|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q # | RFI Section | RFI Page | Question/Rationale | Department Answer |
| Q1 | 3.1.11 | 6 | Requesting that the State please clarify these two parts. The item asks vendors to answer if they would be willing to create a contractual relationship if one does not exist, and then directs vendors to NOT answer if there is no relationship. Please clarify/restate so that vendors may provide compliant responses:  “Would you be willing to create a contractual relationship with any of the contractors in the above contracts for which you don’t currently have a relationship? By what date? Which vendor(s)? If you have no EXISTING contracts with the resellers listed in 3.1.9 for BOTH your company's identity proofing solution AND implementation services DO NOT continue answering questions or submit a response.” | To clarify, if you have no EXISTING contracts with the resellers listed in 3.1.9 **AND** you are not willing to enter a contract with one of them by the end of June 15th, 2022, for BOTH your company's identity proofing solution AND implementation services, DO NOT continue answering questions or submit a response.  ETF’s timeline is tight, and ETF wants to make sure it isn’t delayed by any negotiations that may need to occur between and among a publisher, implementer, and a state contract vendor listed in 3.1.9, before the negotiation with ETF can proceed. Responses should include what the contractual framework will look like for the solution, e.g. existing relationships with which vendors listed in 3.1.9 including how many, realizing that you need at least one existing relationship with a vendor listed in 3.1.9, for both the solution and implementation, to be of interest to ETF.  If you can achieve this using subcontractor relationships, please describe that in your response to 3.1.9 - 3.1.11. It may not be necessary for all actors in the deal to have a direct relationship with a vendor listed in 3.1.9, but at least one of them must. The others that don’t must be willing to work in a subcontractor relationship to the one that does.  If there are other State of Wisconsin contracts ETF could leverage that would be helpful, please advise on their scope and applicability in your response to 3.1.12. |
| Q2 | 3.1.11 | 6 | Does WI ETF have a target date for when respondents should establish a contractual agreement with any of the vendors listed in 3.1.9? | See Q1 and Department Answer. |
| Q3 | 3.3 | 6-7 | Following the initial identity proofing, approximately how many of these account holders will return to login to their account per month or annually? | Most account holders (likely 75%+) will login on an annual basis or more frequently. However, we would not expect them to go through the identity proofing process again when they login in the future. The identity proofing process would be a one-time event unless the user’s identity were lost or compromised to a point where it needed to be recreated. |
| Q4 | 3.3.3 | 7 | What other state or local agencies would you anticipate leveraging this solution? Are there any specific agencies that ETF works alongside that would need this solution? | It is possible that other state agencies or the State of WI enterprise could use this solution in the future, but there is no guarantee that any other agencies or the State of WI enterprise will use the solution. |
| Q5 | N/A | N/A | Is this RFI limited to identity proofing only, or may the proposed solution include an identity assurance and risk assessment at the first part of the workflow? | The solution can include an identity assurance and risk assessment as the first part of the identity proofing workflow. To be clear we do not want or expect a user to go through an identity assurance or risk assessment activity each time they login to ETF’s applications. |
| Q6 | N/A | N/A | Approximately how many identity-proofed account holders are expected to return to make account changes per month or annually? | If by ‘account’ you mean their Okta identity, then very few account holders will return annually to make account changes, i.e. modifying their Okta account information. However, if the question is asking how often user’s will login to ETF’s systems, that will occur for most users on annual basis (see the answer to question 3). |
| Q7 | N/A | N/A | Does the Agency have a mobile app on its road map? | Yes, ETF may provide mobile apps and will also be using third party vendor line of business applications that have mobile apps available. |
| Q8 | N/A | N/A | Should the requested solution address emerging cyber identity fraud? | If your solution addresses emerging cyber identity fraud, please include information related to that. ETF may leverage capabilities provided by the identity proofing solution for this, or it may use other solutions as well. |
