" is referenced in Section B.7.2 (Page 21), Section B.9.1 (Page 27), Section B.20.3 (Page 43), Section E.7.B.6 (Page 85) and Section E.8.1.A (Page 89) as a defined set established in Section B.6.6. Cutover approval and the P1 incident definition both depend on it. Section B.6.6 does not contain a mandatory floor list. Please define the mandatory floor or provide the inventory of reports and data products that comprise it.	Refer to answer 141.
399.	Section E.7.B.7 requires the Offeror to address "Structure 1 and Structure 2 as described in Section B.6.6," and the Senior Business Intelligence Architect qualification in Section B.11.1 requires comparative evaluation of the same. Section B.6.6 does not describe Structure 1 or Structure 2. Please define both structures so that Offerors are able to respond to this requirement.	Refer to answer 141.
400.	Section E.7.B.8 requires the Offeror to address "Option A and Option B as described in Section B.6.4." Section B.6.4 does not describe Option A or Option B. Please define both options so that Offerors are able to respond to this requirement.	Refer to answer 141.
401.	Section B.6.9 requires ten (10) years of data to be retained in the active analytical schema, and that standard is repeated in Section B.7.2 (Page 20) and Section B.20.3 (Page 43). Line 9 of the CLIN0001 tab of Attachment 1 describes the active analytical layer as "6-year retention, Section B.6.9." Please confirm the active retention period Offerors should price.	Ten (10) years governs for design, sizing and pricing (Section B.6.9). The "6-year" wording in Attachment 1 is an error and will be corrected in the revised Bid Sheet.

Q#	Question	Answer
402.	USAC currently licenses Tableau, , Posit, ESRI/ArcGIS and Socrata. Please confirm that these licenses will continue to be held and funded by USAC and are excluded from CLIN 0001 pricing, and identify any of them that Offerors are expected to carry within their CLIN 0001 price.	Tableau, Collibra, Posit, ArcGIS and Socrata licenses stay USAC-funded and are outside CLIN 0001.
403.	Each of the ten Key Personnel descriptions in Section B.11.1, and Section B.11.2, directs Offerors to "See labor category description tab on bid sheet for detailed JD." Attachment 1 – Bid Sheet contains only Summary, CLIN0001, CLIN0002, CLIN0003 and Alternate Pricing tabs; there is no labor category description tab. Please issue the labor category descriptions, as the detailed job descriptions govern the qualifications that must be evidenced in the mandatory formal resumes.	USAC will issue a revised Attachment 1 that adds the labor category descriptions tab and a CLIN 0003 labor rate table, and corrects the CLIN 0003 subtotal formula. Section B.11.1 lists nine Key Personnel roles.
404.	Section E.8.3 states that USAC will evaluate "the overall NTE ceiling and labor rates," and Section B.11.3 refers to "the rate stated in the Contract for that labor category." Attachment 1 does not provide a labor rate table, and CLIN 0003 is a Time and Materials CLIN. Please confirm whether USAC will issue a rate card tab, or whether Offerors should append a fully loaded hourly rate schedule by labor category to Volume 4.	USAC will issue a revised Attachment 1 that adds the labor category descriptions tab and a CLIN 0003 labor rate table, and corrects the CLIN 0003 subtotal formula.
405.	Storage lines are expressed as "Annual, per 10 TB" and "Annual, per 5 TB." Please confirm whether Offerors should enter a unit price per increment or an extended annual price for an assumed volume. If Virtual Reading Room access is not obtained in advance of the Proposal Due Date, please state the active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth Offerors should assume for pricing purposes.	Access to Virtual Reading Room will be available until proposal deadline. VRR includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13).
406.	CLIN 0002 is described as Firm-Fixed-Price, with scope and implementation plan defined during the Proof of Concept and definitized thereafter. Please confirm whether the CLIN 0002 price submitted with the proposal is a budgetary not-to-exceed figure subject to definitization following the POC, and whether Offerors may state pricing assumptions against each CLIN 0002 line item.	Refer to answer 101. Offerors may state pricing assumptions for CLIN 0002 in Volume 4.

Q#	Question	Answer
407.	On the CLIN0003 tab, the Subtotal row contains no formula and the Total cell sums only that row, so the detail lines do not roll up. Please confirm whether USAC will issue a corrected workbook, or whether Offerors may repair the formulas without being treated as having altered the Bid Sheet. On the Summary tab, please also clarify what costs USAC expects on the "Other (describe)" line and confirm that it is included in the Total NTE Price.	A revised Attachment 1 with a tab for labor category is posted. The formula for all tabs is fixed, however, if a formula is broken, offeror can fix it while completing the fields. On the "Summary" tab, "Other (describe)" can be used for any additional pricing offerors deems necessary for the successful completion of project.
408.	Offerors are required to submit separate versions of Attachment 1 for scenarios with and without the use of AI in performance of the Services. Please confirm whether these should be submitted as two separate Excel files, how each should be named, and whether the Volume 2 technical narrative must likewise present both scenarios within the forty (40) page limit.	Submit two versions of Attachment 1 (Section E.7.B.16).
409.	CLIN 0001 is to be priced at the capacity levels established by the sizing basis provided in the Virtual Reading Room. Please state the deadline for submitting Attachment 2 – USAC Confidentiality Agreement, the expected turnaround for granting Reading Room access, and whether USAC will supplement Reading Room materials after the Q&A responses are released on October 26, 2026.	USAC grants Virtual Reading Room access about one week after receiving the signed Attachment 2. Each teaming partner, including subcontractors and the platform provider, must sign and submit its own Attachment 2. There is no separate deadline for Attachment 2; submit early, since access takes about a week. We do not anticipate reading room materials changing after Q&A
410.	Parallel operation is required for not less than ninety (90) calendar days prior to each production cutover, and hypercare for not less than sixty (60) calendar days following each cutover, with cutover phased by data domain. Please state the number of cutover phases Offerors should assume for pricing purposes, and confirm whether parallel operation periods for different data domains may run concurrently.	Vendor to propose.
411.	The proposal schedule lists both the Proof of Concept and the Anticipated Award Date as "TBD, 2026," while pricing must be held firm for one hundred twenty (120) calendar days from the Proposal Due Date. Please provide the anticipated POC window and its expected duration, the number of Offerors expected to be carried into the POC, and confirm whether USAC will request an extension of price validity or issue an addendum establishing a longer period.	USAC will decide the number of POC participants based on the proposals received. USAC will run no more than one POC per technology platform, and POCs will run concurrently. Refer to question 50 for PoC timings start.

Q#	Question	Answer
412.	Section E.9 states that USAC will establish the numeric pass thresholds for each POC test case, while Section B.20.2 states a threshold only for ingestion latency. Please confirm whether the remaining pass thresholds will be published to all participating Offerors in advance of the POC and in advance of submission of the Final Proposal Revision and Best and Final Offer.	USAC will share the numeric pass thresholds with all participating offerors before the POC starts. The same thresholds apply to every participant (Section E.9).
413.	Section D identifies Attachment 3 as the Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms, while Section E.6.2 and Section E.7.B.15 identify Attachment 3 as the Key Personnel resumes. Please confirm how Offerors should label and submit the resume attachment, and confirm whether the Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms are to be executed and returned with the proposal or at award.	Submit resumes as a separate attachment labeled "Attachment 4: Key Personnel Resumes." Attachment 3 remains the Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms. Attachment 3 will be executed at contract award, after the POC. It does not need to be signed and returned with the proposal.
414.	The Volume 2 page limit excludes “technical appendices,” which are not otherwise defined. Please confirm what content may be placed in a technical appendix and whether a page limit applies. Please also confirm whether the Platform Capability Compliance Matrix, the Mandatory Requirements Certification, the “Exceptions to RFP Terms” attachment, the General Counsel certification statement and a glossary of acronyms are excluded from the volume page counts.	The Platform Capability Compliance Matrix, Mandatory Requirements Certification, POC Test Plan and Exceptions to RFP Terms attachment are excluded from the 40-page Volume 2 limit.
415.	Several cross-references do not resolve. Section E.2 cites “Section B.23” for the Proof of Concept, which appears at Section B.20. Section E.7.B.11 cites “Section B.14.4” for division of work, which appears at Section B.11.4. Section E.8.1.C cites “Section B.14.1” for Key Personnel, which appears at Section B.11.1. Section E.11 cites “Section E.6.1” for the platform relationship disclosure, which appears at Section E.7.A.5. Section B.20 refers to “Definitization of the CLIN 0002 and CLIN 0002 NTE ceilings,” which appears to intend CLIN 0002 and CLIN 0003. Please confirm the corrected references.	These reference are fixed, and a redlined RFP is issued to reflect these changes.
416.	Please confirm whether a past performance reference may be an engagement performed by a proposed subcontractor or by the platform original equipment manufacturer, and whether such a reference will be evaluated with the same weight as a reference for work performed by the prime Offeror.	Three past performance references are mandatory, and they must be the prime Offeror's own contracts. Contracts performed by subcontractors, teaming partners or the platform provider do not count toward the three. Proposals without three qualifying references will not be considered for further evaluation.

Q#	Question	Answer
417.	Past performance recency is stated as “no older than three (3) years from the date of this solicitation.” Please confirm whether this means the contract must have been active or performed within the last three years, and confirm that an ongoing contract that commenced more than three years ago but remains current is eligible.	Ongoing and current contract relevant to RFP are fine. However, the reference for completed contract should not be older than years from the start of this solicitation.
418.	Offeror, rather than USAC, is responsible for ensuring the past performance questionnaire is completed and returned. Please provide the questionnaire template and state the return deadline, and confirm whether Offerors may obtain completed questionnaires from their references in advance and submit them with the proposal.	USAC sends the questionnaire directly to your references and will not share the template in advance. The return date will be in USAC's transmittal (Section E.7.C.3.b).
419.	Section B.11 states that USAC “strongly prefers” that all Key Personnel are employees of the Contractor and have been so for a minimum of three (3) years. Please confirm that this is a preference and not a mandatory requirement, and describe how employment tenure will be assessed under the Key Personnel sub-factor.	Key Personnel must be employees of the Offeror or of a subcontractor identified in the proposal. The three-year tenure in Section B.11 is a preference, not a pass/fail requirement.
420.	Please confirm whether Key Personnel may be proposed as contingent hires or as employees of a proposed subcontractor or teaming partner. If so, please state what evidence of commitment USAC requires to accompany the resume, such as a signed letter of intent or contingent offer of employment.	Key Personnel must be employees of the Offeror or of a subcontractor identified in the proposal. The three-year tenure in Section B.11 is a preference, not a pass/fail requirement. Refer to answer 14.
421.	Section B.8.7 requires that all Contractor Staff performing work under the Contract be “United States persons.” The term is not defined in Section C.1 or in the Privacy and Security Addendum. Please confirm whether USAC intends the definition at 22 C.F.R. § 120.62, which includes U.S. citizens, lawful permanent residents and protected individuals, or whether U.S. citizenship is required.	"United States persons" follows 22 C.F.R. 120.62, which includes lawful permanent residents and protected individuals. U.S. citizenship is not required. Refer to answer 23.
422.	Please state the level and type of background investigation required for Contractor Staff, whether USAC sponsors the investigation and bears its cost, the expected processing time, and whether an existing federal investigation or clearance held by proposed personnel may be reciprocally accepted. Section B.20.1 makes completion of these investigations a condition precedent to the production data validation round with no schedule relief, so processing time is material to the POC schedule.	The Offeror is responsible for background investigations of its team, including subcontractor staff. Section B.20.1 provides no schedule relief for meeting the live-data conditions.

