Procurement and Contracting Services

Request for Information for Identity and Access Management (IAM)

ADDENDUM #1

RFI # L162202
Due 10/15/21 no later than 2:00 PM, MST
The following questions were received. **University responses in red.**

1. **Question 2.2: Has the University already addressed the multi-persona issues? Is there a well-defined process currently in use?**
   a. **No**

2. **Question 1.8: Does the University currently have an MDM in place?**
   a. **No**

3. Based on the guidelines provided, has UA developed a roadmap for IAM long-term, short-term or both?
   a. **We hope to have a vendor selected by first quarter of 2022. And then work thought our phased approach for the items that need to be addresses. This is thought to be a 2-3 year project.**

4. **Category 1-13 : Are they applicable to all applications/systems in scope? Or, are there separate list of applications based on the category (e.g. SSO for only external applications, Access Certification: for only enterprise applications, etc.)?**
   a. **Yes**

5. What is the general IT environment at UA look like (e.g. Fully Microsoft, mixed and should support heterogeneous platforms, etc.)
   a. **Mixed (MS, Open Source solutions, other vendors)**

6. In 7.17 - Question regarding connectors to operating systems, is the intent to provision and manage system accounts or local accounts tied to identities (Privileged Access).
   a. **Both - manage system accounts and tied to identities.**

7. **Does UA have a PAM solution in place that the IGA system can integrate with?**
   a. **No central University system, isolated PAM solutions in various teams.**

8. **8.15/8.16 - questions refer to Password Recovery - is the intent to do a recovery or a reset?**
   a. **Reset**

9. Please provide active identity counts for the users that will be supported by the IAM solution (E.g. Faculty, Administrative Staff, Students, Alumni and Affiliates).
   a. **NetIDs – 400K est.**

10. **How many new users does the University estimate will be added per year?**
    a. **10,000 est.**

11. **What are the University’s current plans and estimated timelines for the IAM implementation?**
    a. **Est. start date quarter 2022, 3 yr. project.**
12. Does the University have any preferences for an IaaS Cloud Platform? If yes, does the University have an existing cloud hosting environment where the future state IAM solution can be hosted?
   a. AWS

13. Can the University describe its current IAM operating model?
   a. Unsure of question, please provide clarification for what you are looking for in an answer.

14. How is NetID generated?
   a. Users self-select NetIDs

15. Does the University need Identity Management solution to generate the NetID?
   a. No

16. Are there existing IAM solutions that the University plans to retain with IAM modernization?
   a. Yes

17. Please provide the list of solutions and their purpose.
   a. Grouper
   b. Shibboleth (Potential phase out)
   c. DUO
   d. EDS – Enterprise LDAP (389 Directory Server)
   e. MS AD
   f. Azure AD

18. What is the current user directory?
   a. 389 Directory Server

   • What technology is it supported on?
     o Linux

   • Does the user directory differ based on the user persona?
     o Yes, guests are in a MySQL db.

19. Can the University provide a list of prioritized applications that it plans to integrate with the future-state IAM solution?
   a. 500+ SSO integrations currently.

20. Does the University have a secure API Gateway solution?
    a. No

21. Can you provide more information on Master Data Management (MDM) project initiative and how it applies to future state IAM implementation?
    a. Not at this time, contract award in progress.

    • What platform is MDM supported on?
      o NA
22. Is the University open to considering a global project delivery model (off-shore resources) for this IAM modernization initiative?
   a. No

23. Could you please provide Attachment A required for the RFI submission (it could not be located on the Bids website)?
   a. It is labeled as “Attachment 1” on the Bids website. Sorry for the confusion.

24. Question 2.2: Has the University already addressed the multi-persona issues? Is there a well-defined process currently in use?
   a. No

25. Question 1.8: Does the University currently have a MDM in place?
   a. No

26. Based on the guidelines provided, has UA developed a roadmap for IAM long-term, short-term or both?
   a. Est. start date quarter 2022, 3 yr. project.

27. Category 1-13: are they applicable to all applications/systems in scope? Or, are there separate list of applications based on the category (e.g. SSO for only external applications, Access Certification: for only enterprise applications etc.)
   a. Yes
      • What is the general IT environment at UA look like (eg. Fully Microsoft, mixed and should support heterogeneous platforms etc.)
        o Mixed (MS, Open Source solutions, other vendors)

28. Could you please brief us about your existing IAM solution? Please provide the tools currently in use for
   a. Identity Governance and Administration (IGA), Multi Factor Authentication (MFA), Customer Identity and Access Management (CIAM), and Privileged Access Management (PAM)  IGA - Nothing at this time, MFA - DUO, CIAM - fragmented in house tools, PAM - only in AD side

29. Please share current architecture of Identity and Access Management. Please also provide a segregated view of manual and automated processes.
   a. Unable to provide at this time

30. Does the RFI scope include assessment, implementation approach, and technical product offering in every IAM domain including Identity Governance and Administration (IGA), Single Sign On / Multi Factor Authentication (SSO/MFA), Customer Identity and Access Management (CIAM), and Privileged Access Management (PAM)?
   a. Yes
31. Do you have any tools preference for Identity Governance and Administration (IGA), Single Sign On / Multi Factor Authentication (SSO/MFA), Customer Identity and Access Management (CIAM), and Privileged Access Management (PAM)?
   a. No

32. Are you open for a SaaS based managed service platform solution that is capable of covering your entire IAM landscape?
   a. Yes

33. We understand that there are 500,000 users/records? Please let us know the percentage of following roles in the above mentioned users/records:
   1. Student applicants
   2. Students
   3. Alumni
   4. Faculty
   5. Staff
   6. Foundation employees
   7. Retirees
   8. Guests/Contractors
   Shall we consider all users/records in Identity and Access Management scope?
   a. Please explain why a breakdown is needed. All are in scope.

