

Phone: (785) 296-3463 Fax: (785) 296-1168 oits.info@ks.gov

DeAngela Burns-Wallace, Chief Information Technology Officer

Laura Kelly, Governor

September 6, 2022

Richard Beattie, Director Procurement and Contracts

Dear Mr. Beattie:

The high-level project plan for the Office of Information Technology Services Identity Access Management (IAM) Enterprise Solution project is enclosed. Jeff Maxon is the primary contact for the project and can be reached at (785) 207-3386. This letter constitutes approval of the project pursuant to K.S.A. 75-7209.

K.S.A. 75-7209 states all specifications for any competitive acquisition related to an approved information technology project shall be <u>reviewed</u> by the chief information technology officer for the branch of state government of which the agency or agencies are a part. The requirement that agencies obtain CITO approval of proposed IT projects has been adjusted to be in agreement with JCIT suggestions. As a result, all specifications for any competitive acquisition related to an approved IT project shall now be <u>approved</u> by the CITO before release.

If a variance of 10% or more in time or cost to the approved high-level project plan would occur with vendor selection, a revised high-level project plan must be submitted for CITO approval and the CITO's approval shall be received, *prior* to contract award. The CITO will notify JCIT of such events as per their request.

Once the final contracts are awarded, the high-level project plan will need to be updated with detailed information and receive final CITO approval. As required by statute and reinforced by the JCIT, the detailed project plan must receive CITO approval *prior* to project execution. This detailed project plan should include information found at the following link: https://ebit.ks.gov/kito/epmo/proposed-information-technology-project-plans.

As of July 1, 2013, new CITO-reportable projects are assessed a fee to support KITO operations. The fee will be assessed against the total project cost identified in the agency's detailed project plan. The fee will be billed quarterly until the project's Post Implementation Evaluation Report (PIER) is received. Fees will be based on the following rate structure:

- Projects valued between \$250,000 and \$10,000,000 .0035 of the Project cost
- Projects valued greater than \$10,000,001 .0005 of the Project cost
- Infrastructure projects .00035 of the Project cost

Richard Beattie 9/6/2022 Page 2 of 2

If there is any further assistance I may provide, please contact me.

Respectfully,

DocuSigned by:

Delingela Burns-Wallace

1DAB26281F9B47E...

DeAngela Burns-Wallace

Executive Branch CITO

Kelly O'Brien, CITO, Judicial Branch cc:

Alan Weis, CITO, Legislative Branch Adam Proffitt, Director of the Budget

Aaron Klaassen, JCIT

JCIT Membership

Linda Norris, OPC

Stephanie Creed, OPC

Tracie Gauntt, OPC

Kelly Johnson, OPC

Brian Reiter, OITS

Jeff Maxon, OITS

Donnita Thomas, OITS

Megan Burton, KSHS

Cole Robison, OITS

Alex Wong, CITA

Sara Spinks, KITO



Phone: (785) 296-3463 Fax: (785) 296-1168 oits.info@ks.gov

DeAngela Burns-Wallace, Chief Information Technology Officer

Laura Kelly, Governor

August 15, 2022

DeAngela Burns-Wallace, Chief Information Technology Officer Executive Branch Information Technology Office of information Technology Services 2800 SW Topeka Blvd, Building 100 Topeka, KS 66611

Dear Dr. Burns-Wallace:

The Office of Information Technology Services is requesting approval of our high-level project plan for the Identity Access Management (IAM) Enterprise Solution project. The State of Kansas would greatly benefit from a unified Identity and Access Management solution to support its employees. Several key benefits can be achieved by deploying capabilities such as Multi Factor Authentication (MFA) and Single Sign-On (SSO). The most critical benefit would be an increased security posture by reducing the potential for account compromises. Employee experience and productivity would also be greatly improved by reducing the number of usernames and passwords employees would need. Finally, it would position the State to leverage architectures and concepts that align with Zero Trust principles and have a modern mechanism to identify and authenticate users for both new and existing applications.

The total project cost is estimated at \$3,042,000.

The attached high-level documentation describes the work and costs to complete this project. Please review the submitted documentation and should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (785) 296-2222 or Jeff.Maxon@ks.gov. The following are the Steering Committee members who would be able to respond to any questions you may have as well.

Name, Position	Email	Phone
Alex Wong, CITA	Alex.Wong@ks.gov	(785) 296-4947
Josh White, DofA CIO	Josh.White@ks.gov	(785) 296-6955
Mark Abraham, Deputy CISO	Mark.Abraham@ks.gov	(785) 296-7029
Tanya Heffel, CTO	Tanya.Heffel@ks.gov	(785) 296-0386
Travis Combes, Senior IT Director	Travis.Combes@ks.gov	(785) 296-4004

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

Jeff Maxon

Jeff Maxon, CISO

Office of Information Technology Services

Cc: Alex Wong, CITA

Josh White, DofA CIO Mark Abraham, Deputy CISO Tanya Heffel, CTO Travis Combes, Senior IT Director

