



KENTUCKY COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL ADDENDUM

SOLICITAION NO.: RFP-0355
ADDENDUM NO.: 1
RFP ISSUE DATE: July 23, 2026
ADDENDUM DATE: July 31, 2026
OPENING DATE: September 4, 2026 @ 4:00PM ET

***** RFP proposal submission deadline is extended to September 4, 2026 @ 4:00PM ET*****

The following information is being provided in response to written questions submitted for this RFP:

- 1) Are all the target and source systems centralized, such as 1 AD and PeopleSoft that are shared, or does each location have its own instances of the Source of Authority and Target Applications?
 - a. KCTCS uses a centralized enterprise solution for all its colleges. All colleges and systems share the same IDM practices and infrastructure.
- 2) Are you looking to replace existing SSO with a new solution, and does each location have its own SSO?
 - a. KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.
- 3) May the prime offeror rely upon the documented experience and references of its named software provider and/or approved subcontractor to satisfy Sections 15.A and 15.B, including the required higher-education reference?
 - a. No. Offeror should list experience and references as the company that KCTCS will work to award and contract with. Offeror should only use subcontractors and providers they are confident with representing their company in fulfilling services as required. Offeror will be held responsible for any failure of services within the scope of the resulting contract.
- 4) May the responding offeror serve as the prime contractor, reseller, local implementation provider, and ongoing support provider, with the IGA software manufacturer and specialized PeopleSoft implementation provider identified as subcontractors?
 - a. KCTCS will only award a contract to one Offeror. If the Offeror is planning to utilize subcontracts to fulfill the scope of this solicitation, then that should be included in the submitted proposal. The resulting contract will only be payable to the awarded Offeror. KCTCS will not be making payments directly to subcontractors. Offeror must be able to fulfill the requirements of the solicitation.
- 5) When the prime contractor does not host, maintain or directly process KCTCS identity data, may the SOC Type II report of the SaaS platform and hosting provider satisfy the SOC Type II requirements?
 - a. KCTCS desires SOC reports from the platform where the data is hosted or processed.
- 6) Does Section 31 require the offeror and platform provider to possess ISO/IEC 27001 certification, or is documented alignment with controls at least as rigorous as ISO/IEC 27001 and 27002 acceptable?
 - a. Documented alignment controls is acceptable.
- 7) Does the source-code escrow requirement apply to an established, commercially available SaaS platform? If so, may the software manufacturer's existing source-code escrow arrangement satisfy this requirement?
 - a. This section is not applicable if KCTCS does not receive or operate the source code.
- 8) Must all insurance limits listed in Section 48 be active when the proposal is submitted, or may the offeror provide evidence of its ability to obtain the required coverage before contract commencement, except for the Errors and Omissions documentation requested in Section 15.F?
 - a. Required insurance coverage will only be necessary for the successful Offeror prior to the execution of a contract and engagement of services.

- 9) For pricing purposes, should platform licensing be based on 1.7 million total stored identities, approximately 240,000 annual active users, peak concurrent users, or another measure specified in the Financial Cost Worksheet?

a. Offerors may use their platform licensing of choice based on the following numbers:

Staff	4560
Faculty	2570
Students	120,000
Recent students/graduates	120,000
Contractors	1270
Previous staff/students we still have records for, but accounts are inactive	1,500,000

- 10) Is KCTCS seeking one provider responsible for software licensing, implementation and ongoing support, or will KCTCS consider a team consisting of a prime contractor, software manufacturer, and specialized implementation partner?

a. KCTCS will only award a contract to one Offeror. If the Offeror is planning to utilize subcontracts to fulfill the scope of this solicitation, then that should be included in the submitted proposal. The resulting contract will only be payable to the awarded Offeror. KCTCS will not be making payments directly to subcontractors. Offeror must be able to fulfill the requirements of the solicitation.

- 11) Section 4. Scope – Legacy IDM in PeopleSoft: RFP mentions a “legacy identity management system developed within the PeopleSoft environment” but does not describe the broader IAM stack. Besides the PeopleSoft-embedded identity management functions, what IAM components are currently in use (e.g., AD DS, Entra ID, AD FS, other IDPs, custom portals, legacy IGA tools)?

a. The current KCTCS IDM system is a custom identity management platform built inside PeopleSoft Campus Solutions. Identity data from students, employees, affiliates, HR, Financials, and DSS is consolidated into custom Campus Solutions tables where relationship-based business rules determine access. Custom IDA processes generate provisioning transactions that are imported into AD and processed by PowerShell scripts, which provision accounts, groups, mailboxes, and licenses in Active Directory, Azure AD, and Microsoft 365. The environment provides automated lifecycle management but relies heavily on custom PeopleSoft code, batch jobs, Oracle tables, file-based integrations, and PowerShell scripting. SSO/MFA and application access is controlled by Microsoft software, and this will not change.

- 12) Section 4. Scope – Integration Capabilities: RFP requires integration with Entra ID, Active Directory, Office 365, SIS, LMS, FMS, HCM, Oracle Analytics. How are these systems integrated with existing IAM today (e.g., manual provisioning, scripts, scheduled batch jobs, existing connectors, middleware), and which integrations are working well vs causing issues?

a. The current KCTCS IDM system is a custom identity management platform built inside PeopleSoft Campus Solutions. Identity data from students, employees, affiliates, HR, Financials, and DSS is consolidated into custom Campus Solutions tables where relationship-based business rules determine access. Custom IDA processes generate provisioning transactions that are imported into AD and processed by PowerShell scripts, which provision accounts, groups, mailboxes, and licenses in Active Directory, Azure AD, and Microsoft 365. The environment provides automated lifecycle management but relies heavily on custom PeopleSoft code, batch jobs, Oracle tables, file-based integrations, and PowerShell scripting. SSO/MFA and application access is controlled by Microsoft software, and this will not change.

- 13) Section 4. Scope – User Populations: Multiple user types and large scale identities. What is your current authoritative system of record for each user type (students, faculty, staff, adjuncts, contractors, consultants, temporary workers), and are there any parallel or conflicting sources (e.g., multiple HR systems)?

a. PeopleSoft Campus Solutions (CS) and PeopleSoft Human Capital Management (HCM) are the authoritative systems of record. Campus Solutions data is used for student account creation, while faculty, staff, and affiliate account creation is driven by data from PeopleSoft HCM. The data from HCM is integrated into Campus Solutions, which serves as the source for subsequent identity and account provisioning processes. KCTCS would like contractors and affiliates to be managed directly within the new Identity Management (IDM) system rather than through the HR system, providing a centralized and streamlined approach to identity lifecycle management for these populations.

- 14) Section 4. Scope – Entra ID and AD Mentioned: Entra ID and Active Directory are listed as systems to integrate with, but their current roles are not described. How is Entra ID currently used (license level, workloads, SSO/MFA) and how is on-prem AD structured (forests, domains, trusts) across the KCTCS colleges and campuses?
- a. KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.
- 15) Section 1. Overview & KCTCS Operations: KCTCS is a multi-college system with many campuses and shared services. Do all colleges share the same IAM practices and infrastructure (AD, IDP, portals), or are there significant local variations (e.g., separate domains, local IDPs, local IAM solutions)?
- a. All colleges and systems share the same IDM practices and infrastructure.
- 16) Section 4. Scope – User Population and Scale: >1.7M identities, ~240k active users annually, multiple user types including students, faculty, staff, adjuncts, contractors, consultants, temporary workers. How are these populations currently represented across your identity stores (e.g., Entra ID, AD, SIS, HCM)? Do you have a single enterprise identifier that links a person across systems and institutions?
- a. Each user is assigned a unique EMPLID and username. The username is used as the User Principal Name (UPN) in Active Directory; however, the EMPLID serves as the primary unique identifier across all KCTCS colleges and campuses. While usernames may change over time, the EMPLID remains permanent. All colleges share a single domain/tenant and Identity Provider (IdP). In addition to the EMPLID, the sAMAccountName, UPN, and SMTP email address must also be unique across the environment.
- 17) Section 4. Scope – Multi-Affiliation Support: Solution must support multiple affiliations for a single user across institutions. How do you currently model multi-affiliation users (e.g., student at College A, adjunct at College B, alumni)? Are these affiliations stored and managed centrally or per institution?
- a. Users are assigned to groups called relations, which determine the types of access they receive. For example, a user may have a Current Student relation at one college and an Employee relation at another. Access rights and entitlements from all assigned relations are combined and provisioned to the user's account. Each user is also assigned a primary relation, which is determined based on the ranking or priority of their active relations. While entitlements from all relations are applied, only the user's primary relation is sent to Active Directory (AD) for account classification and provisioning purposes. Relations, rankings, and associated access rights are centrally managed and maintained across the KCTCS environment.
- 18) Section 4. Scope – Contractors and Adjuncts: Must handle contractors, adjunct faculty, and others who do not pass through HR systems. What systems or processes currently manage contractors and adjunct faculty (e.g., local spreadsheets, identity system, ticketing)? Are there standard onboarding/offboarding workflows for them?
- a. KCTCS classifies this type of user as an affiliate. Affiliates request access through an online workflow that includes multiple levels of approval. Once approved, the individual is added to PeopleSoft HCM, and access is granted by assigning the appropriate relation within PeopleSoft, which drives provisioning and access rights. Adjunct faculty are managed through a separate process and are established using the Instructor/Advisor table in PeopleSoft rather than the affiliate workflow. As part of the future-state design, KCTCS would like affiliates, contractors, and similar non-employee populations to be managed directly within the new Identity Management (IDM) system rather than through the HR system, providing a more streamlined and centralized approach to identity lifecycle management.
- 19) Section 4. Scope – Distributed IAM: Support distributed IAM for shared services while maintaining local control. From your perspective, what should be centrally governed vs locally controlled (e.g., global policies, roles vs institution-specific groups and applications)?
- a. All functions are currently governed and managed centrally, and that approach will remain in place during the initial implementation phase. However, KCTCS would like the flexibility to delegate administrative functions to individual colleges in the future, if desired, while maintaining appropriate oversight, governance, and centralized control.
- 20) Section 4. Scope – Identity Governance: Centralized governance with flexibility for individual colleges, plus user-friendly audit/compliance reporting. How do you envision access certifications and role reviews: per application, per role, per institution, or a combination? Who are the business owners expected to approve certifications?
- a. This function is currently governed and managed centrally, and that approach will remain in place during the initial implementation phase. However, KCTCS would like the flexibility to delegate administrative functions to individual colleges in the future, if desired, while maintaining appropriate oversight, governance, and centralized control.

