UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND GLOBAL CAMPUS

DATE: October 27, 2026

TO: All Prospective Proposers

FROM: Lauren Jaber
Senior Buyer, Technology Procurement

and

Phan Truong
Senior Buyer, Technology Procurement

RE: RFP # 92337– Identity Management, Governance, and RBAC Modernization Services Addendum #2 dated 10/27/2026

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

1. Please find the RFP Question and Answer Log that provides answers to all questions received about RFP #92337 in Attachment A to this Addendum #2.

2. The following section is hereby **removed** from Section III, Article 1, 2.1 Methodologies/Approach:

   "2.1.5 Subcontractors- Include subcontractors, if any, that will be used to complete the Scope of Work."

3. The following section is hereby **added** to Section II, Scope of Work.

   2.8 Implementation Requirements. In addition to assessment, strategy, governance, and planning activities, the awarded Contractor shall be responsible for the implementation, configuration, remediation, testing, deployment, and operationalization of approved Identity and Identity Governance capabilities. Implementation activities shall include:

   2.8.1 Configuration and deployment of identity integrations between Workday, Microsoft Entra ID, Active Directory, and other approved systems.

2.8.2 Implementation of identity attribute mappings, synchronization processes, authoritative source controls, and identity lifecycle automation.

2.8.3 Remediation of identity data quality issues, including duplicate, orphaned, stale, inactive, or improperly maintained identities.

2.8.5 Configuration and implementation of Role-Based Access Control (RBAC), role mappings, role assignment processes, and governance controls.

2.8.6 Implementation of Joiner, Mover, and Leaver (JML) workflows, provisioning, deprovisioning, and access change automation.

2.8.7 Configuration of access request, approval, certification, access review, and Segregation of Duties (SoD) controls and workflows.

2.8.8 Integration and implementation of Identity Governance and Administration (IGA) capabilities, governance processes, reporting, dashboards, and compliance controls.

2.8.9 Execution of testing, validation, remediation, user acceptance testing, production deployment, and post-implementation stabilization activities.

2.8.10 Development of operational procedures, administrative documentation, training materials, and knowledge transfer necessary to support ongoing operations.

4. **Revised** Appendix A-2, C-1, C-2 and D are hereby attached and incorporated into the RFP.

5. The due date and time for the Technical Proposal is **Tuesday, November 10, 2026, on or before 10:00 AM ET**. Technical Proposals must be submitted electronically via the BidLocker link below in accordance with Section 1, Paragraph 5 of the RFP document. Late proposals cannot be accepted.

Bid Locker Link for Technical Proposal Submission
https://bidlocker.us/details/6550

6. Receipt of this addendum is to be acknowledged by completing the enclosed "Acknowledgement of Receipt of Addenda Form" and including it in the Technical Proposal.

End of Addendum #2 dated 10/27/2026

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF ADDENDA FORM

Solicitation: UMGC RFP # 92337– Identity Management, Governance, and RBAC Modernization Services

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL DUE DATE: November 10, 2026, on or before 10:00 AM ET

NAME OF PROPOSER: _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF ADDENDA

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

Addendum No. 1 dated 10/22/2026

Addendum No. 2 dated 10/27/2026

Addendum No. _____ dated _____

Addendum No. _____ dated _____

Addendum No. _____ dated _____

_____
Signature

_____
Name Printed

_____
Title

UMGC RFP#92337 Addendum #2: Attachment A - Question and Answer Log

Question No.	Vendor Question	UMGC Response
1	The RFP states that the Offeror must have a minimum of five (5) years of experience providing IAM, IGA, and RBAC modernization consulting and implementation services for large enterprise environments. Could you please confirm whether this is a mandatory vendor qualification?	Yes, this is mandatory.
2	Could you please clarify where the detailed qualifications, responsibilities, and experience requirements for the proposed Key Personnel, specifically the Project Manager and Technical Architect, are provided in the RFP?	See Section II - Scope of Work, paragraph 2.5. Key Personnel Requirements for the qualifications required.
3	Could you please confirm whether resumes are required only for the Project Manager and Technical Architect, or whether resumes are also required for the other proposed team roles listed in the RFP?	SECTION III. PROCUREMENT PHASES AND EVALUATION PROCESS ARTICLE 1. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS, Section 2.2.1 Resumes are not required, however the vendor must provide a description of minimum qualifications, including relevant education, certifications, years of experience, and experience performing similar work of the role.
4	Subcontracting. Appendix S, Item 10 states that UMGC will not consider Proposals that reflect primary and secondary service providers or a prime/subcontractor relationship. Section III, Article 1, Item 2.1.5 directs Offerors to identify subcontractors used to complete the Scope of Work, and Appendix C-1 permits subcontracting with UMGC's prior written approval. Please confirm which provision governs at the proposal stage, and whether an Offeror may propose named subcontractors for specific platform expertise without being deemed non-responsive.	UMGC will not consider Proposals that reflect primary and secondary service providers or a prime/subcontractor relationship.
5	Key Personnel titles. Section II, Item 2.5 identifies the Key Personnel as the Project Manager and the Technical Lead. Section III, Article 1, Item 2.2.2 identifies them as the Project Manager and the Technical Architect. Please confirm the correct titles so that resumes are submitted under the intended designations	The correct Key Personnel titles for this solicitation are Project Manager and Technical Architect. The reference to "Technical Lead" in Section II, Item 2.5 was a typographical error. Offerors should submit resumes for the Project Manager and Technical Architect positions in accordance with Section III, Article 1, Item 2.2.2.
6	Project team roles. Section III, Article 1, Item 2.2.1 lists a Solution Architect, IAM Technical SME, Azure/Entra SME, PeopleSoft SME, and Workday SME. Please confirm whether these must be five distinct individuals, or whether a single individual may fill more than one role where qualifications support it.	It is preferred to have five distinct individuals fill the identified project roles. However, UMGC will accept proposed personnel who meet the qualifications for more than one role, provided that no individual is assigned to more than two roles.
7	Incomplete requirement. Section II, Item 2.1.1.11 appears as a numbered item with no accompanying text. Please clarify the intended requirement or confirm that the item may be disregarded.	The reference to Section II, Item 2.1.1.11 is a typographical error. There is no requirement associated with Item 2.1.1.11, and Offerors may disregard this reference. No additional requirement was intended.
8	Insurance limits. Section III, Article 1, Item 2.7 requires a current Certificate of Insurance evidencing Commercial General Liability, Workers' Compensation, Automobile Liability, and Professional Liability coverage. The Insurance section of Appendix C-1 lists limits as "Omitted." Please provide the minimum coverage limits UMGC requires for each line.	UMGC intentionally did not prescribe minimum coverage limits for the insurance coverages referenced in Section III, Article 1, Item 2.7. Consistent with Appendix C-1, Section 9, Offerors are responsible for determining and maintaining insurance coverage and limits appropriate for the services they propose to provide under the Contract. Accordingly, UMGC leaves the determination of coverage limits to the Offeror's professional judgment, risk assessment, and applicable law.

9	Contract term and value. Section I, Item 7 states the Contract shall be in effect for one year with an anticipated start of February 8, 2027. Appendix C-1 establishes a not-to-exceed amount of $1,000,000. Please confirm there are no option or renewal periods contemplated, and that the $1,000,000 ceiling applies to the single one-year term.	The Contract shall be in effect for one (1) year, with an anticipated start date on or about February 8, 2027, unless otherwise extended, expired, or terminated pursuant to the Contract. While the Contract term is one year, UMGC currently anticipates that the engagement and associated deliverables will be completed in approximately five (5) months no later than June 30, 2027. The Contract term may be shortened or extended as necessary to accommodate expedited services, project delays, schedule adjustments, or other circumstances affecting completion of the required services. The not-to-exceed (NTE) amount of $1,000,000 represents the maximum contractual value authorized under the Contract and should not be construed as the budget for this project. The NTE amount is established to provide contractual flexibility should additional services, extensions, or related project needs arise during contract performance.
10	Application scope. Section II, Item 2.3 addresses third-party and critical applications. To support consistent level of effort estimates across Offerors, please provide the approximate number of in-scope applications, or a range, that UMGC expects to be assessed.	10 critical applications are in scope for assessment.
11	Current state documentation. Please confirm whether existing identity architecture documentation, PeopleSoft persona and identity flag inventories, or prior IAM assessments will be made available to the awarded Contractor at project start.	Yes, existing identity architecture documentation, PeopleSoft persona and identity flag inventories, and prior IAM assessments will be made available to the awarded vendor at the start of the project.
12	Submission channel. Section I, Item 5.1 directs that Technical Proposals be uploaded to Bid Locker at https://bidlocker.us/details/6550. The solicitation is also posted on eMMA under ID BPM059176 with an active response and submission function. Please confirm that Bid Locker is the sole channel for Technical Proposal submission, and whether any response is also required through eMMA.	Technical Proposals must be submitted through Bid Locker only, as specified in Section I, Item 5.1 of the solicitation. Offerors are not required to submit their Technical Proposals through eMMA. The eMMA posting is provided for notice and solicitation access purposes; Bid Locker is the designated submission platform for proposal receipt.
13	Firm experience. Section III, Article 1, Item 2.3 requires a minimum of five years of firm experience providing IAM, IGA, and RBAC modernization consulting and implementation services for large enterprise environments. Please confirm whether an Offeror may satisfy this requirement through the documented experience of its proposed Key Personnel and project team, including experience gained at prior employers, or whether the five years must be held by the Offeror as a legal entity. Relatedly, please confirm whether the three project examples required under Item 2.4 must be contracts held by the Offeror entity, or whether engagements delivered by proposed Key Personnel under a prior employer may be submitted with that relationship disclosed.	The minimum five (5) years of experience requirement under Section III, Article 1, Item 2.3 must be demonstrated by the Offeror firm itself and may not be satisfied through the cumulative experience of proposed Key Personnel or project team members. The requirement is intended to reflect the Offeror's organizational experience as a firm providing IAM, IGA, and RBAC modernization consulting and implementation services. Similarly, the project examples required under Item 2.4 should be contracts or engagements performed by the Offeror firm. Project experience performed solely by proposed personnel under a prior employer may not be submitted to satisfy this requirement.
14	The RFP requires a minimum of five years of experience providing IAM, IGA, and RBAC modernization consulting and implementation services. Would UMGC consider relevant experience acquired by proposed Key Personnel and technical SMEs while employed by other organizations toward satisfying this requirement, or must the five years of experience be attributable directly to the Offeror as a contracting entity?	See response to Question 13.
15	a. May an Offeror include relevant projects performed by proposed Key Personnel at previous employers, clearly distinguishing those experiences from the Offeror's corporate past performance? b. Will UMGC accept projects performed by the Offeror as a subcontractor, where the Offeror can clearly demonstrate its responsibilities and deliverables? c. May distinct projects or technical initiatives performed under one long-term contract be submitted as separate project examples, provided each has documented scope, deliverables, outcomes, and verifiable references?	a. See response to Question 13. b. See response to Question 4. c. Yes. Distinct projects or technical initiatives performed under a single long-term contract may be submitted as separate project examples, provided each project represents a separate and identifiable engagement with its own scope, objectives, deliverables, outcomes, timeline, and client reference. The Offeror must clearly distinguish each project and demonstrate its relevance to the requirements of this RFP. UMGC reserves the right to determine whether submitted examples constitute separate projects and adequately demonstrate the firm's experience.