Q#	Question	Answer
423.	Proposals reliant on more than two subcontractors will be heavily scrutinized for operational integration risk. Please confirm whether the platform original equipment manufacturer or reseller supplying CLIN 0001 licensing is counted as a subcontractor for this purpose, and whether a staffing or recruiting partner supplying personnel under the prime's direct management is likewise counted.	No. A platform OEM or reseller that only supplies licenses does not count toward the two-subcontractor threshold. The relationship must still be disclosed under Section E.7.A.5.
424.	Attachment 3 places primary accountability on the Contractor for any requirement "reasonably discoverable" during discovery, including capacity and load requirements, and bars additional compensation for requirements missed during Contractor-led discovery. The sizing basis, volumetrics, interface control documentation and data models on which those requirements depend are furnished by USAC through the Virtual Reading Room. Please confirm that USAC will warrant the accuracy and completeness of the information it furnishes, and that a requirement arising from inaccurate, incomplete or unavailable USAC-furnished information is excluded from the definition of a Missed Requirement.	Refer to answer 103.
425.	Attachment 3, Section 1.1 states that the Contractor conducted the Discovery and Design phase "within the Scope of CLIN 0002," while Section B.20.3 requires discovery and scoping to be performed concurrent with the Proof of Concept, which is at no cost to USAC. Please confirm whether the discovery and scoping work described in Section B.20.3 is compensated under CLIN 0002 or performed at no cost during the POC.	Preliminary discovery and scoping under Section B.20.3 is done during the POC, and USAC prefers it at no cost. Offerors may include additional time in CLIN 0002 for detailed discovery and to lock the MVP scope at the start of implementation.
426.	Attachment 3 requires remediation of all defects, regardless of severity, at no additional cost and with no change orders, additional fees or schedule extensions. Section C.14 limits USAC's liability but provides no reciprocal limitation of the Contractor's liability. Please confirm whether USAC will consider a mutual limitation of liability, and whether the remediation and rework obligations in Attachment 3 are intended to sit within or outside any such limitation.	Since offeror conducted the Discovery and identified all in scope deliverables and then develops the resulting application/tool, the defects were created through their efforts to deliver the in scope deliverables. As such, they own the liability to fix effectively their own mistakes within the deliverables.

Q#	Question	Answer
427.	Attachment 3, Section 9.3.5 states that USAC will issue written notice of acceptance or rejection "within the timeframe defined in the SOW," but Section B does not state an acceptance review period. Please state the acceptance review period for deliverables and confirm whether a deliverable is deemed accepted if USAC does not respond within that period. Please also confirm the correct reference for Section 4.3, which cites "Section 10 (Dispute Resolution)" in an attachment that concludes at Section 9.	USAC's review period is ten business days (Section B.9.5). The dispute provisions are in Attachment 3, Section 9, items 4 through 7. The reference to "Section 10 (Dispute Resolution)" in Section 4.3 is an error.
428.	Section B states that Pentaho Data Integration will be fully replaced by native platform ingestion capability. Please clarify whether every existing Pentaho job is in scope for replacement, including jobs associated with sources or outputs that may later be rationalized, and whether the complete job inventory and complexity assessment will be provided	Refer to answer 219.
429.	Because the RFP requires a phased cutover by data domain, please clarify the anticipated number of production cutovers. Does each domain cutover require its own minimum 90-day parallel period and minimum 60-day hypercare period, and may those periods overlap across domains?	Refer to answer 273.
430.	What criteria will USAC use to classify sources and data products into near-real-time, CDC, and batch freshness tiers? Will USAC provide an initial tier assignment, or is the Contractor expected to define and validate the tiers during POC discovery?	Section B.9.2 sets the near-real-time and CDC target at 300 seconds and leaves the batch schedule to CLIN 0002 design acceptance. Each source's integration pattern and refresh requirement is documented during discovery (Section B.20.3).
431.	Section B.7.1.2 permits AWS Commercial Cloud (US) or Microsoft Azure, while Section B.8.1 requires AWS GovCloud (US) or Microsoft Azure Government. Please clarify the permissible cloud environments. If a commercial cloud service offering holds the required FedRAMP authorization, is that offering acceptable, or must the platform operate specifically in a government-cloud region?	Refer to answers 110 and 138.
432.	During each minimum 90-day parallel-operation period, who will remain responsible for operating, monitoring, troubleshooting, and correcting the current platform? Will the Contractor be responsible only for the new platform and cross-platform reconciliation, or also for operational support of the legacy estate?	Refer to answer 372.

Q#	Question	Answer
433.	Section B.7.2.2 requires migration of existing Collibra content. Please clarify whether this content is to be migrated to the new platform's native catalog or integrated with Collibra as the continuing governance platform.	Refer to answer 117.
434.	Is NLQ required to be deployed in production under CLIN 0002, subject to USAC approval, or only demonstrated during the POC and available for future use?	Refer to answer 223.
435.	Which AI capabilities identified in Section B.6.7, if any, must be deployed in production under CLIN 0002, and which are required only as platform capabilities for future use?	Refer to answer 223.
436.	Should both versions of Attachment 1 include the same compliant, AI-capable platform, with the "without AI" scenario excluding only the contractor's use of AI to perform services? Please clarify whether this exclusion also applies to platform-native features such as AI-assisted classification, metadata enrichment, and natural-language querying.	Both versions of the Bid Sheet must include the platform AI capability required by Section B.6.7. The two versions differ only in the Contractor's use of AI to perform the Services. USAC will consider both the AI and non-AI prices in evaluation. Platform native features, such as AI-Assisted classification, metadata enrichment and NLQ do not count as contractor use of AI in performance.
437.	Does the prior-written-approval requirement apply to contractor productivity and development tools, including AI-assisted code generation, testing, and documentation? Please identify any distinction between tools that process USAC information and tools that do not.	Yes. Section B.6.7 requires prior written approval for AI tools, services or code of any type used in performing the Contract.
438.	Section E.2 states that the POC will be performed at no cost to USAC, while Section B.20.1 states that USAC will provide and own the secure enclave. Please clarify which POC infrastructure, platform licensing, cloud consumption, connectivity, and related costs will be provided by USAC versus borne by the Offeror.	The POC is performed at no cost to USAC (Section E.2). Offerors bear platform licensing and their own labor and support costs. If the POC runs in a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, USAC pays for that infrastructure. If it runs in the offeror's own tenant, the offeror bears those costs. USAC will consider both models: a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, or the offeror's vendor tenant connected to USAC over private networking.

Q#	Question	Answer
439.	The referenced sections have a slight difference in the way title to software licenses are described. Please confirm that USAC intends to hold title to all third-party software licenses and subscriptions directly throughout the contract term. Where the Contractor facilitates acquisition from a third-party software vendor or authorized reseller, will USAC treat software licenses as direct pass-through costs?	Yes. Licenses are held in USAC's name or assignable to USAC (Sections B.1 and B.7.1.3).
440.	The labor category requirements specify details which could overly restrict offerors from proposing the best personnel for the role and drive prices unnecessarily higher. Examples for changes to improve value of offers: remove PMP requirement from Program Manager to keep the role focused on personnel with the experience managing similar projects with a demonstrated record of value delivery, reduce Program Manager requirement to 8 years experience delivering enterprise data platform solutions to allow for broader pool of personnel, allow for actual program management function to be a separate person from Program Manager who does not have to have the same technical experience, Change Leads and other key personnel roles to require a minimum of 5 years of experience to allow offerors to manage price and still provide people with sufficient demonstrated experience in their role. Would USAC consider these example changes to the minimum requirements and allow offerors to propose people with more experience and certifications if they can demonstrate the additional value delivered a the higher price for those people?	The twelve-year minimum in Section B.11.1 is USAC's preference. USAC will consider individuals with fewer years who bring directly relevant experience. Refer to answer 15. One individual may hold more than one role (answer 4).
441.	The use of a POC in the source selection process will provide great value to USAC by allowing for objective comparison of offeror capabilities and thereby greatly increasing the likelihood of success of the following implementation project. Would USAC consider paying offerors a nominal amount relative to the overall project cost to deliver the POC? We would suggest that USAC select no more than 2 offerors for POCs and pay them 10% of their CLIN 0002 base year price for the POC. If payment for POC is not possible, would USAC consider limiting POC participation to no more than 2 offerors to increase likelihood offerors will be included to participate in the POCs at significant cost?	No. Section E.2 requires the POC at no cost to USAC. USAC will decide the number of participants based on the proposals received.

Q#	Question	Answer
442.	To allow offerors to prepare for meaningful POCs would USAC consider specifying that offerors will have 30 days from notice of selection for POC to start of test case demonstrations?	Offerors can request access to reading room materials now, because of the contract signing there should be an adequate amount of time for the selectee to prepare. Refer to question50 for more information about PoC timelines
443.	Does USAC require spatial indexing and point-in-polygon execution to run natively inside the single-authorization-boundary platform, or is a configuration where ArcGIS Enterprise performs the spatial compute and the platform governs/serves the results considered responsive to B.6.1?	Open to recommendation.
444.	B.6.1 requires a native enterprise catalog with column-level lineage, but the B.20.2 governance test asks offerors to connect to Collibra. Is USAC keeping Collibra as the enterprise catalog or replacing it? If Collibra stays, does a platform that delivers catalog and lineage through Collibra integration meet the B.6.1 mandatory requirement?	Refer to answer 117.
445.	B.8.7 requires all Contractor Staff to be U.S. persons and background-investigated before accessing USAC data. Does this also apply to the platform vendor's own support and engineering staff who hold administrative access to the managed service that stores USAC data?	Yes. "United States persons" in Section B.8.7 has the meaning in 22 C.F.R. 120.62. The requirement applies to all Contractor Staff, including subcontractor staff and platform provider staff with administrative access to the platform holding USAC Data. All Services must be performed in the United States (Section B.4.1); offshore resources are not permitted.
446.	The "mandatory floor" in Section B.6.6 is referenced in B.7, B.9, B.10, B.20.3, and E.7, but is not defined in B.6.6. Please provide the specific reports, data products, or interfaces that make up the mandatory floor.	Refer to answer 141.
447.	Section E asks offerors to address Governance Option A and Option B (B.6.4) and BI Structure 1 and Structure 2 (B.6.6), but these are not defined in B.6.4 or B.6.6. Please provide the definitions, or confirm that offerors are to define and label these options themselves.	Refer to answer 141.