JM:drt

State Entity: Office of Information Technology Services (OITS)	
Project Name: Identity Access Management (IAM) Enterprise Solution	
Greater than \$250,000/ less than \$1,000,000 (Y/N): N	
Greater than \$1,000,000 (Y/N): Y	
IT Project Plan Documents	Included (Y/N)
For forms and/or more detailed information on completion of plan: see https://ebit.ks.gov/kito/it-project-oversight/proposed-it-project-plans	
For ITEC Policy and/or more detailed information on approval of IT projects, see ITEC 2400 and 2400A https://ebit.ks.gov/itec/resources/policies	
Cover Letter Requesting Project Approval	Υ
IT Project Request ExplanationDA518	Y
IT Cost Benefit StatementDA519	Y
Work Breakdown Structure	
Task Name (tasks should be descriptive)	Y
Start	Y
Finish	Y
Milestone	Y
Architectural Statement (ITEC Policy 4010 and 9500) https://ebit.ks.gov/itec/resources/policies	
Statement of products and standards compliance	Υ
If different, attach CITA waiver	
Ownership of Software Code and Related Intellectual Property (ITEC Policy 1500)	
Statement of compliance	Υ
If different, attach CITO waiver	NA
Accessibility Statement (ITEC Policy 1210) https://ebit.ks.gov/itec/resources/policies/policy-1210	
Statement indicating intent to use Voluntary Product Accessibility Template® (VPAT®) to assess compliance with ITEC 1210 as part of the procurement/development and testing process, or attach exception from State ADA Coordinator.	Υ
For more information see: https://www.itic.org/policy/accessibility/vpat.	
Attach approval letter from State Director of IT Accessibility	Υ
Electronic Records Retention Statement (K.S.A. 45-403 and K.S.A. 45-213 through 45-223)	
For more information see https://www.kshs.org/p/records-management-and-the-law/11348	
Identify replaced paper records	Υ
2. Identify new business functions	Υ
3. Reasons for business functions	Υ
Records requirements for business function	Υ
5. Documents in another system?	Υ
6. Public access requirements	Υ
7. Access control requirements	Υ
8. Identify all records with retention period of ten or more years	Υ
9. Estimate three year cost of addressing records identified in No. 8	Υ
Attach approval letter from State Archivist.	Υ
Risk Identification Summary (Form ITEC PM02-11a)	Υ
Risk Assessment Model (RAM) Summary - High Level Plans	Υ
Fiscal Note, if appropriate	NA
Electronic copy submitted four weeks prior to contract award and/or project execution	

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROJECT REQUEST EXPLANATION DA 518							
1. Project Title:	2. Project Priority	3. Estima	ted Dates				
Identity Access Management (IAM) Enterprise Solution	High	Planning Start:	8/23/2022				
Agency:		Execution Start:	1/3/2023				
Office of Information Technology Services (OITS)		Close-Out End:	2/14/2024				
4. Project Description and Justification:	Date Submitted:	8/5/2	:022				

Executive Summary:

The State of Kansas would greatly benefit from a unified Identity and Access Management solution to support its employees. By deploying several of the key and critical capabilities such as Multi Factor Authentication (MFA) and Single Sign-On (SSO) several of the key benefits could be achieved. Most critically, would be an increased security posture by reducing the potential for account compromises. Employee experience and productivity would also be greatly improved by reducing the number of usernames and passwords employees would need. Finally, it would position the State to leverage architectures and concepts that align with Zero Trust principles and have a modern mechanism to identify and authenticate users for both new and existing applications.

Problem Statement

State of Kansas employees are challenged with maintaining multiple usernames and passwords to multiple systems. The requirement of employees needing multiple usernames and passwords for multiple systems presents both security risks as well as major inconveniences to employees and productivity.

Credentials are stored in different databases, different locations with different control and standards. There is no single source of truth for Identity Information or single system of record.

In order to simplify the challenges presented by needing multiple usernames and passwords, employees' resort to practices that present security concerns, such as using the same username and password for multiple systems, not creating complex passwords, saving usernames and passwords to spreadsheets on their systems, and writing them down. In addition, each time they forget their password to a system, they must reset the password taking away from their own productivity and potentially require additional resources, such as system administrator and help desk staff to reset the password.

Current State

Each agency maintains multiple user identification and authentication sources and solutions that are application dependent. These solutions range from Active Directory, application local database, TACACS/RADIUS and several others. There are currently several MFA solutions that exist in the agencies, but in most cases, they do not support many of the applications and are primarily used for remote access. Each agency performs their own administration and support of these solutions and none of the solutions tie into the larger enterprise solutions.

Is this an Infrastructure Project? (Y/N)	N
Will Business Process Modeling be completed during the IT project and business design? (Y/N)	Y
Will national and/or industry data standards be used? (Y/N)	Y

If yes, please specify. National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)

List any collaboration that has taken place in the planning of the IT Project, and/or will take place during execution of the project. Include tools, methods, and best practices used for providing collaboration, user input, and continued social networking.

Have reached out to Gartner for the assistance. Have discussed with the KBI who has recently implemented a similar project. Have conferred with the following States: Arkansas, Ohio, and Iowa. Aware that other states are pursuing similar initiatives. Spoke with Boston Consulting Group (BCG) who recommended a central IAM solution.

5. Estimated Project Cost								
Category Internal Cost (Salaries)	Cost \$0	KITO Rate Structure			Project Quarterly KITO Fee			
Contractual Services	\$2,130,000	Project Va	Project Value Range					
Commodities	\$0	\$250,000	\$10,000,000	0.00350				
Capital Outlay	\$870,000	\$10,000,001	Greater	0.00050				
Sub-Total Project Costs	\$3,000,000	Infrastructu	Infrastructure Projects		\$10,500			
Total KITO Rate Fee	\$42,000							
Total Project Costs	\$3,042,000							