| Q9 | General | N/A | Is there a preferred method for respondents to submit videos and other multimedia files that would help illustrate their solution (e.g. separate file, link to Google Drive, etc.)? | Links to information available on the public internet would be preferred, but if something only ETF could view would be provided, please send us a way to access the information in your response. |
| Q10 | 3.1.9 | 6 | Of the vendors listed in 3.1.9, does WI ETF have a preference of whom to purchase from? | Respondents should offer the best deal possible, no matter which vendor, and are welcome to submit information about working with more than one, and what the differences would be, if any. From ETF’s perspective, ETF prefers the deal only involve one of the vendors on the list in 3.1.9, rather than more than one, but would be willing to consider more than one if the respondent adequately explains why its business model necessitates this. Along with preferring one vendor, the wider scope of 505ENT-O18-NASPOCLOUD-00 necessarily leads to the conclusion that it would be one on this contract. As of now, the State of Wisconsin only has a participating addendum with Unisys, VMware, and Carahsoft on 505ENT-O18-NASPOCLOUD-00. Asking for the State of Wisconsin to add other participating addendums would cause delay, but ETF would consider that if it is in ETF’s best interest. |
| Q11 | Appendix A - Row 8 |  | In the appendix, you state "Our identity assurance levels will be aligned with NIST standards." Can you confirm that you are referencing the NIST 800-63-3 IAL2/AAL2 policy? Are you interested in NIST LOA3 as well for some applications? | At this time, we have not determined a need for LOA3; however, if that is a capability your solution has, please provide that information where applicable. |
| Q12 | Appendix - Row 7 |  | Regarding "Is step up proofing available including where the user could initially be proofed with data centric information and then, based on a risk score (or equivalent approach), the user would be asked to perform document centric proofing? If so, please describe." Are you referring to stepping up from the MFA you currently have in place to NIST 800-63-3 IAL2/AAL2? | This question is meant to determine if based upon the actions of the user can we trigger different proofing methods/workflows. Example: If a user was just viewing data, we may only ask them to verify their SSN and DL#; but if they were to want to edit it, the system would trigger them to do document image capture of the DL# and a liveness test. |
| Follow-up on Q12 | Appendix - Row 7 |  | Is there 1 use case or 2? We think you are asking for the normal workflow – the new user one. If Okta is in this workflow now, you already have existing accounts. You have the new account origination use case, and the login use case.  The login use case has the largest potential for account takeovers – where username, password, and devices themselves are getting compromised. That is when the potential for the account takeover happens. We address that in the login workflow. Say the existing user wants to change info – like change where money is sent – that would change the login use case workflow and make it more robust. What they need to verify is then based on device history but transparent to the user. They would be flagged as high-risk coming in because login users are more likely to pose an issue. | If a user is in an application and has been proofed to a certain level, but then the user asks to do something that requires additional security, then a ‘step-up’ proofing would take place. Based on how identity management attacks are occurring how, if you have the ability to extend the product to perform some level of proofing at login please indicate as such, but that is not a core focus of what we’re looking for now. We must strike a balance between the user experience and security. During normal login activities, if your solution can red flag certain activities including suspicious devices, locations, etc. please indicate as such.  We will need to proof users already in Okta that haven’t used an ETF application yet. When the user comes to use an ETF application for the first time, they will not have a specific attribute on their account, and that will trigger them to be redirected to the Identity Proofing Solution for our agency functions. |
| Q13 | General |  | Can respondents submit an RFI response directly to Wisconsin ETF? Or do you need respondents to have a reseller submit on their behalf? | You do not need to have a reseller submit on your behalf. Submit responses as indicated in the RFI, in one of two ways. 1) To [ETFSMBProcurement@etf.wi.gov](mailto:ETFSMBProcurement@etf.wi.gov). Email subject line should read “[Vendor Name] RFI Response ETB0052.” 2) Via [eSupplier](https://esupplier.wi.gov/psp/esupplier_4/SUPPLIER/ERP/c/WI_SS_SELF_SERVICE.WI_SS_BIDDER_BIDS.GBL?Page=WI_SS_BIDDER_BIDS&Action=U) using the response wizard there. Hard copy mail and fax responses will not be accepted. |