- 21) Section 4. Scope – Authentication and MFA: MFA with multiple methods (push, alternate email, TOTP, U2F/FIDO tokens). Are there specific MFA policies or constraints per population (students vs staff vs contractors), and any groups that must be exempt or handled differently (e.g., exam labs, kiosk scenarios)?
- a. KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.
- 22) Section 4. Scope – SSO and Applications: Enable SSO for all applications and services and one-click access via portals. Do you plan to standardize on a single IDP (e.g., Entra ID) for all SSO-capable applications, or do you foresee maintaining multiple IDPs for certain legacy or external apps?
- a. KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.
- 23) Section 4. Scope – Branded Portals: Ability to incorporate IAM into existing branded portals for each institution. What technologies power your current branded portals (e.g., CMS, custom web apps) and how do they authenticate today? Should the IAM solution integrate behind these portals or partly replace existing login experiences?
- a. Users authenticate through Microsoft Entra ID using Single Sign-On (SSO). The proposed solution should replace the existing account claiming process with a streamlined, automated identity verification and account activation experience.
- 24) Section 4. Scope – Account Claim and Duplicate Remediation: Requires account claim process, identity correlation, remediation of duplicate accounts, and minimizing duplicates for multi-college students. How do users currently claim their accounts, and how are duplicate accounts detected and resolved across colleges today? What pain points would you like to eliminate?
- a. Currently, users receive an email containing a code and are directed to a KCTCS website, where they enter the code along with other identifying information to complete the account setup and claiming process. KCTCS utilizes a PeopleSoft process that periodically scans for potential duplicate identities. Any potential matches are subject to manual review and verification before a record merge is performed to ensure data accuracy and integrity. The proposed solution should replace the existing account claiming process with a streamlined, automated identity verification and account activation experience.
- 25) Section 4. Scope – Near Real-Time Lifecycle: Near real-time updates for account provisioning, deprovisioning, and security access requests, large-scale student onboarding/offboarding. What are your expected SLAs for provisioning and deprovisioning from the moment a change occurs in SIS/HCM (e.g., minutes, hours), especially during peak enrollment periods?
- a. KCTCS requests identity and access changes to be reflected as close to real time as possible, with a maximum acceptable propagation time of 15 minutes.
- 26) Section 4. Scope – Threat Detection and Response: Requires threat detection and response, plus integration with major SIEM platforms including Elastic SIEM in AWS. Do you expect the IAM solution to provide primarily identity-centric threat detections (e.g., unusual login, privilege misuse) or to be part of a broader SOC capability? How is your current SIEM/SOC organized between Elastic and any Azure security tools?
- a. KCTCS expects the IAM solution to integrate with the existing Elastic SIEM platform in AWS for centralized security monitoring, logging, and audit reporting.
- 27) Section 4. Scope – SIEM Integration: Integrate with major SIEM platforms, including Elastic SIEM in AWS, with ability to ingest and retrieve log data. What log formats, ingestion mechanisms, and retention requirements do you prefer for IAM/IGA logs flowing into Elastic SIEM (and any Azure-based SIEM)?
- a. KCTCS requires logs to be retained for a minimum of 30 days and exported in JSON format. Additional requirements will be finalized at a later date.
- 28) Section 4. Scope – Technical Requirements: Cloud-hosted solution preferably on AWS or equivalent, distributed IAM, API-based integration, RBAC, ABAC, delegated admin. How should we interpret preferably on AWS or equivalent in the context of an Azure/Entra-centric solution? Are you open to Azure as the primary IAM platform while keeping Elastic SIEM on AWS?
- a. KCTCS does not require a specific approach, provided the Offeror's solution can integrate with the systems and technologies identified in the RFP.

- 29) Section 4. Scope – Integration Capabilities: Integration with SIS, LMS, FMS, HCM, Office 365, Entra ID, AD, Oracle Analytic Server. Do you have existing integration platforms or middleware (ESB, iPaaS, API gateway) that you want reused, or should IAM/IGA integrations be primarily built using Azure services (Functions, Logic Apps, Event Grid)?
- KCTCS does not require a specific approach, provided the Offeror's solution can integrate with the systems and technologies identified in the RFP.
- 30) Section 4. Scope – Access Requests and Certification: Requires access request processing, workflow orchestration, and access certification. Are access requests today managed centrally or locally per college, and do you have existing tools (e.g., ticketing systems) that you want the new solution to integrate with or replace?
- Access requests are currently managed through a centralized process. KCTCS does not plan to integrate its ticketing system with the IAM solution at this time.
- 31) Section 4. Scope – Low-Code and Limited IDM Staffing: Low-code environment that can be managed with limited IDM staffing. How many staff currently work on IAM/IGA (central and per college), and what technical skills (e.g., Entra admin, PowerShell, API integration) do you want the new solution to rely on or build?
- Not relevant for RFP.
- 32) Section 4. Scope – User Experience: Enhance user experience for students, faculty, and staff, one-click access, reduced duplicates, seamless onboarding/offboarding. Are there specific user journeys (e.g., new student registration, adjunct onboarding, contractor access) that you see as priority scenarios for UX improvement in the first phase?
- Onboarding student experience improved particularly in the account claiming process. Users authenticate through Microsoft Entra ID using Single Sign-On (SSO). The proposed solution should replace the existing account claiming process with a streamlined, automated identity verification and account activation experience.
- 33) Section 4. Scope – Implementation Support: Phased implementation plan, training for IT staff and administrators, ongoing support and maintenance, ability to work with third-party consulting partners. Do you have a preferred implementation phasing (e.g., pilot college + SIS + Entra, then expand) and any academic or operational blackout periods we must avoid for major changes?
- Based on the current architecture, all users and connected systems would need to transition to the new solution simultaneously. KCTCS observes blackout periods during the Fall and Spring academic terms, with specific dates to be provided during project planning. The existing identity management environment relies on seven core processes that support all users across the institution. While a phased implementation of these processes may be possible, changes would likely impact the entire user population due to the shared nature of the current infrastructure and processes.
- 34) Section 15. Proposal Instructions & Evaluation: Emphasizes overview/experience, proposed solution, implementation, staffing, additional info, and cost, extension to other institutions possible. Beyond the RFP scoring criteria, are there any strategic priorities (e.g., standardizing on Microsoft stack, future zero trust initiatives) that you want us to explicitly align with in the solution narrative?
- No.
- 35) Section 4. Scope & Security of Information / Data Sharing Agreement: Security of information, potential Data Sharing Agreement, and legal obligations for handling KCTCS data. Are there any additional data residency, privacy, or security requirements (e.g., restrictions on offshore support, remote access controls) that are not explicitly stated in the RFP but that we must design for?
- To the best of KCTCS' knowledge there are no other requirements that were not listed in the RFP.
- 36) Section 4. Scope – Scalability and Performance: Must support >1.7M identities, 240k active users, high availability and disaster recovery. What are your target non-functional requirements (e.g., uptime %, RTO/RPO, max acceptable login latency) for the IAM/IGA solution?
- Target Non-Functional Requirements**
Service Availability (Uptime): **99.9% or greater**
Recovery Time Objective (RTO): **1 hour or less**
Recovery Point Objective (RPO): **15 minutes or less**
Authentication Latency: **95% of authentication requests completed within 2 seconds under normal operating conditions**
Identity Provisioning: **Account creation, modification, and deprovisioning completed within 15 minutes of source-system change**
High Availability: **No single point of failure and support for geographically redundant disaster recovery**
Disaster Recovery Testing: **Annual documented DR testing with results available upon request**

Scalability: **Support for at least 1.7 million identities and 240,000 active users without material degradation in performance**

Planned Maintenance: **No outage required for routine maintenance, or maintenance limited to published maintenance windows**

