



Procurement and Contracting Services

Request for Proposal to provide Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

ADDENDUM #1

**Please mark all proposal submission
Files with the following information**

**Sealed RFP # S312401
Due on June 28, 2024 no later than 2:00 PM, MST**

The following questions were received prior to the close of the Technical Question period on June 5th, 2024, at 5:00 PM MST:

UAGC Question Response Form
Request for Proposal #S312401
Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

#	RFP Section Number	Supplier Question	UAGC Response
1		Approximately how many applications and processes are to be decoupled from user2? This bears heavily on how long Workstream 1 Phase 2 will take/cost. Can you provide an application catalog of affected systems?	Directly decoupled from users2, three: Workday, Active Directory and Entra ID (fka Azure AD). There are 10 or more other downstream applications, but those get permissions/access via one or more of the direct apps.
2		Do you have expectations around support and service-level agreement/uptime (SLA) for this work? Who will support the systems after a given deliverable (or sub-deliverable) has been accepted?	We do expect that there will be warranty type support for the work that has been done for 60 days after the implementation. After that the support will fall on our internal teams.
3		If our team will be working with the integral UA IT department, what will the collaboration look like? Are there specific expectations or considerations we should address?	The UA IT team will be working with the vendor to integrate the solution or processes determined. this will be a collaboration effort since the UA team will be leaning on the knowledge of UAGC and the vendor.
4		What kind of development environments (Dev, UAT, Production, etc) exist at UA? What are the expectations around software development lifecycle (SDLC) behavior we need to adhere to?	There are Dev, QA and Production environments, but for ID purposes, the focus will be on Production
5		Can you provide more information about the User2 database, such as: a. number of tables involved	Users 2 is a single table with approximately 25k records in it. There are 4 other tables taht may be related as well but unsure at this time without further examination.
6		What platform(s) do you use, or intend to use, for alerting/monitoring/logging/debugging? For example, Datadog, Splunk.	LogicMonitor and Splunk
7	General	Can the project be delivered using an on-shore or off-shore model? Is there an on-site or US only requirement?	Onshore only
8	General	What are the various types of users apart from Students and Staff members that need to be taken into account (e.g. contractors, part time workers, etc.)?	The user populations are: staff (i.e full- or part-time employees), associate faculty, contractors/vendors/partners, and students
9	5.4.1	What are the various authoratitve sources and what are the counts of various user types?	Authoritative source for staff, associate faculty and contractors is Workday (and possibly Peoplesoft?); for students, it is CampusVue

UAGC Question Response Form
Request for Proposal #S312401
Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

#	RFP Section Number	Supplier Question	UAGC Response
10	5.4.1	Are there any existing integrations with Workday, Active Directory, or Entra ID that need to be considered? Any Legacy tools that need to be taken into account?	There are 10 or more integrations that may need to be considered, such as Salesforce, CampusVue, APL NextEd, Unimarket and others. I'd consider Users2 the one legacy tool.
11	5.4.1	What are the key pain points in the existing user management processes that this project aims to address?	The existing setup is managed by a large number of scripts as well as manual processes. This will help with automation of the provisioning and deprovisioning processes as well as reduce the dependencies on external scripts while aligning UAGC with the greater UA Identity processes.
12	5.7.1	Can you provide more details on the current integration points with Anthology and other systems?	The integration is not fully known however we have an account creation tool and scripts that work with Anthology to create the student accounts when they are approved to join the school. Further information will need to be determined as part of this effort.
13	Section 5.3: Scope of Work	Can you provide architecture diagrams for the University of Arizona SailPoint implementation?	Yes - we can provide our future state diagram. Please see below.
14	Section 5.3: Scope of Work	What applications are currently onboarded into the University of Arizona SailPoint environment?	Once go live, the system is ingesting all sources of truth for our identity data. Also google accounting provisioning and de-provisioning will be integrated and phase two will include Box, Zoom, MIM, Grouper, Service Now, Adobe and other smaller applications.
15	Section 5.3: Scope of Work	What version(s) of IIQ is currently installed at the University of Arizona?	8.3
16	Section 5.3: Scope of Work	Describe the non-production environment(s) available for the University of Arizona IIQ installation.	Our non-prod is currently in our University managed AWS account as is our prod account.
17	Section 5.3: Scope of Work	Are there projects on the University of Arizona SailPoint roadmap that may conflict or overlap with this project?	There will be several projects happening in tandem, but should not create issue.

