Addendum No. 1
Technology Infrastructure Modernization Services

To: Request for Proposals Recipients

From: Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority

Date: September 11, 2026

Re: Addendum 1 to RFP 2026-11

Addenda No. 1 consists of:

1. Clarity on the directions for vendors regarding travel costs.
2. Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority has received the following questions in response to its Request for Proposals (RFP) for Technology Infrastructure Modernization services.

Travel Costs

Implementation pricing must be submitted on a deliverable and “milestone” basis. For implementation services under a milestone arrangement, the vendor shall charge a fixed amount for the completion of major milestones. Vendors are to provide all work effort and assumptions used to calculate the fixed fee for each deliverable and milestone. If vendor anticipates travel costs for on site work that must be included in appropriate milestone costs.

Disregard the travel expense direction on the Proposed Fee Schedule section of the RFP.

Questions and Answers

1. **How many laptops, desktops, and mobile devices are in use, and which operating system versions are running on them?**
   A: There are approximately 80 laptops running Windows 11, 3 desktops running Windows 11, 73 mobile devices (Android phones, iPhones, Android tablets and iPads). The number of devices is subject to increase as the agency increases its staff count and device needs.

2. **How many mobile phones are company-issued and BYOD?**
   A: 73 mobile devices are company issued. For BYOD devices, they are generally staff personal phones and the public’s phones or laptops that connect to the separate BYOD Wi-Fi. We can estimate about 65+ devices should be connecting at any given time to each respective Wi-Fi SSID.

3. **Are any on-premises applications or services still authenticating against on-prem AD over LDAP or LDAPS?**
   A: Yes, our Microsoft Entra identity is synced on premises via the hybrid Active Directory. We have on-premises printers for printing and scanning to the on-premises file server that authenticate against LDAP. The agency is mostly SaaS so there should be very little to no application or services authenticating against LDAP.
   However, we would want the vendor to validate these dependencies as part of the AD-to-Entra ID transition discovery phase of the project to ensure that any remaining domain-dependent services are identified and addressed before the transition.

4. **Which third-party antivirus or endpoint protection product is currently deployed, and on which device types?**
   A: Currently the agency utilizes Webroot antivirus on all Windows computers.

5. **If native tooling cannot carry user profiles across, would a third-party profile migration tool be acceptable as an exception?**
   A: Yes, if a third party migration tool is recommended by the vendor, include the estimated cost for the agency to acquire the software. This cost should be included in the milestone costs.

6. **Approximately how many AD user objects, security groups, and Group Policy Objects exist today?**
   A: There are about 53 GPOs, realistically there are 36 custom GPOs disregarding the default GPOs and unused GPOs. We have 6 security groups and 65+ AD user objects.

7. **Is the current domain controller the only DC in the environment?**
   A: Yes, there is a single domain controller.

8. **What is the make, model, and current firmware version of the firewall?**
   A: SonicWall and Fortinet. Model and firmware/version information will not be publicly disclosed for security reasons.

9. **Is the firewall the default gateway for every network segment, or is any inter-VLAN routing handled by a core switch?**
   A: The SonicWall firewall serves as the default gateway and performs Layer-3 routing for the VLANs. Fortinet infrastructure is used for VLAN transport, switching, and wireless connectivity.

10. How many network segments or VLANs will require DHCP scopes?
A: Two VLANS.

11. After AD and the file server are decommissioned, how many on-premises servers will remain, and what roles does each hold?
A: The vendor will recommend a solution to migrate the on-premises server files to another location resulting in a non on-premises server solution by the completion of the project. The other goal of the project as stated in the RFP is that by end of the project there should be no on-premises active directory server in service due to the agency wishing to move to a cloud only environment.

12. What purpose will RDP serve after migration — is it required long term, or only during coexistence?
A: Remote Desktop Protocol is required for our staff to remote into their computers when working from home. The vendor should recommend a solution that allows staff to be able to remote into their computers without an active directory on-premises server or services. As of current we utilize a VPN to establish connections from work from home environment then connect to the computers via RDP aided by the services of Windows 11 and active directory.

13. Do the existing printers support Universal Print natively? For any that don't, which host would you prefer the Universal Print connector to run on?
A: We have a mix fleet of printers that currently natively support universal print and some that don’t. The vendor should recommend a small rack mounted server or server grade desktop computer that can host the Universal Print connector that runs on-premises. The host device ideally should be running on Windows 11 Pro or Windows server.

14. How many network printers and MFPs are in place, and what is the make, model, and firmware level of each?
A: All printers at the agency are MFP, currently we have 6 printers. The models are: Konica Minolta Bizhub C650i, Konica Minolta Bizhub C458, HP DesignJet T730, HP Color LaserJet MFP M477fdn, Brother MFC-L8900CDW. Firmware/version information will not be publicly disclosed for security reasons.

15. **How is scan-to-email currently relayed — through an on-prem SMTP relay, directly to Microsoft 365, or using each device's own SMTP settings?**
A: Currently there is no scan to email services configured, instead scan to a folder scanbox residing on the on-premises file server is currently being utilized. A solution recommended by the vendor to implement the scan to email functionality is required as the on-premises file server and scan box services will be removed by the end of the project.

16. **Do scanned documents need to reach external recipients, or internal only?**
A: Generally scanned documents only need to reach internal recipients. However we sometimes utilize scan to fax to send documents to external recipients.

17. **What is the approximate monthly print volume?**
A: We don’t an estimated number to provide as that is not tracked.