- 37) Section 4. Scope – Legacy IDM in PeopleSoft: RFP references a legacy identity management system developed within PeopleSoft environment. How do you plan the coexistence and transition from the current PeopleSoft-embedded identity system to the new IAM/IGA solution (big bang vs phased coexistence)?
- KCTCS would like the proposed solution to operate in a monitoring or logging-only mode for a period of time prior to cutover, allowing provisioning activities and identity processes to be validated before production implementation. Based on the current architecture, all users and connected systems would need to transition to the new solution simultaneously. KCTCS observes blackout periods during the Fall and Spring academic terms, with specific dates to be provided during project planning. The existing identity management environment relies on seven core processes that support all users across the institution. While a phased implementation of these processes may be possible, changes would likely impact the entire user population due to the shared nature of the current infrastructure and processes.
- 38) Section 4. Scope – Cloud Hosting Preference: Cloud-hosted solution preferably on AWS or equivalent. Do you have any restrictions or preferences regarding Azure region selection (e.g., specific US regions) and cross-region data replication for DR?
- No.
- 39) Section 4. Scope – RBAC/ABAC and Delegated Administration: Requires RBAC, ABAC, delegated administration. How granular do you expect delegated administration to be (per college, department, application), and are there existing governance structures we should align to (e.g., committee or role hierarchy)?
- Access management is currently administered centrally across KCTCS. While delegated administration is not required for the initial implementation, KCTCS would like the option to enable and expand delegated administration to individual colleges in the future. Offerors should include this capability as an optional feature in Section 2 of the Cost Worksheet.
- 40) Section 4. Scope – Low-Code Expectation: Low-code environment managed with limited IDM staffing. Are you comfortable with some custom integrations (e.g., Functions, Logic Apps) where necessary, or do you require the solution to rely almost entirely on off-the-shelf connectors and configuration?
- While KCTCS prefers to minimize customizations whenever possible, we recognize that some custom integrations will be necessary to support unique business requirements and ensure compatibility with existing systems.
- 41) Section 4. Scope & Training Requirements: Training for IT staff and administrators, ongoing support and maintenance. What depth and format of training do you expect (e.g., formal instructor-led courses, hands-on labs, recorded sessions), and for which audiences (central IT, college IT, helpdesk)?
- Most training will be provided to central IT staff and should include comprehensive, hands-on instruction to support administration and ongoing management of the solution. Training may be delivered remotely via Microsoft Teams. Additional training sessions should be available for other KCTCS IT personnel, as needed, and may also be delivered through Microsoft Teams.
- 42) Section 4. Scope & Implementation Support / Oral Presentations: Phased implementation, ability to work with third-party consulting partners, possible oral presentations. After go-live, what level of ongoing vendor/system integrator involvement do you envision (e.g., fully managed service, periodic health checks, support only during peak periods)?
- Following go-live, KCTCS anticipates requiring vendor and/or system integrator support on an as-needed basis for technical issues, troubleshooting, and optimization activities. KCTCS also expects periodic system health checks and best-practice reviews to help ensure the solution continues to operate effectively and align with evolving business and security requirements.

43) Section 4. Scope – SSO and Applications:

RFP mentions support for below:

Authentication

o Support Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) with multiple methods:

- Push notifications
- Alternate email
- Time-Based One-Time Password (TOTP)
- U2F FIDO tokens

o Enable Single Sign-On (SSO) for all applications and services.

Do you expect the solution to provide Identity Provider (IdP), Access Management, and Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) capabilities, or should it integrate with your existing Identity Provider (IdP) solution, such as Microsoft Entra ID?

- a. KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.

44) Resources: Could you please confirm whether KCTCS permits vendors to deliver services from offshore locations (e.g., India), or whether all services are required to be provided exclusively from within the United States?

- a. Offerors should have a US based office.

45) Data retention and Migration: What is the expected migration scope, only active identities or all 1.7 million historical identity records? What historical data must be migrated, including usernames, email addresses, access history, approvals, certifications, roles and audit logs?

- a. Historical data to be migrated includes usernames, email addresses, approvals, certifications, roles, and other identity-related information. Additional data elements and migration requirements may be identified and refined during the implementation and discovery phases.

46) **Authentication and SSO Identity Provider Role:** The Scope identifies both Entra ID and Active Directory among the systems for integration and lists Single Sign-On and authentication as required capabilities. Can KCTCS clarify whether the new IGA platform is expected to serve as the primary authentication and Single Sign-On identity provider, or whether it should federate through Entra ID as the primary IdP, with the platform delivering identity lifecycle management and governance?

- a. KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.

47) **Access Certification and Workflow Orchestration Scope:** The Scope calls for access certification, access request processing, and workflow orchestration. Can KCTCS describe the expected scope and delivery timeline for these capabilities, specifically which are required at initial go-live versus phased in over the five-year term? Also, please confirm whether there is a required cadence for access certifications, such as annual or semi-annual review cycles.

- a. KCTCS anticipates a 9-month implementation timeline encompassing discovery, design, implementation, testing, and production rollout activities. Based on the current architecture, all users and connected systems would need to transition to the new solution simultaneously. KCTCS observes blackout periods during the Fall and Spring academic terms, with specific dates to be provided during project planning. The existing identity management environment relies on seven core processes that support all users across the institution. While a phased implementation of these processes may be possible, changes would likely impact the entire user population due to the shared nature of the current infrastructure and processes. In addition, access certification reviews are required to be conducted on an annual basis.

48) **Application Integration Scope and Inventory:** The Scope lists a representative set of systems for integration, including the SIS, LMS, Office 365, the PeopleSoft Financial and HCM systems, and others. Can KCTCS confirm the approximate number of applications and services that will require Single Sign-On and provisioning integration?

- a. KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.

49) **Peak Concurrent Usage:** The Scope references approximately 240,000 active users annually against a total identity population of over 1.7 million. To help us size the solution appropriately, can KCTCS provide an estimate of peak concurrent usage, particularly during high-demand periods such as the start of a semester or back-to-school enrollment?

- a. The proposed solution should support up to 120,000 active users during peak usage periods while maintaining acceptable performance and response times.

- 50) **Peak and Non-Peak User Counts:** Can KCTCS provide the approximate active user counts during peak and non-peak periods? Understanding the range across the year will help us estimate the infrastructure required to support demand at scale.
- a. Peak active user volume is approximately 120,000 users. Estimating non-peak user counts is challenging, as student accounts remain active between academic terms and are not routinely deprovisioned during enrollment gaps.
- 51) **Institution Branded Portals:** The User Experience requirements reference incorporating identity into existing branded portals for each institution, noting 17. Can KCTCS confirm which portals are in scope and provide their names, along with any indication of whether each requires a separately branded login experience?
- a. KCTCS expects the Offeror's solution to integrate seamlessly with the existing branded web pages used by each college and the System Office, while maintaining a consistent user experience and institutional branding.
- 52) The Scope describes a single system supporting multiple institutions across the Commonwealth, while also referencing distributed IAM for shared services with local control. Can KCTCS clarify whether the core systems such as the SIS, Financial Management System, and HCM are shared instances common to all institutions, or whether individual colleges operate distinct systems with differing integration requirements? This will help us accurately scope the integration effort and reflect it in our proposed approach and pricing.
- a. The core systems such as the SIS, Financial Management System, and HCM are shared instances common to all institutions.
- 53) **Current Identity Management Environment:** Can KCTCS provide an overview of its current identity management environment, including the identity governance platform (if any), authentication platform(s), identity repositories, and other IAM components that will remain in place and require integration with the proposed solution?
- a. The current KCTCS IDM system is a custom identity management platform built inside PeopleSoft Campus Solutions. Identity data from students, employees, affiliates, HR, Financials, and DSS is consolidated into custom Campus Solutions tables where relationship-based business rules determine access. Custom IDA processes generate provisioning transactions that are imported into AD and processed by PowerShell scripts, which provision accounts, groups, mailboxes, and licenses in Active Directory, Azure AD, and Microsoft 365. The environment provides automated lifecycle management but relies heavily on custom PeopleSoft code, batch jobs, Oracle tables, file-based integrations, and PowerShell scripting. SSO/MFA and application access is controlled by Microsoft software, and this will not change.
- 54) **Migration Scope:** Can KCTCS clarify the expected migration scope, including whether identity data, provisioning rules, access policies, workflows, approval processes, application connectors, and historical audit records are expected to be migrated to the new solution?
- a. We expect a 9-month cycle including discovery, implementation, testing, and rollout. This will include identity data, provisioning rules, access policies, workflows, and approval processes. Historical data that needs to be migrated include usernames, email addresses, approvals, certifications, and roles, and others that may be discovered during implementation.
- 55) **Initial Integration Scope:** Can KCTCS identify which enterprise systems are expected to be integrated during the initial implementation phase and whether any remaining integrations may be completed during subsequent phases?
- a. KCTCS expects the PeopleSoft Campus Solutions (CS) student accounts and PeopleSoft HCM accounts be implemented during the initial phase. Currently, HCM feeds into CS to create employee and affiliate accounts. These will need to be tied to together and transferred to AD. PeopleSoft Campus Solutions (CS) and PeopleSoft Human Capital Management (HCM) are the authoritative systems of record. Campus Solutions data is used for student account creation, while faculty, staff, and affiliate account creation is driven by data from PeopleSoft HCM. The data from HCM is integrated into Campus Solutions, which serves as the source for subsequent identity and account provisioning processes. KCTCS would like contractors and affiliates to be managed directly within the new Identity Management (IDM) system rather than through the HR system, providing a centralized and streamlined approach to identity lifecycle management for these populations.

56) **Identity Population Breakdown:** Can KCTCS provide an approximate breakdown of the managed identity population by user type (e.g., active students, alumni, faculty, staff, contractors, service accounts, and inactive identities) to assist Offerors in accurately sizing governance and lifecycle management activities?

a. Offerors may use their platform licensing of choice based on the following numbers:

Staff	4560
Faculty	2570
Students	120,000
Recent students/graduates	120,000
Contractors	1270
Previous staff/students we still have records for, but accounts are inactive	1,500,000

57) **Higher Education Reference Requirement:** The RFP states that at least one client reference should be an institution of Higher Education. Could KCTCS please confirm whether this is a mandatory responsiveness requirement, or whether references demonstrating comparable enterprise Identity and Access Management implementations of similar scope, scale, and complexity in other industries will also be considered acceptable?

a. Having a reference with an institution of higher education is not a requirement to submit a proposal, but it is a preference to KCTCS in this solicitation.