	Dub Total Troject Co	3363	φ5,000,000		mindonaet	are rrojecto	0.00055	
Total KITO Rate Fee			\$42,000	,				
	Total Project Costs		\$3,042,000					
6. Project Subprojects	s (include <u>name</u> , <u>start</u> and	end dates, and cost o	f each Subproject):					
Subproject Name				Start Date	End Date	Internal Cost	External Cost	Total Cost
Planning				8/23/2022	1/10/2023	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000
Execution								
Enter "Execution" or	Subproject 1 Name			1/3/2023	1/2/2024			\$0
Enter Subproject 2 N	ame if Applicable					\$0	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000
Enter Subproject 3 N	ame if Applicable							\$0
Enter Subproject 4 N	ame if Applicable					\$0	\$42,000	\$42,000
Enter Subproject 5 N	ame if Applicable							\$0
			Execution Sub-Total	1/3/2023	1/2/2024	\$0	\$2,542,000	\$2,542,000
Close-Out				10/4/2023	2/14/2024	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000
			Grand Internal, Exte	ernal, and Total Costs		\$0	\$3,042,000	\$3,042,000
7. Amount by Source o	of Financing:							
State Fiscal Years	1. 3753	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	Total
SFY 2023	\$1,424,846	,				_		\$1,424,846
SFY 2024	\$1,617,154							\$1,617,154
SFY 2025						_		\$0
SFY 2026						_		\$0
SFY 2027						_		\$0
SFY 2028					ĺ			\$0

Description of funds listed above

Total Project Costs

\$3,042,000

\$3,042,000

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROJECT REQUEST EXPLANATION DA 519								
1. Project Title	2. Estimat		Projected Months from					
Identity Access Management (IAM) Enterprise Solution	Planning Start:	8/23/2022	Execution to Close-Out					
	Execution Start:	1/3/2023	1.4					
	Close-Out End:	2/14/2024	14					
3. Agency	4. Project Director/Project Manager							
Office of Information Technology Services (OITS)	Jeff Maxon / Donnita Thomas							

5. Qualitative and Quantitative Savings Explanation

While it is difficult to express RoI a general idea of the value of a project can usually be determined based on reasonable estimates and existing metrics. One of the major drivers of this project is the amount of maintenance and management time currently wrapped up in managing the user base. It is anticipated that streamlining and simplifying processes for user management and providing a more fully integrated central user store for use by applications will reduce this time significantly.

Passwords use our time in one of two ways: either through recalling and entering them or spending time resetting them. A recent survey indicates that employees worldwide spend an average of 11 hours each year entering or restting their passwords. Using this information and the Govenor's Budget Report FY 2023 Volume 1 we can extrapolate that the State of Kansas expends around \$8.7 million annually on entering and resetting passwords. In many cases, state staff go through a help desk to reset passwords. Research has indicated that an estimated 40% of help desk calls are for password resets and that it costs the organization an estimated \$70.00 per password reset call. The DofA and OITS helpdesks estimated 183,424 calls annually 40% of which is 73,370. 73,370 password reset calls at \$70.00 per call is \$5,135,872 expended annually. This solution will not eliminate these expenses; however, it does show a potential for significant cost avoidance.

Research also indicates that hacked and stolen passwords cause 89% of web application breaches and a data breach can cost an organization \$4.24 million.

References: https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbestechcouncil/2021/08/17/the-cost-of-logging-in/?sh=5f0781174c4e; https://www.beyondidentity.com/blog/cost-passwords; https://www.techtarget.com/searchenterprisedesktop/tip/Resetting-passwords-in-the-enterprise-without-the-help-

desk#:--:text=Forrester%20Research%20estimates%20that%20the,you%20can%20also%20reduce%20costs; https://duo.com/blog/resetting-passwords-and-saving-time-and-money-at-the-it-help-desk

6. Qualitative and Quantitative Savings Es	timate						
Description of Savings		SFY 2023	SFY 2024	SFY 2025	SFY 2026	SFY 2027	SFY 2028
Cost Avoidance (Soft Dollars)							
Reduction in time spent entering or resetting p	oasswords				\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000
Reduction in Operating Costs associated with	the help desks.				\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000
Wouldn't have to replace the Netscaler hardway (10/2024).	are at its end of life				\$252,500		
Avoiding 1 data breach related to a hacked or	stolen password				\$4,240,000	\$4,240,000	\$4,240,000
Subtotal	\$32,472,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,992,500	\$10,740,000	\$10,740,000
Cash Savings (Hard Dollars)							
Decommission the Netscaler Infrastructure - N	Maintenance				\$82,000	\$82,000	\$82,000
Subtotal	\$246,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$82,000	\$82,000	\$82,000
Other (Include Intangible Benefits)							
Enable identity governance abilities through si	ingle source of truth						
Simplify User Administration; automate provi	sioning and de-						
provisioning;							
Allow us to federate with external systems if n	eeded						
Simplify end users experience: No passwords	changes; only 1						
User Name and Password to remember; faster							
Subtotal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Quantitative Savings	\$32,718,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11,074,500	\$10,822,000	\$10,822,000
7. Summary*		SFY 2023	SFY 2024	SFY 2025	SFY 2026	SFY 2027	SFY 2028
Project Costs Total	\$3,042,000	\$1,424,846	\$1,617,154	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Net Cost Benefit Total	\$29,676,500	-\$1,424,846	-\$1,617,154	\$0	\$11,074,500	\$10,822,000	\$10,822,000
Cost Benefit per Month	\$2,337,036	•	•		•	•	
Calendar Months to Break Even	1						
8. Ongoing Cost		SFY 2023	SFY 2024	SFY 2025	SFY 2026	SFY 2027	SFY 2028
Operational Cost for three ensuing SFYs				\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	
* Project Costs = Total Cost of Project over	all Fiscal Vears from	all Funding Source	ec .		<u> </u>	•	

^{*} Project Costs = Total Cost of Project over all Fiscal Years from all Funding Sources
Net Cost Benefit = Total Qualitative & Quantitative Savings minus Total Project Costs
Cost Benefit per Month = Total Qualitative & Quantitative Savings divided by Length of Project in months
Calendar Months to Break Even = Total Project Costs divided by Cost Benefit per Month