16	Section III requires Offerors to identify subcontractors, if any, while Appendix S indicates that proposals reflecting a prime/subcontractor relationship will not be considered. Would UMGC clarify whether an Offeror may use specialized subcontractors to provide IAM, IGA, Workday, Microsoft Entra, or PeopleSoft technical expertise while retaining full contractual responsibility for project performance?	See the response to Question 4. The reference to subcontractors in Section III was a typographical error. UMGC will not consider proposals that include a prime contractor/subcontractor relationship. Accordingly, Offerors may not use subcontractors to satisfy solicitation requirements or provide specialized IAM, IGA, Workday, Microsoft Entra, PeopleSoft, or other technical expertise under this engagement. All required services and qualifications must be provided directly by the Offeror firm.
17	The RFP identifies several technical roles, including Solution Architect, IAM SME, Azure/Entra SME, PeopleSoft SME, and Workday SME. May appropriately qualified individuals fulfill multiple technical roles, provided the proposed staffing plan demonstrates sufficient qualifications, availability, and capacity to perform the required services?	See response to Question 6.
18	The RFP emphasizes assessments, governance frameworks, architectural design, modernization plans, and migration roadmaps. Would UMGC confirm whether the engagement is primarily intended to develop the strategies, architectures, and implementation plans, or whether the selected contractor will also be responsible for executing system configurations, identity integrations, RBAC implementations, and production migrations during the contract period?	The awarded firm will be responsible for both developing the strategies, architectures, and implementation plans and executing the required system configurations, identity integrations, RBAC implementations, and production migrations.
19	To support an accurate project approach, resource plan, and schedule, could UMGC provide approximate quantities for: a. Active identities and user accounts within the Workday and Microsoft Entra environments; b. Third-party and critical applications requiring RBAC/IGA assessment or alignment; and c. PeopleSoft identity provisioning integrations or dependencies expected to be assessed?	a. Approximate quantities for active identities and user accounts within the Workday and Microsoft Entra environments will be provided to the awarded Contractor at project start. b. Approximately 10 critical applications will be in scope for RBAC/IGA assessment or alignment. c. Yes, PeopleSoft identity provisioning integrations and dependencies are expected to be assessed.
20	Does UMGC anticipate that all identified deliverables will be completed within the initial one-year contract period? Are there established target milestones, phased deliverable deadlines, or dependencies that Offerors should incorporate into their proposed project schedules?	See response to Question 9.
21	Appendix D references RFP #92303, Custom AI-Enabled Content Development, rather than RFP #92337. Would UMGC confirm whether Appendix D is applicable to this solicitation or whether a corrected appendix will be issued?	The reference to RFP #92303 in the footer of Appendix D is a typographical error. Appendix D is updated and provided along with Addendum One.
22	Section 2.3.4 requires Offerors without a current SOC 2 Type II report to describe alternative security certifications, attestations, or independent assessments used to demonstrate the effectiveness of their information security controls. Would UMGC clarify which alternative forms of security assurance are acceptable? Specifically, would documented organizational security policies and controls aligned with NIST CSF, supported by relevant cybersecurity qualifications of proposed personnel, be considered sufficient, or does UMGC require an independent third-party assessment or organizational certification?	The SOC 2 Type II and/or full Higher Education Community Vendor Assessment Toolkit (HECVAT v4.1.6) are the preferred versions for submission. As stated in Section 2, Scope of Work, Paragraph 2.3.4. Offerors shall disclose whether they possess a current SOC 2 Type II report and identify the audit period covered. Offerors that do not maintain a SOC 2 Type II report shall describe alternative security certifications, attestations, or independent assessments used to demonstrate the effectiveness of their information security controls. As stated in Section 2 Scope of Work, Paragraph 2.3.5., submission of a HECVAT is requested "if available." While UMGC recognizes that not all Offerors may have a current HECVAT, Offerors are encouraged to submit a HECVAT or comparable security assessment documentation if available. ISO27001 or documented organizational security policies aligned with NIST CSF will suffice along with a full HECVAT Version 4.1.6.
23	Would UMGC please clarify whether a Prime/Subcontractor (teaming) relationship is acceptable for Offerors responding to this solicitation? Specifically: Appendix S, paragraph 10 states that UMGC will not consider Proposals that reflect a prime/subcontractor relationship. However, Section III, Article 1, Section 2.1.5 asks Offerors to identify subcontractors, and Appendix S, paragraph 11 references principal subcontractors.	See response to Question 4.

24	Could UMGC clarify whether this RFP has any applicable US citizenship and/or clearance requirements that must be considered?	The Contract Affidavit in Appendix C is required by the awarded firm and requires Contractors to certify that they are not identified on the list created by the Maryland Board of Public Works as a person engaging in investment activities in Iran as described in §17-702 of State Finance & Procurement and that they are not engaging in investment activities in Iran as described in State Finance & Procurement Article, §17-702. At this time, UMGC has not established any other U.S. citizenship or security clearance requirements applicable to this solicitation. Offerors should respond in accordance with the requirements set forth in the RFP. If UMGC determines that any additional requirements are necessary, they will be communicated to all prospective offerors through a formal amendment or addendum to the solicitation.
25	Is there an incumbent currently performing this work? And if so, can the incumbent name and contract ID be shared?	This is not required for the preparation or submission of a Technical Proposal. Vendors should base their responses on the requirements and information provided in the RFP and any subsequent addenda.
26	Has UMGC performed an independent cost estimate (ICE) to approximate the total number of hours and dollars that may be required to perform this scope of work? And if so, can this information be shared prior to the (technical) proposal due date?	UMGC has not performed an independent cost estimate for the services.
27	Would UMGC provide approximate counts of identities by population (staff, faculty including adjuncts, students, alumni, and affiliates/contractors), and the approximate number of third-party applications in scope for Section 2.3, including how many are considered critical? If so, can this information be provided before the Technical Proposal due date?	a. Approximate quantities for active identities and user accounts within the Workday and Microsoft Entra environments will be provided to the awarded vendor at project start. b. Approximately 10 critical applications will be in scope for RBAC/IGA assessment or alignment.
28	Would UMGC please clarify whether scope is limited to assessment, design, and planning — or is there an expectation that the Contractor also performs remediation activities, such as Section 2.1.1.9 (Workday and Entra mismatch identification and gap remediation) and Section 2.1.1.10 (unused identity clean-up)?	Yes, the engagement includes the expectation that the awarded firm will perform remediation activities, including Workday and Microsoft Entra mismatch identification and gap remediation, as well as unused identity cleanup.
29	Would UMGC please specify which PeopleSoft modules are currently in use (for example: Campus Solutions or HCM), and where do student and worker identities originate today? Also, please describe how identity data is currently exchanged between PeopleSoft, Workday, Active Directory, and Microsoft Entra ID.	PeopleSoft Campus Solutions is currently in use. The scope is focused on worker identities, and additional details regarding identity origination and data exchanges between PeopleSoft, Workday, Active Directory, and Microsoft Entra ID will be provided to the awarded firm at project start.
30	Is it permissible for an Offeror to use project examples under Section 2.4 that describe experience the Offeror and/or subcontractor/teaming partner performed in its role as a subcontractor to another firm?	See response to Question 13.
31	Is it permissible for an Offeror to use project examples under Section 2.4 that include, or reference, work performed by proposed team member(s)?	See response to Question 13.
32	How is Workday security currently mapped or synced to Microsoft Entra ID groups today, and where do those role mappings break down?	Detailed information regarding the current mapping or synchronization of Workday security roles to Microsoft Entra ID groups, including identified role-mapping gaps, will be provided to the awarded vendor.
33	How do organization codes and job profiles in Workday feed into your current role assignments across third-party applications?	This information will be provided to the awarded vendor.
34	Has UMGC already started defining enterprise roles, or will the awarded contractor be building the Role-Based Access Control (RBAC) taxonomy entirely from scratch?	Foundational information will be made available to the awarded vendor, who will use it as the basis for developing and implementing the enterprise RBAC taxonomy.
35	What is the target timeline for cutting over inbound provisioning completely to Workday and Microsoft Entra ID?	The target cutover timeline will depend on the implementation requirements and dependencies identified.
36	What level of formalized identity governance and access control policies exist today, and how much of your current Joiner-Mover-Leaver (JML) lifecycle management is handled through documented automated policy versus manual ad-hoc intervention?	Automation is in place; however, manual, ad hoc intervention is required in certain circumstances.

37	Technology and Product Strategy: While the RFP focuses on developing a strategic framework, does UMGC have a preference for using a dedicated IGA platform versus building custom processes on top of existing platforms like Microsoft Entra ID Premium?	UMGC currently utilizes Microsoft Entra ID and is not seeking recommendations for a new or replacement IGA platform as part of this engagement. Consistent with the Scope of Work, the focus of this effort is on establishing and maturing UMGC's IGA governance framework and identity lifecycle management practices. As outlined in Section II, Scope of Work, 2.2 IGA Governance and Identity Lifecycle Management Support, Section 2.2.1.3, the awarded vendor is expected to define an IGA governance and operating model, including roles, responsibilities, decision rights, and escalation paths. Recommendations from the awarded vendor should therefore focus on optimizing governance, processes, and operating practices within UMGC's existing technology environment.
38	Technology and Product Strategy: Section 5.1 states UMGC is responsible for procuring software. Is the university open to recommendations for a commercial IGA platform as a potential outcome of this strategic engagement?	See response to Question 37.
39	Technology and Product Strategy: Could you please provide a high-level estimate of the number of third-party applications that will be in scope for IGA and RBAC alignment (e.g., <50, 50-100, 100+)?	10 critical applications will be in scope.
40	Scope and Dependencies: Can you elaborate on the nature and complexity of the current PeopleSoft dependencies? Are they primarily for provisioning, or do they extend into other areas like authentication or custom workflows?	This information will be provided to the awarded vendor.
41	Scope and Dependencies: Are the required Subject Matter Experts for Workday and PeopleSoft (as mentioned in section 2.2.1) available to the selected vendor, or is the vendor expected to provide all personnel?	Offerors are expected to provide all personnel necessary to perform the services described in the RFP, including the required project roles and expertise identified in Section 2.2.1 and 2.2.2. Offerors should clearly identify their proposed staffing approach and any assumptions regarding UMGC resource participation in accordance with Section III, Article 1, Sections 2.1.3, 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 of the RFP. UMGC owners of the services in 2.2.1 will be available for consult.
42	Project and Commercials: The RFP is for a one-year contract. Is this engagement expected to be a full-time effort for the key personnel during that year, or is it a part-time advisory role?	The RFP does not prescribe whether the engagement must be staffed as a full-time or part-time effort for any proposed Key Personnel. Offerors are responsible for proposing the staffing approach, level of effort, and resource allocation they believe are necessary to successfully perform the required services and deliver all contract requirements within the anticipated period of performance. UMGC will evaluate the proposed approach based on the Offeror's demonstrated ability to meet the objectives and requirements of the solicitation. The proposed Key Personnel are considered named personnel. The individuals identified in the proposal for those roles are expected to remain assigned to the engagement throughout the contract period. Any proposed substitution of Key Personnel during contract performance shall be subject to UMGC's review and approval, and any replacement personnel must possess qualifications and experience that are equal to or greater than those of the originally proposed individual.
43	Project and Commercials: Does UMGC have an estimated budget for this initial one-year strategic services engagement?	See response to Question 9. UMGC has not established a specific budget for this initial one-year strategic services engagement. Offerors are responsible for determining the appropriate level of effort, staffing approach, and pricing necessary to perform the required services and should submit a proposal that reflects their recommended approach. The not-to-exceed (NTE) amount of $1,000,000 represents the maximum contractual value authorized under the Contract and should not be construed as the budget for this project. The NTE amount is established to provide contractual flexibility should additional services, extensions, or related project needs arise during contract performance. Offerors should develop their pricing based on their proposed scope, methodology, staffing, assumptions, and estimated level of effort, rather than assuming the NTE amount represents an available project budget.

