



**District of Columbia Courts
Administrative Services Division
Procurement and Contracts Branch**



AMENDMENT NO. 2

TO: ALL PROSPECTIVE OFFERORS

AMENDMENT

ISSUE DATE: July 15, 2021

SUBJECT: Solicitation No. DCSC-21-FSS-93 - Identity and Access Management (IAM) Solution

PROPOSAL

SUBMISSION DATE: July 29, 2021, by 1:00 p.m., Eastern Standard Time.

Responses to written question(s) received from prospective offeror(s) are included as Attachment A to this amendment.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED

One (1) copy of this amendment is being sent to only those offerors who received a copy the solicitation. Offerors shall sign below and attach a signed copy of this amendment to each offer to be submitted to the Courts in response to the subject solicitation. Offers shall be delivered in accordance with the instructions provided in the original solicitation documents. This amendment, together with your offer must be received by the District of Columbia Courts no later than the date and time specified for offer submission. Revisions or price changes occasioned by this amendment must be received by the Courts no later than the date and time set for offer submission. Failure to acknowledge receipt of this amendment may be cause for rejection of any offers submitted in response to the subject solicitation. Offerors who have already submitted their responses may revise their technical and/or price proposals.

Darlene D. Reynolds

Darlene D. Reynolds
Contracting Officer

This amendment is acknowledged and is considered a part of the subject solicitation.

Signature of Authorized Representative

Date

Title of Authorized Representative

Name of Firm

ATTACHMENT A

Solicitation No. DCSC-21-FSS-93 - Identity and Access Management (IAM) Solution

RESPONSE(S) TO QUESTION(S) RECEIVED

1. **Questions:** How many users are to be licensed? Does this include contractors? If not, how many contractors should be considered?

Response: Total 2000 Court User but Using and Total possible User with permissions to IAM application 15

2. **Question:** Are all the users in a central directory?

Response: NO, there are four domains.

3. **Question:** Are there any other applications that SSO and MFA are needed besides the applications listed in Section A. Technical Environment? Are Google apps being used or others?

Response:

- PaloAlto Firewalls,
- AgileJury
- Teens AT Promise for Success (TAPS)
- Web Voucher System
- Tenable SC & IO
- SolarWinds
- NO Google Apps is not used.

4. **Question:** Page 2, B: Which GSA schedule does this RFP tagged to? E.g. Information Technology Category (ITC) or Professional Services Schedule (PSS)

Response: Since it is a purchase of product and professional services it can tag to both.

5. **Question:** Does the solution need to be SaaS or Cloud hosted or either? For cloud-hosted, can we assume that we can leverage the DC Courts Azure FedRAMP environment?

Response: SaaS or Cloud-hosted, and yes, the vendor can use the Courts Azure environment. If the Courts Azure environment is used, the Courts require the vendor to provide an annual cost for the hosted solution. Because the Courts' Azure subscription will incur this cost, it will be deducted from the contract. You can add a SaaS price as an option but not required.

Solicitation No. DCSC-21-FSS-93 - Identity and Access Management (IAM) Solution

6. **Question: Section F.4 Delivery Location:** Does the work related to this initiative to be done onsite (DC Courts location), or can it be done remotely (in the US) and offshore (outside the US)?

Response: If Vendor can meet all contract requirements remotely then yes it can be done remotely.US only

7. **Question: Appendix A:** Identity and Access Management System (IAM)

- a. **Question:** Regarding Authentication, does the proposed identity governance platform need to leverage DC Courts AD infrastructure for authentication?

b. **Response:** YES, four domains

- c. **Question:** In the RFP, there is a reference to multi-factor authentication (MFA), but there is no explicit requirement around MFA in the RFP. Could you please elaborate?

Response: We desire flexibility in the MFA mechanism, to improve the end-user experience. Without requiring any specific mechanism, we are interested in seeing both a "lowest common denominator" solution, such as SMS or phone call, as well as a more user-friendly method such as a smart phone application, a physical token, or smart card. Smart cards that can double as a campus ID card may be considered as well. Respondents may suggest any mechanisms they feel will meet the System's needs. We desire a complete MFA solution that integrates with desktop login, federated single sign-on (SSO), and other authentication mechanisms. We prefer systems that implement open standards. Yes, we want MFA product.

- d. **Question:** For implementation services associated with the proposed identity governance platform,

- a. **Question:** The number of Identity governance platforms (including production) to be considered?