HL_Identity Access Management Enterprise Solution_WBS

Task Name Identity Access Management (IAM) Enterprise S	Duration A55 days	Work 856.28 hrs	Start Mon 4/25/22	Finish Wed 2/14/24	Predecessors	Resource Names	Milestone No
identity Access ivianagement (IAIVI) Enterprise S	olution 455 days	850.28 nrs	NION 4/25/22	wea 2/14/24			NO
Initiating	84 days	77 hrs	Mon 4/25/22	Mon 8/22/22			No
On-boarding of the Project Manager	1 hr	1 hr	Mon 4/25/22	Mon 4/25/22		Donnita Thomas	No
Project Charter	26 days	16.72 hrs	Mon 4/25/22	Tue 5/31/22		Domina monas	No
						Donnita Thomas[5%],Alex Wong[3%],Jeff Maxon[5%]	No
Development of Project Charter	8 days	8.32 hrs	Mon 4/25/22	Wed 5/4/22	_		
Steering Committee Review	17 days	8.16 hrs	Thu 5/5/22	Fri 5/27/22	5	Alex Wong[1%],Jeff Maxon[1%],Josh White[1%],Mark Abraham[1%],Tanya Heffel[1%],Travis Combes[1%]	No
Project Charter Sign-Off	1 day	0.24 hrs	Tue 5/31/22	Tue 5/31/22	6	Jeff Maxon[1%],Donnita Thomas[1%],Dana Morales[1%]	Yes
Planned Project	30 days	6.64 hrs	Tue 4/26/22	Tue 6/7/22			No
Draft Planned Project	13 days	5.2 hrs	Tue 4/26/22	Thu 5/12/22		Donnita Thomas[5%]	No
Steering Committee Review	1 day	0.16 hrs	Wed 5/25/22	Wed 5/25/22		Jeff Maxon[1%],Alex Wong[1%]	No
Planned Project Sign-Off	1 day	0.48 hrs	Wed 5/25/22	Wed 5/25/22		Jeff Maxon[1%],Alex Wong[1%],Josh White[1%],Mark Abraham[1%],Tanya Heffel[1%],Travis Combes[1%]	No
Planned Project Submission to KITO	1 day	0.4 hrs	Wed 5/25/22	Wed 5/25/22		Donnita Thomas[5%]	No
Receive CITO Letter	1 day	0.4 hrs	Tue 6/7/22	Tue 6/7/22		Cole Robison[5%]	Yes
High Level KITO Submission	81 days	19.04 hrs	Mon 4/25/22	Wed 8/17/22			No
RFP Specifications	44 days	3.68 hrs	Mon 4/25/22	Fri 6/24/22			No
Draft RFP Specifications	44 days	3.52 hrs	Mon 4/25/22	Fri 6/24/22		Jeff Maxon[1%]	No
Review with Contract Manager	1 day	0.16 hrs	Tue 6/14/22	Tue 6/14/22		Jeff Maxon[1%],Angela Wilson[1%]	No
Draft other KITO documentation (Cover L							
DA518/519, WBS, Compliance Statement Identification Summary, RAM)		8 hrs	Fri 6/17/22	Fri 7/15/22		Donnita Thomas[5%]	No
Steering Committee Review of KITO documentation	10 days	4.08 hrs	Mon 7/18/22	Fri 7/29/22	18,15	Alex Wong[1%],Jeff Maxon[1%],Josh White[1%],Mark Abraham[1%],Tanya Heffel[1%],Travis Combes[1%]	No
Sign-off on KITO documentation	5 days	0.4 hrs	Mon 8/1/22	Fri 8/5/22	19	Jeff Maxon[1%]	No
Submission to KITO Office	1 day	0.41113 0.08 hrs	Mon 8/8/22	Mon 8/8/22	20	Donnita Thomas[1%]	No
Receive CITO Approval Letter	7 days	2.8 hrs	Tue 8/9/22	Wed 8/17/22	21	Cole Robison[5%]	Yes
Communication					<u></u>	core nonion[5/6]	
	84 days	33.6 hrs	Mon 4/25/22	Mon 8/22/22		Descrite The west [50]	No
4th Quarter FY22 (4/22 - 6/22)	48 days	19.2 hrs	Mon 4/25/22	Thu 6/30/22		Donnita Thomas[5%]	No
1st Quarter FY23 (7/22 - 8/22/22)	36 days	14.4 hrs	Fri 7/1/22	Mon 8/22/22	24	Donnita Thomas[5%]	No
Planning	95 days	119.28 hrs	Tue 8/23/22	Tue 1/10/23			No
Procurement	66 days	52.4 hrs	Thu 8/25/22	Wed 11/30/22			No
Post RFP	1 day	0.4 hrs	Thu 8/25/22	Thu 8/25/22	22FS+5 days	Procurement and Contracts[5%]	No
Bid Process	25 days	20 hrs	Fri 8/26/22	Fri 9/30/22	28	Procurement and Contracts[5%], Angela Wilson[5%]	No
Review and Award	30 days	24 hrs	Mon 10/3/22	Mon 11/14/22	29	Angela Wilson[5%],RFP Review Team[5%]	Yes
Negotiation	10 days	8 hrs	Tue 11/15/22	Wed 11/30/22	30	Angela Wilson[5%],Jeff Maxon[5%]	No
On Board Vendor		8 hrs	Thu 12/1/22		31		No
	10 days			Wed 12/14/22	31	Donnita Thomas[5%],Jeff Maxon[5%]	
