



ADDENDUM NUMBER: 1

For

RFP 742-22-193-2

Selection of a Vendor to Provide

**Managed SAML Services
related to
Migration of All Existing Integrations**

**University of Texas Permian Basin
4901 E. University Blvd.
Odessa, TX 79762**

The following revisions, additions and clarifications shall be incorporated in the Request for Proposal referenced above. All other provisions of the Request for Proposal shall remain unchanged.

2.1 Submittal Deadline

University will accept proposals until 2:30 p.m. Central Time, on Thursday, November 18, 2021 (Submittal Deadline).

******Submittal Deadline has been extended to 2:30 p.m. (CST) on Tuesday, November 23, 2021.**

Submitted Questions and Answers below:

QUESTION: Will there be opportunity for our HUB/WBE to work with a prime on this?

ANSWER: Cannot answer for prime.

QUESTION: Can we get a two week extension on the deadline for submission?

ANSWER: Submittal deadline has been extended per Addendum 1.

QUESTION: Is the proposed solution expected to be hosted with a utpb.edu domain?

If yes, will UTPB provide a SSL certificate for HTTPS traffic?

ANSWER: Yes it is expected to be hosted with a utpb.edu domain name and we can provide an SSL certificate.

QUESTION: Does UTPB have any preference for a particular SAML IdP product or software?

ANSWER: Our experience has been with Shibboleth, but open to other options.

QUESTION: Would the best proposal outlined order include sections entitled Appendix Six - ELECTRONIC AND INFORMATION RESOURCES ENVIRONMENT SPECIFICATIONS selecting Basic Specifications Option 1 A-K) or Option #2 (A-B and 3-6) and Security (1-4) and Integration (1-6) and will answers be acceptable if populated after a copy of each question for this section or should narratives be created for each of the 35 Items.

ANSWER: Each question should be addressed individually

QUESTION: I understand there are about 10,000 users in the system. In order to properly license them, may I get a breakdown of full time employees/staff separate from students, part time staff, contractors and alumni?

ANSWER: We do not break them down into exactly those same groups, but do have the following:

Full Time Employees – 891

Student Employees & Students (if you are student assistant, you actually have two usernames to keep things separate – 11,328 (this also includes graduates for up to 3 semesters following graduation, so while the number is high, a chunk of them are never being used). Our actual enrollment is around 6,000).

Alumni (includes Applicants) – We have about 50 people that have actually requested alumni access. Applicants, that's hard to quantify. They have to have an account to submit all of their paperwork, but can do that multiple semesters in advance, some never show up, but we keep their accounts active for up to a year before making them re-apply.

QUESTION: Is it possible to get a copy of the sample agreement in Word format in order to provide redlines/markups?

ANSWER: Once a vendor has been selected and we move to the contracting stage the agreement will be available for review, redlines/markup.

QUESTION: How many Firewalls are in the network today?

ANSWER: Our network security design is of no relevance to this RFP.

QUESTION: How many networks devices?

ANSWER: Our network topology is of no relevance to this RFP.

QUESTION: How many total locations do you currently have with network infrastructure? How many DC's?

ANSWER: Not sure what relevance this question is either, but rest assured, it's 2021 all locations have network infrastructure.

QUESTION: What is the total number of user and end point count within the network?

ANSWER: The majority of the users are not within out network, not sure how this question applies to this RFP.

QUESTION: How many changes per week are estimated on servers currently?

ANSWER: Not sure I understand this question, but if you are asking how many SAML integrations per week, it typically runs 1 every month or two if that much.

QUESTION: Are there any specific SLA requirements?

ANSWER: See section 5.4.2

QUESTION: What is the total number of servers and applications in use today?

ANSWER: One Shibboleth Server, about 50 applications.

QUESTION: Do you need 24X7 support for the operations?

ANSWER: Yes, we have people authenticating to our systems 24 hours a day. An outage cannot wait until the next business day to be resolved. See section 5.4.2.

QUESTION: What change management process is used currently?

ANSWER: We basically just document changes with a service ticket today to provide a searchable history.

QUESTION: Is there a pre-defined process for Port opening requests for servers?