Q#	Question	Answer
448.	C.15 makes the Contractor's indemnity for security, privacy, and data breaches uncapped, and B.6.11 says the Contractor cannot pass data-security responsibility to the cloud provider. The RFP also requires a commercial SaaS platform, and those vendors cap their own liability. How should offerors address this gap without it being treated as a material exception under E.1.A?	Refer to answer 298.
449.	C.18 says all "Software" and Derivative Works become USAC property as work-made-for-hire, but CLIN 0001 holds platform licenses in USAC's name. Please confirm the commercial platform's own IP is licensed to USAC, not assigned as work-made-for-hire, and that C.18 ownership applies only to the configurations, models, pipelines, and code built in performance.	This is correct, platform licenses use of their IP and isn't assigned as work-made-for-hire.
450.	For the POC in the USAC enclave (B.20), does USAC provide the platform licensing, compute, and storage, or must each offeror bring its own and pay the consumption cost of the test cases? How many offerors does USAC expect to select for the POC?	The POC is performed at no cost to USAC (Section E.2). Offerors bear platform licensing and their own labor and support costs. If the POC runs in a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, USAC pays for that infrastructure. If it runs in the offeror's own tenant, the offeror bears those costs. USAC will decide the number of POC participants based on the proposals received. USAC will run no more than one POC per technology platform, and POCs will run concurrently.
451.	B.20 says the POC definitizes the CLIN 0002 and CLIN 0003 ceilings, but the Bid Sheet is due with the proposal. Are the CLIN 0002 FFP and CLIN 0003 NTE prices in the proposal firm, or not-to-exceed figures finalized after the POC through the FPR/BAFO? For scope the POC is meant to define (B.20.3), how should offerors price it at proposal time?	Refer to answer 101. Yes. Section B.20 should read "CLIN 0002 and CLIN 0003 NTE ceilings." This will be corrected in the redlined RFP. State pricing assumptions for scope the POC will define in Volume 4.
452.	E.7.B.16 requires two bid sheets, with and without AI in performance of the Services, but B.6.7 makes platform AI capability mandatory. Please confirm the "without AI" bid sheet still includes the platform's native AI capability and only removes the use of AI in delivering the Services.	Both versions of the Bid Sheet must include the platform AI capability required by Section B.6.7. The two versions differ only in the Contractor's use of AI to perform the Services. USAC will consider both the AI and non-AI prices in evaluation.

Q#	Question	Answer
453.	B.6.1 states USAC should be able to obtain implementation and support from more than one source over time, and CLIN 0001 holds licenses in USAC's name. Please confirm the platform subscription is separable from the implementation and O&M provider, so USAC can change the services provider mid-term without affecting the licenses it holds.	Yes. Licenses are held in USAC's name or assignable to USAC, and USAC must be able to assume or reassign the platform (Sections B.6.1, B.7.1.3 and B.7.3.4).
454.	E.7.D.6 asks for the data egress cost model and confirmation that returning USAC data at transition is free. The platform also feeds Socrata, external map services, and open-data APIs during normal operations. Please confirm that routine egress for publication during the contract is treated as in-term consumption cost, separate from the free transition return.	Refer to answer 133.
455.	Attachment 3 is listed two ways: Section D calls it the "Design Responsibility and Accountability Term," and Section E (E.6.2, E.7.C) calls it the Key Personnel resumes. Please confirm the correct numbering, and confirm what the Design Responsibility and Accountability Term requires and whether it must be signed and returned with the proposal.	Submit resumes as a separate attachment labeled "Attachment 4: Key Personnel Resumes." Attachment 3 remains the Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms. Attachment 3 will be executed at contract award, after the POC. It does not need to be signed and returned with the proposal. Attachment 3 is posted on the procurement page.
456.	Please define “core platform capability” as used in Section B.6. Specifically, are data integration and ingestion, change data capture (CDC), data quality, metadata catalog and lineage, and master data management (MDM) considered core platform capability that must reside within the same authorization boundary as analytical storage and compute, or may they be provided as “integration with USAC’s existing enterprise tooling” or as “additional authorized services”?	Refer to answer 21.
457.	Will USAC accept a proposal in which the ingestion, integration, and data management layer is delivered through a separate FedRAMP Moderate (or higher) authorized offering, hosted in the United States, operating alongside the analytical storage and compute platform?	Refer to answer 170.

Q#	Question	Answer
458.	May a single Offeror propose multiple commercial offerings from the same parent company under one prime contract, where each offering holds its own FedRAMP authorization? Would such a proposal satisfy the single-authorization-boundary requirement of Section B.6.1?	Yes.
459.	Can integration or CDC runtime components (e.g., agents, connectors, or secure runtime engines) be deployed within USAC's AWS environment or on-premises network to reach source systems, while the control plane operates within a FedRAMP-authorized boundary? Is this deployment model consistent with Section B.6.1?	Yes.
460.	Section B.7.1.2 states the platform shall be provided "within AWS Commercial Cloud (US) or Microsoft Azure," while Section B.8 states "All hosting shall be within the United States, within AWS GovCloud (US) or Microsoft Azure Government." Please clarify which requirement governs, and whether any U.S.-hosted environment holding FedRAMP Moderate or higher authorization is acceptable.	Refer to answer 110.
461.	Does Section B.8 require FIPS 140-3 validated cryptographic modules at the time of award, or are modules with an active FIPS 140-2 validation and a documented FIPS 140-3 transition plan acceptable?	Section B.8.3 requires FIPS 140-3 validated cryptographyA transition plan would be considered if achieving compliance before go-live.
462.	Section B.8.1 states that authorizations described as "in process" do not satisfy the authorization requirement. Please confirm that FedRAMP Moderate (or higher) authorization of the core platform capability is assessed as of the date of award rather than the proposal due date, and identify the evidence USAC will accept to demonstrate authorization (e.g., FedRAMP Marketplace listing, agency Authority to Operate letter, or authorization package).	Refer to answer 21. For vendor-managed SaaS offerings, authorization publicly in FedRAMP marketplace is assessed at award (Section B.8.1).
463.	Section B.6.7 and Privacy and Security Addendum §3.3 gate the use and deployment of AI on USAC's prior written approval. Please confirm whether large language model and generative AI services invoked by the platform must operate within the same FedRAMP authorization boundary as the core platform, or whether separately FedRAMP-authorized, U.S.-hosted model services are acceptable. Should Offerors include AI platform capability in CLIN 0001 pricing for the base period even though its deployment may not be approved until later in performance?	LLM endpoints may operate outside the core platform boundary (answer 21). Include the platform AI capability in CLIN 0001 in both Bid Sheet versions (answer 452). Model authorization is examined during FISMA assessment of the developed system.

Q#	Question	Answer
464.	Does the requirement for Okta-integrated role-based, row-level, and attribute-based access control "evaluated at query execution time" apply to the integration and data management layer, or only to the analytical query layer?	Prefer attribute-based access control apply to all data layers.
465.	Please provide the number of Pentaho Data Integration (PDI) jobs and transformations currently in production, and the number that contain business logic beyond data type conversion and normalization. Is a job-level inventory available in the Virtual Reading Room?	Refer to answer 219.
466.	Please list the PostgreSQL, SQL Server, and MariaDB sources to be connected via log-based CDC, including database versions, hosting model (on-premises, AWS RDS, or Aurora), and whether logical replication is currently enabled. Will source database teams permit replication slots or CDC agents on these hosts?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the source system inventory (platform, integration pattern and volumetrics for each in-scope source) and interface control documentation (Section B.13).
467.	Will the requirement for "native CDC capability … through vendor-supported configuration or graphical interfaces" be satisfied by a vendor-supported CDC service that is part of the proposed solution but not embedded in the storage engine?	Refer to answer 265.
468.	For "business event-triggered data refreshes," which event sources are currently in scope (e.g., AWS EventBridge, SNS/SQS, Kafka, or webhooks from HUBB, EPC, or National Verifier)?	
469.	Will USAC provide the delivery method, frequency, format, and volume for each external feed (FCC, Death Master File, SAM.gov, census data, and location fabric data)?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the source system inventory (platform, integration pattern and volumetrics for each in-scope source) and interface control documentation (Section B.13).
470.	Is AWS API Gateway expected to remain USAC's API management layer, or may Offerors propose a replacement or complementary API management capability (e.g., for open data API rate limiting, egress monitoring, and logging under Section B.6.6)?	Offeror to propose.
471.	For "API-based open data services with rate limiting, egress monitoring, and logging," please provide current or anticipated call volumes, consumer types, and the expected authentication model. Is this capability priced within the baseline or only within the platform-native publication alternate?	Refer to answer 274.

Q#	Question	Answer
472.	Beyond loading data into the EDP, is application-to-application integration in scope (e.g., delivering data products back to UNIFi, Microsoft Dynamics 365, or program systems, or providing real-time APIs to downstream consumers)? If so, please provide the approximate number of interfaces.	Data products sourcing the UNIFi disbursement and payment feed are in scope (Sections B.5.5 and B.7.2.2). Custom application development unrelated to data platform enablement is out of scope.
473.	Section B.5.5 excludes re-engineering of UNIFi interfaces, while the Contractor must deliver and maintain the data products that source them. Please describe the current UNIFi interface mechanism (file, database link, or API) and the expected handoff point between the Contractor and USAC.	Refer to answer 125.
474.	Is Collibra expected to remain USAC's enterprise catalog, with the platform integrating with "third-party governance tooling," or may Offerors propose a replacement? Is the current Collibra license term available in the Virtual Reading Room?	Refer to answer 117.
475.	How many data quality rules and critical data elements does USAC anticipate at go-live, and which program domains are prioritized first?	The expected scope at go-live includes approximately two dozen tables and 28 fields. This includes trimming whitespace, special characters, and address rules (no special characters in address lines, phone numbers, zip codes are numbers only, cities don't allow numbers)
476.	For unstructured content and "enterprise content management repositories," which repositories are in scope (e.g., SharePoint or document stores associated with National Verifier or EPC), and what are the approximate volumes?	Refer to answer 206.
477.	For MDM "capability available for future use," may MDM be priced as a separately licensed optional line item within CLIN 0001? Which entity domains does USAC anticipate prioritizing (e.g., service providers, beneficiaries, carriers, or locations)?	Refer to answer 343. Implementation of master data management is not required under the scope of this procurement.
478.	Section B.13 states the Virtual Reading Room will include the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes, projected annual growth) and concurrency figures and user counts by persona. Will these materials be available to all Offerors promptly upon execution of Attachment 2, and by what date? Will USAC extend the proposal due date if Reading Room access is delayed?	USAC grants Virtual Reading Room access about one week after receiving the signed Attachment 2. Each teaming partner, including subcontractors and the platform provider, must sign and submit its own Attachment 2. USAC is extending the due date by one week (answer 35).