18. **Is the print server a dedicated host, or is the print role running on the domain controller or file server?**
A: The printer server is managed via Active Directory on the Domain controller server. The file server hosts the scan boxes that printer uploads the scanned documents to.

19. **Will the Authority be procuring the physical server hardware required for the on-premises Universal Print Connector server, or is the contractor expected to include hardware procurement and licensing costs within the milestone pricing?**
A: Any hardware or software procurement will be included in the milestone pricing.

20. **What is the specific make, model, and firmware version of the existing perimeter/core firewall to which DHCP services will be migrated from the Active Directory server?**
A: SonicWall and Fortinet. Model and firmware/version information will not be publicly disclosed for security reasons.

21. **Regarding the ~2.4 TB file server migration, has the Authority established a preferred destination architecture (e.g., SharePoint Online document libraries, OneDrive, Azure Files, or local workgroup NAS), or should vendors propose the optimal architecture based on discovery findings?**
A: The vendor should propose an optimal architecture that takes into consideration ease of use to connect for end users, ease of migration, and cost effectiveness. The end goal

is to move the files to a reliable storage location since the file server on premises will be decommissioned by the end of the project. Outside of the project after a few months, the goal is to then move those files to SharePoint as its final storage location.

22. **Are there large proprietary GIS datasets, raster imagery, or database files contained within the 2.4 TB file share that require specialized storage configurations or retention on-premises for ESRI Field Maps and desktop GIS performance?**
A: No, currently the file server does not host any GIS files. It hosts the typical work document types such as Microsoft Word, Excel, PowerPoint, PDF, mp3, mp4, jpeg, other photos file types.

23. **What third-party antivirus, endpoint detection, and email security solutions are currently installed across Authority endpoints and email gateways that will need to be transitioned or uninstalled during the Microsoft Defender rollout?**
A: Currently Webroot antivirus will need to be uninstalled. There is no EDR installed or third party email security integrations in our current Microsoft environment for Outlook.

24. **Are all ~100 staff mobile devices (iOS/Android) agency-owned, or does the mobile device footprint include a Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) component requiring distinct Intune MAM/MEC policies?**
A: Staff mobile devices both iOS and Android are agency owned. The agency's Wi-Fi does include BYOD for personal devices and for the public's access. So configuring separate Staff and BYOD policies via Intune should be recommended by the vendor.

25. **Are ESRI Field Maps, ESRI Survey123, and Avenza licenses already acquired through enterprise agreements, and will the Authority provide Apple Business Manager (ABM) / Google Zero-Touch integration for automated MDM enrollment?**
A: The ESRI apps and Avenza licenses are already purchased through the agency. The authority is seeking recommendation from the vendor to utilize Intune solely to manage both iOS and Android mobile devices and not to include Apple MDM unless absolutely necessary due to technical limitations and concerns of having two MDM solutions. Currently the authority has not enrolled into nor setup Apple Business Manager nor Google Zero Touch integration. These services recommended by the vendor should be included in the milestone costs if required.

26. **What are the specific network bandwidth and uplink specifications between the Authority's server room/headquarters and remote field offices or open space preserve facilities?**
A: There are no satellite offices that require specific network bandwidth or uplink specifications. As the agency transitions to a more cloud-based environment, the underlying factor for speed is ultimately dependent on the client's internet speed as well as the headquarters office max internet speed connection to the SaaS and cloud-based resources.

27. **Can the 1–2 weeks of required on-site server installation and device enrollment be split across two separate phased site visits, or is consecutive on-site execution mandatory?**
A: Assuming that the vendor has ensured network connectivity, printer and scan service, and computer functionality are still functional for authority staff, there should not be an issue splitting the site visits for on-premise installations and device enrollment into different weeks.

28. **Is Microsoft 365 E5 licensing already procured and active within the tenant, or will the contractor need to coordinate licensing procurement timing with the Authority's cloud reseller?**
A: No M365 E5 license are purchased yet. The vendor will include the cost for the license procurement into the milestone costs. The vendor will evaluate whether a reseller or direct purchase of the licenses is appropriate based on ease of use in obtaining new licenses, cancelling licenses, and billing.

29. **What specific invoicing formatting or milestone documentation artifacts are required by the CALOES grant administrator to facilitate grant reimbursement?**
A: The Authority requires the invoice from the vendor to show the vendor's service cost broken down according to each milestone. The invoice for hardware or software procured should be a separate invoice from the vendor's service costs. Minimum requirements for invoices are to include invoice number, invoice date, reasonable amount of description of work completed, and invoiced cost amount.

30. **Are there legacy line-of-business applications, on-premises SQL databases, or domain-dependent services that rely on NTLM/Kerberos authentication that must remain supported during the AD to Entra ID transition?**

A: Yes. Our Microsoft Entra ID environment is currently synchronized with our on-premises Active Directory in a hybrid identity configuration.
The agency is primarily SaaS-based, so we expect very few legacy line-of-business applications or services that depend directly on on-premises Active Directory, NTLM, or Kerberos authentication.
We do have some remaining on-premises dependencies, including on-premises printers/MFPs used for printing and scanning to an on-premises file server. These devices/services currently rely on the on-premises Active Directory environment for authentication (including LDAP-based authentication where applicable).
We are not currently aware of any significant legacy applications or on-premises SQL databases that require NTLM/Kerberos authentication. However, we would want the vendor to discover and validate these dependencies as part of the AD-to-Entra ID transition discovery phase of the project to ensure that any remaining domain-dependent services are identified and addressed before the transition.

