



UMUC

DATE: February 14, 2017

TO: All Prospective Proposers

FROM: Eric Pfister
Senior Buyer, Technology
301-985-7095

Phan Truong
Senior Buyer, Technology
301-985-7143

RE: Solicitation # 91470 – Account Provisioning and SSO Solutions
Addendum #1 dated 2/14/2017

The following amends the above-referenced Solicitation documents. Receipt of this addendum is to be acknowledged by completing the enclosed "Acknowledgement of Receipt of Addenda Form" and including it in the Proposal.

1. Questions from Potential Proposing Firms:

1. *"[Does UMUC] have a current [Workday] partner?"*

UMUC Response
Yes.

2. *"[A proposing firm is] not currently a [Workday] partner. Can [a proposing firm] work with Workday to find a partner to work with [...] on this project? [Is it] necessary [...] to have that relationship before moving forward with the proposal for this project?"*

UMUC Response
It is not necessary to have a pre-existing relationship with a Workday partner. Workday partner requirements are described in SECTION II: Scope of Work. Workday partner evaluation criteria is described in SECTION III, Article 1.

3. “[SECTION II,] 2.1.1. on page 8 states: “UMUC requires a Workday Software Partner with a commercial off-the-shelf (“COTS”) integration solution for Workday provisioning”. Can a [proposing firm] respond on behalf of a manufacturer that meets this requirement?”

UMUC Response

Proposal response requirements are described in SECTION III, Article 1: Technical Proposal Requirements. UMUC will accept proposals from firms that have agreements with manufacturers.

4. “Please list Peoplesoft and OpenLDAP versions?”

UMUC Response

Peoplesoft and LDAP versions information will be disclosed to shortlisted firms during the vendor discussion phase of this procurement.

5. “[Please] provide a diagram of services that authenticate to each of the authoritative user stores, [as] described [in SECTION II, 2.4.1] on page 9:
- a. Authentication for UMUC’s students, faculty and staff (approximately 90,000 users) to 25 service providers. UMUC’s current environment provides the following identification / authentication methods:
- Direct authentication to CAS: In-house services that confirm whether a user is currently logged in. Please list all services
 - Shibboleth/CAS: Third-party applications/services. Please list all services
 - LDAP: Peoplesoft.
 - Active Directory: Windows PCs, Windows-based applications, file shares.”

UMUC Response

Specific configuration information will be discussed with the shortlisted firms during the vendor discussion phase of this procurement. Applications that currently authenticate directly to CAS are in-house developed applications.

Current Third-party applications/services include: Aeronomy, Ares, Bomgar, CampusKudos, CloudCheckr, D2L, Ezproxy, Google, Jive, LucidChart, Mosaic, Office365, PagerDuty, Parature, Parchment, SANS, ServiceNow, SkillPort, Slack, Smartsheet, Tela, Touchnet, Votenet, Webex, Workday, and Workfront.

6. *“Will UMUC plan on using both Financials and HCM Modules of WorkDay?”*

UMUC Response

Yes.

7. *“For [SECTION II,] 3.1 on page 11, protect REST services, is it assumed that those services will use the [proposing firm’s] API/SDKs within the application (aka, they will be changed)? Or is a gateway or proxy service for authentication assumed here?”*

UMUC Response

Yes. UMUC can change application/services to use provided API’s for validating authentication.

8. *“What is the budget for this project?”*

UMUC Response

Budget information is not relevant to the scope of this project. UMUC is seeking a Solution that meets the project requirements as described in the RFP.

9. *“Will UMUC consider proposals that do not include a SSO solution?”*

UMUC Response

No.

10. *“Will UMUC consider proposals from [a proposing firm] that currently [does] not offer SSO, but have SSO on the roadmap? This is assuming the proposal and contract includes negotiated dates for delivery and acceptance language.”*

UMUC Response

No.

11. *“Ref: RFP SECTION III, 2.2 Demonstration of Workday Experience:- Can the [proposing firm] leverage its teaming with its software (solution) partner that has Workday Software Partner status and [W]orkday integration experience, to satisfy this requirement.”*

UMUC Response

Yes.