UAGC Question Response Form
Request for Proposal #S312401
Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

#	RFP Section Number	Supplier Question	UAGC Response
18	Section 5.3: Scope of Work	When does the University desire to kick off the project?	ASAP
19	Section 5.3: Scope of Work	Has the University begun to communicate this project and its importance to its key stakeholders? How will the University ensure that stakeholders are available for discovery sessions?	Yes, this has been communicated to all of IT, and especially IT stakeholders. This project has a high level of priority which should resolve any conflicts with other efforts should they occur.
20	Section 5.3: Scope of Work	Please provide numbers for the following accounts: Active Faculty: Active Staff: Active Students: Alumni: Active Affiliates/Contractors/Vendors: Inactive Accounts:	Approximate counts: Active Faculty: 2200 Active Staff: 1300 Active Students: 20,000 Alumni: included in the Inactive Accounts count below Active Affiliates/Contractors/Vendors: >100 Inactive Accounts: 250,000+ (students), >1000+(staff and faculty)
21	Section 5.3: Scope of Work	In the request, the University has divided the work into three workstreams. Do you envision the workstreams proceeding in parallel, proceeding sequentially, or proceeding based on the outcomes of the analysis and roadmap design?	Sequentially except for where there is obvious paths forward in parallel.
22	Section 5.3: Scope of Work	Does the University expect that the partner will provide project management services for this scope of work?	Yes. The university will also have project managers on our side as well.
23	Section 5.3: Scope of Work	Will the University of Arizona Global Campus or the University of Arizona provide a project manager to assist with coordination?	UA has an internal project manager that will assist in the integration, but will be interested in working with an additional project manager from UAGC and the vendor

UAGC Question Response Form
Request for Proposal #S312401
Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

#	RFP Section Number	Supplier Question	UAGC Response
24	Section 5.4: Workstream 1: Phase I:	Can you describe more about the User2 database, its functionality, and its implementation? How is this system used throughout the identity lifecycle at the University of Arizona Global Campus?	Users2 is a table that acts as a middle man to transform account information between active directory and our scripts to help provision and deprovision. We do not know a bunch about everything it is tied into thus it is part of this effort to help understand how to remove it from the environment and integrate everything outside of that table.
25	Section 5.4: Workstream 1: Phase I:	How will training and communication be delivered? Will the University handle the activities in the End User-Facing Change Management Planning? What role do you expect the partner to play in the execution of the plan?	Documentation of key processes and design documentation will be required from the vendor. A preliminary training of the design and processes will be required so that internal teams can take over support going forward.
26	Section 5.5.1.1: Workstream 1: Phase II: Staff Onboarding and Offboarding Identity Lifecycle Implementation: Tasks	For automation of account provisioning from Workday, task b says to "Assist ... SailPoint administrators in configuring automated account provisioning". For the purposes of the proposal, shall we assume that University of Arizona is doing all of the hands on work or that the partner is doing most of the hands-on work and University of Arizona and the University of Arizona Global Campus will be participating in knowledge transfer?	This would be a joint effort. The Sailpoint knowledge is in the hands of the UA sailpoint individuals, however undersatnding what workflows need to be built, the purpose etc will be knowledge gained for the outcomes through the vendor. It is expected to have the proposing vendor be implementing the work in Sailpoint as well as the existing Sailpoint team.
27	Section 5.5.1.1: Workstream 1: Phase II: Staff Onboarding and Offboarding Identity Lifecycle Implementation: Tasks	Do you know if there are shared employees that would already exist in the University of Arizona's SailPoint deployment that will also be found in the University of Arizona Global Campus' Workday instance?	All employees that are in the university Peoplesoft instance are in the Sailpoint product. Yes, all employee's already exist in Sailpoint as part of the UA peoplesoft integration. These accoutns are seperate however.
28	Section 5.5.1.1: Workstream 1: Phase II: Staff Onboarding and Offboarding Identity Lifecycle Implementation: Tasks	How many Active Directory domains are in use at the University of Arizona Global Campus for employees? What is the purpose of each domain?	10 On Prem Domains: Use Bridgepoint.local: Service accounts, PCs, Servers, Staff Applications Aeb.bridgepoint.local: Dev/Test for Staff Applications Ashford.bridgepoint.local: UAGC staff users Bpi.bridgepoint.local: UAGC staff users Rockies.bridgepoint.local: Former Rockies UAGC staff Bpemail.com: UAGC associate faculty users Bpeservices.local: Student Applications/Services Aep.bpeservices.local: Dev/Test for Student Applications/Services Students.ashford.edu: UAGC & Rockies student users Studev.dev: Test student domain