Q#	Question	Answer
479.	Section B.7.2.2 requires ten (10) years of history to be loaded into the active analytical schema and older data to be placed into archive, and Section B.5.2 notes more than twenty-five (25) years of history currently in active storage. Please confirm whether migration of all history, including data older than ten years into the archive tier, must be completed within CLIN 0002 before Vertica is decommissioned, or whether archive-tier migration may be sequenced after the final production cutover.	All history is migrated: ten years to the active schema and older data to archive (Section B.7.2.2).
480.	How many Tableau workbooks, certified data sources, and other reports must be repointed or rebuilt as part of CLIN 0002? Are non-Tableau reporting assets (e.g., Posit, Excel-based, or other reports) in scope for migration?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the Tableau workbook inventory and usage statistics (Section B.13). Report and semantic-model migration scope will be defined during the POC (Section B.7.2.2) and locked during detailed discovery in CLIN 0002. R and Python analytical code assets are in scope (Section B.7.2.2).
481.	If an Offeror proposes retention of Tableau, should Tableau licensing be included in CLIN 0001 pricing, or will USAC continue its existing Tableau agreement separately from this Contract?	Tableau, Collibra, Posit, ArcGIS and Socrata licenses stay USAC-funded and are outside CLIN 0001.
482.	Is there an incumbent contractor supporting the current Vertica EDW and Pentaho environment? Will USAC or the incumbent provide knowledge transfer and existing job documentation during CLIN 0002? Please identify any firms precluded under Section E.11 because they performed the EDW or data management maturity assessments.	There is no incumbent. This is a new requirement, so there is no prior contract number, contract value or incumbent performance history. Existing documentation is in the Reading Room (Section B.13). USAC will not name the firms. Any Offeror or proposed subcontractor that performed those assessments must disclose it and propose mitigation under Sections E.7.A.4 and E.11.
483.	CLIN 0001 is Annual FFP. May Offerors propose consumption-based pricing (e.g., committed usage or credit tiers) within an annual fixed price? If so, how will USAC normalize consumption-based pricing for evaluation, and will USAC provide a standard usage assumption for all Offerors?	Refer to answer 327.
484.	What is the relative importance of the Technical, Experience & Past Performance, and Price factors? Are the non-price factors, combined, more important than price? Can USAC share an estimated budget or funding range for the total Contract or for each CLIN?	Section E.8.1 lists the technical sub-factors in descending order of importance. USAC will not share budget or cost estimate information.

Q#	Question	Answer
485.	For platform licenses held in USAC's name, may subscriptions be procured through an authorized reseller or directly from the platform provider, with the Contractor managing them? Is the prime Contractor the contracting party for licenses in all cases?	Refer to answer 32.
486.	Please provide the anticipated timeline for POC notification, secure enclave availability, and FPR/BAFO submission. Does USAC anticipate oral presentations or product demonstrations in addition to the POC?	USAC may hold additional Q&A sessions, product demonstrations and discussions with selected offerors (Section E.9). Duration of source selection process is dependent on the number of proposals received. We tentatively anticipate PoCs period to begin in January 2027
487.	May the same platform provider be proposed by more than one prime Offeror? May a platform provider submit a proposal as a direct Offeror while also being proposed by another Offeror? For the scrutiny of "teams utilizing more than two subcontractors" in Section E.8.1.B, does a platform provider supplying only licenses count as a subcontractor?	If more than one offeror proposes the same platform, USAC will select one offeror for that platform's POC based on overall proposal quality, after reviewing the technical proposal, Key Personnel, relevance of past performance, capabilities and price. No. A platform OEM or reseller that only supplies licenses does not count toward the two-subcontractor threshold. The relationship must still be disclosed under Section E.7.A.5.
488.	Are there small-business subcontracting goals, set-asides, or evaluation credits that apply to this procurement, including to platform providers or resellers?	his is a competitive opportunity open for all size companies. All submissions will be evaluated under Section E of this RFP.
489.	What are USAC's anticipated award date, kickoff date, and target go-live or Vertica decommission date? Are there Vertica license, support, or hardware end dates driving the cutover timeline?	USAC anticipates to make the award following the conclusion of the 90 day PoCs and internal approvals. Legacy system timeline constraints will be discussed during discovery.
490.	Will USAC hold a second round of questions after the October 26, 2026 Q&A release or after Offerors gain Virtual Reading Room access?	No. USAC will not hold a second round of questions.
491.	Section C.14 limits USAC's liability only. Will USAC consider a mutual limitation of liability (e.g., Contractor liability capped at fees paid in the preceding twelve months), with customary exclusions?	Refer to answer 293.
492.	Will USAC accept a cap on Contractor indemnification obligations under Section C.15 and Privacy and Security Addendum §2.7, other than for third-party intellectual property infringement and gross negligence or willful misconduct?	Refer to answer 293.

Q#	Question	Answer
493.	Section E.1.A states USAC will not negotiate exceptions after selection of the awardee. Will USAC notify Offerors before selection of any exceptions it considers material or unacceptable, so they may be withdrawn or modified?	Under Section E.1.A, USAC may eliminate a proposal with material or unacceptable exceptions, with or without notice.
494.	For CLIN 0001 licenses held in USAC's name, may the platform providers' standard commercial subscription terms (e.g., service level agreement, data processing addendum, and acceptable use policy) apply alongside the USAC Standard Terms and Conditions?	Refer to answer 293.
495.	Does the "United States persons" requirement in Section B.8.7 apply to platform provider operations and support personnel who have no logical access to USAC Data, or only to Contractor Staff performing Services under the Contract?	The requirement applies to platform provider staff with administrative access to the platform holding USAC Data (answer 23). This is applicable to contractor staff performing services under the contract, not administrative or operations staff of the contractor's enterprise.
496.	May past performance references be drawn from the platform provider(s), teaming partners, or subcontractors, or only from the prime Offeror? May a contract count if the Offeror delivered it jointly with the proposed platform provider?	Three past performance references are mandatory, and they must be the prime Offeror's own contracts. Contracts performed by subcontractors, teaming partners or the platform provider do not count toward the three. Proposals without three qualifying references will not be considered for further evaluation.
497.	The schedule table in Section E.2 lists the proposal due date as "November 23, 2025," while the cover page lists November 23, 2026. Please confirm the proposal due date is Monday, November 23, 2026, at 11:00 AM ET.	Please refer to answer 35.
498.	Sections B.7.2.3, B.9.1, B.20.3, E.7.B.6, and E.8.1.A refer to a "mandatory floor" set out in Section B.6.6; Section B.11.1 and E.7.B.7 refer to "Structure 1 and Structure 2 described in Section B.6.6"; and Section E.7.B.8 refers to "Option A and Option B as described in Section B.6.4." None of these terms are defined in Sections B.6.4 or B.6.6 as issued. Because they are evaluated under Section E.8.1.A, please issue the missing text through an amendment, including the list of mandatory floor data products and reports.	Refer to answer 141.

Q#	Question	Answer
499.	Section B.6.9 requires ten (10) years of data in the active analytical schema, while Attachment 1 CLIN 0001 Item 9 references a "6-year retention" active layer and Item 13 references archive storage "beyond 6 years." Please confirm which retention period Offerors should use for pricing and whether Attachment 1 will be revised.	Ten (10) years governs for design, sizing and pricing (Section B.6.9). The "6-year" wording in Attachment 1 is an error and will be corrected in the revised Bid Sheet.
500.	Section B.11 refers repeatedly to a "labor category description tab on bid sheet," and Section E.8.3 states that labor rates will be evaluated; however, Attachment 1 as issued contains no labor category, job description, or labor rate tab. Please provide the missing tab(s) or confirm the format in which Offerors should submit labor categories and fully loaded hourly rates for the T&M CLIN 0003. In addition, CLIN 0003 Item 3 reads "Training and Transition-out," while Sections B.5.5 and B.7.2.4 exclude training from scope; please confirm what, if any, training should be priced under that line.	USAC will issue a revised Attachment 1 that adds the labor category descriptions tab and a CLIN 0003 labor rate table and corrects the CLIN 0003 subtotal formula. End-user training curricula and instructor-led training are out of scope (Section B.5.5), and knowledge transfer is in scope (Section B.7.3.3).
501.	Section E.7.B.16 requires separate versions of Attachment 1 for scenarios with and without the use of AI in performance of the Services. Please confirm (a) that the "with AI" scenario relates only to the Contractor's use of AI tools in delivering Services, not the AI capability of the platform under Section B.6.7; (b) whether both versions are evaluated, and which is used for total evaluated price; and (c) whether both versions count toward the Volume 4 page limit.	Yes. Both versions of the Bid Sheet must include the platform AI capability required by Section B.6.7. The two versions differ only in the Contractor's use of AI to perform the Services. USAC will consider both the AI and non-AI prices in evaluation. The Bid Sheets are Attachment 1 and do not count toward the Volume 4 page limit (answer 185).
502.	Section D identifies Attachment 3 as the "Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms," while Sections E.6.2 and E.7.B.15 direct Key Personnel resumes to be submitted as "Attachment 3." Please confirm the attachment designation Offerors should use for resumes. Please also confirm whether the POC Test Plan required by Section E.7.B.5 counts toward the forty (40) page limit for Volume 2 or may be submitted as a technical appendix.	Submit resumes as a separate attachment labeled "Attachment 4: Key Personnel Resumes." Attachment 3 remains the Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms. The Platform Capability Compliance Matrix, Mandatory Requirements Certification, POC Test Plan and Exceptions to RFP Terms attachment are excluded from the 40-page Volume 2 limit.