12. *“What is UMUC’s timeline for its transition from PeopleSoft to Workday?”*

UMUC Response

UMUC will continue to use PeopleSoft for an undetermined amount of time.

13. *“What user types will reside in Workday? Will it just be [s]tudents? Or also employees, faculty and staff? Will Workday be the only source of truth for all user types moving forward?”*

UMUC Response

Workday and PeopleSoft will be the sources of truth for distinct types of users. Workday serves staff and faculty. PeopleSoft serves students.

14. *“Of the systems listed under [SECTION II,] 1. Purpose / Description as “Current service providers” – which does UMUC desire to have as target systems for automated provisioning / de-provisioning purposes and which will be targeted for SSO? Or both?*

a. Is there a prioritization for target system integration?”

UMUC Response

UMUC requires a solution that provides automated provisioning / de-provisioning & SSO for all current service providers.

Target system integration prioritization will be discussed with the shortlisted firms at the vendor discussion sessions.

15. *“What systems are needed for “day one” access / birthright provisioning for the following user types:*
a. Staff
b. Faculty
c. Students”

UMUC Response

All systems described in the RFP are needed for “day one” access.

16. *“PeopleSoft Campus Solutions appears to be UMUC’s [Student Information System (“SIS”)] – is that being replaced by Workday’s new SIS – Workday Student?”*

UMUC Response

No.

17. *“What version of AD [is UMUC] currently running? How many domains? Forests?”*

UMUC Response

Version information will be disclosed with the shortlisted firms during the vendor discussion phase of this procurement.

18. *“(Reference [SECTION II,] 2.1.2) – What [is] the approximate [number] of AD and OpenLDAP groups that are targeted for automated provisioning?”*

UMUC Response

This information is not relevant to the scope of this RFP.

19. *“(Reference [SECTION II,] 2.1.3) – Does UMUC have a unique identifier today? Or is the expectation that [a proposing firm] will create one as part of this project?”*

UMUC Response

UMUC has a unique identifier.

20. *“(Reference [SECTION II,] 2.3)- What Google licensing [does UMUC] own? (eg: G Suite?) How does it differ depending on user type (i.e., student vs faculty)[?]”*

UMUC Response

UMUC owns G suite, with separate domains for staff, faculty, and students.

21. *“Is [there] any tool available today for password self-service for students and/or FTEs? Is there a portal that exists today for password reset, forgotten password?”*

UMUC Response

Yes, there is a portal that serves the entire UMUC community.

22. *“Please define [UMUC’s] success criteria – what, from UMUC’s perspective, will define a successful project outcome?”*

UMUC Response

A successful project outcome will be implementation of a solution that meets all of the criteria set forth in the RFP.

23. *“What resources [does UMUC] intend to dedicate to this project and at what percentage amounts, especially for the following resource types:*

- a. Project Manager*
- b. Business Analyst*
- c. Solution Architect*
- d. Developer”*

UMUC Response

UMUC will have a dedicated group of System Engineers and one Project Manager. Additional resources will be added on an ad-hoc basis.

24. *“Have the application owners / business stakeholders been notified of this initiative yet? If not, does UMUC have a clear communications strategy / change management plan developed as of yet to engage these individuals, as well as the end user and admin community?”*

UMUC Response

Yes. UMUC has a clear communications strategy and a mature change management plan.

25. *“Does UMUC have any planned black-out periods during the course of the year that [a proposing firm] should account for when [determining] a deployment strategy?”*

UMUC Response

UMUC has two periods where students register for classes, in August and January, each year. UMUC will not make service impacting changes during those periods.

26. *“How much documentation exists today around [UMUC’s] legacy IDM system / scripts / processes? If it exists, can any of that information be shared with [a proposing firm] now to help [...] scope out the migration strategy to the new system?”*

UMUC Response

This information will be shared with the awarded firm.