UAGC Question Response Form
Request for Proposal #S312401
Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

#	RFP Section Number	Supplier Question	UAGC Response
29	Section 5.5.1.1: Workstream 1: Phase II: Staff Onboarding and Offboarding Identity Lifecycle Implementation: Tasks	Are there test domains for each Active Directory domain?	There are for some, but not all
30	Section 5.5.1.1: Workstream 1: Phase II: Staff Onboarding and Offboarding Identity Lifecycle Implementation: Tasks	Will the University of Arizona Global Campus be responsible for the development and implementation of a test plan or is this something you would expect the partner to do?	Partner responsibility
31	Section 5.6: Workstream 1: Phase III: Automation Script Redeployment	What tasks are being performed by the current PowerShell scripts?	Various tasks including account creation, Deprovisioning, and group management.
32	Section 5.6: Workstream 1: Phase III: Automation Script Redeployment	Is there functionality the University is aware of in current PowerShell scripts or desired future state that requires the use of Azure Automation?	Not that we are aware of but may be necessary.
33	Section 5.7: Workstream 2: Phase I: Student Identity Management Process Discovery and Roadmap (Cloud-only Identity in Entra ID)	How many domains are in use at the University of Arizona Global Campus for students? What is the purpose of each domain?	Two on-prem domains for students, one production and one test Students.ashford.edu: UAGC & Rockies student users Studev.dev: Test student domain

UAGC Question Response Form
Request for Proposal #S312401
Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

#	RFP Section Number	Supplier Question	UAGC Response
34	Section 5.7: Workstream 2: Phase I: Student Identity Management Process Discovery and Roadmap (Cloud-only Identity in Entra ID)	It appears that there is a change that all student accounts will be migrated to EntraID. Is there a target or deadline for this migration?	Students already exist in Entra ID by way of sync from on-prem AD
35	Section 5.8: Workstream 2: Phase II: Student Onboarding and Offboarding Identity Lifecycle Implementation	Is there a reason that the University is indicating that you will be provisioning directly from Anthology to EntraID for students or will this be determined during the discovery phase? If this is your direction, how will you manage accounts for student who could also be in the University of Arizona Global Campus Workday, the University of Arizona HR, and the Anthology systems?	The decision to provision from Anthology to EntraID was determined as a result of other work; primarily switching MFA from Okta to Entra, and also due to a re-vamp of UAGC's application process. As far as students that are also UAGC employees or contractors (i.e. also in Workday) or UA's HR system: we currently assign a separate account for each identity; in other words, if a student were also an employee, they would have two accounts. This could be subject to change as part of this project.
36	Section 5.8: Workstream 2: Phase II: Student Onboarding and Offboarding Identity Lifecycle Implementation	Will the University of Arizona Global Campus be responsible for the development and implementation of a test plan or is this something you would expect the partner to do?	Partner responsibility
37	Section 5.9: Workstream 3: Identity Security Deployments for M365: General Environment and Stakeholders	Can you provide details on your current M365 and Azure AD setup?	Employees, associate faculty and contractors all exist in one Azure tenant with appropriate M365 licenses. Students exist in a separate Azure tenant with appropriate M365 licenses.
38	Section 5.9: Workstream 3: Identity Security Deployments for M365: General Environment and Stakeholders	Do the University of Arizona and the University of Arizona Global Campus share an Azure tenant or do they have separate tenants? If the tenant is shared, how does the shared responsibility model function?	UA and UAGC currently have separate Azure tenants, managed by separate teams in IT.
39	Section 5.9: Workstream 3: Identity Security Deployments for M365: General Environment and Stakeholders	For the purposes of this project, is a separate test domain available?	There is a test domain for student accounts, in addition to prod. There is no designated test domain for employee and faculty accounts, but could be implemented if needed.