44	How is Workday security currently mapped or synced to Microsoft Entra ID groups today, and where do those role mappings break down?	This information will be provided to the awarded vendor.
45	How do organization codes and job profiles in Workday feed into your current role assignments across third-party applications?	They do not feed into current role assignments across third-party applications.
46	Has UMGC already started defining enterprise roles, or will the awarded contractor be building the Role-Based Access Control (RBAC) taxonomy entirely from scratch?	Foundational information will be made available to the awarded vendor, who will use it as the basis for developing and implementing the enterprise RBAC taxonomy.
47	What is the target timeline for cutting over inbound provisioning completely to Workday and Microsoft Entra ID?	The target cutover timeline will depend on the implementation requirements and dependencies identified.
48	What level of formalized identity governance and access control policies exist today, and how much of your current Joiner-Mover-Leaver (JML) lifecycle management is handled through documented automated policy versus manual ad-hoc intervention?	Automation is in place; however, manual, ad hoc intervention is required in certain circumstances.
49	Section 2.7 requires a current Certificate of Insurance for Commercial General Liability, Workers' Compensation, Automobile Liability, and Professional Liability, but no minimum limits are stated, and Appendix C-1, Section 10.23.1 is marked 'Omitted.' What minimum limits apply, and must the certificate name UMGC as additional insured at the proposal stage or only at contract execution?	See response to Question 8.
50	Section 2.1.3 requires all tasks to be provided with resources designated by title and estimated level of effort. Does this apply only to UMGC staff, or also to the Contractor's staff? If contractor hours are expected, would hours alone (without rates) be considered pricing information under Section I, 5.1?	Section 2.1.3 applies only to UMGC staff.
51	For the Firm Profile minimum of five years of IAM, IGA, and RBAC modernization experience, may the offeror count experience from its proposed subcontractors (if allowed) or from key personnel's prior employment, or must the five years belong to the offering firm itself?	See response to Question 13.
52	Section II, 2.1.1.11 is numbered but blank, and 2.5.1.5 and 2.5.1.6 contain identical text. Were any scope activities omitted from either section?	See the response to Question 7 regarding Section II, Item 2.1.1.11. The reference to Item 2.1.1.11 is a typographical error and may be disregarded. With respect to Sections 2.5.1.5 and 2.5.1.6, the identical text is also the result of a typographical error. The provisions are duplicative, and no scope activities were omitted from either section. Offerors should interpret the duplicated language as a single requirement.
53	Section 2.1.2 asks for a timeline to accomplish all deliverables 'by the project completion date.' Is the project completion date the end of the one-year contract term (approximately February 2028), or is an earlier completion expected?	See response to Question 9.
54	Section III, Article 1, 1.2 requires corporate proposals to be signed by an officer and attested by the corporate secretary or an assistant corporate secretary. Which documents require the attestation (the transmittal letter, the affidavits, or all signed forms), and are electronic signatures acceptable?	The Transmittal Letter required by Section III, Article 1, Item 1.1 must be signed by an individual authorized to bind the Offeror to all statements contained in the Proposal. Pursuant to Section III, Article 1, Item 1.2, if the Proposal is submitted by a corporation, the Proposal shall be signed by an officer and attested by the Corporate Secretary or an Assistant Corporate Secretary. If the Proposal is not signed by an officer, the Offeror must provide appropriate documentation demonstrating the signatory's authority to bind the corporation, as specified in the RFP. All other required forms, certifications, and affidavits should be executed by an individual with authority to bind the Offeror, consistent with the requirements of the applicable form and Section III, Article 1, Item 1.2. Electronic signatures are acceptable for all proposal documents and forms.

55	Are there page limits, font or formatting requirements, a preferred file format, or a maximum file size for the Technical Proposal? Should it be uploaded as a single file or as separate files for each criterion and form?	There are no page limits, font requirements, formatting requirements, or prescribed file formats for the Technical Proposal. Clear, concise, yet detailed responses to the technical criteria below are to be provided in the Technical Proposal. Standard sales material may be provided but must be attached as an appendix rather than included within the body of the Proposal. Offerors should be aware that Bid Locker imposes a maximum file size limit of approximately 1.5 GB per file. Multiple files may be uploaded if necessary. Offerors may submit their proposals as a single file or as multiple files organized by evaluation criterion, section, or form, at the Offeror's discretion, provided all required proposal components are submitted through Bid Locker by the proposal due date and time. All submitted files should be in industry-standard formats that are readily accessible and commonly used for business and procurement purposes (e.g., PDF, Microsoft Word, Microsoft Excel). Offerors are responsible for ensuring that submitted files can be opened, reviewed, and evaluated by UMGC without the need for specialized or proprietary software.
56	Appendix A-2, Sections I and J, state financial disclosure and political contribution thresholds of $100,000 and $10,000 (citing Article 33, Sections 30-1 through 30-4), while Appendix C-1, Sections 10.15 and 10.16, state $200,000 thresholds (citing Election Law Sections 14-101 through 14-108). Which thresholds and citations govern?	See revised Appendix A-2, C-1, C-2 incorporated in the RFP document per Addendum One.
57	Appendix C-1, Section 10.25.6 refers to 'this Section 31,' which does not exist, and Section 1.1 cites 'Section 2901, Md. State Fin and Proc. Code Ann.' Please confirm the intended references (likely Section 10.25 for the first).	The reference to “this Section 31” in Appendix C-1, Section 10.25.6 is a typographical error. The reference should read “this Section 10.25.” The reference in Section 1.1 stating, “This Contract is subject to Section 2-901, Md. State Fin. & Proc. Code Ann.” is correct as written and requires no revision.
58	If an offeror provides a HECVAT under Section 2.3.5, which version is acceptable, and will the absence of a HECVAT affect evaluation?	See response to Question 22.
59	Section II, 1 (Purpose/Description) states that unused or stale identities remain in UMGC’s environment, and Section II, 2.1.1.4 and 2.1.1.10 ask the Contractor to identify unused, stale, orphaned, or improperly maintained identities and to perform unused identity clean-up. Does UMGC have existing criteria for classifying an identity as stale or unused (for example, a defined period of inactivity)? If so, please provide them. If not, is the Contractor expected to propose criteria for UMGC’s review and approval as part of the identity hygiene and data remediation plan in Section II, 2.1.1.7?	Yes, the Contractor is expected to propose criteria for UMGC’s review and approval as part of the identity hygiene and data remediation plan outlined in Section II, 2.1.1.7.
60	May an offeror use its own or a subcontractor's identity discovery tooling in UMGC's environment during the engagement, with UMGC security approval? If so, should any tooling cost be in the price proposal, given RFP 5.1?	This is an RFP for Services only. No products or licenses will be procured through this RFP. Per Section II. Scope of Work, Section 5.1 "UMGC is responsible for procuring all required software products and licenses needed to deliver the functionality contained herein." Offeror should not include pricing in the Technical Proposal. See response to Question 95.
61	Are RFP 2.1.1.9 (gap remediation) and 2.1.1.10 (unused identity clean-up) advisory, or should the contractor execute changes?	Workday & Entra Mismatch Identification/Gap Remediation as well as unused identity clean up changes will be executed by awarded vendor.
62	What was intended for the blank item 2.1.1.11?	See response to Question 7.
63	Are the Key Personnel the Project Manager and Technical Lead (Section II) or Project Manager and Technical Architect (Section III)? Is the Solution Architect a separate role?	See response to Question 5.
64	Please provide approximate counts: active and inactive identities, third-party applications in scope, and PeopleSoft modules in use. Is an IGA tool already licensed?	10 critical applications are in scope. UMGC utilizes Microsoft Entra. Insights regarding identity will be provided to awarded vendor.
65	Will UMGC accept a subcontractor's project as references, and may subcontractor experience count toward the 5-year requirement?	See response to Question 4, 13, and 15.
66	Is the project completion date the end of the 12-month term? Is a page limit or font requirement intended?	See response to Question 9 and 55.