31. **Does the Authority currently operate an on-premises Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) or certificate authority that requires migration to Microsoft Cloud PKI / Intune SCEP profiles for 802.1X network authentication?**
A: No, the authority does not utilize any PKI. However, we would want the vendor to discover and validate any dependencies as part of the AD-to-Entra ID transition discovery phase of the project to ensure that any remaining domain-dependent services are identified and addressed before the transition.

32. **What is the expected inventory and model breakdown of existing agency network printers and multi-function copiers (MFDs) to be registered with Universal Print?**
A: All printers at the agency are MFP, currently we have 6 printers. The models are: Konica Minolta Bizhub C650i, Konica Minolta Bizhub C458, HP DesignJet T730, HP Color LaserJet MFP M477fdn, Brother MFC-L8900CDW.

33. **Will the Authority designate a technical project lead and administrative decision-maker with dedicated availability during business hours (Monday–Friday, 8:00 AM–5:00 PM) for weekly touchpoints and deployment approvals?**
A: Yes. The Authority will designate a technical project lead and an administrative/project decision-maker who will be available during normal business hours, Monday–Friday, 8:00 AM–5:00 PM (PST), to participate in weekly project touchpoints and provide deployment approvals as needed. The vendor is also expected

to provide a project manager and technical lead for coordination and implementation on the vendor side.

34. What is the expected budget for this contract?
A: The contract budget is not to exceed $217,500. This money is to be utilized to pay service cost for the vendor and hardware & software procurements for the authority. Vendors when writing the milestone and costs, should include the total cost of everything from vendor services costs to hardware & software costs. The amount should not exceed the contract budget amount.

35. Beyond the stated evaluation factors (approach/strategy, fees, experience, client satisfaction), is there a weighted scoring rubric, and who comprises the evaluation committee (IT staff, procurement, executive leadership)?
A: Proposals will be evaluated based on the evaluation factors identified in the RFP, including approach/strategy, fees, experience, and client satisfaction, and will be considered in their entirety to determine the proposal that provides the best value to the Agency. The evaluation will be conducted by designated Agency staff, including representatives from the IT program area and from management.

36. What prompted this initiative: a specific compliance/audit finding, a security incident, the CALOES grant opportunity itself, or an internally identified technology gap?
A: The initiative was primarily driven by an internally identified technology and security gap. The CALOES grant opportunity provided the funding mechanism and an appropriate opportunity to address that existing need.

37. Given the anticipated October 22, 2026 award date and the required completion date, when does the Authority expect project kickoff / notice to proceed to occur?
A: The Authority expects to complete contracting in October after the award. And for project work to start in early November 2026.

38. Can you describe your current internal IT staffing (headcount and roles) and any functions currently outsourced to a managed service provider (helpdesk, network management, security monitoring, etc.)?
A: One IT staff. No MSP nor external IT.

39. Who will serve as the Authority's technical point of contact and project sponsor during and after implementation?

A: The authority's IT staff will serve as the point of contact and the Administrative Operations Manager is the project sponsor during and after implementation.

40. What type of tenant do you have (Commercial, GCC, or GCC High), and is E5 required for all users or should we evaluate against alternative licensing combinations?
A: Currently commercial tenant. E5 is required for all users.

41. What is your exact user count requiring E5, and does the 5-year TCO cover only licensing/log storage or also hardware, implementation, support, connectivity, and internal labor?
A: The authority currently has 65 staff requiring Microsoft 365 E5 licenses. Per the RFP scope, the 5-year TCO must strictly cover the M365 E5 licensing costs and consumption-based log storage estimates, complete with granular cost projections and anticipated licensing adjustments.

42. Is MS Sentinel in scope, or does the requirement refer only to native Defender XDR capabilities?
A: From the E5 license, the authority wishes to utilize the Microsoft Defender XDR.

43. What are your endpoint counts by platform and ownership?
A: There are approximately 80 laptops running Windows 11, 3 desktops running Windows 11, 73 mobile devices (Android phones, iPhones, Android tablets and iPads). The number of devices is subject to increase as the agency increases its staff count and device needs.

44. Do you expect an in-place profile migration or may devices be reset and provisioned as new?
A: The authority prefers an in-place enrollment strategy or migration path to minimize staff downtime and avoid complete device wipes where technically feasible. However, the authority is seeking vendor recommendations and best-practice approaches on whether an in-place profile migration or a clean provisioning model is more stable and cost-effective for our current device landscape.

45. How man AD GPO's do you currently have and is inventory or backup available?
A: GPO inventory will be available. There are about 53 GPOs, realistically there are 36 custom GPOs disregarding the default GPOs and unused GPOs.

46. What third-party antivirus/EDR product do you currently run, and is it on workstations only or also servers?

A: Webroot antivirus, no EDR. It is installed only on desktops and laptops, not servers.

47. What does your server and legacy application inventory look like, and which authentication dependencies exist (LDAP, Kerberos, NTLM, NPS, certificates, service accounts)?

A: The agency is primarily SaaS-based, so we expect very few legacy line-of-business applications or services that depend directly on on-premises Active Directory, NTLM, or Kerberos authentication.

We do have some remaining on-premises dependencies, including on-premises printers/MFPs used for printing and scanning to an on-premises file server. These devices/services currently rely on the on-premises Active Directory environment for authentication (including LDAP-based authentication where applicable).