ANSWER: None of what this RFP is proposing is housed with out infrastructure, not sure how this question applies.

QUESTION: What is the current throughput in the network?

ANSWER: Not sure how this question applies to this RFP.

QUESTION: How many ISP connections do you have currently?

ANSWER: Not sure how this question applies to this RFP.

QUESTION: How many Domain controllers are in the network today?

ANSWER: Not sure how this question applies to this RFP.

QUESTION: Are you using any MFA currently?

ANSWER: Yes, see section 5.4.2

QUESTION: What IDS/IPS is in use today?

ANSWER: Not sure how this question applies to this RFP.

QUESTION: Is there a Vulnerability Management System tool in place today?

ANSWER: Not sure how this question applies to this RFP.

QUESTION: How many vulnerabilities are found per month in current environment?

ANSWER: Not sure how this question applies to this RFP.

QUESTION: Do you have an SSO integration in place today?

ANSWER: See section 5.4 opening paragraph

QUESTION: Are you open for any other options than SAML 2.0?

ANSWER: Our existing systems and partners all utilize SAML 2.0. We are open to learning more, but it's key that integration with these existing systems be maintained.

QUESTION: What authentication do you use in current environment?

ANSWER: See section 5.4 opening paragraph

QUESTION: (Section 1) Currently the University is using Shibboleth with SAML 2.0. What component, feature, or aspect of the current solution/product is the University unsatisfied with?

ANSWER: We are satisfied with Shibboleth, it has served us well. We simply lack the technical resources to manage it properly.

QUESTION: If the University is satisfied with Shibboleth, is it simply seeking a maintained and cloud-hosted instance of that product?

ANSWER: Yes

QUESTION: Shibboleth does not have regular security updates and is solely open source supported. Is the University seeking a product with a sustainable security update feature (i.e., OEM provided patches and updates)? Does the University want the offeror to include all OEM costs in their proposal or would you be open to some sort of cost-reimbursement arrangement to minimize markup, risks, and costs?

ANSWER: Shibboleth is actively maintained by InCommon as an open source project and is in use by many higher education institutions. We are not concerned about the frequency of updates as much as our own inability to implement those updates in a reasonable time frame. Whatever you are proposing will need to include all costs upfront.

QUESTION: Are the 50 applications planned for initial migration successfully using SAML 2.0 through Shibboleth now?

ANSWER: Yes

QUESTION: (Section 2) We are not a Texas HUB, but we are a Texas-based Federally recognized Small Disadvantaged Business, Native American owned. Would the University consider expanding the scope of the disadvantaged business category to include this?

ANSWER: No. The University of Texas Permian Basin works to promote the HUB program under the Government Code 2161 & Texas Administrative Code Title 14, Chpt. D, Division 1

See:

<https://comptroller.texas.gov/purchasing/vendor/hub/> for additional information

QUESTION: (Section 5) In order to deliver a cloud-based commercial solution, we would need to partner with a supplier of cloud hosting (i.e., Microsoft or Amazon Web Services) as well as the OEM support staff of the deployed product(s). These would normally be part of our subcontractor plan but will not be HUBs. Would the University support the inclusion of CSP and OEM staff in the deployment/maintenance of a solution?

ANSWER: Yes, include this in your HUB HSP plan submittal that your subcontractors will not be HUB
See <https://comptroller.texas.gov/purchasing/vendor/hub/> for HSP plan instructions.

QUESTION: Regarding the cloud hosting solution, does the University want the offeror to include all CSP costs in their proposal or would you be open to some sort of cost-reimbursement arrangement to minimize markup, risks, and costs?

ANSWER: Please provide the full cost to implement/operate the project.

QUESTION: Does the University desire co-location of the SSO solution adjacent to the hosting of Azure AD? Would that hosting be in an environment provisioned/provided by the University of Texas or would the university still desire the offeror to provision it, and to include it in the proposal?

ANSWER: Our vision was for this to be completely turn-key and in a silo so that awarded vendor is not dependent upon University IT staff for access and to lessen the chance of "finger-pointing" should an outage arise.