27. *“Does UMUC leverage ADFS or ADP (AD Azure) in any capacity today?”*

UMUC Response

No.

28. *“Has UMUC developed a Business Requirements Document [(“BRD”)] for this project? Does UMUC plan to develop one prior to the project start?”*

UMUC Response

Other than the requirements listed in the RFP, UMUC does not have a BRD at this time.

29. *“Has UMUC defined key stakeholders / sponsors for this initiative? Can UMUC provide information on [staff members who] will be responsible for approving and signing off on key documentation deliverables and milestones?”*

UMUC Response

This information will be shared with the awarded firm.

30. *“Does UMUC have a preferred or defined project methodology that [a proposing firm is required] to adhere to – eg: SDP stage gates?”*

UMUC Response

UMUC utilizes an ITIL methodology. While ITIL is preferred, there is no required project methodology.

31. *“Please confirm what [UMUC] groups will need to have admin access into the system to do things like access requests, user profile management, and user access reviews:*

- a. Sys Admins*
- b. Help Desk / Service Desk*
- c. Authorized Managers*
- d. Application Owners*
- e. Role Owners”*

UMUC Response

System administrators and service desk personnel will need administrative access to the system.

32. *“Have roles been defined for birthright access into systems and workflow processes for managing user on-boarding and off-boarding scenarios?”*

UMUC Response

A base level of access has been defined for the 3 types of users within UMUC’s environment. During the implementation UMUC will take the opportunity to establish some additional more granular roles.

33. *“[SECTION II,] 2.1.1. UMUC requires a Workday Software Partner with a commercial off-the-shelf (“COTS”) integration solution for Workday provisioning.*

- a. Please elaborate on this requirement, i.e. does this mean that UMUC will only consider solutions from Identity Vendors &/or Integrators that are formal partners with Workday? Or will UMUC consider a [proposing firm] who has standards-based and other common methods for integrating with SaaS providers such as Workday[?] From an IAM software vendor and integrator perspective, Workday is typically one (albeit important) target system of many for both Provisioning Automation and SSO, often designated an authoritative source for certain user attributes.”*

UMUC Response

UMUC will only consider solutions from Identity Vendors and/or Integrators that are formal partners with Workday. See answer to Question #2.

34. “[SECTION II,] 2.3.1. Ability to modify Google API attributes.
a. Please elaborate on this requirement.”

UMUC Response

UMUC requires the ability to modify Google attributes via API access.

35. “[SECTION II,] 2.9. Access to multiple or tiered (Development, QAT, Production) environments for the purposes of testing new provisioning workflows, application integrations and versions of vendor code.

The vendor must monitor hosted systems and applications to ensure availability, proper functionality, and performance.

- a. *It would appear from this requirement that UMUC requires a fully hosted/managed solution from the solution provider-is that accurate?”*

UMUC Response

UMUC would prefer a fully hosted/managed solution. However, this is not listed as a Mandatory Requirement in SECTION II: Scope of Work, 2. Mandatory Requirements.

36. “[SECTION II,] 3.2. Contractor should provide multifactor authentication.

- a. *Does UMUC have any MFA in place today for students, staff, faculty etc? [Are there any] preferred methods UMUC wishes to explore in the future?”*

UMUC Response

UMUC does not have any MFA in place today or any preferred methods at this time.

37. “[SECTION III,] 2.2. Demonstration of Workday Experience: The proposing firm shall confirm Workday Software Partner status, and demonstrate their experience with Workday integration in a large enterprise environment.

- a. *Workday Software Partner status is technically unnecessary to integrate with Workday. Can [UMUC] elaborate on why this is a requirement? There are typically many different target systems at any given client and it would be impractical for an IAM software vendor to have formal partnerships with all.”*

UMUC Response

The criticality of Workday in UMUC’s environment requires a vendor with Workday software partner status.

38. *“[A proposing firm’s] understanding is that the proposed SSO solution will replace the existing CAS and Shibboleth solution completely, and the existing SSO system will be discontinued. Is this accurate?”*

UMUC Response

Yes.