We are not currently aware of any significant legacy applications or on-premises SQL databases that require NTLM/Kerberos authentication. However, we would want the vendor to discover and validate these dependencies as part of the AD-to-Entra ID transition discovery phase of the project to ensure that any remaining domain-dependent services are identified and addressed before the transition.

48. What are your RDP requirements during and after coexistence?

A: As of current we utilize a VPN to establish connections from work from home environment then connect to the computers via RDP aided by the services of Windows 11 and active directory. We expect the vendor to provide a solution to staff to be able to utilize RDP to their computers during any phase of the transition of the coexistence model and when the environment is fully cloud based near the end of the project.

49. Approximately how many files, folders, and shares make up the 2.4 TB dataset, and who has authority to approve the final architecture?

A: There are 917,450 Files, 44,202 Folders, 6 network drives. The authority's IT staff along with their manager has the authority to approve the final architecture.

50. What firewall make and model do you currently run, and how many DHCP scopes exist?

A: SonicWall and Fortinet. Model and firmware/version information will not be publicly disclosed for security reasons. There are 3 DHCP scopes.

51. What does your printer/MFP inventory and required finishing features look like, and are third-party alternatives to Universal Print acceptable?
A: All printers at the agency are MFP, currently we have 6 printers. The models are: Konica Minolta Bizhub C650i, Konica Minolta Bizhub C458, HP DesignJet T730, HP Color LaserJet MFP M477fdn, Brother MFC-L8900CDW. Firmware/version information will not be publicly disclosed for security reasons. The finishing features the authority wishes for the device to continue utilizing hole punches and stapling. More over scan to email is required. Third party alternatives to Universal Print can be recommended by the vendor.

52. Are all devices located at one site? How many vendor personnel may work onsite at once, and how many onsite business days should we assume?
A: The authority's server, printers, and static desktop computers are all on site. Staff laptop, phones, tablets may be onsite, with them outside the agency such as work from home or at the preserves. Staff will be notified to come to the office so enrollment can actively take place. A minimum of at least one vendor personnel can come onsite and work alongside the authority's IT staff to enroll staff devices. The onsite business days should take no longer than 1-2 weeks.

53. Are there specific regulatory or compliance frameworks, beyond general E5 security posture and grant compliance, that the solution must meet?
A: Yes, as a public agency we have retention policies to retain work data. The vendor during discovery and analysis phase of the project can review current retention policies and recommend improvements due to the introduction of the E5 license that allows for more features from its suite of products.

54. What acceptance criteria and remediation-cycle expectations apply during UAT?
A: UAT will be conducted by both IT administrators and representative staff members to validate the deployment from both a technical and daily-use perspective. The rollout will be considered successful when: Microsoft identities and accounts are migrated fully to the cloud, DHCP services are migrated to the firewall, internet connectivity is working for both Wi-Fi and ethernet, RDP connection is stable and reliable, printing and scanning capabilities are working, staff can perform their daily work uninterrupted with their device enrollment into Intune and Microsoft defender along with the migrated GPOs, staff are receiving phishing attack simulations, and when daily operations are not interrupted by the new technology infrastructure as a whole.

55. What must be fully decommissioned by July 31, 2027, versus documented as a future roadmap?

A: By July 31, 2027, the vendor should have already reached project conclusion. The agency will be operating in a 100% cloud-hosted Microsoft environment (spanning our tenant, device enrollment, and possibly the file storage). Consequently, legacy on-prem infrastructure such as local domain controllers and file servers must be fully decommissioned. The only remaining local footprint will be the firewalls, physical printers, the Universal Print Connector server, and possible the file storage. Because this project represents the final phase of our cloud transition, no separate future roadmap is required.

56. Should post-deployment support pricing address security monitoring/MDR, helpdesk, and/or architectural advisory, or would you like us to propose tiered options?

A: The post-deployment support pricing should focus exclusively on helpdesk support and ongoing printer/MFP maintenance, as security monitoring, MDR (Managed Detection and Response) outside the milestones and outside project completion. The architecture advisory should be priced into the milestones as its directly part of the project.

57. May implementation scope be adjusted following the Discovery phase? May pricing be provided as a range and refined following a fixed-fee discovery?

A: The implementation scope should follow as outlined in the RFP and can only deviate slightly during the discovery phase based on the vendor's recommendation and the authority's staff final directive to ensure the core objectives of the RFP are met. Regarding pricing, we prefer that you provide your best initial estimate or range in this proposal, with the understanding that final, binding pricing will be refined and locked in as a fixed fee once the Discovery phase is successfully completed.

58. What is the current on-premises AD forest/domain structure (single domain, multiple domains/OUs)?

A: The on-premises AD is a single forest and domain.

59. Is there an existing MDM/UEM tool in place today (e.g., an older on-prem SCCM, or none at all)?

A: There is no current existing MDM in place. Ninjarmm is the current existing UEM tool. We expect to continue to utilize Ninjarmm after the Intune implementation.

60. **How many GPOs currently exist, and is there any documentation of what they enforce?**
A: GPO inventory will be available. There are about 53 GPOs, realistically there are 36 custom GPOs disregarding the default GPOs and unused GPOs.

61. **What is the exact device count and OS mix (Windows version, mobile OS split between iOS/Android)? The RFP says "~100 devices" and "under 100 staff" — can the Authority provide a current asset inventory?**
A: There are approximately 80 laptops running Windows 11, 3 desktops running Windows 11, 73 mobile devices (Android phones, iPhones, Android tablets and iPads). The number of devices is subject to increase as the agency increases its staff count and device needs.

