

**Universal Service Administrative Co. (USAC)
IT-24-193 – Enterprise Geocoder 2025-2026
Questions & Answers**

Q#	Question	Answer
1	The Use Case mentioned in the RFP appears to be the current USAC Use Case that MapQuest is supporting with our Geocodes. Can you please confirm? If different, how?	The RFP is USAC’s current Use Case. We do not anticipate there to be changes to the use case currently.
2	Our pricing model is for a set number of Geocode transactions per year. I do not see in the RFP an estimated number of Geocodes for the 12-month term. Please advise. I do see 60M of current base but not an estimation of what you will need for the year.	The 60M annual usage is the estimated number of geocodes we anticipate for the next 12-month term. We do not anticipate there to be a significant change in that amount over the next year.
3	We have concerns about protection of search data. How has USAC addressed this with other vendors that allow data to be published?	Data available for search is stored in secured database on USAC’s data center. This searchable data can only access via applications interface and Database administrator. Other vendors have included any limitations on data usage in their response.
4	Who are the users and what control mechanisms are in place to manage access? What level of transparency is there into the downloaded data that is published elsewhere? What attribution requirements are there for data used in other publications?	USAC does not allow public users to directly download data from geocoders. As a handler of government data, USAC is required to make non PII data available to the public under the Open Government Data Act. Currently there are no restrictions on usage or required attribution for the data provided through our Open Data platform. We have put in place control mechanisms on our public facing maps/services to limit the abuse.
5	Is USAC open to the idea of reducing coordinate precision in the downloads or providing coordinates-only.	The downloads are provided as csv files to the public, and reflect the data used to make program determinations. This is done to comply with the Open Government Data Act. As such, USAC provided the number of coordinates used in our systems along with other, pertinent data.

6	<p>The RFP mentions that the geocoder needs to be able to geocode up to 60 million address records (transactions) per year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does USAC have a breakdown of transactions that will be batch vs. transactions that will be on-demand? • Is the maximum number of transactions that USAC would need in Year 1 equal 60 million or because they currently have 60 million addresses in their database, is there a plan to geocode all these addresses first and then as new addresses are added, geocode those as well thereby increasing the total number of addresses geocoded in the first year? 	<p>Most transactions will be on an on-demand basis. There will be few, if any, batch requests, but USAC wishes to have the option should it be required.</p> <p>The maximum number of transactions USAC will need within a year will be 60 million addresses. This is based on past usage and considers existing addresses within the databases.</p>
7	<p>The RFP also requests that pricing be for 1 year only. Would USAC be open to saving up to 30% annually by entering a 3- or 5-year contract that would be billable annually?</p>	<p>USAC is interested in a one-year agreement but is also receptive to reviewing pricing for contracts lasting 3 or 5 years. If USAC opts for a 3- or 5-year contract, billing should be conducted annually.</p>
8	<p>On Page 9, Section F. Deliverables, point 3 indicates an implementation plan to go live no later than April 30th, 2025. But the pricing sheet dates of the contract are from 5/24/2025 - 5/23/2026.</p> <p>Please confirm date for the Implementation Plan to go live.</p>	<p>Implementation plan should go live no later than 5/24/2025</p>
9	<p>What are the expected hours for Maintenance and Tech Support services?</p>	<p>Since geocoding is a core function of our systems, we would prefer 24/7 support services but will consider proposals with a more restricted support hour.</p>
10	<p>2nd Bullet mentions Proposal Due Date is January 20, 2025. While the key activities table under section C.</p>	<p>Proposal due date has been extended to January 27, 2025</p>

	<p>PROPOSAL SCHEDULE, is indicating Proposal Due date on January 27th, 2025.</p> <p>Please confirm the proposal due date.</p>	
11	<p>a. Will the Geocoder be a free-standing solution, or will it be integrated with other products?</p> <p>b. If Geocoder will integrate with other products, is it possible to share the technology stack it will integrate with."</p>	<p>We anticipate the geocoder to be a free-standing solution that will be utilized by internal USAC products. We have Custom product that will proxy geocoder calls and provide geocoder service via API / HTTP rest calls for our internal products.</p>
12	<p>Who are the end users of the Geocoder? Are they technical staff, or field staff providing services to customers</p>	<p>The users of the Geocoder are USAC internal employees and systems.</p>
13	<p>a. Could you provide clarity on how the geocoding platform will be presented to end users? Specifically, will it be an API-only solution, or will there be a user interface component for direct user input and interaction? Will the Geocoder be a free-standing solution, or will it be integrated with other products?</p> <p>b. If Geocoder will integrate with other products, is it possible to share the technology stack it will integrate with.</p>	<p>Access to the geocoder will be done through USAC systems. The internal systems will access it through API calls built by USAC on top of geocoder.</p>
14	<p>Who are the end users of the Geocoder? Are they technical staff, or field staff providing services to customers</p>	<p>The users of the geocoder are USAC internal employees and systems.</p>
15	<p>Considering the integration with OKTA for secure API requests, are there specific compliance standards or certifications beyond FedRAMP that are mandatory for the solution?</p>	<p>Account specific to environment e.g. prod and non-prod</p>