UAGC Question Response Form
Request for Proposal #S312401
Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

#	RFP Section Number	Supplier Question	UAGC Response
40	Section 5.9: Workstream 3: Identity Security Deployments for M365: General Environment and Stakeholders	Do you have any existing identity protection or management solutions in place?	No other than the use of Entra-ID MFA and SSO
41	Section 5.9: Workstream 3: Identity Security Deployments for M365: General Environment and Stakeholders	Who are the key stakeholders and decision-makers for this project?	Michael Bailey, Rhonda Royse, John Luth, Michael Fudge
42	Section 5.9: Workstream 3: Identity Security Deployments for M365: General Environment and Stakeholders	Will the University of Arizona Global Campus or the University of Arizona be providing for Microsoft trained engineers to execute this work or is this something the partner will resource?	Partner responsibility
43	Section 5.9.1.1: Workstream3: Tasks: Self Service Password Reset (SSPR)	Which user groups will be involved in the test phase for SSPR?	All of them
44	Section 5.9.1.1: Workstream3: Tasks: Self Service Password Reset (SSPR)	How do you plan to communicate and onboard users for SSPR? What channels will you use?	Internal communications team working with the vendor to explain the process.
45	Section 5.9.1.1: Workstream3: Tasks: Self Service Password Reset (SSPR)	Are there any specific messaging or branding guidelines we need to follow for the communications?	Communications will come from our internal communications team and will be branded by them.
46	Section 5.9.1.2: Workstream3: Tasks: Customer Lockbox	What's the process for handling alerts from Customer Lockbox?	Would need to be determined as part of this project.
47	Section 5.9.1.2: Workstream3: Tasks: Customer Lockbox	Are there any specific requirements or constraints we should be aware of for enabling Customer Lockbox?	Would need to be determined as part of this project.
48	Section 5.9.1.3: Workstream3: Tasks: Organizational Change Management (OCM)	How will training and education be delivered to users about these changes?	Through documentation created by the provider and initial training for the responsible administrative groups by the provider

UAGC Question Response Form
Request for Proposal #S312401
Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

#	RFP Section Number	Supplier Question	UAGC Response
49	Section 5.9.1.3: Workstream3: Tasks: Organizational Change Management (OCM)	Do you already have any templates or examples of communication artifacts that we can use?	Yes
50	Section 5.9.1.3: Workstream3: Tasks: Organizational Change Management (OCM)	Who needs to approve the OCM artifacts before they are sent out?	Our change management process has this all covered. An internal resource will work with you to implement our changes through our system.
51	Section 5.9.1.4: Workstream3: Tasks: Protecting Privileged Identities	How many admin accounts do you currently have, and what are their specific roles?	Estimate at least 30, likely more, for administrative use in various tools. Some examples would be server admins, Azure Global Admins, database admins, various levels of admin access for service desk and PC support, etc.
52	Section 5.9.1.4: Workstream3: Tasks: Protecting Privileged Identities	Are there any particular roles that require additional protection?	At minimum, Azure Global Admins
53	Section 5.9.1.4: Workstream3: Tasks: Protecting Privileged Identities	Who will have emergency access, and how do we select these accounts?	Would need to be determined as part of this project.
54	Section 5.9.1.4: Workstream3: Tasks: Protecting Privileged Identities	What procedures should be followed during an emergency?	Would need to be determined as part of this project.
55	Section 5.9.1.5: Workstream3: Tasks: Protecting All Identities	Can you share your current Identity Secure Score and the items that need remediation?	Sharing scores with caveat that we have not looked at these recently, nor analyzed improvement actions that are possibly already in place or could be easily done (in other words, these are probably not reliable). Employee/faculty tenant: 45.79% Student tenant: 24.24%
56	Section 5.9.1.5: Workstream3: Tasks: Protecting All Identities	Are there any exceptions or special cases we should consider for blocking legacy authentication?	There is one known legacy application (ImageNow) that still requires basic authentication for Exchange. That is expected to be upgraded within the next month, so part of this project should be to re-visit possibility of blocking all legacy authentication.
57	Section 5.9.1.5: Workstream3: Tasks: Protecting All Identities	Which locations should be exempt from location-based policies?	Unsure if we want any exemptions for this currently, but maybe UAGC's Chandler office location.
58	Section 5.9.1.6: Workstream3: Tasks: Identity Governance	How often do you think user access reviews should be conducted?	Currently they are quarterly; which seems sufficient to remain on that cadence at this time.