39. *“Can [UMUC] please provide current redundancy architecture (HA and DR)? [Is UMUC able to provide a] diagram that represents [the current redundancy architecture?] Also, can [UMUC] provide future requirements for [UMUC] HA and DR (Business continuity plan) requirements?”*

UMUC Response

UMUC deploys systems in multiple AWS regions for HA purposes. UMUC requires that the new solution also be implemented in a highly available configuration.

40. *“[A proposing firm is assuming that] Active directory is UMUC’s trusted Directory. [The RFP] document ... references ... LDAP: PeopleSoft (in [SECTION II,] 2.4.1. [The RFP document also mentions] CAS and IDP bind to OpenLDAP for authentication. What are all the directories used and for what purpose? Which is the trusted Directory? How [is UMUC] keeping them in sync? Please elaborate.”*

UMUC Response

UMUC utilizes AD and OpenLDAP to serve different populations. UMUC manually provisions and deprovisions accounts to both directories.

41. *“If [UMUC] already [has] an SSO system in place, [can UMUC] tell [a proposing firm] a little about the specific issues [currently faced]? This way [a proposing firm] can tailor a solution to fix those pain points.”*

UMUC Response

The project background and purpose are described in SECTION II: Scope of Work: Purpose/Description.

42. *“Please state [the] business goals that [UMUC] would like to achieve[:]
a. From [a] SSO system[:]
b. From Account Provisioning system[.]”*

UMUC Response

UMUC seeks to utilize a vendor hosted SSO implementation and to automate manual processes.

43. *“If [UMUC is] migrating from PeopleSoft to Workday, will this happen during the same timeframe? Please share with [a proposing firm] other parallel project[s] ... in effect during this SSO/Account Provisioning implementation[?]”*

UMUC Response

UMUC will be utilizing both PeopleSoft and Workday for an undetermined amount of time. No other parallel projects are relevant to the scope of this RFP.

44. *“Since this involves multiple software and service provide[rs,] [w]hat level of support [can a proposing firm] expect from [the] in-house team and from the [current] service provider?”*

UMUC Response

UMUC will have system engineers dedicated to this project. Service providers will continue to provide support at their contracted levels.

45. *“There was [a] request for a Project [M]anager. Will there be a project manager internally from UMUC to govern and manage over all [...] related software administrators and service providers?”*

UMUC Response

Yes.

46. *“Please share with [a proposing firm] the team involved in this project from UMUC’s side and their dedication [percentage]. This is important as this should be a coordinated effort with multiple stake holders to test, validate, and [provide] acceptance.”*

UMUC Response

UMUC will have a dedicated group of System Engineers and one Project Manager. Additional resources will be added on an ad-hoc basis.

47. “Every solution comes with a cost. Like buying a Mercedes vs a Toyota. Often times [a proposing firms] best solution [...] does not make sense [after] budget considerations [...]. Is there a budget consideration or range that [UMUC] can share? If [UMUC] can’t share the range, [can UMUC] indicate, or share with [a proposing firm] [...] any budget considerations that [a proposing firm] need[s] to be aware of?”

UMUC Response

Budget information is not relevant to the scope of this project. UMUC is seeking a Solution that meets of the project requirements as described in the RFP.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF ADDENDA FORM

Solicitation: UMUC Solicitation #91470 – Account Provisioning and SSO Solutions

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL DUE DATE: Wednesday, March 1, 2017 at 2:00 PM EST

NAME OF PROPOSER: _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF ADDENDA

The undersigned, hereby acknowledges the receipt of the following addenda:

Addendum No. <u> 1 </u>	dated <u> 02/14/2017 </u>
Addendum No. <u> </u>	dated <u> </u>
Addendum No. <u> </u>	dated <u> </u>
Addendum No. <u> </u>	dated <u> </u>
Addendum No. <u> </u>	dated <u> </u>

As stated in the solicitation documents, this form is included in our Technical Proposal.

Signature

Name Printed

Title