58) What systems will serve as the authoritative identity sources for each user population (students, employees, contractors, alumni, affiliates, etc.)?

a. PeopleSoft Campus Solutions (CS) and PeopleSoft Human Capital Management (HCM) are the authoritative systems of record. Campus Solutions data is used for student account creation, while faculty, staff, and affiliate account creation is driven by data from PeopleSoft HCM. The data from HCM is integrated into Campus Solutions, which serves as the source for subsequent identity and account provisioning processes. KCTCS would like contractors and affiliates to be managed directly within the new Identity Management (IDM) system rather than through the HR system, providing a centralized and streamlined approach to identity lifecycle management for these populations.

59) How are non-PeopleSoft identities (contractors, vendors, guest users, visiting faculty, affiliates) currently created and managed, and what is the desired future-state process?

a. KCTCS classifies this type of user as an affiliate. Affiliates request access through an online workflow that includes multiple levels of approval. Once approved, the individual is added to PeopleSoft HCM, and access is granted by assigning the appropriate relation within PeopleSoft, which drives provisioning and access rights. Adjunct faculty are managed through a separate process and are established using the Instructor/Advisor table in PeopleSoft rather than the affiliate workflow. As part of the future-state design, KCTCS would like affiliates, contractors, and similar non-employee populations to be managed directly within the new Identity Management (IDM) system rather than through the HR system, providing a more streamlined and centralized approach to identity lifecycle management.

60) How many Active Directory forests/domains and Microsoft Entra ID tenants are in scope, and is there a requirement to consolidate or synchronize identities across them?

a. KCTCS uses a centralized enterprise solution for all its colleges. All colleges and systems share the same IDM practices and infrastructure.

61) How are role models currently managed across the 16 colleges? Does KCTCS currently maintain an enterprise role model, or is role engineering and role mining expected as part of this engagement?

a. KCTCS currently maintains an enterprise-wide role model that defines and governs access across the institution.

62) Approximately how many birthright roles, requestable roles, and application entitlements are expected to be governed by the new platform?

a.

Staff	4560
Faculty	2570
Students	120,000
Recent students/graduates	120,000
Contractors	1270
Previous staff/students we still have records for but deleted accounts	1,500,000

KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.

- 63) Are there applications with custom provisioning interfaces that will require bespoke connector development? If so, approximately how many?
- No. KCTCS expects standard, out-of-the-box integrations to be available for PeopleSoft, Active Directory, Microsoft Entra ID, and Microsoft 365/Exchange Online as part of the proposed solution.
- 64) What legacy identity data (usernames, account history, audit records, role assignments, identities) must be migrated to the new platform?
- Historical data that needs to be migrated include usernames, email addresses, approvals, certifications, and roles, and others that may be discovered during implementation.
- 65) Are there any existing IAM technologies (IGA, Access Management, MFA, Password Management, PAM) that will remain in place and require integration with the proposed solution?
- KCTCS utilizes Delinea Secret Server for privileged credential management for select users. This will not be required to integrate with the IAM solution. Also, MFA and SSO will remain in place and will require integration with the proposed solution.
- 66) How many applications are expected to be included in Phase 1, and what criteria will determine the implementation waves?
- KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.
- 67) Are there regulatory or audit requirements (FERPA, PCI, HIPAA, etc.) that require predefined certification campaigns, SoD controls, or reporting beyond standard IGA capabilities?
- The KCTCS RFP team is not currently aware of any such requirements, constraints, or dependencies at this time. Additional data elements and requirements may be identified and refined during the implementation and discovery phases.
- 68) Can KCTCS provide the total number of applications that require identity lifecycle management (provisioning/deprovisioning), categorized by priority?
- The current KCTCS IDM system is a custom identity management platform built inside PeopleSoft Campus Solutions. Identity data from students, employees, affiliates, HR, Financials, and DSS is consolidated into custom Campus Solutions tables where relationship-based business rules determine access. Custom IDA processes generate provisioning transactions that are imported into AD and processed by PowerShell scripts, which provision accounts, groups, mailboxes, and licenses in Active Directory, Azure AD, and Microsoft 365. The environment provides automated lifecycle management but relies heavily on custom PeopleSoft code, batch jobs, Oracle tables, file-based integrations, and PowerShell scripting. SSO/MFA and application access is controlled by Microsoft software, and this will not change.
- 69) Of the applications in scope, how many require SSO, and which authentication protocols (SAML, OIDC, OAuth, LDAP, etc.) are currently supported?
- KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.
- 70) Is KCTCS seeking a pure Identity Governance & Administration (IGA) platform, or a combined IGA + IAM + PAM architecture?
- IAM + IGA
- 71) Will third-party implementation partners already contracted by KCTCS participate?
- This solicitation is open to the public for responses from any supplier that can meet the requirements and qualifications requested.

72) Has KCTCS established a target implementation timeline?

- a. We expect a 9-month cycle including discovery, implementation, testing, and rollout. This will include identity data, provisioning rules, access policies, workflows, and approval processes. Historical data that needs to be migrated include usernames, email addresses, approvals, certifications, and roles, and others that may be discovered during implementation.

73) Authentication Scope (MFA/SSO): Section 4 (Scope) lists Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) and Single Sign-On (SSO) as requirements. Could KCTCS clarify whether the proposed IGA/IAM solution must provide native MFA and SSO capabilities, or whether integration with existing identity systems such as Entra ID or Active Directory will satisfy this requirement? If native SSO is required, how many applications are expected to be onboarded?

- a. KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet

74) Could KCTCS please clarify whether it prefers that the Offeror propose the IGA solution on a resale basis as part of the submission, or whether the Offeror may provide the software licensing quote while KCTCS independently procures the software licenses through its preferred value-added reseller (VAR)?

- a. KCTCS does not plan to procure and provide software licenses separately. Offerors should provide all pricing required for the proposed solution, including applicable software licensing costs, as part of their response.

75) Unique Identity Identifier: Does every identity have a globally unique identifier across all colleges and campuses (e.g., a KCTCS ID or NetID) that is distinct from the Active Directory (AD) sAMAccountName?

- a. Each user is assigned a unique EMPLID and username. The username is used as the User Principal Name (UPN) in Active Directory; however, the EMPLID serves as the primary unique identifier across all KCTCS colleges and campuses. While usernames may change over time, the EMPLID remains permanent. All colleges share a single domain/tenant and Identity Provider (IdP). In addition to the EMPLID, the sAMAccountName, UPN, and SMTP email address must also be unique across the environment.

76) Systems of Record: What are the primary Systems of Record (SoR) for your various user affiliations (e.g., faculty, staff, students)? Specifically, which upstream systems master non-employees (contractors, vendors, guests) and alumni?

- a. PeopleSoft Campus Solutions (CS) and PeopleSoft Human Capital Management (HCM) are the authoritative systems of record. Campus Solutions data is used for student account creation, while faculty, staff, and affiliate account creation is driven by data from PeopleSoft HCM. The data from HCM is integrated into Campus Solutions, which serves as the source for subsequent identity and account provisioning processes. KCTCS would like contractors and affiliates to be managed directly within the new Identity Management (IDM) system rather than through the HR system, providing a centralized and streamlined approach to identity lifecycle management for these populations.

77) Duplicate Accounts for Multi-College Students: Could KCTCS please describe the current identity correlation or matching process used for students enrolled in multiple colleges, and clarify the expected outcome when a duplicate account is identified?

- a. KCTCS utilizes a PeopleSoft process that periodically scans for potential duplicate identities. Any potential matches are subject to manual review and verification before a record merge is performed to ensure data accuracy and integrity.

78) What will be the number of employees using the system?

- a. Staff 4560; Faculty 2570

79) If you have outside contractors or third-party vendors who need access to the system.....do you want to include them in your "employee pool" or would you like to use the NERM solution from Offeror? If NERM, how many users would there be partner?

- a. KCTCS classifies this type of user as an affiliate. Affiliates request access through an online workflow that includes multiple levels of approval. Once approved, the individual is added to PeopleSoft HCM, and access is granted by assigning the appropriate relation within PeopleSoft, which drives provisioning and access rights. Adjunct faculty are managed through a separate process and are established using the Instructor/Advisor table in PeopleSoft rather than the affiliate workflow. As part of the future-state design, KCTCS would like affiliates, contractors, and similar non-employee populations to be managed directly within the new Identity Management (IDM) system rather than through the HR system, providing a more streamlined and centralized approach to identity lifecycle management. We have approximately 1260 of these types of accounts.

80) What is the number of students that need to be included as users?

- a. 120,000 active; 120,000 recent students that still have access for a period of time.

81) What is the number of Alumni Users would you like have?

- a. KCTCS currently maintains approximately 25,000 recent alumni accounts per year that remain active for a defined period after graduation. While student records are retained for all alumni, account access is removed once the designated retention period has expired.

82) Define and breakdown of 1.7 million identities and 240,000 active users. How many users are students, staff, faculty, alumni, contractors, temporary users, super users, or administrators?

a.

Staff	4560
Faculty	2570
Students	120,000
Recent students/graduates	120,000
Contractors	1270
Previous staff/students we still have records for but deleted accounts	1,500,000

83) How many users are in each environment (prod/test/dev/etc)?

- a. Our development, test, and other non-production environments are regularly refreshed with production data. As a result, user volumes and data counts in those environments are generally comparable to the production environment.

84) Does the requirement to support 240,000 active users refer to annual active users or simultaneous concurrent sessions. Please provide an estimate of expected peak authentication use.

- a. 120,000 active; 120,000 recent students that still have access for a period of time; Staff 4560; Faculty 2570; 1260 affiliates.

85) Please provide a high-level description of the existing identity-management environment. Include major components, customizations, sources, workflows, and technologies that will be replaced or retained.