UAGC Question Response Form
Request for Proposal #S312401
Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

#	RFP Section Number	Supplier Question	UAGC Response
59	Section 5.9.1.6: Workstream3: Tasks: Identity Governance	Who will be responsible for conducting and reviewing these access reviews?	IAM and InfoSec teams?
60	Section 5.9.1.6: Workstream3: Tasks: Identity Governance	Are you planning to use Microsoft Entra for Access Reviews for certain identity types along with SailPoint?	Unknown at this time if we will specifically use Entra for Access Reviews
61	Section 5.9.1.6: Workstream3: Tasks: Identity Governance	What's the current process for managing guest user access?	Guest access is considered the same as contractor access when accounts are required. For guest network access we do not provision accounts.
62	Section 5.9.1.6: Workstream3: Tasks: Identity Governance	Are there any specific lifecycle policies for guest and third-party users?	Yes, we set expirations on the accounts and notate who is responsible for the third-party user for extension or cancellation earlier than required. Accounts are also tied to Procurement contracts for any third-party accounts.
64	Section 5.9.1.7: Workstream3: Tasks: Microsoft Defender for Identity	Are there any specific requirements for integrating Defender for Identity with your existing security tools?	To be determined as part of this effort.
66	Section 5.9.1.7: Workstream3: Tasks: Microsoft Defender for Identity	What types of reports and alerts do you need for ongoing monitoring?	To be determined as part of this effort.
67	Section 5.9.1.7: Workstream3: Tasks: Microsoft Defender for Identity	Do we need to integrate Defender for Identity with any other systems?	To be determined as part of this effort.
68	General Questions:	Will the university allow for off-shore resources during the execution of this project?	OnShore only
69	General Questions:	Which consulting company performed the initial implementation of SailPoint? Is this company eligible to bid on this RFP?	ProofID - Yes

UAGC Question Response Form
Request for Proposal #S312401
Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

#	RFP Section Number	Supplier Question	UAGC Response
70		3.4 Please provide the following (a) An estimated date for Orals or Live-Presentation for selected proposals post-submission (b) An estimated date for the start of services post-award	A - written submission will be reviewed once they have all been recieved. No live submissions or presentations are expected at this time. B - As soon as possible post award.
71		4.52.2 We understand the requirement to limit access to University data with-in United States. Can you please clarify if this requirement applies to Non-Production environments? Can the supplier utilize resources located outside of the United States for implementation in Non-Production environments/data?	Onshore only
72		5.2 Are there any considerations or specific milestones (e.g., dependencies due to other initiatives or academic calendar) which should be considered for target dates for discovery and implementation?	No but we are looking to accomplish this work in a rapid fashion and the submission should include a timeline of work to be performed.
73		5.4 Can you please share details of the current state and the overall vision (future-state) of On-prem AD to Azure Cloud Modernization Journey?	We are currently in a state of integration with the University of Arizona. This means that we are in a state of flux on what the future state looks like.
74		5.4 Are AD, Azure and Entra UAGC-only systems or part of larger UofA systems? How many forests and Domains are there in the current AD environment? Is Entra Connect already configured to sync from on-prem AD to Azure? Will Student and HR accounts be created in same or a different Azure/Entra domain/tenant?	Are AD, Azure and Entra UAGC-only systems or part of larger UofA systems? These are all UAGC only; UA has their own instances of AD, Azure and Entra How many forests and Domains are there in the current AD environment? 10, see line 35 for more details Is Entra Connect already configured to sync from on-prem AD to Azure? Yes Will Student and HR accounts be created in same or a different Azure/Entra domain/tenant? Students and employee/faculty are in two separate tenants
75		5.4 Besides HR and Student population, are there any other user populations to be considered (e.g., non-employees, affiliates, guests)? If yes, please describe the system of record and number of identities for such populations.	Yes, contractors, vendors and partners should beconsidered. These should be tracked in Workday, but that could be subject to change as part of this project. I'd estimate at least 100 of these types of accounts exist.
76		5.4 What are the expected number of identities for HR population in-scope of this project? Are these users already present in Workday?	Approximately 1200 employee and 2200 associate faculty would be in-scope, and all are in Workday.