Detail Level KITO Documentation	37 days	23.28 hrs	Tue 11/15/22	Tue 1/10/23			No
Compliance	10 days	4 hrs	Thu 12/1/22	Wed 12/14/22			No
Architectural	1 day	0.4 hrs	Thu 12/1/22	Thu 12/1/22	31	Alex Wong[5%]	No
Ownership of Software Code & Related Intellectual Property	d 1 day	0.4 hrs	Fri 12/2/22	Fri 12/2/22	35	Jeff Maxon[5%]	No
Accessibility	4 days	1.6 hrs	Mon 12/5/22	Thu 12/8/22	36	OITS Staff[5%]	No
Electronic Record Retention	4 days	1.6 hrs	Fri 12/9/22	Wed 12/14/22	37	Jeff Maxon[5%]	No
Draft Detail Level KITO documentation	20 days	16 hrs	Tue 11/15/22	Wed 12/14/22	30	Donnita Thomas[5%], Vendor[5%]	No
Steering Committee Review of KITO documentation	5 days	2.4 hrs	Thu 12/15/22	Wed 12/21/22	39	Alex Wong[1%],Jeff Maxon[1%],Josh White[1%],Mark Abraham[1%],Tanya Heffel[1%],Travis Combes[1%]	No
Sign-off on KITO documentation	5 days	0.4 hrs	Thu 12/22/22	Thu 12/29/22	40	Jeff Maxon[1%]	No
Submission to KITO Office	1 day	0.08 hrs	Fri 12/30/22	Fri 12/30/22	41	Donnita Thomas[1%]	No
Receive CITO Approval Letter	1 day	0.4 hrs	Tue 1/10/23	Tue 1/10/23	42FS+5 days	Cole Robison[5%]	Yes
Communication	89 days	35.6 hrs	Tue 8/23/22	Fri 12/30/22	5 66,5		No
1st Quarter FY23 (8/23/22 - 9/22)	28 days	11.2 hrs	Tue 8/23/22	Fri 9/30/22		Donnita Thomas[5%]	No
		24.4 hrs	Mon 10/3/22	Fri 12/30/22	45	Donnita Thomas[5%]	No
2nd Quarter FY23 (10/22 - 12/22)	61 days				45	Dominica monido[270]	
Executing Implemention of the Environments (Dev, T Prod)	252 days est and 25 days	622 hrs 10 hrs	Tue 1/3/23 Wed 1/11/23	Tue 1/2/24 Wed 2/15/23			No No
Dev	10 days	4 hrs	Wed 1/11/23	Wed 1/25/23	32,43	Vendor[5%]	No
Test	5 days	2 hrs	Thu 1/26/23	Wed 1/23/23 Wed 2/1/23	49	Vendor[5%]	No
1							
Prod	10 days	4 hrs	Thu 2/2/23	Wed 2/15/23	50	Vendor[5%]	No
Integrate logging into state SIEM Integrating into Agency User Stores (Sync us	21 days sers to the 60 days	8.4 hrs 24 hrs	Thu 2/16/23 Thu 2/16/23	Thu 3/16/23 Wed 5/10/23	51 48	Vendor[5%] Vendor[5%]	Yes Yes
solution) Integrating into Enterprise Applications	90 days	72 hrs	Thu 5/11/23	Mon 9/18/23			No
+		42.1	TI 5/4:/00	TI 6/6/22	54.53	A CONTRACT TO STATE OF THE STAT	
Enterprise Application 1	15 days	12 hrs	Thu 5/11/23	Thu 6/1/23	51,53	Agency[5%],Vendor[5%]	No
Enterprise Application 2	15 days	12 hrs	Fri 6/2/23	Thu 6/22/23	55	Agency[5%],Vendor[5%]	No
Enterprise Application 3	15 days	12 hrs	Fri 6/23/23	Fri 7/14/23	56	Agency[5%], Vendor[5%]	No
Enterprise Application 4	15 days	12 hrs	Mon 7/17/23	Fri 8/4/23	57	Agency[5%],Vendor[5%]	No
Enterprise Application 5	15 days	12 hrs	Mon 8/7/23	Fri 8/25/23	58	Agency[5%],Vendor[5%]	No
Enterprise Application 6	15 days	12 hrs	Mon 8/28/23	Mon 9/18/23	59	Agency[5%],Vendor[5%]	No
Develop and implement dynamic/ risk-base		12 hrs	Thu 2/16/23	Wed 3/29/23	51	Vendor[5%]	Yes
policies and rules		12.113	2, 20, 23		-		103
Test	85 days	72 hrs	Fri 6/2/23	Mon 10/2/23			No
Enterprise Application 1	10 days	12 hrs	Fri 6/2/23	Thu 6/15/23	55	Agency[5%],Vendor[5%],OITS Staff[5%]	No
Enterprise Application 2	10 days	12 hrs	Fri 6/23/23	Fri 7/7/23	56	Agency[5%],Vendor[5%],OITS Staff[5%]	No
Enterprise Application 2 Enterprise Application 3	10 days	12 hrs	Mon 7/17/23	Fri 7/28/23	57	Agency[5%], Vendor[5%], OITS Staff[5%]	No
Enterprise Application 4	10 days	12 hrs	Mon 8/7/23	Fri 8/18/23	58	Agency[5%],Vendor[5%],OITS Staff[5%]	No
Enterprise Application 5	10 days	12 hrs	Mon 8/28/23	Mon 9/11/23	59	Agency[5%],Vendor[5%],OITS Staff[5%]	No
Enterprise Application 6	10 days	12 hrs	Tue 9/19/23	Mon 10/2/23	60	Agency[5%], Vendor[5%], OITS Staff[5%]	No