16	Could you clarify the data retention policies post-geocoding?	USAC requests the data retention policies of the vendor, as some geocoder vendors place limitations on how long companies can store the geographic coordinates before requiring them to geocode again. At best, USAC would like to retain the geographic coordinates for an address for 10 years but will look at other retention periods.
17	Could you provide additional examples or contexts on how USAC intends to utilize the geocoding solution within its various programs, particularly in fraud analysis and reporting?	Geocoding is used in several ways at USAC, including in determining program eligibility (rural/urban designation, locations in Medically Underserved Areas, tribal benefit eligibility, etc.), program rule compliance (such as ensuring buildouts are being done in areas awarded to the carrier), and to combat fraud, waste, and abuse. This includes using the provided geographic coordinates for addresses for maps (both public and internal), spatial analysis, and data analysis purposes, as well as generating reports and presentations specifying the findings.
18	What are USAC's expectations regarding training and ongoing support for the solution?	Training and on-going support should include answering questions on how to interpret the geocoder results, answering questions on technical changes and issues, and technical support in case the geocoder goes down. USAC expects most of their questions to be answered in the technical documentation, but there may be cases where we need additional support.
19	Are there specific SLAs associated with the geocoder's response time (e.g., penalties for exceeding the 150ms threshold)?	Success rate above > 99.5% 99% response time in < 300ms
20	Is USAC willing to continue to use the prior Master Service Agreement and Data Processing Addendum that was agreed upon in replacement to section C of the RFP?	Please submit the Master Service Agreement and Data Processing Addendum as part of your submission and USAC will review it as part of its evaluation process.
21	We are not FedRamp certified but maintains SOC2 and ISO 27002 controls and compliance. Are these qualifications sufficient?	FedRamp certification is not required but is considered a bonus for this proposal. Please list that you maintain SOC2 and ISO 27002 controls and compliance as part of your proposal and we will review it as part of our evaluation process
22	(General and technical capabilities) What SLA is required?	Highly Available Response time < 300 MS

		Low error rate < .5%
23	Ability to handle up to 60 million request per year, and up to 120 requests per second. Are 120 requests per second a maximum peak demand?	120 requests per second is the peak demand based on past usage.
24	Technical support available 24/7 via either email and/or phone What SLA is required?	Email or Phone is fine but resolution for High Severity/ SEV1 should be less than 2-4 hours
25	A dashboard or tool to track usage statistics. This should include: Number of calls per day Number of calls per month Number of calls since the beginning of the contract How much of our contract limit remains or how much we have used of our contracted limit The ability to download or create a report on these metrics Customizable reporting options to track performance indicators and usage statistics Usage can be tracked on a per token basis via console, however contract limits, downloading reports and performance indicators are not customizable.	Please include this information in the response and USAC will review it as part of the technical evaluation. While having all these capabilities for usage are desirable, USAC will consider more limited usage tracking capabilities.
26	The ability to geocode our existing database of 60 million addresses What database vendor?	The databases are internal to USAC. USAC will initiate and manage the re-geocoding of our internal data through the geocoder solution.

	<p>What is the schema of the existing database?</p> <p>Is the intent of this requirement for to perform the conversion or provide scripts to enable?</p> <p>Is the intent of this requirement to upset results on a per-row basis?"</p>	
27	<p>These additional features, while not required, will contribute to a more favorable evaluation:</p> <p>Ability of the geocoder solution to limit geocodes to the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii and all territories, including Puerto Rico, Guam, US Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Northern Marianas (aka bounding box)</p> <p>Addition of the US Postal Services Residential Delivery Indicator (RDI) as part of the API return</p> <p>Batch processing capabilities for bulk geocoding</p> <p>Please describe your requirement for address verification by CASS or RDI in detail. Vendor does not supply this in the API response?</p>	<p>Some geocoding vendors provide in their API response a designation of whether an address is marked as residential or commercial delivery. This is done through the USPS's RDI process. If vendor has another way of accessing this information beside the API response, please put it in the proposal.</p>
28	<p>Allow storage of the same online on the USAC website and as part of USAC Open Data datasets</p> <p>Allow USAC to provide the geocoded coordinates in a downloadable file</p> <p>Allow for the display of the geocoded coordinates and associated addresses on USAC generated offline and online maps with no restrictions"</p>	<p>The downloaded files are publicly available through USAC Open Data platform. As such, any member of the public can access the data. This is a requirement of the Open Government Data Act as USAC's data is considered Federal data. USAC does not resell its data.</p> <p>USAC does not currently use Mapbox to support data display in its on-line maps.</p>

	Can you elaborate more on who will be accessing the geocoded coordinates from the downloaded files? Who can access the online catalog and for what purpose? Is this a resell opportunity? USAC generated maps - are these Mapbox maps or another vendor?	
29	We are concerned about competitors downloading the data and effectively stealing it from us. Have other vendors included limitations on data usage to prevent something like this? (the response to our question states that vendors <i>have</i> included limitations, but this may be a type-o)	USAC has not reviewed the bids for the current RFP. However, in the past, we have received bids that include limitations on how data could be used, which is what the previous answer was trying to convey. Please include such limitations in your proposal, and we will consider these limitations in our technical evaluation.
30	You say they can't download data directly, but our understanding is the public can download lists of addresses with coordinates directly. Is that correct? What control mechanisms are in place to prevent abuse and what attribution requirements are there?	The general public cannot download the addresses and coordinates in a spatial format (shapefile, GeoJSON, etc.) However, we do provide the data as a csv, which can be translated back into a spatial format. As stated previously, because we are required to make this data available to the public per the Open Data Government Act, there are no restrictions on how it can be used or attribution requirements. However, if a vendor has restrictions on how data should be used or attributed, they should put that in their proposal.
31	Because our address to precise coordinate mapping is basically important IP, we are afraid of a competitor downloading this information. So, our suggestion here is to reduce the precision of the lat/lon. e.g. turn a lat/lon from (40.6716, -111.50701) to (40.671, -111.507). This makes our data less sensitive if a competitor downloads it.	If there are restrictions on how the coordinates can be displayed or the data used, please include them in the proposal and we will consider these restrictions in our technical evaluation.