62. **Is procurement of the Universal Print Connector server hardware the Authority's responsibility, or is the vendor expected to also furnish/procure it as part of milestone pricing?**
A: The vendor is expected to procure and provide pricing part of the milestone pricing.

63. **Did SCVOSA need recommendations on hardware for new printers or just hardware recommendations for print servers?**
A: No printer recommendations are required as those are not being replaced. The selected vendor will only need to recommend the print server connector device.

64. **Does "decommissioning the on-prem AD domain controller" mean full decommission by project end, or a defined stopping point at July 31, 2027 with certain coexistence elements remaining?**
A: The on-premise AD controller should be decommissioned by the end of the project by July 31, 2027. The coexistence elements are to ensure no disruption to staff daily operations who are still on the legacy infrastructure during the transition period as staff are incrementally enrolled into a cloud only environment. The goal is by the end of the project the information technology infrastructure is completely cloud based with the exception of the on-premise printers, printer server, and possibly the file storage.

65. **Given the July 31, 2027 hard grant deadline and evaluation/award timeline running to late October 2026, what is the Authority's expected project *start* date, and is there flexibility if award is delayed?**

A: The Authority anticipates a project start date following contract award, targeted for early November 2026, to ensure full project completion prior to the July 31, 2027 grant deadline. Vendors should bid with this timeline in mind. Because schedule adjustments involving grant funds are subject to regulatory review and approval by Cal OES, the Authority cannot unilaterally commit to timeline flexibilities, and any adjustments would depend strictly on formal grant modifications. To avoid such situations and stay within grant compliance, the project must be completed by July 31, 2027.

66. Confirm the on-site requirement: is 1–2 weeks a hard cap, or an estimate that may need to expand depending on complexity discovered during discovery? Is this on-site time contiguous or can it be split across UEM enrollment and Print Connector phases separately?

A: The 1-2 weeks on-site timeframe is an estimate, dedicated strictly to device enrollment, as this phase requires direct hands-on interaction with staff devices. Other project phases such as the on-site discovery or the physical installation of the print connector can occur on separate timelines and do not need to be bundled into that single time block.

67. Is there a budget range or not-to-exceed ceiling the Authority can share, even informally, given this is grant-funded with a fixed CalOES allocation?

A: The contract budget is not to exceed $217,500. This money is to be utilized to pay service cost for the vendor and hardware & software procurements for the authority. Vendors when writing the milestone and costs, should include the total cost of everything from vendor services costs to hardware & software costs. The amount should not exceed the contract budget amount.

68. **Are there any CalOES-specific reporting, invoicing, or documentation requirements (beyond standard Authority invoicing) that vendors should account for in their proposed approach?**

A: CALOES requires the invoice from the vendor to show the vendor's service cost broken down according to each milestone. The invoice for hardware or software procured should be a separate invoice from the vendor's service costs.

69. What was the annual spend under the previous contract for these services?

A: None, there was no prior project similar to this scope of work.

70. If this is a new contract, what is the estimated annual budget?

A: There is no estimated annual budget. This project is a one time contract that is not reoccurring.

71. **Is the agency open to a hybrid delivery model utilizing a combination of onshore and offshore resources?**
A: Yes, all project resources regardless of whether they operate onshore or offshore must be fully available to conduct business, coordinate, and attend meetings during Pacific Standard Time (PST) working hours. Additionally, any resources designated for onshore tasks must be fully prepared to travel and conduct on-site work as required.

72. **Will the work be performed onsite, remotely, or through a hybrid arrangement?**
A: A mixture of remote and onsite work. Onsite installation and configuration for the print server connector and device enrollment for staff are required.

73. **Would it be possible to consider a 1–2 week extension to the proposal submission deadline?**
A: No extension to the proposal submission deadline will be given.

74. **Is this contract intended for a single vendor or for multiple vendors?**
A: One vendor to for this contract.

75. **Who is the current or previous incumbent vendor for these services?**
A: None. There are no current or previous incumbent vendor for the services.

76. **Are there any challenges, gaps, or pain points with the current solution or contractor that the agency is looking to address through this procurement?**
A: There are no current contractor that the agency is involved with, so there are no pain points. The technology gaps the agency faces are detailed in the RFP in the section Project Background.

77. **Is there a projected contract award date and anticipated start date?**
A: The Authority anticipates a project start date following contract award, targeted for November 2026, to ensure full project completion prior to the July 31, 2027 grant deadline. Vendors should bid with this timeline in mind. Because schedule adjustments involving grant funds are subject to regulatory review and approval by Cal OES, the Authority cannot unilaterally commit to timeline flexibilities, and any adjustments would

depend strictly on formal grant modifications. To avoid such situations and stay within grant compliance, the project must be completed by July 31, 2027.

78. **Is the Authority currently using Microsoft Entra Connect Sync, Entra Cloud Sync, or another synchronization method between on-premises Active Directory and Microsoft Entra ID? If so, please identify the current authentication method and synchronization scope.**
A: The authority is utilizing Entra Connect Sync (formerly known as Azure AD Sync) to connect Microsoft identities in a hybrid model from on-premises AD to Microsoft Entra ID. Currently, computers are excluded from this sync process and management and only the on-premises AD is managing those devices. By the end of the project there will be no need for an on-premises AD since Microsoft Entra ID in the cloud will retain and manage the Microsoft identities and users account while Intune will retain and manage the devices.