- a. The current KCTCS IDM system is a custom identity management platform built inside PeopleSoft Campus Solutions. Identity data from students, employees, affiliates, HR, Financials, and DSS is consolidated into custom Campus Solutions tables where relationship-based business rules determine access. Custom IDA processes generate provisioning transactions that are imported into AD and processed by PowerShell scripts, which provision accounts, groups, mailboxes, and licenses in Active Directory, Azure AD, and Microsoft 365. The environment provides automated lifecycle management but relies heavily on custom PeopleSoft code, batch jobs, Oracle tables, file-based integrations, and PowerShell scripting. SSO/MFA and application access is controlled by Microsoft software, and this will not change.

86) What annual growth rate should we account for within the five year contract term?

- a. 4% annual growth rate

87) Please provide the approximate number and type of existing identity interfaces, including APIs, web services, database integrations, flat-file exchanges, message queues, and scheduled batch processes.

- a. The current KCTCS IDM system is a custom identity management platform built inside PeopleSoft Campus Solutions. Identity data from students, employees, affiliates, HR, Financials, and DSS is consolidated into custom Campus Solutions tables where relationship-based business rules determine access. Custom IDA processes generate provisioning transactions that are imported into AD and processed by PowerShell scripts, which provision accounts, groups, mailboxes, and licenses in Active Directory, Azure AD, and Microsoft 365. The environment provides automated lifecycle management but relies heavily on custom PeopleSoft code, batch jobs, Oracle tables, file-based integrations, and PowerShell scripting. SSO/MFA and application access is controlled by Microsoft software, and this will not change.

88) Please identify the current number of applications requiring:

- A) SSO
- B) Automated provision
- C) Automated deprovisioning
- D) Access-request workflows
- E) Access certification
- F) Password synchronization or reset
- G) API integration

a. EntraID is our IdP. It will handle SSO and MFA. We primarily need automated provisioning for Active Directory. Additional API integration with EntraID and Exchange Online would be beneficial. There might be a need for integration with the LMS Blackboard, also. PeopleSoft Campus Solutions (CS) and PeopleSoft Human Capital Management (HCM) are the authoritative systems of record. Campus Solutions data is used for student account creation, while faculty, staff, and affiliate account creation is driven by data from PeopleSoft HCM. The data from HCM is integrated into Campus Solutions, which serves as the source for subsequent identity and account provisioning processes. KCTCS would like contractors and affiliates to be managed directly within the new Identity Management (IDM) system rather than through the HR system, providing a centralized and streamlined approach to identity lifecycle management for these populations

89) Please describe the decisions individual colleges must be able to control locally versus policies that must be administered

a. All functions are currently governed and managed centrally, and that approach will remain in place during the initial implementation phase. However, KCTCS would like the flexibility to delegate administrative functions to individual colleges in the future, if desired, while maintaining appropriate oversight, governance, and centralized control. Offerors should include this capability as an optional feature in Section 2 of the Cost Worksheet.

90) What is the minimum cloud environment availability commitment that is required, excluding or including scheduled maintenance?

a. **Target Non-Functional Requirements**

Service Availability (Uptime): **99.9% or greater**

Recovery Time Objective (RTO): **1 hour or less**

Recovery Point Objective (RPO): **15 minutes or less**

Authentication Latency: **95% of authentication requests completed within 2 seconds under normal operating conditions**

Identity Provisioning: **Account creation, modification, and deprovisioning completed within 15 minutes of source-system change**

High Availability: **No single point of failure and support for geographically redundant disaster recovery**

Disaster Recovery Testing: **Annual documented DR testing with results available upon request**

Scalability: **Support for at least 1.7 million identities and 240,000 active users without material degradation in performance**

Planned Maintenance: **No outage required for routine maintenance, or maintenance limited to published maintenance windows**

91) The RFP states that the solution should be cloud hosted, preferably on AWS or equivalent. Please confirm that a vendor-operated SaaS solution hosted on another major commercial cloud platform is considered equivalent and acceptable.

a. KCTCS does not require a specific platform, provided the Offeror's solution can integrate with the systems and technologies identified in the RFP.

92) Please clarify if the expectation is for the vendor of choice to run and maintain the requested services.

a. KCTCS expects the vendor to lead the implementation and rollout of the solution. Following deployment, KCTCS staff will assume responsibility for day-to-day operations and administration. The vendor should provide ongoing technical support as needed and be available to assist with system modifications, enhancements, or issues requiring specialized expertise.

93) Does the prohibition on offshoring also require that all personnel who can access KCTCS data, including support and engineering personnel, be physically located within the United States?

a. Personnel who will access KCTCS data should not be located outside the US

- 94) Please clarify the intended role of Microsoft Entra ID and Active Directory after implementation. Should the proposed solution replace, govern, federate with, or coexist with these platforms?
- KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.
- 95) Please describe existing connectivity between KCTCS, AWS, Microsoft cloud services, Oracle systems, and campus networks, including VPN, private circuits, or cloud interconnects.
- Microsoft cloud services are primarily accessed over the public internet using HTTPS. KCTCS also maintains an Azure ExpressRoute connection for infrastructure services; however, Entra ID and Microsoft 365 traffic do not traverse the ExpressRoute connection. AWS connectivity is provided through a site-to-site VPN with the KCTCS network. The Oracle systems (PeopleSoft Campus Solutions, HR, and Financials) are hosted on AWS. In addition, all KCTCS campuses have robust network connectivity to support access to cloud-based services.
- 96) How many environments are required? For example, development, test, integration, quality assurance, training, preproduction, production, and disaster recovery.
- KCTCS currently maintains separate Development, Test, Training, and Production environments. The proposed solution should provide comparable environments to support implementation, testing, training, and ongoing operations.
- 97) Does KCTCS expect the identity platform itself to provide behavioral threat detection and automated response, or may these functions be delivered through integration with KCTCS security tools?
- No. These functions will be delivered through integration with KCTCS security tools.
- 98) Please clarify the relationship between the 72-hour notification requirement in Section 43 and the two-business-day reporting requirement in Section 59. Which standard governs an actual or suspected incident?
- Any unauthorized disclosure of confidential information pertaining to KCTCS user information managed by the IAM. This mandate/statute is in accordance Kentucky House Bill 5: <https://kctcs.edu/about/safety-security/security-policy/cpe-breach.aspx>
- 99) What is KCTCS's desired date for the first production phase and for completion of the full implementation?
- We expect a 9-month cycle including discovery, implementation, testing, and rollout. This will include identity data, provisioning rules, access policies, workflows, and approval processes. Historical data that needs to be migrated include usernames, email addresses, approvals, certifications, and roles, and others that may be discovered during implementation.
- 100) Does KCTCS have a preferred implementation sequence, such as workforce identities first, students first, governance first, or authentication first?
- Based on the current architecture, all users and connected systems would need to transition to the new solution simultaneously. KCTCS observes blackout periods during the Fall and Spring academic terms, with specific dates to be provided during project planning. The existing identity management environment relies on seven core processes that support all users across the institution. While a phased implementation of these processes may be possible, changes would likely impact the entire user population due to the shared nature of the current infrastructure and processes.
- 101) Has KCTCS selected, or does it intend to select, a separate implementation or advisory partner?
- KCTCS will only award a contract to one Offeror. If the Offeror is planning to utilize subcontracts to fulfill the scope of this solicitation, then that should be included in the submitted proposal. The resulting contract will only be payable to the awarded Offeror. KCTCS will not be making payments directly to subcontractors. Offeror must be able to fulfill the requirements of the solicitation.
- 102) Should the prime Offeror include all required implementation services?
- KCTCS will only award a contract to one Offeror. If the Offeror is planning to utilize subcontracts to fulfill the scope of this solicitation, then that should be included in the submitted proposal. The resulting contract will only be payable to the awarded Offeror. KCTCS will not be making payments directly to subcontractors. Offeror must be able to fulfill the requirements of the solicitation.
- 103) Are there academic dates or operational blackout periods during which major migrations, authentication changes, or production cutovers cannot occur?
- Based on the current architecture, all users and connected systems would need to transition to the new solution simultaneously. KCTCS observes blackout periods during the Fall and Spring academic terms, with specific dates to

be provided during project planning. The existing identity management environment relies on seven core processes that support all users across the institution. While a phased implementation of these processes may be possible, changes would likely impact the entire user population due to the shared nature of the current infrastructure and processes.

- 104) Does KCTCS require independent accessibility testing in addition to vendor-provided conformance documentation?
- KCTCS does not require independent accessibility testing. ADA testing is handled in-house throughout the year at KCTCS.
- 105) Section 44.02 requires source-code escrow for software provided to KCTCS. Please confirm whether this requirement applies to commercially available multitenant products for which customers do not receive or operate the source code.
- This section is not applicable if KCTCS does not receive or operate the source code.
- 106) Section 50 requires data to be available within 48 hours and access to remain available for at least 120 days. Please clarify the required format, transfer mechanism, and whether standard export capabilities satisfy this requirement partner.
- The file format and transfer method will be determined during the implementation and design phase based on KCTCS requirements and the capabilities of the selected solution.
- 107) Please clarify whether the requirement that the vendor selected pay all notification, investigation, and mitigation costs applies only to incidents caused by the Offeror's failure to comply with its contractual security obligations.
- Kentucky's Personal Information Security Breach Investigations Act applies to security breaches involving personal information as defined in KRS 61.931 regardless of whether the party was at fault.
- 108) The RFP states that pricing must remain firm during the agreed contract term and requires 12 months' notice before increases in renewal periods. Please confirm whether subscription pricing must remain fixed for all five initial years.
- KCTCS has revised the Financial Cost Worksheet to reflect pricing for all five years. Please provide the proposed pricing for each year of the 5-year contract. Pricing will remain firm based on the proposed pricing.
- 109) Please confirm whether the table of contents, cover page, divider pages, compliance matrix, resumes, security certifications, accessibility documentation, and contractual exceptions count toward the 50-page limit.
- In response to the requested page limit, KCTCS has revised section 15 to read:
Each Proposal(s) should be kept to a **maximum of 75 pages**. The following required pages/information will not be included in maximum page count:
 - Signature Page (Page 1)
 - Any associated addendum issued during the solicitation process.
 - References (section B in the below criteria)
 - Fees (section G in the below criteria) – should be submitted as a separate document.
- 110) When a new student joins, how do you validate their identity to prevent fraud?
- KCTCS currently employs several controls to help identify potentially fraudulent applications, including checks against known fraudulent IP addresses and monitoring application completion times. Additional review is performed on an as-needed basis, with admissions staff evaluating applications for data inconsistencies or other indicators that warrant further investigation.
- 111) Will you be looking for identity verification services to prevent fraud?
- Identity verification services to prevent fraud are not within the scope of the current implementation phase. However, KCTCS may consider such capabilities in a future phase.
- 112) Would KCTCS please consider extending the response deadline to September 4, allowing more time for thorough review of requirements and responses to submitted questions?
- KCTCS agrees to extend the proposal submission deadline to 9/4/26 @ 4:00pm ET
- 113) When will we receive response to this Q&A?
- This Addendum is the response to all questions received for RFP-0355. KCTCS worked as quickly as possible to respond in a timely manner.