Q#	Question	Answer
503.	Please confirm the intended cross-references for the following, which do not appear to match the RFP as issued: "Section B.23" in E.2 (POC, which appears to be B.20); "Section B.14.1" and "B.14.4" in E.7.B.11 and E.8.1.C (which appear to be B.11.1 and B.11.4); "Section B.12.1" in B.9.7 and "Section B.12" in Deliverable 5 (which appear to be B.9.1); "Section E.6.A.4.b" (which appears to be E.7.A.4.b); and "Section E.6.1" in E.11 (which appears to be E.7.A.5). In addition, Section B.20 lists "Definitization of the CLIN 0002 and CLIN 0002 NTE ceilings"; please confirm whether the second reference is intended to be CLIN 0003.	A redlined RFP with corrected references is posted.
504.	Section E.2 states that POCs will be executed at no cost to USAC. Please provide: (a) the anticipated number of Offerors to be selected for the POC; (b) the expected POC duration and the duration of the final validation round against live production data; (c) whether USAC or the Offeror bears platform subscription and compute consumption costs within the USAC-owned secure enclave; and (d) for multi-tenant SaaS offerings that cannot be deployed into a customer-owned account, how the "dedicated public sector tenancy" described in Section B.20.1 is expected to be established (e.g., an Offeror-provisioned FedRAMP tenant connected to USAC via private networking).	USAC will decide the number of POC participants based on the proposals received. USAC will run no more than one POC per technology platform, and POCs will run concurrently. USAC will consider both models: a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, or the offeror's vendor tenant connected to USAC over private networking. The POC is performed at no cost to USAC (Section E.2). Offerors bear platform licensing and their own labor and support costs. If the POC runs in a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, USAC pays for that infrastructure. If it runs in the offeror's own tenant, the offeror bears those costs. Refer to question 50 about PoC duration
505.	Section B.2 describes CLIN 0002 as FFP, while Section B.7.2 describes it as "FFP with an annual not-to-exceed ceiling definitized" following the POC, and Section B.20 lists definitization of CLIN ceilings as a POC outcome. Please clarify whether the CLIN 0002 price submitted with the proposal is binding, or whether it is an estimate to be definitized after the POC and discovery, and how USAC will evaluate CLIN 0002 price under Section E.8.3 in either case.	Refer to answer 101.

Q#	Question	Answer
506.	Attachment 3 is written as a "Firm-Fixed-Price Amendment" executed after a Contractor-led discovery phase within CLIN 0002, while Section B.20.3 places discovery and scoping concurrent with the pre-award POC. Please clarify: (a) at what point Attachment 3 is executed (award, or definitization of CLIN 0002 following discovery); (b) whether its "missed requirement" and defect provisions apply to defects in commercially available SaaS platform software licensed under CLIN 0001, as opposed to Contractor-delivered configuration and implementation; (c) whether Offerors may propose exceptions to Attachment 3 under Section E.1.A, including to the provision that remediation shall not result in schedule extensions; and (d) the intended reference for "Section 10 (Dispute Resolution)" cited in Attachment 3, Section 4.3.	(a) Attachment 3 will be executed at contract award, after the POC. It does not need to be signed and returned with the proposal. (c) Refer to answer 298. (d) The dispute provisions are in Attachment 3, Section 9, items 4 through 7. The reference to "Section 10 (Dispute Resolution)" in Section 4.3 is an error.
507.	The Contract Term is a one (1) year base period with two (2) one-year options, while CLIN 0002 requires phased cutover by data domain with not less than ninety (90) days of parallel operation before each cutover and sixty (60) days of hypercare after each cutover. Does USAC expect all migration and cutover to be completed within the base year? Please share any target timeline. Please also confirm whether the Transition-Out Plan and Support Package under B.7.3.4 are due only before final Contract expiration, or before expiration of each period of performance.	The Transition-Out Plan and Support Package are due before Contract expiration (Section B.7.3.4). Refer to question 30
508.	CLIN 0001 is an annual FFP subscription, while Section C.11 permits termination for convenience on one (1) day's notice and Sections C.6 and C.8 provide for payment upon acceptance, in arrears. Please clarify (a) whether CLIN 0001 annual subscription fees may be invoiced annually in advance upon provisioning, and (b) how USAC will treat committed annual subscription fees in the event of a termination for convenience during a period of performance.	efer to answer 369.

Q#	Question	Answer
509.	Privacy and Security Addendum §2.6(ii) requires cloud-based services that interact with USAC Data to be FedRAMP Moderate certified "by the time the cloud-based Services are implemented," while Section B.8.1 requires the core platform to be authorized at award. For capabilities that USAC determines are outside the c`ore platform capability (e.g., in response to Question 1), must FedRAMP Moderate authorization be held at the time of award, or is it sufficient that authorization is obtained before that service is implemented or used with USAC Data during CLIN 0002?	A FedRAMP moderate authorization must be achieved before award. FISMA assessment to obtain an ATO will be conducted 2by USAC Security.
510.	Section B.6.12 requires "reserved or guaranteed GPU capacity" and scaling of "GPU/CPU/vRAM capabilities to meet any new recommended requirements with ArcGIS Pro upgrades." Please clarify: (a) the GPU workloads anticipated (e.g., ML training, geospatial processing, or ArcGIS Pro desktop sessions); (b) the expected quantity and class of GPU capacity for pricing; and (c) whether hosting ArcGIS Pro desktop sessions (e.g., virtual desktop infrastructure) is in scope, or whether ArcGIS Pro will continue to run on USAC-managed workstations with a direct connection to the platform per Section B.6.8.	See Virtual Reading Room.
511.	Section B.9.1 applies P1–P4 incident service levels to both production and pre-production environments. Will USAC consider limiting P1 and P2 service levels, including 24x7 P1 coverage, to the production environment, with pre-production subject to business-hours targets?	It is only applicable to production environments.
512.	Section C.18 provides that all Software and Deliverables are USAC property and works made for hire. Please confirm that commercially available SaaS platform software, and Offeror or platform provider pre-existing intellectual property (including product features, connectors, and accelerators), are excluded from Section C.18 and are governed by the applicable license terms, with USAC owning USAC Data, USAC-specific configurations, and Deliverables first produced under the Contract.	USAC IP applies to any software developed for USAC and does not conflict with any existing IP for commercially offered software and services.

Q#	Question	Answer
513.	Section C.1.N defines Key Personnel as "full-time employees of Contractor," and Section B.11 states USAC strongly prefers Key Personnel who have been Contractor employees for at least three (3) years. May Key Personnel be employees of a proposed subcontractor or platform provider? If so, how will the three-year employment preference be applied in evaluation?	Key Personnel must be employees of the Offeror or of a subcontractor identified in the proposal. The three-year tenure in Section B.11 is a preference, not a pass/fail requirement
514.	Section E.7.A.4 requires disclosure of any business or contractual relationship between the Offeror (or a proposed subcontractor) and any USF stakeholder. Large commercial technology providers routinely sell standard commercial products to telecommunications carriers, schools, libraries, and health care providers that participate in USF programs. Does USAC consider such arm's-length commercial customer relationships to be a conflict of interest requiring a mitigation plan, or is disclosure at a summary level sufficient?	The offeror must determine if that is a conflict of interest. If so, disclosure and a mitigation plan must be provided as part of the proposal.
515.	Section B.9.3 requires a Recovery Time Objective of four (4) hours and a Recovery Point Objective of one (1) hour for the production environment, and Section B.6.1 ties high availability and disaster recovery to those objectives. Please clarify whether these objectives apply to each component of the proposed solution (including integration and orchestration management or control planes) or to the production data services as a whole. Please also confirm whether the 99.9% monthly availability target in Section B.9.2 may be measured using the platform provider's published service level reporting.	Applies to production as a whole.
516.	May an Offeror perform Services through its wholly-owned subsidiaries or affiliates? If so, (a) are such affiliates treated as subcontractors for purposes of Section C.9 consent and the "more than two subcontractors" consideration in Section E.8.1.B, and (b) do affiliate employees satisfy the Section C.1.N definition of Key Personnel as employees of Contractor?	Yes, an Offeror may perform services through its wholly owned subsidiaries or affiliates. Offeror must identify any proposed affiliate performing services and clearly describe the proposed arrangement and relationship. The affiliate employees may satisfy the requirement of Key Personnel as employees of the contractor depending on the exact relationship between the offeror and those affiliates and subsidiaries. However, USAC cannot make a determination now and must review the proposed relationship and arrangement as part of proposal review.

Q#	Question	Answer
517.	If the same platform is proposed by more than one Offeror, including a platform provider submitting directly, (a) will USAC conduct a separate POC for each Offeror or a single POC per platform, and (b) will USAC require any information firewall or organizational conflict of interest mitigation from a platform provider that also supplies its platform to other Offerors?	If more than one offeror proposes the same platform, USAC will select one offeror for that platform's POC based on overall proposal quality, after reviewing the technical proposal, Key Personnel, relevance of past performance, capabilities and price.
518.	After USAC notifies an offeror that it has been selected for the POC, for resource planning purposes, can USAC give an estimate of the sufficient time it will give vendors to setup and execute the POC?	Refer to question 50 for PoC duration
519.	The instructions say resumes go in "Attachment 3," but Attachment 3 was an RFP file provided as the Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms. How should the resumes attachment be labeled?	Submit resumes as a separate attachment labeled "Attachment 4: Key Personnel Resumes." Attachment 3 remains the Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms.
520.	Can USAC please explicitly define what constitutes the "core platform capability" that is required to have a single FedRAMP Moderate or higher authorized offering, under a single authorization boundary, authorized at the time of award?	Refer to answer 21.
521.	Can USAC share an independent cost estimate or planned budget for the Enterprise Data Platform procurement?	USAC will not share budget or cost estimate information.
522.	Which version of the Attachment 1 - bid sheet, with the use of AI or without the use of AI, will be used for total evaluated price and for the down-select comparison against the median price?	Both versions of the Bid Sheet must include the platform AI capability required by Section B.6.7. The two versions differ only in the Contractor's use of AI to perform the Services. USAC will consider both the AI and non-AI prices in evaluation.

Q#	Question	Answer
523.	During review, we identified several internal cross-references in the RFP that appear to point to incorrect or non-existent sections. Can USAC confirm the correct section references for these citations, and clarify whether other cross-references throughout the RFP should similarly be rechecked for accuracy? For example: - B.14.4 and B.14.1 are cited in regards to Key Personnel and Labor Categories - however, B.14 is a section on Meetings. Section B.11 is Key Personnel and Labor Categories. - B.12.1 is cited on pg.29. Section B.12 has no sub-sections. - B.23 is cited on pg. 80. Section B ends at B.20.3 - there is no B.23. - E.6.1 on pg.90 is cited in regards to platform relationship disclosure. However, it is an incorrect citation that points to "Proposal Presentation", and should instead point to E.7.A.5.	Refer to answer 503.
524.	Section B.6.6 does not include a description of Structure 1 and Structure 2. Can USAC describe these Structures, or just confirm the offeror should respond to the requirements within B.6.6?	Refer to answer 141.
525.	Section B.6.4 does not include a description of Option A and Option B. Can USAC describe these Options, or just confirm the offeror should respond to the requirements within B.6.4?	Refer to answer 141.
526.	Section B.6.6 does not explicitly define the mandatory floor items. Can USAC please confirm the mandatory floor items in B.6.6?	Refer to answer 141.
527.	Given the time it will take vendors to review and evaluate additional materials available in the Virtual Reading Room, will USAC permit one more round of questions by October 30th with any questions on these materials?	No. USAC will not hold a second round of questions.
528.	Can USAC provide the tab/spreadsheet update that provides the detailed JDs for key personnel?	A revised bid sheet with labor category is posted.
529.	The Attachment 1 - bid sheet does not contain any information to provide labor rates. Please specify how and where this labor rates information should be provided.	Refer to answer 528.
530.	Does USAC currently have volume/enterprise licensing agreements with AWS or Microsoft Azure? Will this be shared, and if so, how can it be accounted for to support estimates and pricing?	USAC has volume estimates that are included in the reading room.