DocuSign Envelope ID: 05318A10-762C-4158-842E-ECFAB5007979

HL_Identity Access Management Enterprise Solution_WBS

D	Task Name	Duration	Work	Start	Finish	Predecessors	Resource Names	Milestone
69	Testing Complete	0 days	0 hrs	Mon 10/2/23	Mon 10/2/23	63,64,65,66,67,68		Yes
70	Organziational Change Management	190 days	132 hrs	Wed 1/11/23	Mon 10/9/23			No
71	Transition Plan to Steady State	30 days	24 hrs	Wed 1/11/23	Wed 2/22/23	32,43	Vendor[5%],OITS Staff[5%]	No
72	Implementation of Transition Plan	160 days	108 hrs	Thu 2/23/23	Mon 10/9/23			No
73	Training	90 days	60 hrs	Fri 6/2/23	Mon 10/9/23			No
74	Training Documentation Creation (Admin &	30 days	12 hrs	Fri 6/2/23	Fri 7/14/23	55	Vendor[5%]	No
	End User)	,.						
75	Deliver Training (Admin & End User)	60 days	48 hrs	Mon 7/17/23	Mon 10/9/23	74	Vendor[10%]	No
76	Administrative and Operational Support	60 days	48 hrs	Thu 2/23/23	Wed 5/17/23			No
77	Develop a long-term operational support plar that details staffing requirements and operating procedures to support the solution		16 hrs	Thu 2/23/23	Wed 3/22/23	71	Vendor[5%],OITS Staff[5%]	No
78	Develop High Level Transition / Back out plan	20 days	16 hrs	Thu 3/23/23	Wed 4/19/23	77	Vendor[5%],OITS Staff[5%]	No
79	Prepare the solution for Agency application integrations	20 days	16 hrs	Thu 4/20/23	Wed 5/17/23	78	Vendor[5%],OITS Staff[5%]	No
80	OCM/Transition Plan Completed	0 days	0 hrs	Mon 10/9/23	Mon 10/9/23	73,76		Yes
81	Enterprise Policy and Standards	90 days	144 hrs	Thu 3/30/23	Fri 8/4/23			No
82	Access Control	45 days	72 hrs	Thu 3/30/23	Thu 6/1/23	61	Alex Wong[10%],Jeff Maxon[10%]	No
83	Identification and Authentication	45 days	72 hrs	Fri 6/2/23	Fri 8/4/23	82	Alex Wong[10%],Jeff Maxon[10%]	No
84	Policies and Standards Approved	0 days	0 hrs	Fri 8/4/23	Fri 8/4/23	82,83	ITEC[5%]	Yes
85	Communication	251 days	116.4 hrs	Tue 1/3/23	Fri 12/29/23			No
86	3rd Quarter FY23 (1/23 - 3/23)	63 days	25.2 hrs	Tue 1/3/23	Fri 3/31/23		Donnita Thomas[5%]	No
87	4th Quarter FY23 (4/23 - 6/23)	64 days	25.6 hrs	Mon 4/3/23	Fri 6/30/23	86	Donnita Thomas[5%]	No
88	1st Quarter FY24 (7/23 - 9/23)	63 days	25.2 hrs	Mon 7/3/23	Fri 9/29/23	87	Donnita Thomas[5%]	No
89	2nd Quarter FY24 (10/23 - 12/23)	61 days	24.4 hrs	Mon 10/2/23	Fri 12/29/23	88	Donnita Thomas[5%]	No
90	Quarterly KITO Reports	198 days	16 hrs	Mon 3/20/23	Fri 12/29/23			No
91	3rd Quarter FY23 (1/23 - 3/23)	10 days	4 hrs	Mon 3/20/23	Fri 3/31/23		Donnita Thomas[5%]	No
92	4th Quarter FY23 (4/23 - 6/23)	10 days	4 hrs	Mon 6/19/23	Fri 6/30/23		Donnita Thomas[5%]	No
93	1st Quarter FY24 (7/23 - 9/23)	10 days	4 hrs	Mon 9/18/23	Fri 9/29/23		Donnita Thomas[5%]	No
94	2nd Quarter FY24 (10/23 - 12/23)	10 days	4 hrs	Fri 12/15/23	Fri 12/29/23		Donnita Thomas[5%]	No
95	Go Live	76 days	7.2 hrs	Fri 6/16/23	Tue 10/3/23			No
96	Enterprise Application 1	1 day	1.2 hrs	Fri 6/16/23	Fri 6/16/23	63	Agency[5%],Vendor[5%],OITS Staff[5%]	Yes
97	Enterprise Application 2	1 day	1.2 hrs	Mon 7/10/23	Mon 7/10/23	64	Agency[5%],Vendor[5%],OITS Staff[5%]	Yes
98	Enterprise Application 3	1 day	1.2 hrs	Mon 7/31/23	Mon 7/31/23	65	Agency[5%],Vendor[5%],OITS Staff[5%]	Yes
99	Enterprise Application 4	1 day	1.2 hrs	Mon 8/21/23	Mon 8/21/23	66	Agency[5%],Vendor[5%],OITS Staff[5%]	Yes
100	Enterprise Application 5	1 day	1.2 hrs	Tue 9/12/23	Tue 9/12/23	67	Agency[5%],Vendor[5%],OITS Staff[5%]	Yes
101	Enterprise Application 6	1 day	1.2 hrs	Tue 10/3/23	Tue 10/3/23	68	Agency[5%],Vendor[5%],OITS Staff[5%]	Yes
102	Post Go Live Support	60 days	24 hrs	Wed 10/4/23	Tue 1/2/24	101	Vendor[5%]	No
103	Closing	90 days	38 hrs	Wed 10/4/23	Wed 2/14/24			No
104	Decommissioning of Netscalers	30 days	12 hrs	Wed 1/3/24	Wed 2/14/24	102	OITS Staff[5%]	No
105	Lesson's Learned	5 days	2 hrs	Wed 10/4/23	Tue 10/10/23	95	Donnita Thomas[5%]	Yes
106	PIER	60 days	24 hrs	Wed 10/11/23	Tue 1/9/24	105	Donnita Thomas[5%]	Yes