79. **The RFP calls for migration of on-premises AD identities to Microsoft Entra ID while maintaining existing credentials and permissions. Is the intended final state for users to become cloud-only Entra ID identities, with directory synchronization ultimately removed?**
A: Yes, the end goal of the project is for the user's Microsoft identities and accounts to become cloud only Entra ID. The on-premises active directory services will be decommissioned by the vendor.

71. Is actual decommissioning of the Active Directory domain controllers expected within this project, or is the required deliverable a roadmap for future decommissioning after remaining dependencies are retired?
A: Yes, the decommission of the active directory domain controller is expected by the end of the project. By the end of the project there will be no need for an on-premises AD since Microsoft Entra ID in the cloud will retain and manage the Microsoft identities and users account while Intune will retain and manage the devices.

72. What applications, servers, service accounts, scripts, appliances, or other systems currently depend on Active Directory authentication, LDAP, Kerberos, NTLM, or domain-joined computer accounts?
A: We have on-premises printers for printing and scanning to the on-premises file server that authenticate against LDAP. The agency is mostly SaaS so there should be very little to no application or services authenticating against LDAP.

However, we would want the vendor to discover and validate these dependencies as part of the AD-to-Entra ID transition discovery phase of the project to ensure that any remaining domain-dependent services are identified and addressed before the transition.

80. **What is the current join state of Windows endpoints: AD joined, Hybrid Entra joined, Entra joined, or mixed? Is the intended final state for supported Windows endpoints to be Entra joined and Intune managed with no dependency on AD computer accounts?**
A: Currently the windows endpoints are managed by the on-premises Domain Controller running Active Directory. The domain controller is not syncing the devices up to the Microsoft Entra cloud via the hybrid model. However, the domain controller is syncing the user's Microsoft identities and account up to Microsoft Entra ID via the hybrid model. By the end of the project there will be no need for an on-premises AD since Microsoft Entra ID in the cloud will retain and manage the Microsoft identities and users account while Intune will retain and manage the devices.

81. **Is the Authority expecting existing Windows devices to be migrated in place from AD joined to Entra joined, or is reset/reprovisioning through Windows Autopilot acceptable? Is preservation of the existing Windows user profile required?**
A: To minimize staff downtime and disruption, the preferred approach is an in-place migration of existing Windows devices from Active Directory (AD) joined to Entra joined while preserving the existing Windows user profile. However, if technical limitations or specific device conditions require a full reset and provisioning via Windows Autopilot, that method is also acceptable as a fallback.

82. **Which specific on-premises resources must remain accessible from Entra-joined devices during the coexistence period? For the RDP requirement, should users continue authenticating to legacy servers/workstations using existing AD credentials until those systems are retired?**
A: The vendor should find a solution that allows staff to RDP into the file server and any on-premises desktop computers during the coexistence period utilizing their AD credentials until the systems are retired. Once the Domain controller is retired, the vendor will implement a solution so that staff can RDP into the on-premises desktop computers without the need for an on-premises Domain controller for authentication.

76. Approximately how many Group Policy Objects are currently in use? Does the Authority expect a direct translation of applicable GPOs, or should the consultant rationalize and redesign policies using modern Intune configuration where appropriate?

A: The Authority currently manages approximately 53 Group Policy Objects, with roughly 36 active custom GPOs (excluding default and unused policies). The Authority expects a 1-to-1 translation of applicable GPOs implemented via Intune. If a direct 1-to-1 match is technically unsupported in the cloud, the vendor is expected to configure a functionally equivalent policy within Intune that matches the original intent as closely as possible.

83. Which Microsoft 365 E5 capabilities are expected to be implemented during this project versus documented only in the five-year adoption/utilization plan? Please clarify whether capabilities such as Entra ID P2, Defender for Identity, Defender for Cloud Apps, and Microsoft Purview are implementation requirements or future utilization items.

A: To maximize the value of the M365 E5 license and strengthen cybersecurity, active implementation is required for Entra ID P2, Microsoft Defender components (including Defender for Identity), and Microsoft Purview compliance features. Microsoft Defender for Cloud Apps is not required for the project implementation, but vendors may propose its inclusion if they recommend it in order to meet core project objectives.

84. The RFP requests consumption-based log-storage estimates. Is Microsoft Sentinel currently deployed or expected as part of the target architecture? If not, what logging destination and retention requirements should be assumed?

A: Microsoft Sentinel is not currently deployed nor expected as part of the target architecture nor part of the project scope. Log storage and retention should be handled natively within the M365 E5 ecosystem utilizing Microsoft Purview Audit, while file storage and migration costs should account for your cloud file repository target (such as SharePoint Online). Vendors should base their 5-year TCO and consumption estimates on native M365/Purview retention capabilities and projected cloud file storage needs.

85. Is Exchange Online fully deployed today, with no remaining on-premises Exchange infrastructure? Are there existing SMTP relay, application mail, printer/scan-to-email, connector, or other mail-flow dependencies that must be preserved during the migration?

A: Both Exchange Online and M365 Outlook are fully deployed in the cloud with non on-premises connectors. The only on-premises objects that remain are the user's Microsoft identity/account.

86. **The RFP requires a five-year TCO and utilization analysis for Microsoft 365 E5, including licensing adjustments and consumption-based log-storage estimates. Please clarify the expected level of detail for this deliverable and whether the Authority expects a high-level planning model or a detailed year-by-year financial and utilization forecast covering individual E5 workloads and projected consumption.**
A: The 5-year forecast should be structured year-by-year, providing a clear breakdown of projected utilization and costs across the E5 suite of products including security and compliance workloads rather than an overly granular, individual-level micro-model.