Response: Minimum of 10

- b. **Question:** The number and Type of System of Record/Authoritative Source?

Response: The IAM platform will be the system of record for identity once it is established.

- c. The number of applications/systems to be integrated with the proposed identity governance platform?

Response: See refer to response #3 and RFP

Solicitation No. DCSC-21-FSS-93 - Identity and Access Management (IAM) Solution

d. **Question:** The number of identities to be managed by IAM system.

Response: See response to question #1

e. **Question:** The number of types of identities to be managed by IAM system (E.g., Employee, Contractors, Third Party Contractor/Vendor, etc.)

Response: See response to question #1

f. **Question:** The high-level architecture of DC Courts' Active Directory environment (E.g., Number of Domains, Forests, trust relationship across forests)

Response: We have 4 Domains and Forest and a trusted relationship between two of them. One will be going away soon.

8. **Question:** Does DC Courts currently have an existing legacy IAM system?

a. If yes, please describe the current features and functionalities used in the legacy system.

b. If yes, please describe if migration should be considered from legacy system.

Response: No

9. **Question:** Page 9, C 3.3. Please clarify how to derive SLAs based on the current environment knowing the Courts' Identity Governance solution doesn't exist.

Response: This purchase is a solely managed and operated solution by DC Courts once Vendor has completed the work and DC Courts accepts it No SLA requirements. If Vendor wants to add as an Option a SAAS Solution, they are welcome too.

10. **Question:** Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)

Response: This procurement is restricted to firms that hold a current U.S. Government General Service (GSA) Schedule and are qualified to provide the required service.

11. **Question:** Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

Response: No, Remote Video Meetings are acceptable.

12. **Question:** Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)

Solicitation No. DCSC-21-FSS-93 - Identity and Access Management (IAM) Solution

Response: See response to question #10

13. **Question:** Can we submit the proposals via email?

Response: yes.

14. **Question:** Do you have an MDM system? What are you using if so?

Response: ManageEngine but it is only used for iPads currently.

15. **Question:** Can you define/elaborate on what you mean by "data sparse model" in section 4.2?

Response: This was a typo it should have said (Third Party Contractors/Vendors 4.2 Setup data sparse model to monitor external users) Description: The IAM system to facilitate functionality to monitor 3rd party contractors/vendors/external users using data sparse model(s) to define patterns to mitigate identity and access related threats (brute force, excessive privileges, etc.)

16. **Question:** What are the different application types involved (on prem vs. cloud, legacy, etc.)?

Response: We currently have all three on prem, Cloud and legacy.

17. **Question:** Do you have a disk management tool?

Response: No

18. **Question:** Is simply disabling mass blanket approvals an option (pertaining to section 6.5)?

Response: We are not looking to Disable this we want to be notified if it happens.

19. **Question:** For section 7.2, are you wanting to RESET passwords after 90 days?

Response: This is a capability the Courts want for elevated accounts such as an admin as well for normal users if that is decided by the Courts.

20. **Question:** For section 8.6, are you looking for automation to kick off version rollback, or would a manual process suffice?

Response: We want and automated capability in the event a role back is required.

Solicitation No. DCSC-21-FSS-93 - Identity and Access Management (IAM) Solution

21.Question: For section 11.11, are you looking to IMPORT data into the IGA solution or push data from the IGA solution into these other systems? If you are looking to import can you elaborate as to why? We have historically seen data pushes, so importing would be unusual.

Response: This would be a data push such as push to a SIEM

22.Question: For section 13.2, are you looking for the IGA solution to be able to classify data or would a separate solution be acceptable?

Response: If the proposed solution does not have the capabilities but can be handles in another manner to meet the contract requirements and is included in the quoted price making this a complete solution it is acceptable.

23.Question: Is this effort being procured through GSA Schedule IT-70?

Response: YES

24.Question: Who is the incumbent?

Response: None

25.Question: KPMG LLP signed a contract (#DCSC-20-FSS-51 for assisting DC Courts with a risk profile report and another one (DCSC-20-FSS-74 for assisting DC Courts with Robotic Process Automation (RPA). a contract (signed contracts. Both these solicitations were on GSA Schedule and Terms & Conditions (T&C's) proposed by KPMG were accepted by DC Courts. Would you consider that we leverage the same T&C's for this solicitation for Identity and Access Management (DCSC-21-FSS-93).

Response:

No. The terms and conditions (T&C's) were specifically for the contracts you referenced.