34. How many applications / end-points are currently integrated with the IAM solution?
   Are you looking for further integration in the future? If yes, then could you please provide a ballpark count of the same?
   a. 500+ SSO integrations; Yes; Unknown at this time.

35. Must references be only for HED or can it be other verticals?
   a. Yes, must be HED.

36. Do we need to have a contractual vehicle/agreement with U of AZ or will you release an RFP?
   a. Undecided at this time

37. How many unique logins per month are you expecting?
   a. Around 90K

38. Are we allowed access to assessment documentation of your current state before we make any recommendations tailored to your needs?
   a. Don’t currently have one

39. Are you expecting to need professional services for this?
   a. Initially yes – Help with the building and implementation. Afterwards, base support for any questions or issues.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>40. Cost Worksheet</strong></td>
<td>As per pricing sheet, you have mentioned 45,000 FTE &amp; 15,000 Employees. Question - Is this count for current year? If yes, what’s year-on-year user identities count growth</td>
<td>Yes, current year. Est. new identities - 10K/yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>41. Cost Worksheet</strong></td>
<td>As you have requested Customer Identity Management Solution in the main RFI but corresponding count has not been mentioned. Question - Please mention number of Identities to be considered for Customer Identity solution (CIAM). Also; provide year-on-year growth considerations for CIAM user identities.</td>
<td>100,000+ but unsure a of exact number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>42. Page 2</strong></td>
<td>There are more than 500,000 records in our Identity Repository (EDS) Question - Does it include internal IAM as well as CIAM identities &amp; provide identity bifurcation between IAM &amp; CIAM</td>
<td>No, EDS is only internal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>43. Page 10, point 1.22</strong></td>
<td>Please clarify what solution do you currently have for protection against fake account creation</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>44. Page 10, point 2.4</strong></td>
<td>Which Authoritative source should be considered by new IAM solution</td>
<td>PeopleSoft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **45. Page 17, point 5.25** | What additional functions would like to perform on Active Directory apart from grouping people and apps | Password sync
User sync |
<p>| <strong>46. Page 19, point 7.8</strong> | Please elaborate on data &amp; event transformation policies with respect to IAM | Too broad of a question, please be more specific. |
| <strong>47. Page 19, point 7.9</strong> | Please provide total number of end-point systems / applications to be integrated with new IAM system. If possible, provide name of | 500+ current SSO integrations |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>48. Page 20, point 7.20</th>
<th>Please share which Master Data Management solution is deployed at University</th>
<th>Contract award in progress.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49. Page 25, category 11</td>
<td>General - Are you looking for a new SSO solution for internal users? If yes, how many applications required to be integrated with the SSO solution?</td>
<td>Open to possibility of SSO replacement. 500+ current SSO integrations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Page 25, category 11</td>
<td>General - Please confirm authentications per second expected to be handled by SSO solution</td>
<td>Unable to gather at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Page 25, category 11</td>
<td>General - What's user base to be considered for SSO solution</td>
<td>Unsure of what the question is referring to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Page 25, category 11</td>
<td>General - Are applications required to be integrated only using Federation? Any use case for header based application integration with SSO.</td>
<td>Unsure of what the question is referring to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Page 28, Request for Information Process</td>
<td>Will it be allowable to conduct Proof of Concept remotely</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. N.A</td>
<td>Do you have any preference for cloud based solution vis-à-vis an on-premise solutions?</td>
<td>Yes - Cloud based is required. It does not need to be SaaS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. N.A</td>
<td>For an on-premise solution, please share the number of environments to be created - e.g. Dev, Test, Prod etc.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. N.A</td>
<td>If ongoing support for the new IAM platforms is in scope, please share the hours/window to be supported.</td>
<td>24/7 emergency service available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. N.A</td>
<td>Could you describe what kind of users will be the 'Customers' in the CIAM solution and what CIAM</td>
<td>Season Ticket holders, Volunteers, Parents, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>58. N.A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Do you currently have a CIAM solution? Please share brief description of existing CIAM solution, if any.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>59. N.A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Are you currently using Azure Active Directory? Please share what IAM features are in use and your plans with this tool.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes - Office 365 support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60. Page 23-10.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>How many different MFA use cases are expected to be implemented?</strong></td>
<td><strong>50 - 100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>61. N.A</strong></td>
<td><strong>We assume IGA and SSO can be two separate solutions based on best-fit. Please confirm.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>62. N.A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Do you expect additional supplementary documentation other than the required table in the word document, in terms of capabilities, approach and methodology, case studies, tools and enablers, etc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No, we do not expect additional information.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>