87. **The RFP requires proposers to provide a statement indicating agreement with the terms of the sample contract and notes that deviations may result in a proposal being considered nonresponsive. Please confirm whether proposers may identify limited requested modifications, clarifications, or exceptions to Attachment A. If so, please confirm the preferred format for presenting such items and whether reasonable requested contract modifications will affect proposal responsiveness.**
A: The Authority is not entertaining vendor proposed changes to the contract terms.

88. **Would the Authority consider including a commercially reasonable aggregate limitation of liability tied to the fees paid or payable under the resulting contract, together with a mutual exclusion of indirect, consequential, incidental, special, punitive, lost profit, lost revenue, and business interruption damages, subject to mutually agreed exceptions such as fraud or willful misconduct?**
A: No.

89. **Please confirm whether the indemnification obligation under Section 9 is intended to apply to third party claims and to the extent such claims arise from the Contractor's negligence, recklessness, willful misconduct, violation of law, or other acts or omissions for which the Contractor is legally responsible.**
A: Authority does not provide legal advice to vendors. You should contact an attorney. Authority takes the position that the provision applies to third party claims.

90. **Section 2 addresses Authority ownership of project work product. Please confirm that this provision will not transfer ownership of the Contractor's pre existing or**

independently developed software, scripts, tools, templates, methodologies, workflows, know how, generic configurations, or other background intellectual property, or Microsoft and other third party intellectual property incorporated into or used in connection with the services.

A: The Authority is not intending to cause the transfer of any existing intellectual property of vendors or third parties. This provision is intended to apply only to work product that is created specifically for Authority. Given that this RFP concerns computer software, Authority staff will consult its Legal Counsel to determine if clarification to Authority's standard contract template is warranted.

91. **The RFP requires fixed pricing by milestone, while several factors that could materially affect implementation effort, including GPO count, file share permissions, printer compatibility, and device upgrade eligibility, are identified as matters to be assessed during Discovery. Will the Authority accept fixed milestone pricing based on clearly stated assumptions, with an equitable adjustment if Discovery findings materially differ from those assumptions? Alternatively, does the Authority expect proposers to price each milestone based on a worst case implementation scenario?**

    A: The Authority does not permit post-discovery equitable adjustments to fixed-price milestones, as bids must be evaluated on a comparable, fixed-cost basis under public procurement guidelines. Proposers should not price for a worst-case scenario, but rather submit a best-balanced cost proposal utilizing the detailed technical data provided in the addendum, baking in reasonable contingencies for the unknowns to be finalized during discovery. All reasonable assumptions have been provided in the RFP and addendum. Fixed milestone pricing is not expected to be adjustment post-discovery unless material changes have been found.

92. **Travel appears to be addressed in multiple ways within the RFP. The pricing instructions state that implementation rates should be fully loaded except for travel, another provision states that anticipated travel for on site work should be included in the applicable milestone costs, and proposers are also requested to provide travel and expense allowances. Please confirm whether anticipated travel should be included within fixed milestone pricing, separately reimbursed at actual cost, or quoted as a separate not to exceed travel allowance.**

    A: That is an error in the RFP and addressed in this addendum on page 1. Vendors should follow the travel pricing as follow: Implementation pricing must be submitted on a deliverable and “milestone” basis. For implementation services under a milestone arrangement, the vendor shall charge a fixed amount for the completion of major milestones. Vendors are to provide all work effort and assumptions used to calculate the fixed fee for each deliverable and milestone. If vendor anticipates travel costs for on site work that must be included in appropriate milestone costs.

93. **If Discovery identifies pre existing technical conditions such as Active Directory replication issues, unsupported operating systems, devices that cannot support Windows 11, incompatible printers, corrupted profiles, unsupported applications, or other environmental issues that require remediation before migration can proceed, should remediation of those conditions be included within the original fixed milestone price? Alternatively, may such remediation be addressed as additional work through the change process under Section 15 where it was not reasonably identifiable when the proposal was submitted? Please also clarify how many rounds of correction, remediation, or retesting following User Acceptance Testing proposers should assume within the applicable fixed milestone price.**
A: If there are any change orders that create materials changes to the scope of work, they must be formally approved by both parties before proceeding.

94. **The RFP requires milestone based fixed pricing and invoicing upon completion of major milestones. Please clarify how payment will be handled if a milestone or the overall project is substantially, but not fully, completed by July 31, 2027.**
For example, if approximately 90 percent of an applicable milestone has been completed by July 31, 2027, will the Contractor be entitled to payment for the objectively completed portion of that milestone?
Would the Authority permit partial payment based on documented work performed, completed deliverables, objectively verifiable percentage completion, or another mutually agreed measure of progress where the applicable milestone has not reached full completion? Please also confirm whether payment for properly performed and accepted services is contingent upon the Authority receiving reimbursement under the applicable grant.
A: The work must be completed by July 31, 2027. If there is a delay to the project that is clearly communicated and understood by both parties or created due to an agreed upon change in scope the Authority will pay for all services rendered.

Payment for services is not contingent on the Authority's grant reimbursement details and will be made in accordance with the payment terms outline in the sample contract.