67	Which NIST CSF version and control categories apply (RFP 2.6.1.2)?	NIST CSF 2.0 applies.
68	Would the contractor assisting with this initiative precluded from the potential follow up implementation work?	No. Participation in this engagement will not, by itself, restrict an awarded firm from consideration for subsequent work.
69	May the contractor use offshore resources (staff located outside the U.S.) for part of this work?	UMGC will accept staffing models that include U.S.-based Key Personnel (Project Manager and Technical Architect) and offshore resources for other project roles identified in Section III. Procurement Phases and Evaluation Process, Article 1. Technical Proposal Requirements, Section 2.2.1. Organization Chart of the Project Team (Solution Architect, Identity and Access Management Technical Subject Matter Expert ("SME"), Azure/Entra SME, Peoplesoft SME, Workday SME). The awarded firm must be registered to do business in the State of Maryland. All proposed personnel must meet the applicable qualification requirements and maintain availability during UMGC's standard business hours (Monday – Friday, 8am – 5pm EST). If your proposal involves offshore resources outside the United States, please clearly identify this in your submission, including how you will ensure compliance with all relevant U.S. laws.
70	What are Workday and PeopleSoft each used for today (for example HR, payroll, student records, finance)? Which user groups does each system hold, and are there plans to retire PeopleSoft or any of its modules?	Workday is used as our HCM solution. Peoplesoft is used for our Student Information System. There are no plans to retire any systems.
71	Is Workday to Entra ID provisioning set up today? If not, how are employee accounts created in Entra ID (for example MIM, scripts, PeopleSoft jobs, or manually)?	Workday-to-Entra ID provisioning is currently configured and operational, though manual intervention is still required in certain circumstances.
72	Are student and non-employee identities (contractors, affiliates, guests) in scope for the lifecycle and RBAC design, or only Workday worker identities?	Workday worker identities.
73	Does UMGC have an IGA tool today, or Entra ID Governance licenses? Is evaluating or selecting an IGA tool part of this scope?	See response to Question 37.
74	Sections 2.1.1.9 and 2.1.1.10 mention remediation and clean-up. Is the contractor expected to carry out remediation in UMGC systems, or identify the issues and provide recommendations and plans for UMGC to execute?	Yes. The contractor is expected to execute remediation and clean-up activities.
75	Section II describes several outputs that are not listed in §2.7, such as the identity hygiene plan, future-state architecture, IGA roadmap, application roadmap and PeopleSoft decommissioning plan. Are these separate deliverables, or should they be included within the §2.7 deliverables?	2.7 specifically outlines IGA Roadmap (2.7.2), application roapmap (2.7.3) and we expect a PeopleSoft decom plan (2.4.1.11) for **obsolete** PeopleSoft identity flags, personas, integrations, and related technical processes.. Tracking Identity Hygiene as part of a larger document is not the same as seperate identity hygene plan. *
76	For third-party applications, §2.7.3.1 asks for an Entra ID readiness assessment, but §2.3.1 describes a full application-level review with role mapping and a roadmap. Which one reflects the expected scope?	These outputs are already included as §2.7 Project Deliverables. (2.7.1.2 - Production of Access Governance and Role Management Framework) *
77	What level of RBAC design is expected: enterprise and birthright roles with a governance framework, or detailed application-level role engineering and role mining? §2.7.1.2 says "foundational," but §2.6.1.5 asks for 100% of role requirements.	The expected scope is foundational RBAC design, including enterprise and birthright role. *
78	Does RBAC within Workday include redesigning Workday's security setup (security groups and policies), or only using Workday as the source for role attributes?	Workday RBAC is limited to role attributes and identity data; redesigning Workday security is out of scope.
79	For the PeopleSoft decoupling, is the expectation a migration strategy and plan only, or also implementation-ready technical specifications?	The scope is a migration strategy and decoupling plan. Implementation-ready technical specifications are not required.
80	Is there a target completion date or preferred phasing within the one-year contract term?	See Response to Question 9.
81	Roughly how many identities are in scope, broken down by group (students, faculty, adjuncts, staff, affiliates)?	Insights regarding identity will be provided to awarded vendor.
82	Can UMGC provide an estimate of the number of third-party and critical applications in scope? Should the contractor perform detailed RBAC and access model analysis for all of them, or only for a prioritized subset?	10 critical applications in scope. Detailed RBAC and access model analysis is expected for a prioritized subset of critical applications.
83	Can UMGC provide an estimate of the number of PeopleSoft identity attributes, flags and personas used for provisioning and access management? Does UMGC maintain documentation of the applications, integrations, workflows and scripts that depend on them?	Insights regarding identity attributes and documentation for applications, integrations, workflows, and scripts will be provided to the awarded vendor.
84	How many business units are expected to take part in workshops and sign off on deliverables?	Approximately 45 business units are expected to participate in workshops and sign off on relevant deliverables.

85	In addition to plans and frameworks, does UMGC expect future-state architectural diagrams, data flows, governance artifacts, and RACI matrices as formal deliverables?	Yes. Future-state architecture, governance artifacts, and RACI matrices are expected as part of the deliverables.
86	Appendix S §10 states that UMGC will not consider proposals that reflect a prime/subcontractor relationship. However, Section III, Article 1, §2.1.5 of the RFP asks offerors to list any subcontractors, and §10.5 of the Appendix C-1 Contract permits subcontracting with UMGC's prior written approval. Please confirm whether subcontractors are allowed under this solicitation. If they are, may subcontracted personnel fill the required project roles (Section III, Article 1, §2.2.1) or Key Personnel positions (§2.2.2)? Are independent (1099) consultants engaged and managed by the offeror considered subcontractors?	See response to Question 4.
87	Section II, §2.5 (Key Personnel Requirements) identifies the Key Personnel as the "Project Manager and the Technical Lead," while Section III, Article 1, §2.2.2 identifies them as the "Project Manager" and "Technical Architect." Section III, Article 1, §2.2.1.1 also lists a "Solution Architect" as a required project role. Please confirm the correct Key Personnel titles, and whether one individual may serve as both the Technical Architect (or Technical Lead) and the Solution Architect.	See response to Question 5.
88	Section III, Article 1, §2.9 (Acknowledgement of Review of Contract) refers to UMGC's "Professional Services Contract and Contract Affidavit." The solicitation package includes the Contract (Appendix C-1) but no Contract Affidavit. Is a Contract Affidavit required with the Technical Proposal? If so, will UMGC provide the form?	All solicitation documentation, including Appendix C-2, can be found at https://bidlocker.us/details/6550. The Contract Affidavit (C-2) is required of the awarded firm only.
89	Appendix E (Living Wage Requirements) and Appendix S §20 state that an offeror that fails to complete and submit the Living Wage Affidavit of Agreement may be deemed not responsible. However, the Affidavit is not listed among the required Technical Proposal items in Section III, Article 1, §2.1 through §2.9. Should the completed Appendix E Affidavit of Agreement be included in the Technical Proposal?	Yes, Appendix E Affidavit should be included in the Technical Proposal.
90	The footer of Appendix D (Electronic Funds Transfer Schedule) reads "UMGC RFP #92303 – Custom AI-Enabled Content Development." Please confirm that Appendix D applies to RFP #92337.	See response to Question 21.
91	Appendix S §19 refers offerors to Appendix M if an MBE subcontracting goal has been set in Section I, but Appendix M was not included in the solicitation package. Please confirm that no Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) or Veteran-Owned Small Business Enterprise (VSBE) participation goal applies to this solicitation.	There is no MBE goal associated with this RFP.
92	Section III, Article 1, §2.7 requires a Certificate of Insurance for Commercial General Liability, Workers' Compensation, Automobile Liability, and Professional Liability but does not state minimum limits, and §10.23.1 of the Appendix C-1 Contract is marked "Omitted." Please provide the minimum coverage limits UMGC requires for each of these policies.	See response to Question 8.
93	Section III, Article 1, §2.3.4 allows offerors that do not maintain a SOC 2 Type II report to describe alternative security certifications or assessments, while §11.8 of the Appendix C-1 Contract requires the Contractor to provide a SOC 2 Type 2 report, "or equivalent," annually. For an advisory engagement in which UMGC data remains in UMGC systems, will UMGC accept alternative security attestations (for example, a HECVAT, an independent assessment, or NIST-based controls documentation) as the equivalent under §11.8?	See response to Question 22.

94	In Section II (Scope of Work), §2.1.1.11 is blank, and §2.5.1.5 and §2.5.1.6 are identical. Is any scope missing from these sections? In addition, several Section II activities produce outputs that are not listed as Deliverables in §2.7 (Project Deliverables), including the identity hygiene and data remediation plan (§2.1.1.7), the future-state originating identity provider architecture (§2.1.1.8), the IGA implementation roadmap (§2.2.1.8), the application alignment roadmap (§2.3.1.10), the PeopleSoft decommissioning plan (§2.4.1.11), and the IAM maturity assessments referenced in §2.6.1.1. Should these be treated as separate formal Deliverables subject to acceptance, or as components of the §2.7 Deliverables? Similarly, should Deliverable §2.7.3.1 (assessment of Microsoft Entra ID readiness) include the full application assessment, role mapping, and roadmap activities described in §2.3.1?	See response to Question 52 regarding §2.1.1.11, §2.5.1.5 and §2.5.1.6. The reference to Item 2.1.1.11 and §2.5.1.5 and §2.5.1.6 is a typographical error and may be disregarded. Yes, the expectation is the Vendor shall produce an identity hygiene and data remediation plan (§2.1.1.7), recommend a the future-state originating identity provider architecture (§2.1.1.8), produce the IGA implementation roadmap (§2.2.1.8), produce the application alignment roadmap (§2.3.1.10), produce the decommissioning plan for obsolete PeopleSoft identity flags, personas, integrations, and related technical processes. (§2.4.1.11), and produce the IAM maturity assessments (§2.6.1.1) conducted. These shall be considered components of §2.7 Deliverables. Yes, §2.7.3.1 is the Microsoft EntraID assessment of current state readiness shall include the full application assessement, role mapping and roadmap activities within EntraID. The focus will be on our 10 critical applications.
95	Section III, Article 3 states that Price Proposal instructions will be issued by addendum. To help offerors frame the assumptions and schedule in the Technical Proposal, can UMGC indicate whether the Price Proposal will be fixed-price by deliverable, time-and-materials by labor category, or another structure? Should offerors assume that all Deliverables will be completed within the one-year contract term stated in Section I, §7?	Offerors should prepare their Technical Proposals based on the Scope of Work provided in the RFP and should not include Price Proposal assumptions in the Technical Proposal. No pricing information is to be provided in the Technical Proposal submittal. Per Section III. PROCUREMENT PHASES AND EVALUATION PROCESS, ARTICLE 3. PRICE PROPOSALS 1. Submission. Price Proposals will be requested, via addendum, after the completion of technical evaluation. Price Proposals will only be requested from Offerors who remain shortlisted following the Technical Evaluation. See Response to Question 9.
96	Does UMGC have a preferred sequence or priority for the Deliverables listed in Section II, §2.7 (for example, completing identity hygiene and organization code work before RBAC design, or starting inbound provisioning planning early in the contract term)?	It would be preferred to understand which elements are needed to support sequential steps.
97	What is the current state of identity data across Workday, Microsoft Entra ID, Active Directory, and any other identity repositories? To help offerors size the effort described in Section II, §2.1 through §2.4, can UMGC share approximate figures for: (a) active identities in each repository by population (staff, faculty, adjuncts, students, contractors, guests); (b) the number of third-party applications in scope for RBAC alignment under §2.3, and how many require in-depth assessment versus inventory only; (c) the approximate number of PeopleSoft identity flags and personas in use; (d) the number of business units expected to participate in workshops and deliverable sign-off under §2.6.1.4; and (e) known duplicate or orphaned accounts, data quality issues, and synchronization failures? Can UMGC also provide any existing reconciliation reports?	Detailed identity repository metrics, application inventories, and PeopleSoft identity attribute information will be provided to the awarded contractor during the discovery and assessment phases.
98	Section II, §6.1 states that all project activities will be conducted remotely and that onsite presence is not required, but the solicitation does not address work performed outside the United States. May any Contractor personnel, or any work performed under the contract (including access to UMGC systems or data), be located outside the United States? If so, what restrictions apply to accessing UMGC data or systems from outside the United States?	See response to Question 69.
99	Is the engagement limited to advisory services and roadmap development, or does UMGC also expect implementation? Section II, §2.1.1.9 (Workday & Entra mismatch identification and gap remediation), §2.1.1.10 (unused identity clean-up), and Deliverable §2.7.1.2 ("Foundational Design Build Framework/Plan of RBAC within Workday & Entra") could be read as requiring hands-on configuration or data changes in UMGC systems, while §1.1 of the Appendix C-1 Contract describes "strategic advisory and technical consulting services." Please confirm whether the Contractor is expected to (a) provide recommendations, designs, and plans that UMGC staff carry out, or (b) perform configuration, data remediation, or account clean-up directly in UMGC systems. If (b), which systems are involved and what change-management process applies? Is the expected outcome a set of recommendations and implementation estimates, a working pilot, or a production-ready capability within the contract term?	The awarded vendor will perform configuration, data remediation, and account clean-up directly in UMGC systems.