State Archives Division 6425 SW 6th Avenue Topeka KS 66615-1099



785-272-8681, ext. 272 megan.burton@ks.gov kshs.org

Patrick Zollner, Acting Executive Director

Laura Kelly, Governor

July 15, 2022

Dr. DeAngela Burns-Wallace, Secretary of Administration Executive Branch Chief Information Technology Officer 2800 SW Topeka Blvd Building 100 Topeka, KS 66611

Dear Dr. Burns-Wallace,

As part of the approval process for information technology projects over \$250,000, the State Archivist is required to evaluate the impact of information technology projects on government records with long-term (10+ year) retention requirements. If the project impacts long-term records, the State Archivist must ensure that appropriate provisions have been made for these records in the high-level and detailed project plans, in the system design, and for their ingestion, if prudent and feasible, into the Kansas Enterprise Electronic Preservation (KEEP) system. An Electronic Records Retention Statement and approval letter from the State Archivist must accompany high level and detailed project plans submitted to you in your role as the Executive Branch Chief Information Technology Officer.

In compliance with this process, Donnita Thomas, Project Manager, recently sent to me for review an Electronic Records Retention Statement for the Kansas Office of Information Technology's Identity Access Management (IAM Enterprise Solution high-level plan. From my review of the project plan materials, it appears that this is an project could have an effect on records. Project staff have indicated in the work breakdown structure their intention to identify records management issues as well as work with KSHS staff to properly address those.

The Electronic Records Retention Statement for the high-level project plan is approved. A copy of this approval letter should be included when submitting the project plan for approval.

Sincerely,

Megan Burton Senior Archivist

Cc: Cole Robison, Director of IT Accessibility, OITS

Donnita Thomas, Project Manager, OITS



Phone: (785) 296-3463 Fax: (785) 296-1168 oits.info@ks.gov

DeAngela Burns-Wallace, Chief Information Technology Officer

Laura Kelly, Governor

July 13, 2022

DeAngela Burns-Wallace, Chief Information Technology Officer Office of Information Technology Services 2800 SW Topeka Blvd., Building 100 Topeka, KS 66611

Dear Dr. Burns-Wallace:

As part of the approval process for information technology projects over \$250,000, a statement indicating compliance with State Information Technology Executive Council (ITEC) Policy 1210 *Information and Communication Technology Accessibility Standards* must be filed with the Branch Chief Information Technology Officer and approved by the Director of Information Technology (IT) Accessibility. I recently received from Donnita Thomas an Accessibility Statement for the Identity Access Management (IAM) Enterprise Solution project for review in compliance with this process.

This statement affirms that the project will comply with the requirements of ITEC Policy 1210, and that the Voluntary Product Accessibility Template® (VPAT®) will be utilized to assess compliance.

The Accessibility Statement for the IAM Enterprise Solution high-level project plan is approved. A copy of this letter should be included with the submittal of the IAM Enterprise Solution high-level project plan to the Branch CITO for approval.

Sincerely,

B7372BF57AD54B7...
Cole D. Robison

DocuSigned by:

Director of IT Accessibility

cc: Anthony Fadale, State Americans with Disabilities Act Coordinator Jeff Maxon, Office of Information Technology Services Sara Spinks, Director, Kansas Information Technology Office Donnita Thomas, Office of Information Technology Services



Phone: (785) 296-3463 Fax: (785) 296-1168 oits.info@ks.gov

DeAngela Burns-Wallace, Chief Information Technology Officer

Laura Kelly, Governor

July 7, 2022

RE: Identity Access Management (IAM) Enterprise Solution [PRJ 22 009]

The goal of this project is to implement a centralized Identity Access and Management (IAM) solution. This would create a single source of record for employee access and privileges.

Architectural Statement

The Office of Information Technology Services (OITS) complies with ITEC Policies 4010 and 9500 as found at https://ebit.ks.gov/itec/resources/policies/itec-policy-4010 and <a href="https://ebit.ks.gov/itec/resources/policies/itec-policy-policies/itec-policy-policies/itec-policy-policies/itec-policy-policies/itec-policy-policies/itec-policy-policies/itec-policy-policies/itec-policy-policies/itec-policy-policies/itec-policy-polic

Current, planned, and future OITS projects are in compliance with the Kansas Information Technology Architecture version 12.0. In-house development and vendor supplied technologies will be implemented in accordance with State Architecture standards.

Ownership of Software Code and Related Intellectual Property Statement

The Office of Information Technology Services will comply with ITEC Policy 1500 as found at https://ebit.ks.gov/docs/default-source/itec/itec/itec/policy/1500.pdf.

Accessibility Statement

The Office of Information Technology Services will use the Voluntary Product Accessibility Template® (VPAT®) to comply with the Accessibility Statement (ITEC Policy 1210) as found at https://ebit.ks.gov/itec/resources/policies/policy-1210.

Electronic Record Retention Statement

1. For each business function supported by the new system, what paper records are being replaced and which will continue to exist in both paper and electronic form?

This will need to be discussed during the preparation of the Detailed Level plan. The WBS reflects this activity.

2. What new business functions will be implemented?

This will need to be discussed during the preparation of the Detailed Level plan. The WBS reflects this activity.