- 114) Please confirm that Offerors are permitted to take exceptions to certain terms in the RFP.
- Please refer to RFP section 21 for the precedence of order for terms. If Offeror submits exceptions to terms, there is no guarantee that KCTCS can or will accept the exceptions. Offeror should submit any exceptions to terms with proposal to ensure KCTCS is aware of intent. KCTCS will review request. Exceptions to terms will not affect the technical evaluation; however, per section 21, it could result in rejection of proposals or contract award should the terms not be acceptable to KCTCS.
- 115) The signature on page 1 of the RFP, Section 21 on page 11, and Section 57 on page 23 state that by submitting a proposal or responding to this RFP with a proposal, the Offeror accepts and agrees to KCTCS's terms and conditions and order of precedence. If exceptions are permitted, please confirm that KCTCS will not disregard such exception(s) and will not hold the Offeror to the term and conditions of the RFP as originally written.
- Please refer to RFP section 21 for the precedence of order for terms. If Offeror submits exceptions to terms, there is no guarantee that KCTCS can or will accept the exceptions. Offeror should submit any exceptions to terms with proposal to ensure KCTCS is aware of intent. KCTCS will review request. Exceptions to terms will not affect the technical evaluation; however, per section 21, it could result in rejection of proposals or contract award should the terms not be acceptable to KCTCS.
- 116) On RFP page 6, it states that "after contract award, this solicitation file will become a public record." Please confirm that Offeror's responses to this RFP will be subject to the Kentucky Open Records Act.
- As a state entity, KCTCS confirms that any Offeror's response to this RFP will be subject to the Kentucky Open Records Act per KRS 61.870 – 61.884.
- 117) Are you expecting the implementer to create connectors to systems not named in the RFP? If so, can you please name those systems?
- At this time, KCTCS expects any required integrations to be limited to the systems identified in the RFP. KCTCS is not currently aware of any additional systems that would require custom connector development.
- 118) Is the goal to have all 17 KCTCS institutions migrated to a single identity and access management system?
- Yes. KCTCS currently operates a single identity and access management environment that serves all 16 colleges and the System Office. The objective of this initiative is to migrate all institutions and users from the current platform to a new enterprise-wide identity and access management solution while maintaining a centralized approach.
- 119) Please clarify what is meant by enhancing user experience for students, faculty, and staff?
- Onboarding student experience improved particularly in the account claiming process. Users authenticate through Microsoft Entra ID using Single Sign-On (SSO). The proposed solution should replace the existing account claiming process with a streamlined, automated identity verification and account activation experience.
- 120) Please clarify if the seamless integration you are requesting is for central KCTCS applications, or will this be expanded to all systems and applications?
- The current KCTCS IDM system is a custom identity management platform built inside PeopleSoft Campus Solutions. Identity data from students, employees, affiliates, HR, Financials, and DSS is consolidated into custom Campus Solutions tables where relationship-based business rules determine access. Custom IDA processes generate provisioning transactions that are imported into AD and processed by PowerShell scripts, which provision accounts, groups, mailboxes, and licenses in Active Directory, Azure AD, and Microsoft 365. The environment provides automated lifecycle management but relies heavily on custom PeopleSoft code, batch jobs, Oracle tables, file-based integrations, and PowerShell scripting. SSO/MFA and application access is controlled by Microsoft software, and this will not change.
- 121) As part of the response, are you open additional security products, such as Access Governance, to be implemented as part of this project to meet request processing and workflow orchestration?
- Please list any products not specifically requested in the RFP in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.
- 122) As a cloud provider, Offeror has established a robust set of cloud licensing terms that are used globally for its customers and based on Offeror's established business models and security practices. Would KCTCS consider using a mutually agreed upon existing agreement between Offeror and KCTCS?
- The resulting contract award for this RFP will be a separate and new contract for the services requested/required within the scope of work.

- 123) What are the existing systems and applications, and what protocols do they support for integration with an identity management system? Is this strictly for authentication or also authorization?
- KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.
- 124) What applications and services need SSO capabilities? What protocols are supported?
- KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.
- 125) For provisioning users, what systems will provide information for onboarding and offboarding of users and role assignments? What format or methods does source system(s) offer for providing user/role information to the identity system?
- The current KCTCS IDM system is a custom identity management platform built inside PeopleSoft Campus Solutions. Identity data from students, employees, affiliates, HR, Financials, and DSS is consolidated into custom Campus Solutions tables where relationship-based business rules determine access. Custom IDA processes generate provisioning transactions that are imported into AD and processed by PowerShell scripts, which provision accounts, groups, mailboxes, and licenses in Active Directory, Azure AD, and Microsoft 365. The environment provides automated lifecycle management but relies heavily on custom PeopleSoft code, batch jobs, Oracle tables, file-based integrations, and PowerShell scripting. SSO/MFA and application access is controlled by Microsoft software, and this will not change. PeopleSoft will continue to be the source of information for onboarding and offboarding accounts.
- 126) Do all or some of the 17 institutions have their own identity and access management systems that will need integration with this solution? Or will this identity and access system be system wide?
- KCTCS currently operates a single identity and access management environment that serves all 16 colleges and the System Office. The objective of this initiative is to migrate all institutions and users from the current platform to a new enterprise-wide identity and access management solution while maintaining a centralized approach.
- 127) Are all users created in the system verified by a human? Or is some user creation done via self-service?
- User accounts are generally created only after the applicable validation processes have been completed. For students, KCTCS Admissions offices follow established procedures to verify applicant information before accounts are provisioned.
- 128) Section 4. Scope: Scope overview, user population. Can you provide a breakdown of the approximately 1.7 million identities and 240,000 active annual users by population type, meaning students by credit, non-credit, and dual enrollment status, alumni, faculty, staff, contractors, and temporary workers? Current counts for each group will let us size licensing tiers and connector effort correctly.
- | | |
|--|-----------|
| Staff | 4560 |
| Faculty | 2570 |
| Students | 120,000 |
| Recent students/graduates | 120,000 |
| Contractors | 1270 |
| Previous staff/students we still have records for but deleted accounts | 1,500,000 |
- 129) Section 6. Extension to Other Institutions: Kentucky Fire Commission. Are Kentucky Fire Commission personnel already included in the 1.7 million identity and 240,000 active user figures in Section 4, or are those numbers limited to the 16 colleges, with Fire Commission users added later under the extension clause?
- Yes, Fire Commission users are included.

- 130) Section 4. Scope: Identity Lifecycle Management, contractors and adjunct faculty. For contractors, adjunct faculty, and other personnel who do not pass through the HR system, what is the current system or process used to track and sponsor these individuals today? We want to know whether this is a manual process, a separate tool, or something the new platform needs to originate.
- a. KCTCS classifies this type of user as an affiliate. Affiliates request access through an online workflow that includes multiple levels of approval. Once approved, the individual is added to PeopleSoft HCM, and access is granted by assigning the appropriate relation within PeopleSoft, which drives provisioning and access rights. Adjunct faculty are managed through a separate process and are established using the Instructor/Advisor table in PeopleSoft rather than the affiliate workflow. As part of the future-state design, KCTCS would like affiliates, contractors, and similar non-employee populations to be managed directly within the new Identity Management (IDM) system rather than through the HR system, providing a more streamlined and centralized approach to identity lifecycle management.
- 131) Section 4. Scope: Integration Capabilities. Do the 16 colleges share a single instance of PeopleSoft Campus Solutions, HCM, and FMS, or does each college run its own instance? A count of distinct source system instances will change our integration approach and pricing.
- a. KCTCS uses a centralized enterprise solution for all its colleges with PeopleSoft Campus Solutions, HCM, and FMS.
- 132) Section 4. Scope: Integration Capabilities, EntraID and Active Directory. Is Active Directory a single forest or domain shared across the system office and all 16 colleges, or are there separate domains per college? Is Entra ID already federated or synced with that Active Directory environment today?
- a. KCTCS uses a centralized enterprise solution for all its colleges with one tenant. Entra ID is synced with AD.
- 133) Section 4. Scope: Authentication. The RFP asks for both a governance platform and native SSO and MFA with push, TOTP, and FIDO2 support. Is KCTCS expecting a single platform to deliver both identity governance and the authentication and SSO layer, or is there an existing identity provider, such as Entra ID, that the governance platform should provision into while SSO and MFA continue to be brokered separately?
- a. KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.
- 134) Section 4. Scope: Identity Governance, distributed IAM. For the distributed IAM model where colleges keep local autonomy under centralized governance, which decisions do you expect to remain at the college level, such as role definitions, approval workflows, or account naming, and which policies must be enforced system-wide regardless of college?
- a. Currently, all access is managed centrally. Delegated administration is something that may be added later. Please include this feature in section 2 of the Cost Worksheet.
- 135) Section 4. Scope: Integration Capabilities, Oracle Analytic Server. For the Oracle Analytic Server integration, is that system meant to consume identity and access data for reporting, serve as a source of authoritative role or organizational data, or both?
- a. Neither.
- 136) Section 4. Scope: Technical Requirements, RBAC/ABAC and delegated administration. Is governance of privileged or administrative accounts, typically handled through a privileged access management tool, in scope of this RFP, or is that managed today by a separate existing product outside this procurement?
- a. That will remain managed by a separate existing product outside this procurement.
- 137) Section 4. Scope: Other Requirements, threat detection and response. Should threat detection and response be a native function of the proposed platform, or does this requirement refer to sending identity events and logs to KCTCS's existing security operations function for detection there?
- a. We would like to have identity events and logs sent to KCTCS' existing security operations solution (Elastic SIEM)