100	Which identity populations are in scope for Section II, §2.1 and §2.2 (for example: staff, full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, students, applicants, alumni, contractors and contingent workers, sponsored guests, and overseas or military-affiliated populations)? For each population in scope, what is the current authoritative source system? Which lifecycle events must the future-state Identity Lifecycle Management framework (§2.2.1.5 and Deliverable §2.7.2.4) support for these populations? Specifically, should it cover pre-hire provisioning, employee transfers, manager changes, leaves of absence, rehires, contractor extensions, terminations, and emergency access changes?	Workday workers will be in scope.
101	Section II, §2.4 addresses PeopleSoft identity flags and personas. Which PeopleSoft modules currently supply these flags and personas (for example, Campus Solutions, HCM, or Financials), and how deeply are identity provisioning and lifecycle processes tied to PeopleSoft? Which PeopleSoft identity flags, personas, business rules, interfaces, or provisioning workflows do downstream systems currently use? Is PeopleSoft being retired or replaced, and if so, on what timeline, or will it continue to support other business functions after identity provisioning is migrated? Is there a target date for removing PeopleSoft identity dependencies? In the target state, what will be the authoritative system of record for student identities?	PeopleSoft identity attributes, personas, and dependencies will be assessed during discovery. Relevant documentation and system information will be provided to the awarded vendor.
102	When the RFP refers to "Entra" (for example, in Section II, Deliverables §2.7.1.2 and §2.7.3.1), does UMGC mean the Microsoft Entra ID Governance suite? Has UMGC selected a target IGA platform (for example, Microsoft Entra ID Governance or a third-party IGA product), or is technology selection or a platform recommendation expected as part of this scope? Which Microsoft Entra license tiers does UMGC currently hold (Entra ID P1, Entra ID P2, and/or Entra ID Governance)?	See response to Question 37. Current licensing details will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery and assessment activities.
103	Section II, Deliverable §2.7.1.2 references a foundational RBAC framework "within Workday & Entra." Does the scope include designing Workday's internal security model (security groups and domain or business process security policies), or is it limited to using Workday worker data to drive role assignments in Microsoft Entra ID and downstream applications?	The scope is limited to using Workday identity and role data to support RBAC design and role assignments. Redesign of Workday security groups and security policies is out of scope.
104	Appendix S §16 (Assistance in Drafting) prohibits a person who assisted in drafting an RFP from submitting a proposal for that procurement. Did a third party assist UMGC in developing this RFP? If so, can UMGC identify the third party so that offerors can confirm they have no conflict?	No, a third party did not assist UMGC in drafting this scope.
105	Beyond the third-party applications addressed in Section II, §2.3, does UMGC plan to provision identities to other applications that are outside the scope of this RFP?	See response to Question 39.
106	What business outcomes does UMGC expect from organization code modernization (Section II, §2.1.1.5 and Deliverable §2.7.1.1) and identity data cleanup (§2.1.1.4 and §2.1.1.7)? Are the primary drivers organizational restructuring, improved reporting, stronger access controls, automated provisioning, compliance, or a combination of these? Who at UMGC will approve changes to organization codes, identity attributes, and related business rules?	The objective is to improve identity data quality, access governance, and RBAC effectiveness. Approval of organization code, identity attribute, and business rule changes will be managed by UMGC-designated stakeholders.
107	How mature are UMGC's existing access governance and role management processes (Section II, §2.2.1.1)? Are there existing governance policies or processes that should be retained and improved? Are formal access reviews, approval workflows, role catalogs, and segregation-of-duties controls already in place, or will they need to be developed?	Current access governance and role management maturity will be assessed during discovery. The engagement includes evaluating existing controls and defining recommendations for governance, access reviews, approval workflows, role catalogs, and segregation-of-duties controls as applicable.
108	For the IGA governance and operating model (Section II, §2.2.1.3 and Deliverable §2.7.2.2), who will own enterprise roles, application roles, access approvals, and access certification decisions?	Ownership and decision authorities are to be defined as part of the IGA governance and operating model deliverable and approved by UMGC-designated stakeholders.
109	Section II, §2.6.1.2 requires guidance to align with NIST CSF IAM governance controls. Beyond that framework, which business risks and compliance requirements should drive the IAM program's priorities? Are there specific audit findings, regulatory obligations, sensitive business functions, privileged access concerns, or segregation-of-duties conflicts that should be addressed first?	Applicable compliance requirements shall be identified during discovery and assessment activities. The awarded vendor shall align recommendations with NIST CSF and applicable UMGC security, privacy, audit, and regulatory requirements.
110	Section II, §2.3.1.8 calls for short-term approaches for applications that cannot immediately support centralized RBAC or automated provisioning. How should UMGC handle these applications? Will UMGC accept temporary manual workflows, application-specific approval processes, or compensating controls while longer-term integrations are developed? Are there applications that cannot support modern authentication, automated provisioning, or standard access governance integrations?	Applications that cannot support centralized RBAC or automated provisioning shall be addressed through documented compensating controls and future-state remediation recommendations.

111	Please confirm the engagement covers assessment, design, planning and roadmap work only. Is any configuration or implementation in scope (e.g., Entra ID Governance, JML workflows, Workday inbound provisioning)?	Configuration and implementation are considered in-scope, including Workday & Entra mismatch identification/gap remediation as well as RBAC architecture and role engineering.
112	Deliverable 2.7.1.2 says 'Foundational Design Build Framework/Plan of RBAC'. Does 'Build' mean building roles in Workday and Entra, or only a design and build plan?	This will relate to building roles in Workday and Entra including RBAC architecture and role engineering.
113	Should the contractor carry out the Workday/Entra mismatch remediation and unused identity clean-up, or only identify and recommend actions?	The awarded vendor shall identify and remediate Workday & Entra Mismatch/Gap Remediation as well as unused identity clean up changes.
114	About how many identities are in scope, split by employees, faculty, students, contractors and alumni?	Identity population counts will be provided to the awarded contractor during the discovery phase.
115	Are student identities in scope, or only workforce identities?	Only Workforce identities.
116	How many third-party and critical applications are expected to be assessed for RBAC alignment? Is there an existing application inventory?	An application inventory will be provided to the awarded contractor. Application scope and assessment requirements will be validated during discovery.
117	What is the current Microsoft Entra licensing (Entra ID P1, P2, Entra ID Governance)?	Current Microsoft Entra licensing information will be provided to the awarded contractor during the discovery phase.
118	Is Workday-to-Entra inbound provisioning in place today, fully or partly? Is on-premises Active Directory still used, and how is it synchronised?	Current-state Workday-to-Entra provisioning and Active Directory integration will be assessed for improvement during discovery. Relevant architecture, synchronization, and configuration details will be provided to the awarded contractor.
119	Which PeopleSoft modules hold the identity flags and personas: Campus Solutions, HCM, or both?	PeopleSoft modules, identity flags, and persona assignments are within scope for assessment and will be validated during discovery.
120	Is an IGA tool in use or planned? Are there existing role models or access review processes?	See response to Question 37.
121	Can the vendor deliver the required services remotely through a hybrid or offshore delivery model?	See response to Question 69.
122	Is the UMGC currently using any service providers that are assisting in performing the requested services? If so, who are these providers?	See response to Question 25.
123	Can the UMGC provide any information on the budget required to support these services? (E.g., budget details)	See response to Question 9 and 43.
124	To assist with project planning and avoid duplicative effort, please identify any prior or ongoing IAM, IGA, RBAC, Workday identity, Microsoft Entra identity, or PeopleSoft identity modernization initiatives that may provide inputs to the selected contractor. Please indicate whether any assessments, roadmaps, inventories, architecture documentation, attribute mappings, integration inventories, or recommendations will be available for review.	UMGC will provide available assessments, roadmaps, inventories, architecture documentation, and related artifacts to the awarded vendor for review and consideration during discovery.
125	The RFP requests information regarding subcontractors, while Appendix S appears to state that UMGC will not consider proposals reflecting a prime/subcontractor relationship. Please clarify whether subcontractors or teaming partners may be included as part of an integrated delivery team and, if so, whether any restrictions apply to their staffing, qualifications, workshare, or responsibility for deliverables.	See response to Question 4.
126	To assist offerors in proposing an appropriately sized team and level of effort, can UMGC provide an anticipated budget range, independent estimate, not-to-exceed value, or expected funding ceiling for this engagement?	See response to Question 9 and 43.
127	Does the five-year IAM/IGA/RBAC modernization experience requirement apply solely to the prime contractor, or may qualifying experience of named subcontractors or teaming partners be considered?	See response to Question 13 and 16.
128	Does UMGC anticipate a fixed-price, time-and-materials, or deliverable-based contract, and will the subsequent pricing addendum establish a required pricing structure?	See response to Question 95.
129	May the three required project references include projects completed by proposed subcontractors or individual key personnel, or must they represent contracts performed directly by the prime contractor?	See response to Question 13 and 16.
130	Where a prime contractor does not maintain a SOC 2 Type II report, may it submit a current report from a proposed technology or hosting partner, or should it provide only its own alternative security attestations?	See response to Question 22.

