ADDENDUM 1

DATE: June 20, 2023

RFP NUMBER: UTA2023-024

RFP DUE DATE: June 23, 2023

The following changes and/or clarifications are hereby incorporated into the RFP. Your proposal must reflect the following:

As many, many questions were submitted on this RFP each exact question may not be answered here as it may have been a repeat question from another proposer. If a proposer has further questions after reviewing the questions and answers below, please forward to me.

Q1   Can the University confirm whether an HSP is required with the bid? P. 19 states that the *University will not under any circumstances consider a proposal that is received after the Submittal Deadline or which is not accompanied by the HSP as required by Section 2.5.* However, section 2.5 says *Intentionally left blank.*

A1   *That was a mistake on my part leaving in the statement on page 19. This RFP DOES NOT require an HSP as we anticipate the total contract value to be well below the threshold to need an HSP.*

Q2   P. 19 of the proposal states that *In the Pricing and Delivery Schedule, the Proposer should describe in detail (a) the total fees for the entire scope of Work; and (b) the method by which the fees are calculated.* Can the University clarify what is meant by "method by which the fees are calculated?" Is this referring to the questions about Discounts and Payment Terms? If not, what alternative pricing details is the University requesting?

A2   *Once again, I failed to alter our standard RFP template. For your pricing we're simply looking for one lump sum for the entire project.*

Q3   Can the University confirm that we should submit the Pricing Attachment in addition to the Pricing and Delivery Schedule?

A3   *The Pricing and Delivery Schedule (Section 6) needs to be signed and returned with the other RFP documents in Envelope 1 in BidNet. The separate Pricing Attachment will include your lump sum total price for the project in the blank provided and submitted separately in BidNet in Envelope 2.*

Q4   Has a Business Impact Analysis been performed that would identify applications tied to "critical" business processes? If not, has there been an assessment performed to identify and rank criticality of applications?

A4   *This is part of the scope for this audit. Portions of this work have been completed.*

Q5   What backup application(s) are utilized across campus, and do you anticipate any of the services that UT System Shared Information Services provides to be in scope for the audit?

A5   *Shared services performed by UT will be excluded. There are multiple backup applications depending on centralized versus decentralized operations.*

Q6   Based on the question asked on the Pre-proposal call, approximately how many critical information systems, services, and infrastructure are in scope for this audit?

A6   *Sample selection will be made during the audit with input from IT, Audit and Supplier.*

Q7   For the critical information systems, services, and infrastructure in scope for the audit, are these managed centrally with one tool / solution? If not, can you please provide the list of backup tools / solutions supporting the in-scope systems, services, and infrastructure?

A7   *A portion are managed centrally. A portion are decentralized. We will include some of both in sample. As stated above, sample to be selected by IT, Audit and Supplier.*

Q8   For the critical information systems, services, and infrastructure in scope for the audit, are there any dependencies on other systems from other campuses in the University of Texas System?

A8   *We will exclude UT System solutions from this scope.*

Q9   Are backup operations centrally managed at UTA?

A9   *No.*

Q10   Does the University have a completed Business Impact Assessment, including defined recovery time and recovery point objectives, for the in-scope systems?

A10   *This is part of the scope of this RFP. Portions are complete. Recommendations will likely come from this audit.*

Q11   What standards will this audit be performed under? What standards does UTA use?

A11   *Generally, NIST. We will also be relying on the supplierr's expertise in this area to advise on appropriate standard.*

Q12   Is the desired scope limited to Technology Backup Operations and Disaster Recovery or should we consider including any of the related processes below?
- Business continuity management and contingency planning process for institution operational functions.
- Cybersecurity incident response and crisis management processes triggered in a ransomware attack scenario.

A12   *This is in scope for this RFP. However, only IT applications will be included.*

Q13   Should our proposed scope include assessment of the completeness and accuracy of the system inventory, risk assessment, and risk management processes that help establish the population of systems, services, and infrastructure and their assigned criticality categorization?

A13   *The selected supplier will be able to assess in preliminary survey inquiries. We will rely on your expertise related to scope.*

Q14   Are there any established controls frameworks beyond the Texas DIR Controls Catalog that the institution uses to govern the Backup Operations and Recovery process area? e.g., NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) / CMMC (Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification), ISO (International Standards Organization), CIS (Center for Internet Security), etc.

A14   *Good list. We'll rely on your expertise to advise here. Texas DIR and NIST are generally used as standard.*

Q15   How many systems, services, and infrastructure components does the infrastructure team support, how are they categorized according to risk/criticality, how many are in each category, and how many would be in-scope for this review?

A15   *We need a representative sample from centralized and decentralized areas. Sample selection will be determined with input from IT, Audit and Supplier. Sampling will be used.*

Q16   Please describe the key centralized and decentralized computing environments, related technology services and infrastructure components expected to be in-scope for this review.

A16   *We will discuss this with the selected supplier.*

Q17   For the systems, services and infrastructure anticipated to be in scope for this review, how many different tools are used to perform, manage, and monitor backup operations?

