

PT-AM-CPE Pass4sure Pass Guide - PT-AM-CPE Verified Answers

**PT-AM-CPE CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL – PINGAM
COMPLETE EXAM QUESTIONS AND EXPLAINED
ANSWERS**

PT-AM-CPE Certified Professional - PingAM Exam

Q1. Which component of PingAM is primarily responsible for evaluating login policies and determining whether a user can authenticate?

- A. Policy Agent
- B. Authentication Tree
- C. Data Store
- D. Session Service

Answer: B. Authentication Tree
Explanation: Authentication Trees provide flexible, node-based flows to evaluate credentials and contextual information for login. They replace static authentication chains in newer versions.

Q2. What is the default protocol PingAM uses for **federated single sign-on (SSO)** between service providers and identity providers?

- A. OAuth2
- B. OpenID Connect
- C. SAML 2.0
- D. Kerberos

Answer: C. SAML 2.0
Explanation: While PingAM supports multiple federation standards, SAML 2.0 is the primary standard for enterprise SSO between IdPs and SPs.

Q3. In OAuth2, which grant type is most secure for mobile/native applications that cannot keep a client secret?

- A. Implicit Grant
- B. Authorization Code with PKCE

P.S. Free 2026 Ping Identity PT-AM-CPE dumps are available on Google Drive shared by Itcertking: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1dCAMPJG5sA56ZhSWsJ-JW-3wBn_jansr

The certification of Ping Identity PT-AM-CPE exam is what IT people want to get. Because it relates to their future fate. Ping Identity PT-AM-CPE exam training materials are the learning materials that each candidate must have. With this materials, the candidates will have the confidence to take the exam. Training materials in the Itcertking are the best training materials for the candidates. With Itcertking's Ping Identity PT-AM-CPE Exam Training materials, you will pass the exam easily.

Ping Identity PT-AM-CPE Exam Syllabus Topics:

Topic	Details
Topic 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federating Across Entities Using SAML2: This domain covers implementing single sign-on using SAML v2.0 and delegating authentication responsibilities between SAML2 entities.
Topic 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving Access Management Security: This domain focuses on strengthening authentication security, implementing context-aware authentication experiences, and establishing continuous risk monitoring throughout user sessions.

Topic 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhancing Intelligent Access: This domain covers implementing authentication mechanisms, using PingGateway to protect websites, and establishing access control policies for resources.
Topic 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Installing and Deploying AM: This domain encompasses installing and upgrading PingAM, hardening security configurations, setting up clustered environments, and deploying PingOne Advanced Identity Platform to the cloud.
Topic 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extending Services Using OAuth2-Based Protocols: This domain addresses integrating applications with OAuth 2.0 and OpenID Connect, securing OAuth2 clients with mutual TLS and proof-of-possession, transforming OAuth2 tokens, and implementing social authentication.

>> PT-AM-CPE Pass4sure Pass Guide <<

PT-AM-CPE Verified Answers, Exam PT-AM-CPE Overviews

New developments in the tech sector always bring new job opportunities. These new jobs have to be filled with the Certified Professional - PingAM Exam (PT-AM-CPE) certification holders. So to fill the space, you need to pass the Certified Professional - PingAM Exam (PT-AM-CPE) exam. Earning the Certified Professional - PingAM Exam (PT-AM-CPE) certification helps you clear the obstacles you face while working in the Ping Identity field. To get prepared for the Certified Professional - PingAM Exam (PT-AM-CPE) certification exam, applicants face a lot of trouble if the study material is not updated.

Ping Identity Certified Professional - PingAM Exam Sample Questions (Q90-Q95):

NEW QUESTION # 90

In which OAuth2 grant would you find a user code?

- A. Client credentials grant
- B. Resource owner password credentials grant
- C. Device flow
- D. Authorization code grant

Answer: C

Explanation:

The Device Authorization Grant (commonly referred to as the Device Flow, RFC 8628) is a specialized OAuth 2.0 grant flow supported by PingAM 8.0.2. It is designed for internet-connected devices that either lack a browser or have limited input capabilities (e.g., Smart TVs, IoT devices, or CLI tools).