Q#	Question	Answer
531.	Will the reading room provide answers to the below questions? If not, can USAC please provide responses to the below questions? - Does USAC maintain a known volume of semi-structured or unstructured data in addition to the structured data under management listed in section B.5? - How many data domains does USAC maintain as part of the current solution?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the source system inventory (platform, integration pattern and volumetrics for each in-scope source) and interface control documentation (Section B.13).
532.	What are the USAC's primary pain points with the current Datawarehouse and analytics environment?	Section B.5.4 lists the documented limitations driving this procurement.
533.	Could you provide the number of data sources and list of data sources to be integrated with the proposed platform.	Section B.5.3 lists the source systems and integration points. The Virtual Reading Room includes the source system inventory (platform, integration pattern and volumetrics for each in-scope source) and interface control documentation (Section B.13).
534.	Can you provide the amount of available historical data that should be migrated to the new platform.	More than 25 years of history sit in active storage today (Section B.5.2). Ten years load into the active schema and older data moves to archive (Section B.7.2.2). The sizing basis is in the Reading Room.
535.	Please confirm the expected data-refresh frequency required?	Refer to answer 430.
536.	The RFP permits AWS Commercial Cloud (US) or Microsoft Azure and requires a single FedRAMP Moderate-or-higher authorized core platform. Please confirm whether the proposed platform must be hosted exclusively on one of these two cloud environments or whether any other platform vendors are preferred.	Refer to answer 110. USAC has no preferred platform vendor; the POC informs platform selection (Section B.20).
537.	Please identify which existing tools - including Tableau, Collibra, ESRI, Socrata, Okta and Posit must be retained or integrated, and confirm whether USAC will provide continued access to existing licenses and vendor support.	Collibra, ESRI ArcGIS Enterprise, Socrata, Okta and Posit are retained and integrated. Tableau may be retained or replaced by native reporting (answer 141). Tableau, Collibra, Posit, ArcGIS and Socrata licenses stay USAC-funded and are outside CLIN 0001.
538.	Please confirm whether all required capabilities, including data quality, governance, catalog, lineage, geospatial processing, AI enablement and monitoring, must be included in the core platform subscription, or whether separately licensed services within the permitted authorization boundary are acceptable.	Refer to answers 70 and 109.

Q#	Question	Answer
539.	The current environment includes Tableau reporting assets. Please provide the total number dashboards and reports requiring migration or validation. Will the final migration scope be limited to assets selected during the Proof of Concept (POC)?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the Tableau workbook inventory and usage statistics (Section B.13). Report and semantic-model migration scope will be defined during the POC (Section B.7.2.2) and locked during detailed discovery in CLIN 0002.
540.	The RFP specifies ten years of data in the active analytical schema and archival of older data. Please clarify the required archive solution, retrieval-time expectations, retention rules and whether archive storage and retrieval costs must be included in CLIN 0001.	Refer to answer 118. Archive storage in the platform's managed storage is priced in CLIN 0001 (Sections B.6.9 and B.7.1.1). Retention follows USAC's records retention policy and NARA schedules.
541.	Please clarify the expected reconciliation tolerances and acceptance criteria for migrated data, reports, semantic models and data products, including how pre-existing data quality issues will be treated.	Refer to answer 121. USAC does not expect for the Offeror to address pre-existing data quality issues.
542.	The RFP excludes rebuilding or re-engineering UNIFi interfaces but requires delivery and maintenance of the related data products. Please clarify the contractor's responsibility if changes to those interfaces or their upstream dependencies are required for successful migration or operation.	Refer to answer 125.
543.	Please confirm the expected POC duration, number of participating offerors, evaluation criteria and required deliverables, Will the POC be completed before the final implementation scope and CLIN 0002 price/ceiling are established?	USAC will decide the number of POC participants based on the proposals received. USAC will run no more than one POC per technology platform, and POCs will run concurrently. The test cases are in Section B.20.2, and thresholds will be shared before the POC starts. The POC is completed before CLIN 0002 is definitized (answer 101).
544.	Can you confirm whether USAC will reimburse POC-related costs to the vendor?	The POC is performed at no cost to USAC (Section E.2). Offerors bear platform licensing and their own labor and support costs. If the POC runs in a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, USAC pays for that infrastructure. If it runs in the offeror's own tenant, the offeror bears those costs.
545.	Please provide the anticipated contract award date, target production date and mandatory interim milestones for platform implementation, migration, parallel operation and cutover.	Refer to question 489
546.	The RFP requires at least 90 calendar days of parallel operation before each production cutover. Please clarify the anticipated number of cutover waves, whether parallel periods may overlap across data domains, and the expected overall migration duration.	Refer to answer 273.

Q#	Question	Answer
547.	CLIN 0002 is firm-fixed-price, and the contract terms place responsibility on the contractor for requirements that should reasonably have been identified during discovery. Please clarify how requirements identified after the POC will be distinguished from genuinely new scope, and what process will be used to resolve disputes before additional work is required.	Refer to answer 29. The dispute provisions are in Attachment 3, Section 9, items 4 through 7. The reference to "Section 10 (Dispute Resolution)" in Section 4.3 is an error.
548.	Please provide expected annual platform consumption and sizing assumptions for CLIN 0001, including storage and compute. Can USAC provide anticipated annual data-growth projections to support pricing for the contract term?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13).
549.	Please clarify expected staffing levels, support hours, incident volumes, on-call coverage, operations-and-maintenance duration and estimated annual labor effort for CLIN 0003, including the minimum 60-day hypercare period following each cutover.	Offerors propose CLIN 0003 staffing and labor mix (Section B.11.2). Core support hours are 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. ET on weekdays with on-call P1 coverage (Section B.9.1), and hypercare runs at least 60 days after each cutover (Section B.7.3.1).
550.	Please clarify how the overall not-to-exceed amount for CLINs 0001-0003 should be calculated across the one-year base period and two one-year renewal options, and whether separate annual amounts or ceilings are required for each CLIN.	Refer to answer 201.
551.	The RFP states that services must be performed within the United States and that contractor staff presently must work at USAC's office at least two days per week. Can you clarify which roles must be working onsite.	The two-day-per-week onsite requirement applies to all Contractor Staff. USAC is willing to consider alternate staffing proposals, which offerors should describe in the technical proposal.
552.	The RFP states that services must be performed within the United States and that contractor staff presently must work at USAC's office at least two days per week. Can you confirm whether the requirement applies to all project staff or only designated personnel, and whether exceptions to the hybrid-work requirement may be approved.	The two-day-per-week onsite requirement applies to all Contractor Staff. USAC is willing to consider alternate staffing proposals, which offerors should describe in the technical proposal.
553.	Please clarify how responsibility will be allocated when delays, defects or performance issues result from USAC-managed infrastructure, source systems, third-party products, unavailable access or other dependencies outside the contractor's reasonable control.	Refer to answer 331.

Q#	Question	Answer
554.	Please confirm whether the Confidentiality Agreement must be executed by the offeror only or also by all proposed subcontractors and partners before they may access the Virtual Reading Room or USAC information.	Each teaming partner, including subcontractors and the platform provider, must sign its own Attachment 2.
555.	Can you confirm the number of dashboard pages/reports that are required to be implemented?	Refer to answer 52.
556.	Could you please provide the estimated number of dashboard users	The Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13).
557.	Can you confirm whether the project delivery model permits the use of both onshore and offshore resources, specifically including personnel based in India.	No. All Services must be performed in the United States by U.S. persons (Sections B.4.1 and B.8.7). Offshore resources, including personnel based in India, are not permitted.
558.	Could you please confirm whether references from commercial-sector clients are acceptable, or whether references should be only from public-sector agencies?	Refer to answer 166.
559.	Is USAC looking for a phased implementation or a big bang implementation?	Phased. Cutover is sequenced by data domain (Section B.7.2.3).
560.	Can you clarify the envisioned project start date and end date?	Refer to question 489 for tentative start timelines, End date will be determined during discovery and planning
561.	Could you please share the estimated budget allocated for this project?	USAC will not share budget or cost estimate information.
562.	Can you confirm the expected POC scope, duration, evaluation criteria, schedule.	Refer to answer 50.
563.	Can USAC clarify the available or expected budget allocation across CLIN 0001 (platform licensing and hosting), CLIN 0002 (implementation and migration), and CLIN 0003 (operations and hypercare), including parallel operations and transition costs?	USAC will not share budget or cost estimate information.
564.	To protect USAC's long-term ownership of its data and reduce future transition risk, will USAC require that all USAC Data be stored in open, non-proprietary table and file formats that can be read directly by multiple third-party query engines, without requiring export, conversion, or the incumbent platform's licensed compute? If so, should Offerors describe the cost, effort, and timeline to transition the full data estate to a successor platform at contract end?	The RFP does not require a specific table or file format. It requires standard connectivity (Section B.6.1), return of all USAC Data in a format USAC specifies at no cost (Section B.7.3.4), and technology that USAC can support through more than one source.

Q#	Question	Answer
565.	Please confirm that all capabilities evaluated under Section B.6 must be delivered natively within the Offeror's single FedRAMP authorization boundary. This includes data engineering, governance and lineage, geospatial processing, machine learning, vector search, and generative AI. Will capabilities delivered through separately authorized third-party add-ons or partner marketplace components be considered non-responsive? Additionally, please confirm that an offering authorized at FedRAMP High satisfies the FedRAMP Moderate-or-higher requirement for AWS Commercial (US) or Azure deployments.	Refer to answers 21 and 170. FedRAMP High satisfies the Moderate-or-higher requirement.
566.	Does USAC intend to retain its current data governance tool alongside the new platform, or does it prefer a single, platform-native governance layer? Specifically, will USAC evaluate favorably a solution in which one catalog applies the same access policies, dynamic masking, and column-level lineage to tables, files, dashboards, machine learning models, and AI agents? How will USAC weigh this against solutions that need separate governance tools for data and for AI?	Refer to answer 117. USAC will evaluate each proposal on the basis of the requirements stated in the RFP. If a platform has capabilities exceeding requirements then it may rate more favorably in that area.
567.	For the geospatial POC test case, will USAC require that point-in-polygon joins on ESRI shapefiles and GeoJSON run natively within the platform's governed, elastically scalable compute, using built-in spatial SQL functions and spatial indexing? Or is processing through an external GIS server, desktop tool, or data extract acceptable? Please also clarify whether a standard JDBC/ODBC connection from ArcGIS Pro is sufficient to meet the "direct connection" requirement.	Refer to answer 443. Refer to answer 266.
568.	To avoid dependence on a single AI model provider, will USAC require that the platform support both open-source and commercial large language models, hosted within the authorization boundary and switchable without re-engineering? Will Offerors be expected to show end-to-end AI governance (prompt and response logging, guardrails, evaluation, and lineage from source data to AI output), as well as Model Context Protocol support, during the POC rather than only describing it in the narrative?	The RFP requirements do not expressly require the platform to support both open-source and commercial LLMs. Platforms which are able to provide multiple options which meet security requirements may be rated more highly. USAC would like to see the end-to-end governance, and MCP support during the PoC in order to evaluate platform capability.
569.	Which MariaDB engine versions are used by the in-scope source databases?	Refer to answer 265 .