131	Does UMGC expect all assessments, frameworks, and migration plans to be completed within the one-year contract term beginning approximately February 8, 2027, or is there a shorter target project completion date?	See response to Question 9.
132	What level of participation and estimated availability can UMGC commit from Workday, Entra, PeopleSoft, application owners, security, and business-unit representatives?	UMGC will provide access to required stakeholders for discovery, workshops, and deliverable validation.
133	Must the five technical roles identified in §2.2.1 be staffed by separate individuals, or may qualified individuals fulfill multiple roles? Are minimum FTE commitments required?	See response to Question 6. The RFP does not establish minimum FTE commitments for these roles. Shortlisted Offerors following Discussion Sessions are expected to clearly identify the proposed level of effort, resource allocation, and staffing assumptions in the Price Proposal. UMGC will evaluate the proposed approach based on the Offeror's demonstrated ability to meet the requirements of the solicitation.
134	Are the Project Manager and Technical Architect expected to be assigned full-time for the engagement, or may they be staffed according to project phases and workload?	The RFP does not require the Project Manager or Technical Architect to be assigned on a full-time basis. Offerors may staff these roles in a manner they deem appropriate based on their proposed approach, project phases, workload, and overall methodology. Offerors are expected to clearly identify the proposed level of effort, resource allocation, and staffing assumptions in their Price Proposal. UMGC will evaluate the proposed approach based on the Offeror's demonstrated ability to successfully perform the required services and deliver all contract requirements.
135	How many business units and stakeholder groups are expected to participate in discovery workshops, requirements validation, and deliverable approvals?	Approximately 45 business units and stakeholder groups are expected to participate in discovery, validation, and deliverable approval activities.
136	Is this engagement limited to assessment, architecture, governance frameworks, and implementation roadmaps, or is the contractor also expected to configure, develop, test, and deploy production IAM/IGA/RBAC solutions?	Assessment, architecture, governance frameworks, implementation roadmaps and configure, develop, test, and deploy IAM/IGA/RBAC solutions are all in scope.
137	How many identities/personas, active users, and identity types (employees, faculty, students, contractors, affiliates, and service accounts) are currently managed across Workday, Microsoft Entra ID, and PeopleSoft?	Identity population counts by user type and persona will be provided to the awarded contractor during the discovery phase.
138	Approximately how many third-party and critical applications are in scope for RBAC assessment and alignment? Can UMGC provide an application inventory identifying integration methods and business criticality?	An application inventory, including integration methods and business criticality, will be provided to the awarded contractor. Applications in scope for assessment will be validated during discovery.
139	Is the contractor expected to execute identity data remediation and unused-account cleanup, or to produce a remediation plan for UMGC personnel to execute?	The contractor shall perform identity data remediation and unused-account cleanup as part of the engagement.
140	Does UMGC have a preferred future-state IGA platform, or should the contractor perform a vendor-neutral assessment and recommend potential solutions?	See response to Question 37.
141	What are the current Workday, Microsoft Entra ID, Active Directory, and PeopleSoft configurations, including major integrations and existing provisioning tools?	Current Workday, Microsoft Entra ID, Active Directory, and PeopleSoft configurations, integrations, and provisioning tools are within scope. Relevant documentation will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
142	Approximately what percentage of identity provisioning currently depends on PeopleSoft flags and personas, and how many applications or processes must be evaluated for decoupling?	PeopleSoft dependencies and the number of applications and processes requiring decoupling are within scope for assessment and will be validated during discovery.
143	Will current-state identity architecture diagrams, attribute mappings, synchronization workflows, and integration inventories be made available to the selected contractor?	Current-state identity architecture diagrams, attribute mappings, synchronization workflows, integration inventories, and related documentation will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
144	Are there known identity data quality issues, audit findings, or security risks that UMGC considers mandatory remediation priorities?	Known identity data quality issues, audit findings, and security risks are within scope for assessment. The contractor shall identify, prioritize, and address remediation requirements as part of the engagement.
145	Does UMGC currently maintain an enterprise role taxonomy or role catalog, or must the contractor develop initial business and technical role definitions?	The awarded vendor shall assess existing role definitions and develop role taxonomy and role catalog recommendations as required to support the future-state RBAC framework.
146	Can UMGC provide a deliverable acceptance matrix identifying required content, acceptance criteria, approving authority, and anticipated review cycle for each deliverable in §2.7?	Deliverable acceptance criteria, review cycles, and approving authorities will be defined and communicated by UMGC during project execution.
147	How will UMGC define the complete population of role-based requirements against which the 100% capture metric will be measured?	The complete population of role-based requirements shall be established through discovery, stakeholder validation, and assessment activities, and will serve as the baseline for measuring the 100% capture requirement.
148	Does UMGC expect pilot implementations or proof-of-concept demonstrations to validate the proposed RBAC and provisioning architecture?	Yes, verification of the proposed RBAC and provisioning architecture is required from the awarded vendor.

149	What process will UMGC use to resolve conflicting stakeholder requirements or delayed sign-offs, and how will these affect deliverable acceptance and milestones?	UMGC will work collaboratively with the awarded vendor to address stakeholder questions, requirements, and approvals through the designated UMGC Project Coordinator and other appropriate stakeholders. Deliverable review and acceptance will be governed by Sections 5.1 through 5.4 of the Contract (Appendix C-1 Contract), including the applicable review, acceptance, rejection, and resubmission procedures. To the extent stakeholder decisions, approvals, or other UMGC dependencies affect project timing, UMGC and the awarded vendor will work together to address impacts to deliverables and milestones in accordance with the Contract.
150	Will UMGC please consider a two week extension on the due date, in order for the university to answer all questions, and vendors be able to incorporate answers into their responses/submittals? Thank you.	No.
151	Please confirm whether the requested services are limited to assessment, architecture, governance, roadmap, and planning deliverables, or whether the awarded contractor is also expected to perform implementation, configuration, data remediation, production cutover, and operational transition.	Yes, implementation, configuration, data remediation are in scope, for this RFP production cutover and operational transition are not in scope.
152	For “Unused Identity Clean-Up” and PeopleSoft dependency remediation, is the contractor expected to execute changes in UMGC systems, or only identify issues and provide recommendations and plans for UMGC execution?	The awarded vendor shall perform unused identity cleanup. Identify current state PeopleSoft dependency removal requirements are the only activities within scope.
153	Please provide the baseline and measurement method for the stated performance criteria, including 100% role-based requirement coverage, 100% roadmap initiative coverage, and 90% workshop action-item completion.	Final performance measurements, acceptance criteria, and project governance procedures will be established in collaboration with the awarded Contractor during project initiation, as appropriate.
154	Please provide the approximate number and types of identities in scope, including employees, faculty, students, contractors, affiliates, service accounts, privileged accounts, and other populations.	Identity population details will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
155	Please identify the Workday tenant(s), relevant modules, release/version information, worker populations, and current identity-related business processes that will be included in the assessment.	Workday tenant business process details will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
156	Please identify the Microsoft Entra tenant(s), Active Directory forest/domain environments, synchronization components, and relevant identity lifecycle or provisioning services currently in use.	Microsoft Entra tenants, Active Directory environments, synchronization components, and identity lifecycle services are within scope for assessment. Relevant information will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
157	Please describe the current originating identity provider model and data flows among PeopleSoft, Workday, Entra ID, Active Directory, integrations, and downstream applications. Is there an existing architecture diagram or data-flow document available?	Current-state identity architecture, data flows, and integration dependencies are within scope for assessment. UMGC will provide available architecture diagrams, data-flow documentation, and related artifacts to the awarded contractor during discovery.
158	How many organization-code structures are in scope, and can UMGC provide the current organization-code hierarchy, data dictionary, ownership model, and known quality issues?	Organization-code structures, hierarchies, ownership information, and known data quality issues are within scope for assessment. Relevant documentation will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
159	Please provide an inventory of third-party and critical applications, infrastructure platforms, and services in scope, including application owner, business criticality, user population, environment, and integration priority.	An application inventory, including application owners, business criticality, user populations, environments, and integration priorities, will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
160	For each in-scope application, what authentication, provisioning, deprovisioning, role, entitlement, access-review, API, SCIM, federation, or directory-integration capabilities are currently available?	Application authentication, provisioning, deprovisioning, role, entitlement, access review, and integration capabilities are within scope for assessment and will be validated during discovery.
161	Should the contractor assess every application in the inventory, or only a prioritized subset of critical applications and services? If a subset is expected, how many applications should be included in each priority tier?	The awarded vendor shall assess a prioritized subset of critical applications and services. The final application scope will be validated by UMGC during discovery.
162	Does UMGC expect the contractor to recommend and/or select a future IGA platform, or should the work assume a specific existing or planned IGA product?	See response to Question 37.
163	For applications that cannot support centralized RBAC or automated provisioning, what interim controls or manual processes does UMGC expect the contractor to design and document?	Applications that cannot support centralized RBAC or automated provisioning shall be addressed through documented compensating controls and remediation recommendations.

164	Please identify the PeopleSoft product/version, relevant modules, identity flags, persona configurations, integrations, scripts, and operational processes currently affecting provisioning and access management.	PeopleSoft product details, modules, identity attributes, personas, integrations, scripts, and provisioning dependencies are within scope for assessment and will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
165	Please provide the current Information Governance, Security, and Technology policies referenced in §II.3, including any requirements for FERPA, privacy, data classification, data residency, encryption, retention, incident reporting, or privileged access.	Per Section II. Scope of Work Section I. Data and Security Requirements. The Contractor shall adhere to UMGC's Information Governance, Security, and Technology policies outlined in this link: https://www.umgc.edu/administration/policiesand-reporting/policies/info-governance-security-technology/information-security. Relevant requirements, standards, and onboarding materials will be provided to the awarded Contractor, as appropriate, following contract award. See Appendix C-1 for contractual requirements regarding FERPA, Confidential Information and Data Retention. Offerors should develop their proposals based on generally accepted higher education, information security, privacy, and regulatory compliance practices, including applicable requirements related to FERPA, privacy, data protection, access control, encryption, incident reporting, records retention, and privileged access management. Other Publicly available UMGC policies may be accessed at: https://www.umgc.edu/administration/policies-and-reporting/policies
166	What access will UMGC provide to Workday, Entra ID, Active Directory, PeopleSoft, applications, logs, identity data, and documentation? Please specify read-only versus administrative access and whether production access is permitted.	UMGC will provide appropriate access to systems, identity data, and documentation required to support the assessment. Access levels will be determined by UMGC based on project needs and security requirements.
167	Are background checks, security training, higher-education-specific attestations, cyber insurance, data-processing agreements, or other personnel/vendor-risk requirements applicable before access is granted?	UMGC has not established a comprehensive list of such requirements as part of this solicitation. Specific requirements will be communicated to the awarded Contractor following contract award and may vary based on the nature and level of access requested. Offerors should assume that reasonable higher education, information security, privacy, and vendor risk management controls may apply and should incorporate such considerations into their proposed approach.
168	Are the Solution Architect, IAM SME, Azure/Entra SME, PeopleSoft SME, and Workday SME all mandatory staffed roles, or are they examples of capabilities that may be fulfilled by the Project Manager and Technical Architect team?	They are seperate roles from the Project Manager and Technical Architect. See response to Question 6.
169	What is UMGC's formal review and acceptance process, including review periods, number of review cycles, required sign-offs, and treatment of disputed findings or deliverables?	UMGC's review and acceptance process will be governed by Sections 5.1 through 5.4 of the Contract (Appendix C-1 Contract). UMGC will have up to thirty (30) business days following receipt of a deliverable to review and evaluate the deliverable for acceptance. If a deliverable does not satisfy the applicable requirements or acceptance criteria, UMGC may reject the deliverable and identify deficiencies in accordance with the Contract. The Contractor shall address identified deficiencies and resubmit the deliverable within the timeframes specified in the Contract. Acceptance of deliverables will be handled in accordance with the procedures set forth in Sections 5.1 through 5.4. The specific stakeholder review, approval, and sign-off process may vary depending on the deliverable and will be managed during contract performance.
170	Please confirm the initial contract term, whether extension or renewal options exist, and whether the one-year term is expected to cover all discovery, design, roadmap, and transition activities.	See response to Question 9.