In this flow, the interaction is split between the "Device" and a "Secondary Device" (like a smartphone or laptop) that has a full browser. The User Code is a fundamental component of this process:

Device Request: The device requests a code from PingAM.

PingAM Response: AM returns a Device Code (for the device) and a User Code (a short, human-readable string like BCDF-GHJK).

User Action: The device displays the User Code and a verification URL to the user.

Authorization: The user navigates to the URL on their smartphone, logs into PingAM, and enters the User Code.

Token Issuance: Once the user authorizes the request, the device (which has been polling AM using the Device Code) receives the Access and Refresh tokens.

The User Code is unique to the Device Flow (Option D). It is not used in the Client Credentials Grant (which is machine-to-machine), the Authorization Code Grant (which uses a redirect-based code), or the Resource Owner Password Credentials Grant (which uses direct username/password submission). In PingAM 8.0.2, administrators can configure the length, character set, and expiration time of these user codes within the OAuth2 Provider settings.

NEW QUESTION # 91

During the PingAM startup process, what is the location and name of the file that the PingAM bootstrap process uses to connect to the configuration Directory Services repository?

- A. <user-home>/<am-instance-dir>/boot.json
- B. <user-home-dir>/<am-instance-dir>/config/boot.json
- C. /path/to/tomcat/<tomcat-instance-dir>/webapps/<am-instance-dir>/boot.json
- D. <user-home-dir>/openam/config/boot.json

Answer: A

Explanation:

In PingAM 8.0.2, especially when utilizing File-Based Configuration (FBC), the startup sequence relies on a "bootstrap" phase to locate the system's configuration. According to the "Installation Guide" and "Configuration Directory Structure," the primary file involved in this process is named boot.json.

The boot.json file contains the essential connection details required for the AM binaries to find and unlock the configuration store (usually PingDS). This includes the LDAP host, port, bind DN, and references to the secret stores needed to decrypt the configuration.

The location of this file is determined by the Configuration Directory path specified during the initial setup. By default, PingAM creates its configuration directory in the home directory of the user running the web container. The standard path structure is <user-home>/<am-instance-dir>/. Therefore, the boot.json file is located at the root of this instance directory: <user-home>/<am-instance-dir>/boot.json.

Options A and D are incorrect because they place the file inside a /config subdirectory; while AM has many config files in subdirectories, the boot.json sits at the root to be accessible as the first point of entry.

Option B is incorrect because it suggests the file is stored within the Tomcat webapps folder. PingAM specifically avoids storing configuration data within the web application binaries to ensure that configuration persists even if the .war file is deleted or redeployed.

Understanding the location of boot.json is vital for DevOps engineers who need to automate the deployment of PingAM using tools like Amster or when troubleshooting a "Failed to connect to the configuration store" error during server startup.

NEW QUESTION # 92

Which of the following options represents best practice for an implementation that configures an ID token in a subject condition for policies validating the token's claims?

- A. Policy evaluation only validates the claims, not the ID token. The ID token should be validated after making the policy evaluation request
- B. Policy evaluation validates the claims and the ID token. There is no need to validate the ID token before the policy is evaluated
- C. Policy evaluation only validates the claims, not the ID token. The ID token should be validated before making the policy evaluation request
- D. Policy evaluation only validates the claims, not the ID token. There is no need to validate the ID token that was obtained before the policy is evaluated

Answer: C

Explanation:

In PingAM 8.0.2, Authorization Policies can be configured to use complex conditions to determine if access should be granted.

When a policy uses a Subject Condition based on an OpenID Connect (OIDC) ID Token, the policy engine looks for specific claims within that token (such as group membership or a specific user ID).

According to the "Authorization and Policy Evaluation" best practices, it is crucial to understand the separation of concerns between the Policy Decision Point (PDP) and the client. The PingAM policy engine is designed to evaluate logic-it checks if claimX == valueY. However, the policy engine typically does not perform a full cryptographic validation of the ID token's signature every time it evaluates a condition, especially if the token is passed as a string in the evaluation request.