QUESTION: Regarding the 10 applications per year, does on-boarding mean designing SAML authentication or just supporting those applications efforts to develop/configure SAML? In other words, is the offeror responsible for required changes to those applications to make them compatible/configured to work with SAML 2.0 or is there another development team(s) responsible for that component of the effort?

ANSWER: An example of this would be, the University purchases a new hosted application that supports SAML 2.0. You would be responsible for coordinating/testing the exchange of metadata, agreement of which attributes they need released, etc. You are not responsible for programming changes within the other vendors applications, but could have credentials provided into those applications to configure their SSO portal parameters to tie into our system. You will not be helping them become SAML 2.0 compliant, if they are not already there, then we don't run them through this process.

QUESTION: 10K users are noted, but what is the hourly rate of login activities?

ANSWER: No idea

QUESTION: Section 5.4.2, Managed Services. "Provide support for all issues ..." Can the University be more descriptive of what is covered by 'support'?

ANSWER: You are responsible to keeping the service fully operational 24x7. Should an issue arise, you would review applicable system logs to identify the issue and correct the issue should it be found within the deployed service. If it's an issue with Azure AD, then you would simply need to initiate a ticket to the University's ticketing system including any applicable information. In no case would you be providing direct support to employees or students regarding their individual logon issues as those go to the IT HelpDesk.

QUESTION: Regarding 24/7 Monitoring. Is there an existing ticket management system for Level 1 or 2 issues to be escalated to the offeror's team? Reporting requirements?

ANSWER: Our vision is for a Network Monitoring Capability that ensures the HTTPS service is operational and that your deployed service is capable of successful communication with Azure AD. Our own monitoring system includes alarms for low disk space, high CPU usage, etc. Anything that might indicate an issue before it becomes an outage. When we are alerted to an issue, we would simply ask for a defined process to notify you of the issue.

QUESTION: The RFP states "monitor all environments with an Intrusion Detection System". Is this solution/system to be provided by the offeror? Included in cost/tech proposal? Or is this a standard system provided by the University which needs to be monitored? If so, what is the system?

ANSWER: We expect vendor to provide monitoring of the deployed service with an IDS. For example, if someone launches a brute-force attack against your service, the IDS should detect such activity and alert (and ideally stop it automatically).

QUESTION: Who is responsible for managing user provisioning, credentialing, and roles assignment within each of the application in the SSO?

ANSWER: The University will provision/deprovision/assign access to all users.

QUESTION: (Section 6) We are concerned about the timeline of 13 December 2021 to move through award, introduction, kickoff, engineering, provisioning, migration, and testing. Is 13 December 2021 the correct date to have services in place? Would the University consider a later date to ensure adequate testing?

ANSWER: We will absolutely consider a later date if needed to ensure everything is tested completely before cutting over to the new service. We do have a window between semester that would an ideal time to make the transition, but that can be discussed as needed with the awarded vendor.

QUESTION: (Appendix One, Section 3) Regarding customer references, our firm supports approximately 4 government agencies on a single unified delivery contract. May we re-use the same contract reference, but with the separate contact/agency information? Alternatively, if we are leveraging OEM capabilities, could we use an OEM (licensed partner) reference?

ANSWER: Yes

QUESTION: Has the University already considered and rejected Microsoft Azure Active Directory (Azure AD) as a managed SAML service provider solution? Or is the University open to considering a solution built on Azure AD SAML if the proposal meets the qualification requirements?

ANSWER: We would consider Azure AD SAML, but this may be an issue given that applicants must authenticate through this service and they are not licensed for Azure AD.

QUESTION: Does the University already have Microsoft subscription licensing plans that include the use of Azure AD? If so, please include the licensing levels and quantities, e.g., "Azure AD Premium Plan 1: 10,000".

Note: Azure AD entitlements are also included with Microsoft Office 365 and Microsoft 365 subscription plans.

ANSWER:

Azure AD Premium P2 – Employees - 891

Azure AD Basic for Education – Students - 11,328 (This number includes students that have graduated for up to 3 semester's prior, then they are aged off so not all are in use)

Applicants which must also authenticate through this system are not licensed for Azure AD.