



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

UK-2619-27

Research Security Consultant

ADDENDUM # 1

August 20, 2026

ATTENTION: This is not an order. Read all instructions, terms and conditions carefully.

IMPORTANT: RFP AND ADDENDUM MUST BE RECEIVED BY 9-4-2026 @ 3:00 P.M. LEXINGTON, KY TIME

Offeror must acknowledge receipt of this and any addendum as stated in the Request for Proposals.

This addendum moves the RFP due date to 9/4/2026.
Please refer to and incorporate within the offer the attached questions and answers.

OFFICIAL APPROVAL
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Patricia Pflug', written over a horizontal line.

Patricia Pflug, Category Specialist, 859-257-5409

SIGNATURE

Typed or Printed Name



Written Questions and Answers

Research Security Consultant

RFP UK-2619-27

Closing Date: 9/4/2026

Today's Date: 8/20/2026

No.	Question	Answer
1	We would like to respectfully inquire whether the submission deadline can be deferred from September 1st to September 4 th .	See addendum.
2	Has the University previously engaged a consultant to assess its research security program, or conducted an internal self-assessment? If so, will that work be made available to the selected offeror?	No
3	Does the scope of this assessment include research security practices within UK HealthCare, affiliated hospitals, or academic medical center research programs, or is it limited to the core university research enterprise?	University research enterprise, which would include, for example, the College of Medicine.
4	Can the University describe its current organizational placement of the research security function (e.g., reporting line, staffing level) relative to its export control and research compliance offices?	These functions are housed in the UK SECURE office. https://research.uky.edu/secure
5	Section 2.1 indicates the assessment will include both on-site and virtual engagement activities. Can the University provide guidance on the anticipated number and duration of on-site visits, which project phases (e.g., stakeholder interviews, kickoff, final presentation) are expected to occur on campus versus virtually, and whether on-site presence is required at a single campus location or across multiple UK sites (e.g., UK HealthCare, regional affiliates)?	Maximum of 5 days onsite, most likely during interview phase. Virtual meetings can occur throughout the duration of the effort. Onsite visits would occur in Lexington, KY – no regional affiliates.
6	Can the University provide an estimate of the number of stakeholder interviews anticipated, or a preliminary list of departments/offices to be included?	Estimate range from 10 - 15

7	Section 2.1 asks the selected contractor to provide recommendations for <i>'technology-enabled oversight tools.'</i> Can the University clarify whether this means: (a) recommending specific software or platform solutions for ongoing research security monitoring, (b) evaluating and assessing the University's existing tools and systems, or (c) providing general guidance on the types of technology capabilities the University should consider, without recommending specific vendors or products?	(a) and (b) are of primary interest
8	How decentralized is research administration and research security across the University?	Research security is housed in the UK SECURE office, which works with many units across the research enterprise
9	How many dedicated secure research environments or enclaves are currently being used?	<10
10	Does the University have expectations regarding the number of units and research projects that should be sampled as part of the assessment? If so, could you provide additional details regarding your preferred sampling methodology or expectations for coverage?	There is not a target number, but the goal is to sample enough to gain a clear understanding of current strengths and gaps.
11	We note that the University Information references the University's clinical component, UK HealthCare. Is UK HealthCare in scope for this assessment?	For this assessment, UK Healthcare is not in scope.
12	We note that the scope includes reviewing institutional approaches to coordination between research security and export control functions, but that the overall purpose is focused on research security. Is the University's export control program out of scope for the assessment, except for coordination between research security and export control?	Instances where Research Security overlaps with Export Control are in scope. Assessment of the stand-alone export control program is out of scope.
13	We see that the RFP references institutional approaches to Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) governance and oversight. Can the University clarify whether the assessment is expected to evaluate compliance and maturity against specific federal standards, such as NIST SP 800-171, CUI requirements under 32 CFR Part 2002, and related sponsor expectations, or whether the assessment is intended to focus primarily on governance, policies, organizational	The goal is more the latter, and could include: Process for receiving CUI, evaluation of control requirements, SSPs, paths to optimization to enable seamless compliance

	responsibilities, and oversight mechanisms associated with identifying and managing CUI?	
14	Has the University previously conducted any research security, NSPM-33 readiness, export control, or CUI-related assessments? If so, should the selected consultant validate prior findings and recommendations or perform a wholly independent assessment?	No
15	The RFP references cybersecurity considerations as part of research security. Should the assessment include an evaluation of cybersecurity controls supporting research environments and federally funded research activities, or is the review intended to focus solely on governance, coordination, and policy-level cybersecurity oversight?	The primary goal of this assessment is more focused on the latter.