Therefore, the best practice is as follows:

The client application or the PEP (Policy Enforcement Point) must validate the ID token (ensuring it is signed by a trusted provider, has not expired, and contains the correct audience) before sending the claims to the AM policy service for evaluation. If an unvalidated or forged token is used to supply claims for a policy request, and the policy engine assumes the input is "trusted," it could result in unauthorized access.

By validating the token first (Option C), the implementation ensures that only legitimate identity data is processed by the authorization logic. Option D is incorrect because the policy engine's primary role is decision-making based on presented attributes, not act as a full OIDC validation service during a REST evaluation call. Option B is a security risk as it ignores the necessity of cryptographic proof of identity.

NEW QUESTION # 93

A customer wishes to customize the OpenID Connect (OIDC) id_token JSON Web Token (JWT) to include the subject's employee number. Which of the following scripts should be customized to meet this requirement?

- A. OIDC parameters script
- B. OIDC attributes script
- C. OIDC JWT script
- **D. OIDC claims script**

Answer: D

Explanation:

In PingAM 8.0.2, the OpenID Connect (OIDC) Claims Script is the specific extensibility point designed to govern how user information is mapped and transformed into claims within an OIDC ID token or the UserInfo response. While PingAM supports standard scopes like profile and email out of the box, specialized business requirements—such as including an "employee number" which might be stored as employeenumber in an LDAP directory—require a custom transformation.

According to the "OIDC Claims Script" reference in the PingAM documentation:

The script acts as a bridge between the Identity Store (the source of truth) and the OIDC Provider (the issuer). When a client requests a token, PingAM executes this script, providing it with a claimObjects map and the userProfile. The developer can then write Groovy or JavaScript logic to retrieve the employeeNumber attribute from the user's profile and add it to the resulting claims set.

The script typically follows this logical flow:

Identify the requested claims from the OIDC scope.

Fetch the corresponding raw attributes from the Identity Store (e.g., PingDS or AD).

Format and name the claim as per the OIDC specification or the specific client requirement (e.g., mapping LDAP employeenumber to OIDC claim emp_id).

Return the claims to be signed and embedded into the JWT.

Why other options are incorrect: Options A, C, and D reference script types that do not exist under those specific names in the standard PingAM 8.0.2 scripting engine. While there are "Access Token Modification" scripts and "Client Registration" scripts, the OIDC Claims Script is the only one authorized and designed to manage the payload of the id_token.

NEW QUESTION # 94

Which of the following would be a possible combination of fields in the JSON body when making a policy evaluation via REST?

- A. subject, application, advices
- B. resources, application, advices
- C. resources, subject, advices
- **D. resources, subject, application**

Answer: D

Explanation:

In PingAM 8.0.2, requesting policy decisions via the REST API involves sending a POST request to the policies endpoint with the _action=evaluate parameter. To receive an accurate decision, the request body must provide the context of the access attempt.

According to the "Request policy decisions over REST" documentation, the JSON body typically includes the following core fields:

resources: (Required) An array of strings representing the URIs the user is attempting to access.

application: (Required) This field specifies the name of the Policy Set (formerly known as the application) that contains the relevant policies for the evaluation.

subject: (Optional, but usually required for user-specific policies) This object identifies the user or entity requesting access. It can include the user's ssoToken or a set of claims if using JWT-based subjects.

Why other options are incorrect: Advices (Options A and C) are not inputs for a policy evaluation request. Instead, advices are returned by PingAM in the response if a policy condition fails (e.g., an AuthLevelConditionAdvice requesting the user to provide MFA). A request cannot "evaluate" an advice; it triggers one. Option D is incorrect because the resources field is a mandatory requirement for any evaluation; without a target resource, the engine has nothing to compare against the defined policy rules.

Therefore, the combination of resources, subject, and application represents the standard, valid structure for a policy decision request in PingAM 8.0.2.

NEW QUESTION # 95

.....