A17   *We will discuss with selected supplier. Large percent on cloud with one supplier.*

Q18   What is the percentage of SaaS (Software as a Service) vs on-prem vs. IaaS (Infrastructure as a Service) or PaaS (Platform as a Service) applications are supported by the institution and would be in-scope for this review?

A18   *We will discuss with selected supplier.*

Q19   Are there agreements in place with third parties to support potential off-site infrastructure recovery needs for the institution or are all recovery capabilities/options fully managed internally? Where third parties are involved, please share how many of these agreements/ procedures are expected to be in-scope.

A19   *This is part of the scope of the audit.*

Q20   Can you provide the operating effectiveness sampling guidance that the Internal Audit
        department would expect us to use for this engagement?

A20   *This will be a joint decision as discussed.*

Q21   Given the fixed fee request inclusive of travel expenses, please describe the work
        arrangements for the key audit stakeholders and your work arrangement expectations
        for the contractor. We will plan to be on-site for meaningful in-person interactions,
        especially if those we are working with will also plan to be on-site.

A21   *We will have key parties available. We will work with your teams to help schedule
        meetings. We will utilize teams and in person meetings.*

You'll also find attached a PowerPoint entitled Audit Report which documents our preferred
Audit Report template.
    -

PLEASE SUBMIT WITH YOUR PROPOSAL

            Nancy Czarowitz   Contract Specialist   czarowitz@uta.edu

SIGNED: _____

COMPANY NAME: _____

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS A ARLINGTON

Audit Report

Title

Month Year
DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Summary – Title

Recommendations	Rating	Count
5	Priority	0
	High	5
	Medium	0
	Low	0

We recently completed an audit of {Insert Audit Name} at UTA. The background, audit objective, scope, and ratings are detailed on page X of this report.

Overall, the audit identified the need to improve {insert language} Specific observations from the audit are provided below:

Observations	Recommendations	Rating	Page
A. Observation – Match Title	1. Summary of recommendation	High	Page 3
B. Observation – Match Title	2. Summary of recommendation.	High	Page 4
C. Observation – Match Title	3. Provide additional resources and requirements for students that are accepted on a "conditional" basis. 4. AO students that are accepted with GPAs below 2.25 should be classified as "conditional." 5. Implement a cap on the number of students admitted "conditionally" based on UTA's ability to provide necessary resources.	High High High	Page 5

Further details can be found on the following pages. Other less significant opportunities were communicated to management separately.

We appreciate the outstanding courtesy and cooperation received from {insert language}

Observation 1 – Title

Paragraph 1

Header:
Paragraph 2

Size and insert graphics as necessary.

DRAFT

Recommendation:
Paragraph

Management Response:
Insert

Target Implementation Date:
Insert

Responsible Party:
Insert

Observation 2 – Title

Paragraph 1

Header
Paragraph 2

Size and insert graphics as necessary.

Recommendation:
Paragraph

Management Response:
Insert

Target Implementation Date:
Insert

Responsible Party:
Insert

Observation 3 – Title

Paragraph 1

Header
Paragraph 2

Size and insert graphics as necessary.

Recommendation:
Paragraph

Management Response:
Insert

Target Implementation Date:
Insert

Responsible Party:
Insert

Observation 3 – Title (Continued)

Paragraph 1

Header
Paragraph 2

Size and insert graphics as necessary.

DRAFT

Recommendation:
Paragraph

Management Response:
Insert

Target Implementation Date:
Insert

Responsible Party:
Insert

Observation 4 – Title

Paragraph 1

Header
Paragraph 2

Size and insert graphics as necessary.

Recommendation:
Paragraph

Management Response:
Insert

Target Implementation Date:
Insert

Responsible Party:
Insert

Background, Audit Objective, and Scope & Methodology

Background
Paragraph

Audit Objective
Paragraph

Audit Scope and Methodology
Paragraph

The audit was conducted in conformance with the Institute of Internal Auditors' *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing*. Additionally, we conducted the audit in accordance with Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS). Both standards are required by the Texas Internal Auditing Act, and they require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. The Office of Audit and Consulting Services is independent in both standards for internal auditors.

Ranking Criteria – Title

Ranking Criteria

All findings in this report are ranked based on an assessment of applicable qualitative, operational control and quantitative risk factors, as well as the probability of a negative outcome occurring if the risk is not adequately mitigated. The criteria for these rankings are as follows:

Priority	An issue identified by an internal audit that, if not addressed on a timely basis, could directly impact achievement of a strategic or important operational objective of UTA or the UT System as a whole.
High	A finding identified by an internal audit that is considered to have a medium to high probability of adverse effects to UTA either as a whole or to a significant college/school/unit level.
Medium	A finding identified by an internal audit that is considered to have a low to medium probability of adverse effects to UTA either as a whole or to a college/school/unit level.
Low	A finding identified by an internal audit that is considered to have minimal probability of adverse effects to UTA either as a whole or to a college/school/unit level.

None of the findings from this review are deemed as a "Priority" finding.