Q#	Question	Answer
570.	Which MariaDB editions are used by the in-scope source databases?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the source system inventory (platform, integration pattern and volumetrics for each in-scope source) and interface control documentation (Section B.13).
571.	What is the hosting model for each in-scope MariaDB source, including whether it runs on Amazon RDS?	Refer to answer 265.
572.	Which binary-log or replication interfaces are available for log-based change data capture (CDC) from each in-scope MariaDB source?	Binary-log or replication interfaces available for MariaDB CDC.
573.	May USAC-approved upgrades or configuration changes to MariaDB source databases be included in CLIN 0002 to enable CDC?	Offeror to propose.
574.	Does a platform-vendor-supported MariaDB connector or ingestion service within the proposed offering's single FedRAMP authorization boundary satisfy B.6.2's native CDC requirement if it is separately configured rather than built into the platform?	Refer to answer 265.
575.	What documentation must an offeror provide to demonstrate platform-vendor support for its proposed MariaDB CDC solution?	Platform vendor capabilities as asserted in publicly available documentation and marketing materials.
576.	What documentation must an offeror provide to demonstrate that its proposed MariaDB CDC solution is covered by the offering's single FedRAMP authorization boundary at award?	See #576
577.	Is USAC aiming to replace its existing Collibra platform for data cataloging and governance, or does USAC intend to retain Collibra and integrate it with the proposed Enterprise Data Platform (EDP)?	Refer to answer 117.
578.	Section B.7.2.2 references migrating existing Collibra content. Can USAC clarify whether this refers to migrating metadata and lineage information into the new EDP's native catalog or maintaining and updating Collibra's integrations with the new environment?	Refer to answer 117.
579.	Does USAC require the proposed EDP to replace all existing Collibra capabilities, including data cataloging, lineage, business glossary, and governance workflows, or can these capabilities continue to be supported through integration with Collibra?	Refer to answer 117.
580.	Section B.6 references a single FedRAMP-authorized core platform. Can USAC clarify whether the proposed solution may incorporate complementary third-party technologies for capabilities such as data quality, orchestration, or governance, provided the core EDP meets all mandatory requirements?	Refer to answers 70 and 109.

Q#	Question	Answer
581.	Beyond the Vertica Enterprise Data Warehouse, does USAC anticipate replacing any other existing technologies, including Pentaho Data Integration, Tableau, Esri, Posit, or Socrata, as part of this modernization initiative?	Vertica and Pentaho will be replaced. Refer to answer 537.
582.	Can USAC provide additional information regarding its current Collibra deployment, including which modules are licensed, the extent of their implementation, and any known limitations or challenges that the new EDP is expected to address?	Metadata is ingested into Collibra through its metadata connectors, and no complete enterprise business glossary exists (Section B.5.4).
583.	Section B.6.10 references future MDM capabilities. Does USAC expect these capabilities to be available natively within the proposed EDP, or would integration with a dedicated MDM solution be acceptable for future implementation?	Refer to answer 343.
584.	Does USAC anticipate that the selected contractor will provide all implementation, migration, and ongoing operational services directly, or may respondents propose a team consisting of a technology provider and a specialized implementation/consulting partner?	Refer to answer 9.
585.	Section B.7.1.2 states the platform shall be provided within AWS Commercial Cloud (US) or Microsoft Azure, while Section B.8.1 requires all hosting, including primary, backup, and disaster recovery copies, to be within AWS GovCloud (US) or Microsoft Azure Government. Which requirement governs? Is a FedRAMP Moderate authorized offering in AWS Commercial (US) or Azure Commercial regions acceptable?	Refer to answers 110 and 138.
586.	Several sections refer to "the mandatory floor items in Section B.6.6," but Section B.6.6 contains no such list. Please provide the mandatory floor items, or identify the Virtual Reading Room document in which they appear.	Refer to answer 141.
587.	Offerors must address "Structure 1 and Structure 2 as described in Section B.6.6," but Section B.6.6 does not describe them. Please provide the definitions of Structure 1 and Structure 2, or identify the Virtual Reading Room document in which they appear.	Refer to answer 141.
588.	Section E.7.B.8 requires Offerors to address "Option A and Option B as described in Section B.6.4," but Section B.6.4 does not describe them. Please provide the definitions of Option A and Option B. Do they concern retaining Collibra versus using the platform's native catalog?	Yes. Option A is retention of Collibra and Option B is the platform's native catalog. Refer to answer 141.

Q#	Question	Answer
589.	Section D lists Attachment 3 as "Design Responsibility and Accountability Term," while Sections E.6.2 and E.7.B.15 identify Attachment 3 as Key Personnel resumes. Please provide the Design Responsibility and Accountability Term if it is a separate document, and confirm the correct attachment numbering for resumes.	Submit resumes as a separate attachment labeled "Attachment 4: Key Personnel Resumes." Attachment 3 remains the Design Responsibility and Accountability Terms. Attachment 3 is posted on the procurement page.
590.	Several places refer to a "labor category description tab on bid sheet." Please confirm when Attachment 1 will be released, with the labor category descriptions and the required CLIN/year structure.	USAC will issue a revised Attachment 1 that adds the labor category descriptions tab and a CLIN 0003 labor rate table, and corrects the CLIN 0003 subtotal formula.
591.	Please confirm the intended sections for these references: B.12.1 (likely B.9.1); B.14.4 (likely B.11.4); B.14.1 (likely B.11.1); B.23 (likely B.20); E.6.1 (likely E.7.A.5); "Section B.10" for Transition-Out content; and "B.20.2" in the Senior QA role.	These references are fixed. A redlined RFP is posted to reflect the changes.
592.	The schedule table lists the proposal due date as Monday, November 23, 2025. Please confirm the due date is Monday, November 23, 2026 at 11:00 AM ET.	Refer to answer 35.
593.	Virtual Reading Room access requires a signed Attachment 2, and Reading Room material controls over Section B.5. (a) Will subcontractors and teaming partners be granted access under the prime Offeror's executed Confidentiality Agreement, or must each team member execute Attachment 2 separately? (b) How quickly after receiving a signed agreement will USAC grant access? (c) Will Offerors have a second opportunity to submit questions after reviewing the Reading Room materials?	USAC grants Virtual Reading Room access about one week after receiving the signed Attachment 2. Each teaming partner, including subcontractors and the platform provider, must sign and submit its own Attachment 2. No. USAC will not hold a second round of questions.
594.	Section C.1.N defines Key Personnel as "the full-time employees of Contractor," and Section B.11 states a preference that Key Personnel be Contractor employees for at least three (3) years. May employees of a proposed subcontractor be named as Key Personnel? If so, will they be evaluated equally to the prime Offeror's Key Personnel, and does the three-year preference apply to tenure with the subcontractor's own firm?	Key Personnel must be employees of the Offeror or of a subcontractor identified in the proposal. The three-year tenure in Section B.11 is a preference, not a pass/fail requirement.
595.	Must all Key Personnel be dedicated full-time to the Contract for the entire period of performance, or may certain Key Personnel roles (for example, Change Management Lead or Data Modeling Lead) be proposed at less than full-time or for specific phases only?	Yes. One individual may hold more than one Key Personnel role, and roles may be proposed at less than full time or by phase, as long as the proposal shows enough capacity and continuity.

Q#	Question	Answer
596.	May the three (3) past performance references include contracts performed by a proposed subcontractor or teaming partner? If so, will they be evaluated equally to the prime Offeror's own past performance?	Three past performance references are mandatory, and they must be the prime Offeror's own contracts. Contracts performed by subcontractors, teaming partners or the platform provider do not count toward the three. Proposals without three qualifying references will not be considered for further evaluation.
597.	Teams with more than two subcontractors receive added scrutiny. Does a platform vendor (OEM) or a software reseller providing CLIN 0001 licensing count toward that number? Do independent consultants count?	No. A platform OEM or reseller that only supplies licenses does not count toward the two-subcontractor threshold. The relationship must still be disclosed under Section E.7.A.5.
598.	For Company Profile and Scale and the responsibility determination, should corporate metrics (annual revenue and full-time employees) be provided for the prime Offeror only, or for each member of the proposed team? Does USAC apply a minimum revenue or headcount threshold?	Provide corporate metrics for the prime Offeror, and for the parent if the Offeror is a subsidiary or joint venture (Section E.7.A.6). Refer to answer 6.
599.	For the Platform Relationship Disclosure: (a) Which platforms are "under evaluation"? (b) Are standard vendor partner program memberships, certifications, and partner tiers within scope, in addition to reseller, referral, revenue share, rebate, and marketing development fund arrangements? (c) Does a disclosed partner relationship with the proposed platform's vendor disqualify the team, or only require a mitigation plan? (d) Is the disclosure due from each teaming partner separately, and does it count toward the Volume 1 five-page limit?	A disclosed relationship requires a proposed mitigation plan, and failure to disclose is grounds for exclusion (Section E.7.A.5).
600.	Will USAC identify the firms that performed the assessments of the existing EDW and of USAC's data management maturity, so Offerors can evaluate potential organizational conflicts of interest within their teams? Does "same resources" mean individuals or whole firms?	USAC will not name the firms. Any Offeror or proposed subcontractor that performed those assessments must disclose it and propose mitigation under Sections E.7.A.4 and E.11.
601.	Is there a current contractor supporting the existing EDW, Pentaho, or Tableau environment, and is that contractor eligible to propose on this solicitation?	There is no incumbent. This is a new requirement, so there is no prior contract number, contract value or incumbent performance history.
602.	May the platform subscription be bought through a reseller or cloud marketplace, as long as it is held in USAC's name or assignable to USAC? May USAC contract directly with the platform vendor for CLIN 0001?	Refer to answer 32.