- 138) Section 4. Scope: Can you describe what the current PeopleSoft-based identity system does today, including which functions it performs, so we can accurately scope the migration and decide whether it needs to run in parallel with the new platform during rollout?
- a. The current KCTCS IDM system is a custom identity management platform built inside PeopleSoft Campus Solutions. Identity data from students, employees, affiliates, HR, Financials, and DSS is consolidated into custom Campus Solutions tables where relationship-based business rules determine access. Custom IDA processes generate provisioning transactions that are imported into AD and processed by PowerShell scripts, which provision accounts, groups, mailboxes, and licenses in Active Directory, Azure AD, and Microsoft 365. The environment provides automated lifecycle management but relies heavily on custom PeopleSoft code, batch jobs, Oracle tables, file-based integrations, and PowerShell scripting. SSO/MFA and application access is controlled by Microsoft software, and this will not change. PeopleSoft will continue to be the source of information for onboarding and offboarding accounts.
- 139) Section 4. Scope: User Experience, identity correlation. Do you have an estimate of how many duplicate identity records exist today, and which populations are most affected? This will help us size the identity correlation and remediation effort called out under User Experience.
- a. It is mostly students, but we are not sure of the number.
- 140) Section 4. Scope: Other Requirements, username creation. Can you share KCTCS's current username naming convention and template so we can confirm the proposed platform supports it without modification?
- a. First initial, last name, next sequential 4 digit number. For example John Doe, jdoe0078.
- 141) Section 4. Scope: Other Requirements, username and email history. How long does KCTCS need username and email address history retained? Is that driven by an internal policy, a specific state or federal requirement, or left to the offeror to recommend?
- a. We don't allow any usernames or email addresses to be reused, so history would need to be retained forever for these 2 items.
- 142) Section 4. Scope: User Experience, account claim process. What identity verification method do you expect for the account claim process, for example date of birth and the last four digits of a Social Security number, or security questions? This ties directly to which personal data elements need to flow from source systems.
- a. Date of birth and emplID.
- 143) Data Sharing Agreement - Attachment A, Item 8: Disclosed data elements. The sample Data Sharing Agreement lists disclosed data elements for employees only, while the RFP scope covers students, dual enrollment, and alumni populations. Will a separate or amended data sharing agreement be executed to cover student identity attributes under FERPA, and if so, which student data elements will be shared for provisioning?
- a. The Data Sharing Agreement included with the RFP is provided solely as a sample and is not intended to represent the final form of any agreement that may be executed with the selected vendor. The specific terms of the final Data Sharing Agreement, including the categories of data to be shared and applicable privacy and security requirements, will be determined during contract negotiations based on the services being provided and applicable legal requirements, including FERPA where student data is involved.
- 144) Data Sharing Agreement - Attachment A, Item 8g: Protected health information. Item 8g of the Data Sharing Agreement references protected health information as a possible disclosed data element. Is health-related data expected to flow into the identity platform for any population, and if so, for which group and for what purpose?
- a. The Data Sharing Agreement included with the RFP is provided solely as a sample and is not intended to represent the final form of any agreement that may be executed with the selected vendor. KCTCS does not currently anticipate that protected health information (PHI) will be shared with or processed by the identity platform. The specific categories of data to be shared, if any, will be determined during contract negotiations based on the services being provided and applicable legal and regulatory requirements.
- 145) Section 4. Scope: Other Requirements, SIEM integration. For the Elastic SIEM in AWS integration, what protocol or format do you expect for log delivery, such as syslog, CEF, or a REST API, and roughly what event volume should we plan for? Is that SIEM environment managed by the KCTCS system office or by an outside party?
- a. The Elastic SIEM is managed by a managed services provider. The log delivery expectation is typically JSON or Syslog format. Event volume needs will likely need to be determined at a later time, but likely 8am-5pm EST logging will suffice.

- 146) Section 44.05 Offshoring: Offshoring restriction. Section 44.05 states that KCTCS data cannot be transmitted, exported, or stored outside the United States. Does that restriction also prohibit offshore-based personnel from performing configuration or build work using masked or synthetic data in non-production environments, or does it apply only to access involving live KCTCS data?
- a. We would prefer support be located within the USA but OGC would likely need to confirm if this is mandatory or not. I can't speak to that.
- 147) Section 44. Disaster Recovery: SOC Type 2 report. Section 44 references the disaster recovery controls in the offeror's SOC Type 2 report as though one already exists. Must an offeror already hold a completed SOC 2 Type II report to be considered responsive, or can an offeror commit to obtaining one within a defined period after contract award?
- a. KCTCS would require Offeror to have a SOC report before contract award.
- 148) Section 4. Scope: Authentication, SSO. Roughly how many distinct applications will require SSO integration under this contract? An approximate count will help us size the application onboarding effort.
- a. KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.
- 149) Section 4. Scope: Technical Requirements, cloud hosting. Section 4 states the solution should be cloud-hosted, preferably on AWS or equivalent. Is AWS a firm requirement, or is another major cloud provider, such as Azure, acceptable given that Entra ID is already listed as an integration target?
- a. KCTCS requires a cloud-hosted solution. Provided that all SLA commitments, non-functional requirements, security requirements, and data retention requirements are met, the specific underlying hosting provider is not a significant factor.
- 150) Section 4. Scope: Authentication, MFA. Is there an MFA solution in use today, and if so which one? Should the new platform replace it, integrate alongside it, or run in parallel during a transition period?
- a. KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.
- 151) Section 4. Scope: Other Requirements, self-service password reset. Is self-service password reset already available today through an existing tool, or is this a net-new capability for the new platform to deliver?
- a. Self-Service Password Reset (SSPR) is currently available through two systems: Microsoft Entra ID and a custom in-house solution. KCTCS intends to retire the custom solution and move to either Entra ID SSPR or the proposed IAM solution, leveraging integration with Entra ID and/or Active Directory.
- 152) Financial Worksheet, Section 1: Enterprise Level annual license fee, contract term. The RFP describes an initial five-year contract term with pricing that must stay firm throughout, but the cost worksheet has a single field for the annual license fee. Should that figure represent the fee for every year of the initial term, or is it a Year 1 figure with a separate mechanism for later years?
- a. KCTCS has revised the Financial Cost Worksheet to reflect pricing for all five years. Please provide the proposed pricing for each year of the 5-year contract. Pricing will remain firm based on the proposed pricing.
- 153) Financial Worksheet, Section 1: Enterprise Level annual license fee, pricing basis. What basis does KCTCS want used for the Enterprise Level annual license fee, for example a per-identity rate, a per-active-user rate, a flat enterprise fee, or a tiered structure? Knowing the intended metric will keep all offeror pricing comparable.
- a. Offerors may use their platform licensing of choice based on the following numbers to provide annual pricing requested in the financial cost worksheet:

Staff	4560
Faculty	2570
Students	120,000
Recent students/graduates	120,000
Contractors	1270
Previous staff/students we still have records for but deleted accounts	1,500,000