171	Given the availability of mature commercial IGA platforms that provide pre-built integrations, governance workflows, compliance reporting, regulatory framework alignment, and Zero Trust support, please clarify the rationale for pursuing a services-based solution. Specifically, what requirements cannot be met through a commercial platform that may offer lower implementation costs, reduced delivery risk, and faster time-to-value? This question extends to the continued use of in-house technologies like Workday and Entra, which both require substantial professional services to extend those solutions to address full enterprise scope and coverage.	This information is not required for Offerors to provide a Technical Proposal. Offerors should prepare their Technical Proposals based on the Scope of Work provided in the RFP.
172	Since Workday and Entra both have specific environment coverage models and scalability, is it the University's intention that the proposed framework would then span all natively unsupported applications, data stores, cloud services, internally developed digital resources, etc.? And, if so, is it the University's preference that the proposed framework be an actual custom developed application, a process and integration hub, or a collective resource to define processes, controls and automations?	The awarded vendor shall define a future-state IAM and RBAC framework that addresses in-scope systems and identity use cases.
173	What is the desired interface for the processes, actions, controls, reporting, data management, etc. for the proposed framework? Will MS Entra serve as the collective management interface? And if so, how will these additional services, controls, processes be exposed and utilized by the business community or data owners?	The contractor shall define the future-state IAM governance and operating model, including processes, controls, reporting, and data management.
174	How will the framework and custom integration and control processes be managed post-production launch (product / performance stability, security vulnerabilities maintenance, environmental or coverage model extension or expansion, control-process-regulatory evolution, etc.)?	They will need to be tested and validated with the UMGC technical team prior to any production level changes.
175	The RFP states a project start date sometime around Feb 28, 2027. Is there an expected project end date? Are there business / technology requirements that carry expected usability dates?	See Response to Question 9.
176	University Digital Resource Users under management are not described in depth, nor are the populations that constitute the members of the 3rd Party requirements: Will the framework address ALL direct University Employees (full / part / temp / intern), Students, Alumni? Does the framework also extend to external academic professors, researchers, consortium members, etc.? And do you have estimates of what the proposed transaction volumes will be for JML, governance, Attestation-Review Members, Aces Request, activities? This data is key for building a scalable and extendable framework and down-stream supporting technologies.	All workday workforce populations are in scope. Identity population details and transaction volumes will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
177	Can UMGC describe the current state of its Microsoft Entra ID enterprise application inventory; specifically, whether a structured catalog of integrated applications exists, how it is maintained, and whether it is considered complete and accurate enough to serve as a baseline for third-party RBAC alignment work under Section 2.3?	Current-state Microsoft Entra application inventory and related application catalog information are within scope for evaluation. Available inventories and supporting documentation will be provided to the awarded contractor.
178	Can UMGC clarify whether there is an agreed definition of application criticality for prioritization purposes?	Yes, this will be provided to the awarded vendor.
179	Can UMGC describe the current state of documentation for PeopleSoft identity flags, persona configurations, and provisioning dependencies; specifically, whether these have been formally inventoried, and whether existing documentation is sufficient for the contractor to begin dependency tracing under Section 2.4, or whether discovery and enumeration should be treated as a first-order activity within that workstream?	This information will be provided to the awarded vendor.
180	Can UMGC identify any active or planned initiatives, including system upgrades, platform migrations, organizational changes, or application retirements that are expected to occur concurrently with this engagement and that could affect the availability of identity platforms, the stability of identity data, or the sequencing of contractor deliverables?	Known concurrent initiatives, platform changes, and organizational impacts relevant to the engagement will be communicated to the awarded contractor during discovery and project initiation.
181	Can UMGC clarify (a) the number of business units and applications expected to be onboarded to the RBAC model during this contract; (b) the expected integration depth per application, e.g., role and entitlement mapping only, Entra ID access packages and access reviews, or automated provisioning connectors; and (c) whether a target maturity level or success measures have been defined to determine when a business unit is fully onboarded?	Business unit onboarding scope, application integration depth, and success criteria will be defined and validated by UMGC during discovery and requirements validation activities.

182	Can UMGC identify the provisioning and synchronization tools currently in use to manage identity data across its identity platforms and whether the design of replacement provisioning flows or decommissioning of legacy tools falls within the scope of this engagement? Can UMGC also confirm whether Microsoft Entra ID Governance capabilities, including access packages, lifecycle workflows, and access reviews are intended as the target platform for IGA enablement, and whether the necessary licensing is already in place or is planned to be procured?	Current licensing and platform information will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery. See response to Question 37.
183	Can UMGC confirm whether each of the following is in or out of scope for this engagement: (a) expanding PIM/PAM coverage; (b) onboarding non-SSO or legacy applications to SSO; (c) shared and service account governance; (d) segregation-of-duties policy definition; (e) role-based training and change management for managers, approvers, and IT Liaisons; and (f) running access certification campaigns after go-live?	Scope applicability for these capabilities shall be assessed as part of the current-state evaluation. The contractor shall provide future-state recommendations; however all subparts a-f are not in scope for this RFP.
184	The Scope of Work references modernizing the originating identity provider model and developing an inbound provisioning migration plan. To appropriately scope the migration architecture deliverable, please confirm: what is the current technical mechanism connecting Workday to Microsoft Entra ID (e.g., Microsoft Identity Manager, Workday native SCIM-based inbound provisioning, a custom integration, or another middleware layer)? Are multiple mechanisms currently in use simultaneously?	Current Workday-to-Entra provisioning architecture and integration mechanisms are within scope. Relevant technical documentation and configuration details will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
185	Section 2.4 describes decoupling PeopleSoft identity flags, persona configurations, and provisioning dependencies from business applications and technical processes. Can UMGC please confirm which PeopleSoft modules are in scope for this workstream (e.g., HCM, Campus Solutions, Financials). Are the identity flags and persona configurations targeted for decoupling currently documented, or should offerors assume this is a discovery-from-scratch effort?	PeopleSoft modules are within the scope for this assessment. Existing documentation will be provided to the awarded contractor.
186	Section II.5.1 states UMGC procures all required software and licenses. May an Offeror propose a commercial identity discovery / governance platform as part of its approach, and would that subscription be procured by UMGC separately or through the resulting contract?	See response to Question 37.
187	Does UMGC currently own or plan to procure an IGA platform? Is tool selection within scope?	See response to Question 37.
188	Approximately how many third-party applications are in scope for Section 2.3, and how many are federated through Entra ID today?	Entra ID federation status and application inventory will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
189	What PeopleSoft modules and version are in use, and will read access to the PeopleSoft database or APIs be available for dependency analysis?	PeopleSoft module, version, and access requirements are within scope. Relevant system information to support dependency analysis will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
190	Approximately how many worker identities exist in Workday and user objects in Entra ID / Active Directory?	Worker and user identity counts are within scope for assessment and will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
191	Will Section II.4 (works for hire) apply to pre-existing Contractor or subcontractor software and methodologies, or only to deliverables created for UMGC?	Reference Appendix C-1 - Professional Services Contract, Section 4. Work Product for what constitutes Work.
192	Will subcontractor references count toward the three required references?	No. Section III. PROCUREMENT PHASES AND EVALUATION PROCESS, ARTICLE 1. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS, Paragraph 2.4. Firm Experience/References: The Offeror shall provide three (3) project examples that demonstrate the **firm's** experience performing consulting services similar in scope, complexity, and objectives to those requested under this RFP.
193	Is implementation of the Workday–Entra provisioning integration expected within the one-year term, or is the deliverable limited to design and migration planning?	No new provisioning integrations are needed between Workday-Entra for this scope, integration is already established.
194	Is the Entra ID tenant hybrid with on-premises Active Directory (Entra Connect or Cloud Sync)? If so, is AD still the authoritative source for Entra user objects, and are there multiple forests, domains, or tenants, including for UMGC Europe and UMGC Asia?	Relevant environment and configuration details will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
195	Are student, alumni, applicant, and affiliate identities in scope, or only faculty and staff? Where are student identities mastered today (PeopleSoft Campus Solutions or another system), and is a Workday Student migration planned?	Only Staff.

196	How are contingent workers, contractors, vendors, and sponsored guests sourced today? Are they created in Workday, PeopleSoft, or manually in Entra ID?	This information will be provided to the awarded vendor.
197	Are service accounts, shared accounts, and privileged or administrative accounts within scope of the identity hygiene and ownership activities?	Service accounts, shared accounts, and privileged accounts are in scope for identity hygiene, ownership validation, and governance assessment activities.
198	What does UMGC mean by "organization codes"? Where are they mastered today (PeopleSoft department IDs, Workday supervisory organizations, cost centers), approximately how many exist, and are they consumed by downstream systems for access decisions?	Relevant documentation will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
199	For Sections 2.1.1.4, 2.1.1.9, and 2.1.1.10, does UMGC expect the Contractor to execute remediation (disabling, correcting, or removing identities) in production systems during the term, or to produce remediation plans for UMGC staff to execute?	The awarded vendor shall perform identity remediation activities, including correction, disabling, and removal of identities as required.
200	Is there a target date or driver for retiring PeopleSoft identity dependencies, such as a PeopleSoft decommissioning program, a Workday phase, or an audit finding?	The target date for retiring Peoplesoft identity dependencies will be decided beyond this RFP and the work included.
201	Has UMGC completed any prior IAM assessment, RBAC design, or identity data analysis, internally or with a vendor, that will be made available to the awarded Contractor? Is there an incumbent firm supporting identity today?	See responses to Questions 11 and 25.
202	Does UMGC have a prioritized list of the "critical applications" referenced in Deliverable 2.7.3.1, and does an application inventory or CMDB exist? Approximately how many in-scope applications use local account stores rather than Entra ID?	A prioritized application inventory and critical application list will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery. Current authentication and identity store dependencies are within scope for assessment.
203	Which business units are expected to participate in workshops and sign-off under Section 2.6.1.4, and what review and sign-off turnaround can UMGC commit to for deliverables?	Approximately 45 business units and stakeholder groups are expected to participate. UMGC will provide timely review and approval support for deliverables throughout the engagement.
204	What UMGC staff will be assigned to the engagement (identity engineering, Workday, PeopleSoft, and Entra administrators), and at roughly what availability?	Required UMGC business, functional, and technical resources will be available for consult. See Response to Question 41.
205	Section 2.1.1.11 appears blank. Was content omitted?	See response to Question 7.
206	For Section 2.6.1.2, can we assume the version of NIST CSF is v2.0? Are other frameworks required (NIST SP 800-53, GLBA Safeguards Rule, FERPA)?	The awarded vendor shall align recommendations with NIST CSF and applicable UMGC security, privacy, audit, and regulatory requirements.
207	May the Contractor deploy software, collectors, or integration components within the UMGC environment, and may UMGC identity data be processed in a Contractor-hosted cloud service, subject to security review? What is UMGC's security review and approval process and typical lead time for new tools?	UMGC will provide the required system access and data necessary to support the assessment. Deployment of contractor-hosted tools or software is subject to UMGC approval and applicable security requirements.
208	Will Contractor personnel access Workday, Entra ID, and PeopleSoft from UMGC-issued devices or VDI, or from Contractor-managed devices meeting UMGC policy?	UMGC will provide the access method and security requirements during project initiation. Contractor access shall comply with UMGC security and access control policies.
209	Will read access to the Workday API or Workday reports (RaaS), Microsoft Graph, and the PeopleSoft database be granted directly to the Contractor, or will UMGC staff run extracts on the Contractor's behalf?	UMGC staff run extracts on the Contractor's behalf and will support the assessment.
210	Where does People Soft fit in?	Peoplesoft is used for identity attributes, personas, and provisioning dependencies.
211	Are they looking to use Entra ID's Governance capabilities, or are they open to recommendations based on outcome?	See response to Question 37.
212	What are the user populations / personas that are included and what is the user count for each?	Detailed population information by user type and persona will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
213	Is there an application list that accounts are being or the client would like automated or request based provisioning/deprovisioning to and governance of?	An application inventory and details for automated and request-based provisioning, deprovisioning, and access governance will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
214	Section III, Article 1, Section 2.1.5 requests identification of subcontractors, while Appendix S, Section 10 states that UMGC will not consider proposals reflecting a prime/subcontractor relationship. Please clarify whether an Offeror may utilize specialized subcontractors for Workday, PeopleSoft, Microsoft Entra ID, or other technical services while remaining solely accountable for contract performance?	See Response to Question 4.
215	Please clarify whether the scope is limited to assessments, architecture designs, governance frameworks, and migration plans, or whether the selected Contractor will also be responsible for production implementation, identity remediation, application integrations, RBAC deployment, and PeopleSoft dependency removal during the contract period?	The selected vendor will be responsible for implementation, identity remediation, critical application integrations and RBAC deployment. Identity current state PeopleSoft dependency removal requirements are the only activities within scope.