95. Please clarify whether July 31, 2027 represents an absolute contractual completion deadline or the current deadline associated with the Authority's grant funding.
If the project schedule is affected by delays attributable to the Authority, the Contractor, mutually agreed scope changes, third party dependencies, Microsoft related dependencies, equipment procurement, Authority approvals, staff availability, User Acceptance Testing, unforeseen technical conditions, or other circumstances affecting the agreed schedule, may affected milestones and the overall project schedule be reasonably extended by mutual agreement?
If a delay attributable to the Authority or a mutually agreed project change makes completion by July 31, 2027 impracticable, will the Authority seek an extension of the applicable grant deadline where available?
If an extension beyond July 31, 2027 is not available, please clarify how the Authority will address compensation for services properly performed through that date, including completed deliverables, partially completed milestones, and authorized work in progress.
A: July 31, 2027 is the deadline for project completion per the grant terms. The Authority cannot provide any comment on the possibility or likelihood of a grant extension. The Authority is entering into this project looking to engage a vendor who is as committed as the Authority is to complete the project before the deadline.

96. Please confirm that each milestone will have mutually understood and objective completion or acceptance criteria. Please also confirm the review period the Authority expects for milestone deliverables, the process for identifying and correcting any material deficiencies, and the payment term applicable to undisputed invoices following milestone completion and acceptance.
A: Each milestone deliverable will be evaluated based on the successful completion of its defined scope. The Authority will review and either approve or provide notice of material deficiencies for each milestone deliverable completed. If a material deficiency is identified, the vendor will correct the issue and resubmit for re-evaluation. Consultant is to provide a proposed project timeline as required by the RFP, and said timeline should outline the UA review period and timeline to remedy any deficiencies. Payment terms are Net 30.

97. The RFP requests separate pricing for post deployment support. Does the Authority have a target support term, anticipated monthly hour range, support hours, expected response and resolution times, or preferred pricing structure? If these parameters

have not yet been established, may proposers provide tiered support options with recommended service levels and pricing?
A: The authority does not have a preferred pricing structure in place for post deployment support. The vendor is to provide tiered support options with recommended service levels and pricing.

98. **During the anticipated one to two week on site migration period, will all staff members and devices requiring migration be available at the Authority's San Jose office? If Authority staff and devices are ordinarily located at preserves or other field locations, should proposers assume that those employees and devices will be scheduled to come to the San Jose office, or should the proposal include travel to additional Authority locations? Please also confirm whether the Authority will provide an appropriate staging area, network connectivity, administrative access, and Authority IT personnel to support device migration activities during the on site period.**
A: The Authority staff will be available at the single office location for the onsite migration period. The Authority will provide a staging area, network connectivity, administrative access where reasonable, and Authority IT staff will be available to support the effort.

99. **Please provide additional information regarding the Authority's current identity architecture. Is Microsoft Entra Connect currently deployed with mailbox enabled users synchronized from the on premises Active Directory environment? Is ADFS or another federation technology currently in use? Are any Microsoft 365 user accounts currently maintained independently from on premises Active Directory? Are multifactor authentication and Conditional Access currently enabled, and if so, for approximately what portion of users and administrative accounts?**
A: The authority is utilizing Entra Connect Sync (formerly known as Azure AD Sync) to connect Microsoft identities in a hybrid model from on-premises AD to Microsoft Entra ID. Currently, computers are excluded from this sync process and management and only the on-premises AD is managing those devices. By the end of the project there will be no need for an on-premises AD since Microsoft Entra ID in the cloud will retain and manage the Microsoft identities and users account while Intune will retain and manage the devices. Microsoft SSO is currently being used. There are some accounts maintained independently on the on-premises AD. Multifactor authentication and conditional access policies is applied to all accounts.

100. The RFP requires the selected Contractor to evaluate alternative approaches for approximately 2.4 TB of file server data during Discovery, including SharePoint Online, OneDrive, a standalone file server environment, or another recommended architecture. Because these approaches may require materially different levels of effort and cost, please confirm whether proposers may price the implementation based on a stated file migration assumption, with any materially different architecture selected following Discovery addressed through an agreed change in scope and pricing.

A: The Authority does not permit post-discovery equitable adjustments to fixed-price milestones, as bids must be evaluated on a comparable, fixed-cost basis under public procurement guidelines. Proposers should not price for a worst-case scenario, but rather submit a best-balanced cost proposal utilizing the detailed technical data provided in the addendum, baking in reasonable contingencies for the unknowns to be finalized during discovery.

101. Please confirm whether proposers may identify specific proposal information as confidential, proprietary, trade secret, or security sensitive information. To the extent permitted under applicable public records law, will the Authority provide notice to the proposer before disclosure of information that the proposer has specifically identified as confidential or proprietary so that the proposer may pursue any available protections? We appreciate the Authority's clarification of these items and look forward to submitting our response.

A: The Authority is not intending to usurp any copyright or other protections over vendors proprietary work products. If proposers have specific proposal information that is confidential, proprietary, trade secret, or security sensitive they should identify it clearly so that the Authority can handle that information appropriately.

102. The Authority received a request to submit a form for a vendor in lieu of vendor questions.

The "questionnaire" provided contains a few questions, but largely requires the Authority to disclose a number of specifications and identifying information before the vendor's proposal is even submitted or selected. Providing answers may result in an unfair advantage to competing proposers, and the Authority does not have the staff time to devote to providing detailed information in response to a 14-page "questionnaire" to assist the potential vendor with its proposal. Moreover, Authority staff has one staff person dedicate to IT. If the vendor is selected, the Authority may provide the information to the vendor to assist with its work.