- 154) Financial Worksheet, Section 1 and Section 2: Base cost versus optional services. Can you give an example of what belongs in the non-scored Section 2 optional services and products versus what must be bundled into the scored Section 1 base cost? For instance, should optional modules like a self-service request catalog or identity proofing be listed as optional, or are they expected to be part of the base proposal?
- a. The base cost should include solution options that are required throughout the scope of work. Section 2 is for additional services and products that your company may offer. This could be of interest to KCTCS later if the budget allows. Section 2 are optional products/modules and are **not** considered in evaluation.
- 155) Section 22. Term of Contract: Contract effective date. Is there a target go-live date tied to an academic milestone, such as before a fall term registration cycle, given the contract is anticipated to become effective in September 2026? A firm target date will help us scope a realistic phased rollout.
- a. We expect a 9-month cycle including discovery, implementation, testing, and rollout. This will include identity data, provisioning rules, access policies, workflows, and approval processes. This would mean go live would occur after the Spring term which ends in early May, but before the Fall term which starts in early August.
- 156) Section 4. Scope: Implementation & Support, phased implementation plan. Does KCTCS have a preferred sequence for the phased implementation, such as by college, by user population, or by functional capability, or is that sequencing left to the offeror's proposed strategy?
- a. Based on the current architecture, all users and connected systems would need to transition to the new solution simultaneously. KCTCS observes blackout periods during the Fall and Spring academic terms, with specific dates to be provided during project planning. The existing identity management environment relies on seven core processes that support all users across the institution. While a phased implementation of these processes may be possible, changes would likely impact the entire user population due to the shared nature of the current infrastructure and processes.
- 157) Section 4. Scope: Implementation & Support, training. About how many KCTCS IT staff and administrators will need training, and does KCTCS prefer on-site delivery, virtual sessions, or a train-the-trainer approach?
- a. Most training will be provided to central IT staff and should include comprehensive, hands-on instruction to support administration and ongoing management of the solution. Training may be delivered remotely via Microsoft Teams. Additional training sessions should be available for other KCTCS IT personnel, as needed, and may also be delivered through Microsoft Teams.
- 158) Section 4. Scope: Implementation & Support, third-party consulting partners. The RFP mentions the ability to work with third-party consulting partners for rollout. Does KCTCS already have an internal team or an existing systems integrator engaged on related projects that our implementation team would need to coordinate with?
- a. KCTCS has an internal team (with limited time) that will work with the provider on implementation.
- 159) Section 46. Kentucky Reciprocal Preference Laws: Resident bidder preference. Is the Kentucky resident or qualified bidder preference described in Section 46 applied within the scored evaluation criteria in Section 19, or is it considered separately during the award decision?
- a. The Kentucky resident or qualified bidder preference is not included in the technical evaluation criteria. Per KRS 45A.494(4), if there is a tie between a resident bidder and a non-resident bidder, preference shall be given to the resident bidder.
- 160) Section 15. Proposal Instructions: Section C, Proposed Solution and Services. Given the 50-page proposal limit, can screenshots or wireframes of the governance and reporting dashboards referenced in Section 15.C be included as exhibits, or does KCTCS prefer a narrative description of reporting capability instead?
- a. Offerors are encouraged to draft and submit proposals in the best way that they feel represents their company. In regards to the page limit, KCTCS has opted to revise section 15 to read:
 Each Proposal(s) should be kept to a **maximum of 75 pages**. The following required pages/information will not be included in maximum page count:
 - o Signature Page (Page 1)
 - o Any associated addendum issued during the solicitation process.
 - o References (section B in the below criteria)
 - o Fees (section G in the below criteria) – should be submitted as a separate document.
- 161) Section 4. Scope: Other Requirements, low code environment. The RFP asks for a low code environment that can be managed with limited IDM staffing. What is the current size of the team that manages identity systems today? That baseline will help us right-size the proposed operating model.
- a. Currently there is one full-time person.

- 162) Section 4. Scope: Scalability & Performance, high availability and disaster recovery. Does KCTCS have specific recovery time and recovery point objectives in mind for high availability and disaster recovery, or should the offeror propose targets as part of the solution?
- a. **Target Non-Functional Requirements**
Service Availability (Uptime): **99.9% or greater**
Recovery Time Objective (RTO): **1 hour or less**
Recovery Point Objective (RPO): **15 minutes or less**
Authentication Latency: **95% of authentication requests completed within 2 seconds under normal operating conditions**
Identity Provisioning: **Account creation, modification, and deprovisioning completed within 15 minutes of source-system change**
High Availability: **No single point of failure and support for geographically redundant disaster recovery**
Disaster Recovery Testing: **Annual documented DR testing with results available upon request**
Scalability: **Support for at least 1.7 million identities and 240,000 active users without material degradation in performance**
Planned Maintenance: **No outage required for routine maintenance, or maintenance limited to published maintenance windows**
- 163) Section 38. KCTCS Brand Standard: ADA/WCAG 2.1 AA compliance. Does the WCAG 2.1 Level AA accessibility requirement in Section 38 apply only to KCTCS-branded end-user portals, or does it also extend to back-office administrative interfaces used by IT staff and delegated college administrators?
- a. **The WCAG 2.1 Level AA accessibility requirement applies to all user-facing KCTCS digital experiences, including but not limited to public websites, authenticated student, faculty, and staff portals, mobile applications, and digital content provided to end users. In alignment with the U.S. Department of Justice's updated Title II accessibility requirements, KCTCS expects all digital services to support WCAG 2.1 Level AA compliance.**
- 164) Section 4. Scope: Identity Governance, audit and compliance reporting. Is there a specific reporting format or framework, such as a particular state or federal audit schema, that the audit and compliance reporting needs to align with, or is the format left to the offeror to propose?
- a. **At this time, KCTCS is not aware of any particular format; however, KCTCS just onboarded a new internal audit firm, so there may be some formatting requirements from the new firm in the future.**
- 165) Section 23. Contract Changes: Contract administration across colleges. Section 23 notes that local modifications made between an individual college and the offeror are not considered a contract amendment. Will this be a single system-office contract covering all 16 colleges under one invoicing structure, or will individual colleges separately fund and purchase against the resulting contract? This affects how we structure milestone billing.
- a. **KCTCS intends to award one contract covering all KCTCS entities. This contract is not intended to be an opt in/opt out contract structure. All modifications and amendments to this contract will be handled at the KCTCS System Office by the KCTCS Procurement to Payment Department.**
- 166) Section 15.E: Staffing. Does KCTCS anticipate that implementation services may be performed primarily remotely, or is regular onsite presence expected during implementation and production rollout? If onsite support is anticipated, can KCTCS provide guidance regarding the expected frequency and duration of onsite activities?
- a. **All work will be done primarily remotely.**
- 167) Section 4. Scope: Licensing & Scope. How many employees do KCTCS have that would be in scope?
- a. **Staff 4560; Faculty 2570**
- 168) Section 4. Scope: Licensing & Scope. Do you want to license outside contractors (NERM)?
- a. **KCTCS classifies this type of user as an affiliate. Affiliates request access through an online workflow that includes multiple levels of approval. Once approved, the individual is added to PeopleSoft HCM, and access is granted by assigning the appropriate relation within PeopleSoft, which drives provisioning and access rights. Adjunct faculty are managed through a separate process and are established using the Instructor/Advisor table in PeopleSoft rather than the affiliate workflow. As part of the future-state design, KCTCS would like affiliates, contractors, and similar non-employee populations to be managed directly within the new Identity Management (IDM) system rather than through the HR system, providing a more streamlined and centralized approach to identity lifecycle management.**
- 169) Section 4. Scope: Licensing & Scope. How many students in the system would need to be licensed?

- a. Approximately 120,000 current students, and approximately 120,000 students that are recent students but not current that will need access for a period of time.

170) Section 4. Scope: Licensing & Scope. Do alumni accounts need access and if so how many?

- a. KCTCS currently maintains approximately 25,000 recent alumni accounts per year that remain active for a defined period after graduation. While student records are retained for all alumni, account access is removed once the designated retention period has expired.

171) Section 4. Scope: Scope overview, user population. Does KCTCS have existing roles to which users are assigned, or is role discovery and development part of this engagement?

- a. KCTCS currently maintains an enterprise-wide role model that defines and governs access across the institution.

172) The RFP emphasizes both a low-code platform and advanced identity governance. If there's a tradeoff between ease of administration and overall functionality, which carries more weight during the evaluation?

- a. KCTCS is seeking a solution that provides both strong identity governance capabilities and a low-code administrative experience. Offerors should propose the solution that best meets the functional, technical, security, and governance requirements of the RFP while minimizing the need for custom development. Solutions that provide robust functionality through configuration rather than customization are preferred. Proposals will be evaluated based on the published scoring criteria in the RFP.

173) Is KCTCS looking for a single platform that provides identity governance, lifecycle management, SSO, and MFA, or will integrated best-of-breed solutions be evaluated equally?

- a. KCTCS is primarily seeking an IAM and IGA solution that provides identity governance and lifecycle management capabilities. KCTCS is not seeking to replace its existing Microsoft Entra ID-based SSO and MFA environment as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory infrastructure. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.

174) For users with multiple affiliations across institutions (student, employee, adjunct, contractor, etc.), does KCTCS envision a single enterprise identity with multiple concurrent affiliations, or should the proposed solution correlate identities from multiple institutional sources?

- a. KCTCS utilizes a single enterprise identity for each individual, identified by a unique EMPLID and username that remains constant across all colleges and campuses. The proposed solution should support a single enterprise identity with multiple active relations (explained below) and associated entitlements. Users are assigned to groups called relations, which determine the types of access they receive. For example, a user may have a Current Student relation at one college and an Employee relation at another. Access rights and entitlements from all assigned relations are combined and provisioned to the user's singular account. Each user is also assigned a primary relation, which is determined based on the ranking or priority of their active relations. While entitlements from all relations are applied, only the user's primary relation is sent to Active Directory (AD) for account classification and provisioning purposes. Relations, rankings, and associated access rights are centrally managed and maintained across the KCTCS environment.

175) Of the approximately 1.7 million identities, how many require interactive access versus being retained for historical, alumni, or compliance purposes?

- a. KCTCS currently has approximately 120,000 active students, 120,000 recent students and graduates who retain access for a defined period, 4,560 staff, 2,570 faculty, and approximately 1,270 contractor/affiliate accounts. The remaining approximately 1.5 million identities are retained for historical, compliance, and recordkeeping purposes and do not have active accounts.

176) Since Entra ID is already part of the current environment, does KCTCS anticipate retaining Entra ID for enterprise authentication and access management, or is the objective of this RFP to replace or consolidate those capabilities within the proposed solution?

- a. KCTCS is not seeking to replace its current SSO or MFA solution as part of this procurement. Offerors should assume integration with the existing Entra ID and Active Directory environment. Optional SSO/MFA replacement capabilities may be proposed as a future phase and priced separately in Section 2 of the Financial Cost Worksheet.

Bidders must acknowledge receipt of this and any addenda either with solicitation or by separate letter or email prior to award of contract. If by separate letter, the following information should be placed in the lower left-hand corner of the envelope:

RFP No.: RFP-0355
Title: Identity Management System Solution

Name of Firm: _____

Signature: _____