216	To assist Offerors in developing an accurate project schedule and staffing model, can UMGC provide estimated counts of active and inactive identities, Workday and Entra ID users, PeopleSoft-dependent applications, and third-party or critical applications expected to be assessed?	Identity population counts, application inventories, and dependency metrics will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
217	Has UMGC established an estimated budget or funding range for this engagement? Additionally, does UMGC anticipate a firm-fixed-price, time-and-materials, or deliverable/milestone-based pricing structure for the Price Proposal phase?	See response to Question 43 and 95, respectively.
218	What identity governance and access management solutions are currently licensed or deployed within UMGC, including Microsoft Entra ID Governance, Microsoft Entra provisioning capabilities, or third-party IGA platforms? Is the selected Contractor expected to evaluate or recommend additional IGA technologies?	See response to Question 37.
219	Can one qualified individual perform multiple identified technical roles, such as Solution Architect, IAM SME, and Azure/Entra SME, provided the individual demonstrates the required expertise? Are the Project Manager and Technical Architect expected to be assigned full-time for the entire period of performance?	See response to Question 6 and 134.
220	Is UMGC expecting all assessments, frameworks, roadmaps, and migration planning deliverables to be completed within the one-year contract period, or is an accelerated delivery timeline anticipated? Are there any mandatory intermediate milestones or priority workstreams?	See Response to Question 9.
221	Can UMGC provide a high-level overview of the current Workday-to-Entra provisioning architecture and the major PeopleSoft identity dependencies, including whether these dependencies support employee, faculty, student, contractor, or multiple identity populations?	Relevant architecture, dependency, and population information will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
222	For the five-year firm-experience requirement in Section III, 2.3, will UMGC consider relevant IAM/IGA modernization projects performed by proposed key personnel in prior employment, or must all five years and associated projects have been delivered directly under the Offeror's legal entity?	See response to Question 13.
223	Will UMGC provide Appendices C-1, C-2, and E, as applicable, to prospective Offerors before the Technical Proposal due date? Please also clarify whether a formal HECVAT assessment or SOC 2 Type II report is mandatory, or whether documented alternative security assessments are acceptable as indicated in Section III, 2.3.4–2.3.5.	All solicitation documentation, including Appendix C-1, C-2, and E, can be found at https://bidlocker.us/details/6550. See response to Question 22.
224	Can UMGC clarify whether the selected contractor is expected to provide assessments, architecture design, governance frameworks, and migration planning only, or whether hands-on implementation activities, including identity remediation, account cleanup, RBAC configuration, and provisioning changes, are also required under this engagement?	Hands-on implementation activities, including identity remediation, account cleanup, RBAC configuration, and provisioning changes, are also required.
225	Is it mandatory to provide the HECVAT?	See response to Question 22.
226	Does UMGC currently utilize a dedicated Identity Governance and Administration (IGA) solution? If so, please identify the existing solution and clarify whether UMGC intends to retain it, enhance its capabilities, or evaluate alternative IGA technologies.	See response to Question 37.
227	Approximately how many identities are currently managed across Workday, Microsoft Entra ID, and PeopleSoft? Please provide an estimated breakdown by identity population, including employees, faculty, students, contractors, and other affiliated users, as applicable.	Identity population counts details, will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
228	Can UMGC provide additional details regarding the current integration between Workday and Microsoft Entra ID, including the provisioning or synchronization mechanisms in use, the approximate number of mismatched identities, and the primary data quality challenges requiring remediation?	Relevant technical documentation and configuration details will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
229	Does UMGC have an existing enterprise RBAC framework or established business and application roles that the selected contractor will be expected to assess and refine, or is the contractor expected to develop the foundational RBAC model from the ground up? Approximately how many business units and application roles are anticipated to be in scope?	The awarded vendor shall assess existing role definitions and develop the foundational RBAC model as required. Business unit and application role scope will be validated during discovery.
230	Approximately how many third-party and critical applications are expected to be included in the RBAC and IGA alignment assessment? Can UMGC provide an estimated application count and indicate whether the selected contractor will be responsible for integration design only or for implementing and configuring application integrations?	10 third-party and critical applications.

231	The RFP anticipates a one-year contract term. Does UMGC expect all assessment, governance, RBAC, and migration planning deliverables to be completed throughout the full 12-month period, or would UMGC prefer a shorter, intensive consulting engagement followed by advisory support and implementation readiness activities?	See response to Question 9.
232	Is UMGC planning to retire PeopleSoft entirely, or only eliminate its identity provisioning dependencies?	There are no plans to retire Peoplesoft. The focus is to elminiate Peoplesoft's identity provisioning dependencies.
233	Does UMGC anticipate awarding the entire scope to one vendor, or could specific workstreams be executed separately?	Per Section 1. General Information, Paragraph 7. Contractual Agreement and Term.It is intended that 1 (one) contract will result from this Solicitation.
234	Does the scope include executing the migration from PeopleSoft to Workday and Entra ID, or only developing the migration architecture and implementation roadmap?	The scope is limited to migration architecture, planning, and roadmap development. Identify current state PeopleSoft dependency removal requirements are the only activities within scope.
235	Can UMGC provide an inventory of critical applications, including their existing authentication and provisioning methods?	A critical application inventory, including authentication and provisioning methods, will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
236	Does UMGC expect dedicated full-time resources for each required technical role, or can qualified personnel fulfill multiple roles based on project needs?	See response to Question 6.
237	What level of participation and availability can the contractor expect from UMGC's internal Workday, PeopleSoft, Entra ID, infrastructure, and business teams?	See Response to Question to Question 41 and 42.
238	Are there specific applications that UMGC has prioritized for immediate integration or modernization?	10 critical applications.
239	What are the most significant challenges with the current Joiner, Mover, and Leaver lifecycle processes?	Consistency and system alignment.
240	Are existing access certification, segregation-of-duties, and access review processes documented?	Foundational information for this is available and will be shared to awarded vendor.
241	Is this a new requirement or a follow-on to an existing engagement? If it is a follow-on, can UMGC identify the incumbent contractor, previous contract number, and approximate contract value?	See responses to Question 11 and 25.
242	Has UMGC established an approved budget or estimated funding range for the anticipated one-year engagement? If so, can this information be shared with prospective Offerors?	See responses to Question 9 and 43.
243	Can UMGC provide the approximate number of identities, personas, business units, and third-party applications within the scope of this engagement? Additionally, have any applications or business units been identified as priorities for assessment and modernization?	Identity population details and assessment priorities will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
244	Can UMGC clarify whether the scope includes hands-on implementation activities, such as identity data cleanup, system configuration, integration, remediation, and pilot deployments, or whether the engagement is primarily focused on assessments, architecture, framework development, and migration planning?	Scope will be focused on configuration and implementation are considered in-scope, including Workday & Entra mismatch identification/gap remediation as well as RBAC architecture and role engineering.
245	Can UMGC provide additional details regarding its existing identity management environment, including the Workday modules, PeopleSoft components, Microsoft Entra ID provisioning configurations, and any currently deployed IGA tools or capabilities?	Relevant system documentation and configuration details will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
246	Can UMGC confirm whether qualified personnel may fulfill multiple proposed technical roles, provided they possess the requisite expertise? Are there any minimum staffing levels or dedicated full-time resource requirements? Additionally, can UMGC clarify whether the terms Technical Lead (Section 2.5) and Technical Architect (Section III, Article 1, Section 2.2.2) refer to the same mandatory Key Personnel position?	See responses to Question 5 and 6.
247	Section III, Article 1, Section 2.3.4 requires Offerors to disclose whether they maintain a current SOC 2 Type II report and permits alternative security certifications, attestations, or independent assessments. Can UMGC confirm whether SOC 2 Type II certification or an independent third-party information security audit is mandatory, or whether alternative certifications, such as ISO 27001 or ISO 9001:2015, will be considered acceptable evidence of security controls?	See response to Question 22.

248	Section II, Section 6.1 states that all project activities will be performed remotely during UMGC's standard business hours. Can UMGC clarify whether contractors may utilize qualified offshore resources to perform portions of the work, provided they comply with UMGC's security, confidentiality, data protection, and working-hour requirements? Are there any restrictions regarding offshore access to UMGC systems or data?	See response to Question 69.
249	Are any specific security clearances, background investigations, citizenship, or U.S. residency requirements applicable to contractor personnel assigned to this engagement? If so, can UMGC identify the required clearance or screening levels and whether these requirements apply to all personnel or only those accessing sensitive systems and information?	See response to Question 24
250	Could you please clarify the total number of users across Workday, Microsoft Entra ID, and PeopleSoft, including active employees, contractors, and other identity types, to help us accurately assess the scope of the identity management and RBAC modernization effort?	Identity population details will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
251	Is an IGA platform already selected (Entra ID?), or is that choice in scope?	Entra ID is selected.
252	How many third-party applications are in scope?	10 critical applications will be in scope.
253	What are the identity counts by population (staff, faculty, students)?	Identity population details will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
254	What is the underlying relationship between Workday and Peoplesoft? Are they separate sources of truth for different populations?	The authoritative source model for identities and populations will be validated during discovery and documented as part of the current-state assessment.
255	How many departments would be involved in the RBAC?	Approximately 45 business units and stakeholder groups are within scope for RBAC
256	How many total users in their organization?	Identity population details will be provided to the awarded contractor during discovery.
257	Is there buy-in from the business departments, GRC and Audit for the effort?	Yes.
258	Are HR open to changing any data collected if it is required for effective role definition?	We will only be able to propose changes at this time.
259	What percentage of coverage for automated provisioning of access for users is expected?	The entire Workday worker environment (100%).
260	Are they using SailPoint ISC now - if yes do they have licenses for Access Insights for Access Modelling and Access Insights for Certifications?	No, we are not using SailPoint currently.