

**Universal Service Administrative Co. (USAC)
RFQ IT-26-107 AI-Based Coding Assistant Solution
Questions & Answers**

Q#	Question	Answer
1	Attachment 3, Supply Chain Risk Management Questionnaire, is required by Sections 2.H, 3.I and 15.A, but only Attachment 1 and Attachment 2 are posted on the procurement page. Please provide Attachment 3.	Attachment 3, Supply Chain Risk Management Questionnaire is posted on the procurement page.
2	Attachment 1, Bid Sheet, states that the quote is submitted "in accordance with the terms and conditions of Contract No. IT-26-103." Please confirm whether the posted bid sheet is the correct one for IT-26-107, or issue a corrected version.	Contract No. IT-26-107 is the correct contract number. The updated Attachment 1 – Bid Sheet is posted on the procurement page.
3	Sections 3.E (Service Level Agreements), 3.G (Product Roadmap, Model Versioning, and Change Management) and 3.D.5 (Key Performance Indicator Framework) are marked TBD pending USAC input. Will these requirements be issued by amendment before the August 31 due date? If they will not, should Offerors propose their own SLA, roadmap and KPI terms, and will those proposals be evaluated under Section 16?	Offerors can propose their own SLA, roadmap and KPI terms, and those proposals be evaluated under Section 16.
4	Section 15.A directs that the Quote "should include separate versions of Attachment 1, Bid Sheet, for scenarios with and without the use of AI." Because the product procured under this RFQ is itself an AI tool, please clarify what a "without the use of AI" bid sheet is intended to represent, and whether it refers instead to the Offeror's own use of AI in delivering the implementation, training and support services.	Product itself is an AI tool. However, it refers instead to the Offeror's own use of AI in delivering the implementation, training and support services required by this RFQ. If offeror is using AI for delivering the services required by the RFQ, two versions of Attachment 1 (bid sheet) should be submitted.

Q#	Question	Answer
5	Section 13 defines two volumes, but Section 15.C.1.f refers to "Volume 4" and Section 15.C.2 limits "volumes 1-4." Please confirm the quote comprises two volumes, and that the page limits are 15 pages for Volume 1 and 4 pages for Volume 2	There are only two volumes: Volume 1 – Corporate Information, Technical Capability, and Eperience & Past Performance - fifteen (15) pages Volume 2 – Price four (4) pages. The updated RFQ is posted on the procurement page.
6	Section 17.5 requires "the official letter of authorization from the manufacturer confirming that Offeror is, and will be, an authorized seller, partner or reseller." Please confirm whether that letter must accompany the quote at submission, or whether a manufacturer commitment to authorize the Offeror prior to award is acceptable at the quote stage.	The official letter of authorization should be submitted with offeror's quote.
7	Section 3.B.1, Tier 2, requires a signed commitment letter with a target FedRAMP authorization date not to exceed 18 months from award. Please confirm whether that letter must be signed by the product manufacturer, by the Offeror, or by both?	Should be signed by Offeror
8	Section 3.A.2 identifies Bitbucket as the primary SCM platform. Please confirm whether USAC uses Bitbucket Cloud or Bitbucket Data Center, since the two have materially different AI integration paths.	USAC uses on-premise implementation of Bitbucket
9	What are the main responsibilities of the contractor?	Contractor will propose a COTS solution that USAC can implement. Contractor will bill USAC directly for the solution's monthly subscription/usage. See the RFQ for detailed requirements and services needed.
10	Will the contractor implement, maintain, and bill USAC directly for the solution's monthly subscription/usage, or will the contractor only be responsible for the assessment	Contractor will propose a COTS solution that USAC can implement. Contractor will bill USAC directly for the solution's monthly subscription/usage

Q#	Question	Answer
	and implementation of the commercially available solution?	
11	How many USAC users are expected to leverage the tool - Developers, Architects, & other SDLC roles?	About 200 users with initial implementation. The number of users can grow after initial implementation
12	If USAC cannot provide a specific number of users at this time, would T Shirt size pricing based on industry standards be acceptable?	See response to question #11
13	For a solution with a multi-model routing architecture (i.e., that routes code and prompts across multiple third-party foundation-model providers), does a Tier 1 or Tier 2 FedRAMP determination require every routed subprocessor to independently meet the same authorization tier, or does USAC evaluate the prime Offeror's compensating-controls and data-handling architecture as the controlling factor regardless of individual subprocessor authorization status?	USAC will evaluate the offerors' controls and underlying architecture of proposed solution before making a purchase/award decision.
14	Section 3.A.2 states there is "no requirement for developer code to be transmitted to external endpoints outside USAC-approved data-handling boundaries." For a solution with multi-model routing architecture, would each destination model provider need to be individually pre-approved as within USAC-approved data-handling boundaries, and what is the process and timeline for USAC to review and approve such an architecture prior to award?	USAC will review the offeror's proposed controls and overall architecture, including subprocessors, data flows, and data-handling boundaries, as part of its decision-making process. Offerors should provide full transparency about all model providers, their locations, the types of data they process, and the agreements that govern that processing. USAC's review will include security and compliance documentation, any compensating controls, and confirmation of FedRAMP authorization or an equivalent security posture for each provider. These evaluations will be completed within a reasonable period and aligned with the RFQ's procurement schedule. The review typically takes place during the technical evaluation phase before award and will be coordinated directly with the offeror.

Q#	Question	Answer
15	Section 3.E (Service Level Agreements) is marked TBD. Will USAC issue defined SLA terms (uptime, support response/resolution times, service credits) via the Q&A or a subsequent amendment prior to the August 31 quote due date?	Offerors are welcome to propose their own SLA terms, including uptime commitments, support response and resolution targets, service credits, and any related roadmap or KPI measures. These proposed terms will be reviewed and evaluated as part of the technical factors described in Section 16. This gives each offeror the flexibility to present the service levels they believe best support their solution while allowing USAC to assess them consistently during evaluation.
16	Section 3.D.5 (KPI Framework) is marked TBD. Should Offerors propose their own KPI framework for evaluation purposes, or will USAC provide the framework before quotes are due?	See response to Question #15
17	For a proposed AI coding assistant product with a shorter commercial availability history than the full three-year past-performance window, may Offerors satisfy Section 15.A.5 using references for closely related predecessor products from the same vendor and product family, provided the underlying technology, delivery organization, and support model are substantially the same?	Offerors may use past-performance references from closely related predecessor products if the underlying technology, delivery organization, and support model are essentially the same. USAC understands that some AI coding assistants are relatively new and will consider these references when they clearly demonstrate relevant experience. These submissions will be evaluated under Section 15 in line with the broader past-performance criteria.