3. What are the reasons for performing the business functions?

This will need to be discussed during the preparation of the Detailed Level plan. The WBS reflects this activity.

4. What legal, regulatory or operational requirements, including State Records Board approved retention schedules, exist for keeping records related to each business function?

It appears that accessibility records are covered under the following:

Agency Number: 000-009

State General Retention and Disposition Schedule

Information Technology

SERIES ID 0110-000

TITLE System Users Access Records

Electronic or textual records created to control or monitor individual access to a system and its

DESCRIPTION data for security purposes, including but not limited to, user account records, security logs, and

password files.

RETENTION See Comments

COMMENTS Retain until no longer of administrative value to the agency, then destroy.

DISPOSITION Destroy
RESTRICTIONS None
APPROVED 2000-08-17
K.A.R.
NUMBER 53-2-124

5. Will any of the data necessary to document the business functions either be maintained in another system within the agency or in a system outside the agency? If so, please specify.

This will need to be discussed during the preparation of the Detailed Level plan. The WBS reflects this activity.

6. What are the legal, regulatory or operational requirements to providing public access to the records?

This will need to be discussed during the preparation of the Detailed Level plan. The WBS reflects this activity.

7. What are the legal, regulatory or operational requirements for controlling access to the records in order to ensure confidentially?

This will need to be discussed during the preparation of the Detailed Level plan. The WBS reflects this activity.

8. Identify all records with retention periods of ten or more years that will be affected by the project or indicate that the project has no such records involved.

NA

9. Estimate of the three-year total cost of addressing records identified in No. 8 above and included on the DA519, Item #8.

NA

Risk Identification Summary (Top Five Risks)

A description of project risks, the probability of the risk occurring, the impact of the risk on the project, and the suggested mitigation activities.

Last Risk Assessment Date: 7/7/2022 Prepared by: Donnita Thomas

Category	Prob	Imp	Risk	Mitigation Approaches
Strategic	High	High	The state could choose not to implement an enterprise IAM solution, and we would continue to have major security gaps and a poor user experience.	Started socializing this project with agency leadership and stakeholders.
Change Management / Operational	High	High	Rely on Agencies to assist with setting up and maintaining integrations	Continuous engagement with the agencies. Providing resources as needed.
Financial	High	High	Funding source is undefined at this time	Researching funding source options such as ARPA, Cyber Security Grant, etc.
Technology	High	High	System is the single point of entrance into applications	Use a highly available cloud solution.
Technology	High	High	User access is internet facing	Using an industry leading Identity Authentication platform while using additional security controls.
Change Management / Operational	High	High	Will impact all executive branch employees	Ensure that training is provided to end users.
Technology	High	High	Integration with native applications	Bring in a vendor that can specializes in building IAM integration platform. Or accept the fact that the native system cannot utilize the enterprise IAM.
Change Management / Operational	Moderate	High	The level of commitment and availability of internal resources to support the technology long term.	Engage the vendor to provide day to day management of the solution until the state has staff in place and trained to take over that effort.
Financial	Moderate	High	This is a new service with licensing expenses. Agencies will not have budgeted for this cost.	It is the intent to include the initial licensing within the project cost giving sometime to work this expense into the billable services. It is also anticipated that other solutions may be reduced and/or eliminated helping to bridge the expense gap.

Risk Identification Summary (Top Five Risks)

Category	Prob	Imp	Risk	Mitigation Approaches
Technology	High	Low	System will hold encrypted usernames and passwords	Accept the risk.
Technology	Moderate	Low	The estimate for this project is around 12 months due to the need to establish connectivity with each of the agencies.	Establish clear communication with the agencies. Start communication early and provide clear requirements and expectations.
Strategic	Moderate	Low	Compliance with Statute, Regulations and Policies	Closely review the Statute, Regulations and Policies. Ensure that compliance requirements are covered within the proposed solution.
Strategic	Low	High	If agencies independently attempt to implement MFA and SSO solutions: 1) could potentially have duplicate but disparate systems; 2) key & critical enterprise systems would not be covered; 3) likely more expensive and require a significant level of redundant staffing; 4) should a solution be deployed for enterprise resources and agencies deployed their own, end users could have multiple portals and tokens defeating the concept of SSO	Management is regularly engaging with Agencies and Stakeholders

Legend

Prob = Probability of Occurrence

Imp = Impact

RISK ASSESSMENT MODEL High Level Plan - Summary Report Ver. 1.0

Agency Name: Office of Information Technology Services (OITS)

Project Name: Identity Access Management (IAM) Enterprise Solution

1. Introduction

The Risk Assessment Model measures risk in distinct areas. Below are the average scores based on the results from the questionnaire. Each area indicates the measured risk on a scale from 1 to 9, with 9 being the highest risk. Scores lower than 2.0 are considered "Low Risk", scores higher than 2.0 are "Medium Risk" and scores higher than 3.0 are considered "High Risk".

2. Summary

Score	Risk Level	Risk Area
1.5	LOW	Strategic Risk
1.3	LOW	Financial Risk
3.0	MEDIUM	Project Management Risk
4.0	HIGH	Technology Risk
1.0	LOW	Change Management / Operational Risk

Note: If you get "#VALUE!" as a result in any of the "Score" or "Risk Level" fields, you have unanswered questions. Go back and check your answers.

3. Signature

I have reviewed the results of the Risk Assessment Model. The results are indicators only and do not represent all the risks of the project. ITEC will use the results as the basis of discussion, and will not rely solely on the output.



Project Director

RISK ASSESSMENT - Summary Report

High Level Plan - List of Comments

(Expand Row Height to Show all Text)