UAGC Question Response Form
Request for Proposal #S312401
Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

#	RFP Section Number	Supplier Question	UAGC Response
77		5.4 Is Workday considered UAGC-only solution or is it part of larger UofA Workday solution/tenant?	Workday is only utilized by UAGC. UA has a separate Peoplesoft system.
78		5.4 Besides On-prem AD, Azure and AD groups, are there any other Systems/Applications which are currently provisioned from User2 DB? Are these in-scope for future state provisioning (e.g., LDAPs, DBs, Exchange, Google, Kerberos, Canvas, Student Portal, Faculty Portal)?	We believe other systems are not directly provisioned from Users2, but instead based on data from Workday, AD and/or Entra. CVUE accounts are provisioned thru Users2
79		5.4 Which system is responsible for assignment/management of Microsoft licenses in AD/Azure? What would be the scope for SailPoint or Entra regarding management of Microsoft licenses for Exchange, Teams, SharePoint etc.	For employees and faculty tenant, licenses are managed by security groups (on-prem and dynamic cloud groups); for students, licenses are currently allocated with a powershell script, but will soon be managed via an integration with our SIS (Anthology). The specific scope for the project would be determined as part of this engagement.
80		5.4 What is considered as a unique identifier for UAGC? Is this unique across UAGC Workday and Anthology or across UofA system? How is it generated and what are the integrations expected as part of this project?	For employees/faculty, employee ID generated by Workday. For students, student number generated by Anthology. Both these systems are specific to UAGC and not used by UA, and values are generated by the respective systems. Integrations would be determined as part of the project.
81		5.4 How does the university manage lifecycle of a Student-Workers (student who becomes an employee, or an employee who becomes a student)? Is it considered a single Identity, and how is it accomplished?	UAGC assigns separate identities for each; for example, a full time employee who is also a student and acts as an associate faculty member would get an employee account, a student account and an associate faculty account. This could be subject to change as part of this project.
82		5.4 Can you please describe current state of UofA SailPoint implementation and how it interacts with UAGC processes and solutions? Is UofA SailPoint an on-prem (IdentityIQ) or cloud/SaaS version (IdentityNow)? Does UAGC already have an integration with UofA SailPoint, or is Workday going to be first UAGC integration with UofA SailPoint? If existing, what are the current capabilities/use-cases of this integration.	Currently SailPoint IIQ 8.3 is nearing roll out of Phase 1 with Phase 2 work already started. There is no current integration into SailPoint with the UAGC systems or processes

UAGC Question Response Form
Request for Proposal #S312401
Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

#	RFP Section Number	Supplier Question	UAGC Response
83		5.4 Are IAM administrative capabilities in-scope such as the following? If yes, please specify the use cases and the administrators who will be using these capabilities (e.g., Helpdesk, IAM team, Computer Accounts team, etc.)?. Examples: (a) manually grant/revoke AD groups (b) manually manage Exchange/Teams access	IAME is responsible for these manual actions, add/remove groups, lists, shared mailboxes
84		5.4 Do HR population Accounts and Exchange mailboxes already exist in AD, Entra/Azure or both. Can you please elaborate on the scope of data conversion/migration?	All accounts already exist in on-prem AD and Entra/Azure.
85		5.5 How many AD groups does the University have? How are the dynamic group memberships managed in current state? Is the intention to use UofA SailPoint to perform dynamic group memberships in future state?	Approximately 7k on-prem AD groups. Entra groups: 6,655, of which 34 are dynamic groups. Open to using SailPoint to perform group management.
86		5.6.1 How many PowerShell Task/Scripts are currently implemented? Please briefly describe the capabilities/use-case for these PowerShell.	IAME has 6 scripts used in automation of provisioning/deprovisioning
87		5.7 What are the expected number of identities for Student populations in-scope of this project? Which populations are considered Student users? Does it include Applicants, Summer term, Continuing education, Alumni, etc. as well?	At minimum: Active students (in class currently or within the last year), Alumni, Inactive (haven't taken class in over 1 year), Suspended/Expelled?
88		5.7 Is Anthology considered UAGC-only system or is it part of larger UofA solution/tenant?	Anthology is only used by UAGC; UA has a separate SIS.
89		5.7 How is the Student identity lifecycle managed in the current state? Which solutions and processes are used to integrate with Anthology and AD for provisioning and de-provisioning?	Our understanding is that OAP initiates a process that creates the AD account for a student, and CampusVue determines if it should be in an Active or Inactive OU. All Active OU students are synced to Entra and assigned an A1 license. This will be changing with planned work, which will assign student licenses based on Anthology status.