| Q14 | 3.1.1 | 5 | How many subsequent years should we submit pricing for? | Submit as many years as you can provide pricing for up front and guarantee the price won’t change, or will change based on a pre-determined system, e.g. no more than x% increase year over year. |
| Q15 | Appendix - Row 15 |  | Regarding "Once within your solution's workflow, what percentage of users drop out during the image capture process?" Are you referring to document image capture? Or selfie capture? | Please provide data for both if you have it available. |
| Q16 | Appendix - Row 30 |  | Regarding "Please indicate the different support tiers and when support is available based on the tier." Is this referring to support for ETF or support for ETF's members? | Please include information about support for ETF, as well as for ETF’s members. |
| Q17 | General |  | In the event that there is a delay posting answers to these questions, will WI ETF consider extending the RFI due date? | Yes, but there are no such extensions in place right now. |
| Q18 | General |  | Is there any page limit for RFI responses? | No. |
| Q19 | General |  | Will WI ETF require Presentation Attack Detection for all IAL2 Identity Proofing in accordance with recommendations from NIST 800-63-3? | This is a desired feature. Depending on what other controls are in place, it may or may not be required. If this is offered, please include it in your response where applicable. |
| Q20 | General |  | Must the vendor be capable of offering multiple ways to verify identities such as on-line self-service, live video chat, and in-person verification? | While desired, this is not a necessity. Please include all possible options to verify an identity in your response. |
| Q21 | General |  | Will WI ETF require the Identity Proofing solution to act as a credential broker for existing/third party credentials? | No, user credentials will be managed by Okta. |
| Q22 | 1.1 Introduction | 2 of 9 | Regarding, “This RFI is issued solely for information and planning purposes and does not constitute a solicitation.”  Under Section 1.2, the table titled ‘Timeline of Identity Proofing Solution,’ says that the intention is to sign a Contract in July 2022.  Will there be a separate RFP to follow this RFI, or will this document serve both purposes? | See 3.1.9. 3.1.10, and 3.1.11. A separate RFP is not planned at this time. The plan is to leverage pre-existing contractual relationships with partners who broker software licensing, implementation, and hosting.  See also Q1 and answer. |
| Q23 | 3.1.8 | 6 of 9 | Regarding this:  Does your company have a SOC II, Type 2 it will share with customers? Please provide your SOC2 report if you have one. Contact [ETFSMBProcurement@etf.wi.gov](mailto:ETFProcurement@etf.wi.gov) if an NDA is needed.  SOC 2 Type 2 reports contain information that must remain confidential to maintain security of systems and data. The Department is subject to Section 19.21 of the Wisconsin Statutes, which could result in a report becoming public in response to a freedom of information request. We, therefore, ask the Department to delete its request for a copy of a SOC 2 Type 2 report. Instead, the Department could work with responding companies to gain access to these reports in a manner that does not risk release. | ETF is executing NDAs for this purpose. If you believe an NDA won’t protect your SOC 2 Type 2 report, ETF will not be able to do business with your company. Listing your SOC 2 Type 2 on your Designation of Confidential and Proprietary Information form, included with your response, may be advisable. |
| Q24 | 2.a | 3 of 9 | Please confirm that proposals are due on Monday, April 25, 2022, like it says at the first page of the RFI file. | Confirmed and corrected. |
| Q25 | 1.2 Background and Current Plans | 3 of 9 | Regarding, “The State of Wisconsin Department of Employee Trust Funds (ETF) requires an identity proofing solution for non-state staff accessing our information.”  What identity assurance levels are required for Wisconsin’s identity proofing solution (e.g., IAL1, IAL2)? | Our required identity assurance level will be IAL2. |
| Q26 | 3.1.7 | 5 of 9 | If a company’s 5 largest references have anonymity clauses, and the vendor could provide that info with written permission of the client down-the-road, how should the vendor answer 3.1.7? | If you can tell us the number of users on your 5 largest accounts, please do, or anything that is not confidential. Tell us what you can. As we get further into our process, we may ask for additional information about those clients using an NDA; however, we understand there may be limits to what can be provided. For now, please provide up to 5 non-confidential references, with a focus on government entities that need to process confidential information. |