Q#	Question	Answer
603.	Please provide the anticipated POC schedule, including the number of Offerors expected to be selected, the expected start date, the duration of each round, and the expected time between notification of selection and the start of execution.	Refer to answer 50.
604.	Please describe the POC enclave hosting model: the cloud provider, region, and account or tenancy in which it resides; whether USAC will provide the cloud account or Offerors must deploy the proposed platform into USAC's enclave account or connect a platform-provider environment to it over private networking; and whether the enclave will be provisioned for each Offeror's proposed platform or as a common environment.	USAC will consider both models: a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, or the offeror's vendor tenant connected to USAC over private networking.
605.	Section E.2 states the POC will be performed at no cost to USAC. Are Offerors responsible for platform licensing, compute, and storage consumption incurred within the USAC-owned enclave during the POC? Will USAC impose any limits on that consumption?	The POC is performed at no cost to USAC (Section E.2). Offerors bear platform licensing and their own labor and support costs. If the POC runs in a USAC-managed AWS or Azure environment, USAC pays for that infrastructure. If it runs in the offeror's own tenant, the offeror bears those costs.
606.	Will POC execution within the USAC-provided enclave be performed remotely by Offeror staff? If so, what device and network requirements apply (for example, USAC-issued equipment or approved device posture)? Will any portion of the POC, including the final validation round against live production data, require on-site presence at USAC Headquarters?	The POC can be performed fully remotely.
607.	Section E.9 states USAC will establish numeric pass thresholds for each test case. Will these thresholds be published before Offerors submit their final POC Test Plans? Will POC results be evaluated as pass/fail, scored comparatively, or both?	USAC will share the numeric pass thresholds with all participating offerors before the POC starts. The same thresholds apply to every participant (Section E.9). USAC will develop an Internal scoring rubric which will be utilized to assess the PoCs.
608.	Please define the "parallel round" and the "final validation round." Section B.20.1 refers to "the fourth bullet point above," but the live production data test is the third bullet. Please confirm which round uses live production data and when it happens.	The live production data round is described in the third bullet of Section B.20.1, "Testing against live, unmasked production data." The parallel round uses the de-identified dataset. The reference to the "fourth bullet" will be corrected.
609.	Does the time needed to meet the conditions for the live data round (background investigations, training, Privacy Impact Assessment) count against the POC schedule? What level of background investigation applies?	Yes. Section B.20.1 provides no schedule relief for meeting those conditions. Offerors conduct background investigations of their own staff.

Q#	Question	Answer
610.	For the Ingestion and Change Data Capture test case, please provide the PostgreSQL engine version of the USAC-provided AWS RDS read replica and the expected mutation rate (transactions per second) during the test, and confirm whether Offerors may configure the replication slot and publication themselves.	See Virtual Room.
611.	For the Late-Arriving Data test case, should "correct ordering" in the analytical layer be determined by the record's transactional (business event) timestamp or by the source commit sequence? Please describe the expected end state for a backdated record that arrives after a later-dated record for the same key.	Vendor to propose best practice.
612.	The Consumption test case requires natural language query, and Section B.6.7 makes AI use in performance of the Contract subject to written approval. Please confirm that platform-native AI capabilities required by the POC test cases may be used during the POC without separate approval, and whether Offeror staff may use AI-assisted development tools during the POC.	Yes. Platform-native AI capabilities used for the POC test cases are approved for POC use. Any other AI tools still need prior written approval under Section B.6.7.
613.	Which existing reports will USAC select for the report reproduction test case in item (d)? Will USAC provide Tableau licenses in the enclave?	USAC will identify the representative reports (Section B.20.2).
614.	Section B.2 identifies CLIN 0002 as Firm-Fixed Price, while Section B.7.2 refers to "FFP with an annual not-to-exceed ceiling definitized" during the POC phase, and its scope is finalized only after the POC (Section B.20 also refers to "CLIN 0002 and CLIN 0002 NTE ceilings"). Since discovery and scoping occur concurrently with the POC, on what scope assumptions should Offerors price CLIN 0002 in the initial proposal? Will Offerors be permitted to revise CLIN 0002 pricing in the Final Proposal Revision or BAFO based on POC and discovery findings?	Refer to answer 101.
615.	CLIN 0001 is priced as an annual FFP. For platforms priced on consumption, will USAC accept a committed annual capacity with stated unit rates for consumption above or below that capacity? Will the sizing basis in the Virtual Reading Room include projected concurrency and workload profiles sufficient to price consumption?	Refer to answer 327. The Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13).

Q#	Question	Answer
616.	The term is one base year plus two option years, while each cutover requires at least 90 days of parallel operation and 60 days of hypercare. Does USAC expect full migration within the base year, or across option years? Is there a target go-live date, a target date for decommissioning the existing Vertica environment, or an expiration date for current Vertica or Pentaho licensing that the schedule should accommodate? Please also identify any FCC reporting windows or audit periods that would constrain cutover.	USAC will identify the FCC reporting and audit windows (Section B.7.2.3). Refer to question 30
617.	Section C.2 leaves the number of option years blank, and the notice periods differ between Section B.3 (30 days) and Section C.2 (10 days). Please confirm two option years and which notice period applies.	The 30-day notice in Section B.3 governs, with two one-year renewal options. Section C.2 will be corrected.
618.	Offerors must submit separate Bid Sheets with and without the use of AI in performance of the Services, but AI use requires post-award written approval. Which version will USAC use to evaluate price? Please clarify the scope of "use of AI in performance of the Services" for pricing purposes, for example whether it includes AI-assisted code conversion, test generation, documentation, and coding assistants used by Contractor Staff.	Both versions of the Bid Sheet must include the platform AI capability required by Section B.6.7. The two versions differ only in the Contractor's use of AI to perform the Services. USAC will consider both the AI and non-AI prices in evaluation. By “use of AI in performance of the services” we mean AI-assisted code conversion, semantic model generation, test generation, etc. used by the Contractor Staff.
619.	What is the relative importance of the Technical, Experience and Past Performance, and Price factors, and how will POC results be weighted relative to those factors?	Section E.8.1 lists the technical sub-factors in descending order of importance.
620.	What are the minimum insurance coverage amounts, especially for cyber liability?	Section C.22 requires insurance in amounts required by law or appropriate for the industry, whichever is greater, including cyber liability as appropriate.
621.	Will USAC consider a mutual limitation of liability applicable to both parties, or a cap on Contractor liability tied to contract value, excluding gross negligence and willful misconduct?	Refer to answer 293.
622.	Are integrations with tools USAC keeps (Tableau, Collibra, ESRI ArcGIS Enterprise, Posit, Socrata) acceptable outside the platform's authorization boundary? Does a platform whose compute runs in a customer-managed cloud account, under the vendor's FedRAMP authorization, satisfy the single-boundary requirement?	Refer to answer 21.

Q#	Question	Answer
623.	For the master data management capability required for future use, must that capability be native to the core platform within its authorization boundary, or may it be provided by an additional authorized service operating within the same authorization boundary?	Refer to answer 343.
624.	Is USAC keeping Collibra as its enterprise catalog, or does "migrate existing Collibra content" mean migrating into the platform's native catalog?	Refer to answer 117.
625.	If Tableau is kept, will USAC continue to provide Tableau Server licensing outside CLIN 0001? How many workbooks and reports are in migration scope beyond the 59 certified data sources?	Tableau, Collibra, Posit, ArcGIS and Socrata licenses stay USAC-funded and are outside CLIN 0001. The Virtual Reading Room includes the Tableau workbook inventory and usage statistics (Section B.13). Report and semantic-model migration scope will be defined during the POC (Section B.7.2.2) and locked during detailed discovery in CLIN 0002.
626.	Section B.6.8 requires a "Direct ArcGIS Pro connection to the cloud database." Please clarify what USAC considers a direct connection, for example a native ArcGIS Pro cloud data warehouse connection type, a connection through ODBC or OLE DB drivers, or access mediated through ArcGIS Enterprise. Is this requirement evaluated as mandatory?	Refer to answer 266.
627.	Given that ESRI ArcGIS Enterprise remains the authoritative system of record for spatial data, may OGC services (WMS, WFS, WCS) for platform-hosted data be served through ArcGIS Enterprise rather than natively by the platform?	Refer to answer 339.
628.	Does the requirement to scale GPU, CPU and vRAM "with ArcGIS Pro upgrades" mean the platform must host ArcGIS Pro desktop sessions (for example, through virtual desktops), or only provide the compute that serves ArcGIS Pro users connecting to the platform?	Refer to answer 210.
629.	Does the 4-hour RTO and 1-hour RPO require failover to a separate region, or does availability-zone redundancy within one region satisfy it?	Refer to answer 265.
630.	Which sources, by count and system, are in the near-real-time and CDC tiers subject to the 300-second freshness target?	Refer to answer 265.

Q#	Question	Answer
631.	How many terabytes fall outside the 10-year active window, and what annual growth should Offerors assume until the Reading Room sizing basis is available?	The Virtual Reading Room includes the sizing basis (active terabytes, archive terabytes and projected annual growth), the table and object inventory, load profile and processing window detail, and concurrency figures and user counts by persona (Section B.13).
632.	Will Pre-Production hold unmasked production PII, or masked and synthetic data only?	Any POC using pre-production data will hve PII masked or replaced with synthetic data.
633.	Which enterprise content management repositories are in scope for integration, and roughly what volume of documents?	Refer to answer 206.
634.	Is USAC's Okta tenant a FedRAMP or government instance? Are there constraints on connecting it to a GovCloud or Azure Government deployment?	USAC's Okta is FedRAMP moderate compliant.
635.	Section B.4.1 requires Contractor Staff to be in the USAC office at least two (2) days per week. Does this apply to all Contractor Staff, or only to Key Personnel and designated roles that need on-site access? May Offerors propose engineering staff who perform their work remotely from within the United States?	The two-day-per-week onsite requirement applies to all Contractor Staff. USAC is willing to consider alternate staffing proposals, which offerors should describe in the technical proposal. Remote work must be performed within the United States.
636.	What background investigation level or tier is required? Does the Contractor or USAC pay for and arrange it? Does it apply to staff who have no access to USAC systems?	The Offeror is responsible for background investigations of its team, including subcontractor staff. Section B.8.7 requires investigation before access to USAC IT Systems. See #609
637.	Please confirm whether the following count toward the forty (40) page limit for Volume 2 or may be submitted as technical appendices: the POC Test Plan, the Platform Capability Compliance Matrix, the Mandatory Requirements Certification, and the Exceptions to RFP Terms attachment.	The Platform Capability Compliance Matrix, Mandatory Requirements Certification, POC Test Plan and Exceptions to RFP Terms attachment are excluded from the 40-page Volume 2 limit.