UAGC Question Response Form
Request for Proposal #S312401
Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

#	RFP Section Number	Supplier Question	UAGC Response
90		5.7 Do Student Accounts and exchange mailboxes already exist in AD, Entra/Azure or both? Can you please elaborate on the scope of data conversion/migration?	All accounts already exist in on-prem AD and Entra/Azure.
91		5.9 Is the Entra/Azure Security policy, Privilege Access policy and Azure Governance rules defined conceptually (e.g., Geo based rules, MFA rules, privilege access definition, risk definition and calculation, guest user access terms etc.)? Please clarify if designing/defining these policies and rules in scope of this project, in addition to configuration.	These rules already exist and would not need to be designed/defined. Ideally, this project would include a review of these to ensure they are properly configured and align with best practices and desired state.
92		5.9 Is management/configuration of Azure/Entra Security model in scope of this project. If yes, what are the Entra/Azure roles/groups currently configured and how are they managed?	Yes, include these in the scope. We use multiple Entra roles and it would be difficult to summarize. This is generally managed by Platform Engineering and IAM.
93		5.9 Except Azure PIM, is there any other PAM products being used by the University as part of Privileged Account Management? If yes, are there any integrations expected with existing PAM system?	To our knowledge, no other PAM is in use.
94		5.9 Does the University already have the authentication mechanisms in place to support Azure as an Identity provider for student and faculty applications. If, the University requires migration of applications from legacy (user2-based) authentication to Azure authentication, please list the applications, and application type (SaaS, Web, Mobile etc.) in-scope of such transition.	We already utilize Entra/Azure as the IdP for many applications, and use Active Directory for most others. There may be a small number of apps utilizing local accounts. Users2 is not an authentication tool, but rather the system that interfaces between Workday, AD and Entra.
95		5.9 Does the University already have the Application Security Groups (Resource Groups) configured in Entra/Azure to support student and faculty applications. If, the University requires migration of application security from legacy (user2-based) to Azure, please list the applications, and number of groups in-scope of each application.	We believe we already have necessary security groups in place for most, if not all, applications.
96		Are you replacing existing or legacy identity management?	Not exactly sure what this means. Goal of project is to replace an outdated, in-house developed integration between Workday, AD and Entra with Sailpoint in its place, between Workday, AD and Entra.
97		Is this for internal use and/or will there be external access utilizing this solution such as contractors, partners, etc?	This is for internal use. External contractors, vendors and partners may be provisioned with an AD/Entra account when needed, and this is in-scope for the overall project work.

UAGC Question Response Form
Request for Proposal #S312401
Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

#	RFP Section Number	Supplier Question	UAGC Response
98		How does fit into your Zero Trust approach?	We work off of a least privileged access model. We restrict rights to only what people require to do their job. We have buildsheets that explain exactly which groups and rights people need.
99		How many users will this include?	See Question 20
100		Is this RFP to build an identity solution to help integrate with Sailpoint or replace Sailpoint while migrating off on prem AD to Entra ID?	The goal is to integrate Sailpoint with Workday, AD and Entra and for Sailpoint to replace our legacy in-house integration database.
101		Is Entra ID for students while Sailpoint for faculty and staff?	Entra is used by student, staff and faculty; Sailpoint integration would apply to staff and faculty as well, since students will be integrated with Anthology/CampusVue.
102		Due to the language used in the RFP, can references be listed by industry, size, and use case while withholding client information, unless in final contention at which NDA can be signed, and information shared?	Yes
103		What is user2, there's a reference to that and sailpoint for decoupling, how used?	Users2 is a legacy in-house developed integartion system that uses a Maverick database and legacy code (not sure of language) to act as an intermediate system between Workday and on-prem Active Directory. The goal of the project is to replace that with Sailpoint.
104		There's mention of privilege access management (PAM) form, is there a current PAM solution in place?	There is currently no PAM/PIM in use. We have discussed (but not yet implemented) Azure/Entra PIM.
105		Has the University of Arizona's SailPoint instance been selected as the IGA solution or are other IGA solutions being considered, include Microsoft Entra ID Governance?	Sailpoint has been selected as the IGA for the University

UAGC Question Response Form
Request for Proposal #S312401
Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

#	RFP Section Number	Supplier Question	UAGC Response
106		What version of SailPoint is being utilized, SaaS version or on-premise (IdentityNow vs Identity IQ)	IIQ 8.3
107		What is the level of SailPoint expertise expected by the selected Vendor, i.e., will UofA SailPoint administrators be responsible for architecture, development and integration to the connected systems or will the Vendor need to provide SailPoint SME and perform these tasks?	Knowledge of the Sailpoint platform is preferred to be able to work together with the UA IAM team for an integration
108		What are the current Microsoft license entitlements? (e.g. A3, A5, etc)	Currently, employees and faculty get A5 licenses, and students get A1 Plus. Since Microsoft is eliminating A1 Plus, and in order to reduce license expense, the future plan is as follows: Employees will get A5 licenses, faculty will get A3 licenses, active students will be given A3 for Student Use Benefit licenses and inactive/alumni will get A1 licenses.
109		How many total identities are currently being managed?	See Question 20
110		What is the average rate of change for identities (joiners vs leavers)? Are their peak periods?	There is no current "average". The University hires/releases people almost every week.
111		Is there an existing process for account claiming and identity proofing?	No
112		Is Workday the only source of identity truth?	Ideally it is for employees, faculty and contractor/partner/vendors. Source of truth for students is SIS (Anthology) It would be if all were in Workday. Not all contractors are in Workday.
113		What is the budget range for this RFP?	Not applicable
114		What are your systems of record for students, faculty, and staff?	Workday for staff and faculty, Anthology/CampusVue for students.

UAGC Question Response Form
Request for Proposal #S312401
Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

#	RFP Section Number	Supplier Question	UAGC Response
115		What do you use for your Student Information System? If you are using Banner, what other Banner modules do you use?	Anthology/CampusVue
116		Will the IDM solution directly or indirectly service auxiliary systems such as Parking, ID Cards, Dining, Student Health Services, Intramural Sports Office, Facility Access, and so on?	UAGC is a fully online campus and does not utilize any of these services.
117		Will this solution service outside vendors or service providers such as financial institutions, state or federal agencies, research consortiums, or other non-UAGC entities?	This solution will service UAGC and currently services UA and it's contractors. This will not be used outside of the institutions.
118		Will this solution be used by your Alumni Office or University Foundation?	The IIQ solution is meant to service applications and processes that affect the universities staff, faculty, students, and contractors
119		What is the level of executive sponsorship and oversight for this project?	Rhonda Royse (UA) and Michael Bailey (UAGC) are the sponsors for the project and are actively engaged. Executive sponsors are engaged from an update perspective but not actively engaged in the project.
120		What percentage of this work can be performed remotely?	100% remote
121		If any onsite work is required, where is the place of performance and how is access handled?	N/A. We do not anticipate any on-sitework to be required.
122		What cloud service providers are you currently using?	Primarily Azure, with small AWS footprint
123		Do you anticipate changing cloud service provides as part of this project?	From the UA side for where the production instance of IIQ is, no

Request for Proposal to provide Enterprise Identity and Security Modernization

ADDENDUM #1 ANNEX A

**Reference: Question #13
UA Sailpoint Future-State Integration Diagrams**





