

## 19-000 Questions and Answers: Round Two

Question 1) NCIC notes the historical calling activity referenced on Page 11 of the original RFP document. NCIC would like to request the *actual* monthly Revenue Statements which should have been provided by the incumbent Inmate Telephone Vendor, covering the same traffic period. Such reports should provide a detailed breakdown of Call Traffic, broken down by Call Type and Bill Type.

ICN Response: The 200Mb Excel spreadsheet which contains the information can be found at the following Google Drive link. Vendors will need to download the file, as it is too large to open in Google Sheets.  
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/16parsszyXV6wEhwJDXoDroeGNhtpFusU/view?usp=sharing>

Question 2) Please provide a complete copy of the current Contract which exists between the Iowa Communications Network (ICN) and the incumbent Inmate Telephone Vendor, including any Attachments, Addendums, Amendments or Exhibits.

ICN Response: A copy of the Agreement is posted on the ICN webpage, under Bidding Opportunities with the balance of the RFP documents. <https://icn.iowa.gov/bidding-opportunities>

Question 3) Section 1.2.1 requires a soft copy to be submitted in MS Word and Excel software. However, many sections of our proposals are available only in PDF format, and implementation plans are typically created using MS Project. As such, vendors typically use Adobe PDF to create a single file that contains all proposal sections. Would the State accept a soft copy in PDF format, so long as the file is electronically searchable?

ICN Response: ICN understands there are files/attachments that may not be easily incorporated into MS Word and ICN will accept those exhibits or attachments in PDF or MS Project format. ICN requires a MS Word copy of the RFP response to chapter 4 as that will be used to assemble any resulting contract.

Question 4) The State mentioned site visits in Q&A round #1. Can you please can you expand on the list of exemplary sites that vendors can visit? What are the steps for scheduling the site visits? Will the State allow for additional questions post site visits?

ICN Response: As identified in Round one question& Answers, site visit will be Anamosa State Penitentiary on February 12<sup>th</sup> and Newton Correctional Facility on February 13<sup>th</sup>. DOC believes this will provide Vendors an idea of a challenging and an easier installation. The state does not anticipate receiving or responding to additional questions after the site visits. After the site visits ICN will provide brief recap of the visit to the Vendor list.

- Anamosa State Penitentiary, 406 North High St., Anamosa, IA 52205 (Feb 12<sup>th</sup>) Starting at 11AM
- Newton Correctional Facility, 307 South 60<sup>th</sup> Ave. West, Newton, IA 50208 (Feb 13<sup>th</sup>) Starting at 9AM
  - Each visit should not last more than three (3) hours
  - The site visit is not mandatory.
  - Vendor shall be limited to three (3) attendees.
  - Vendor shall be required to provide names of attendees to ICN in advance to speed in the check in process. Vendor shall email the list of attendees to [brian.clayton@iowa.gov](mailto:brian.clayton@iowa.gov) by close of business February 10<sup>th</sup>.
  - The group will meet in the lobby area of the institution; there is only one entrance to the facility.
  - Tour Guide: DOC Leadership staff member and the institution lead IT staff person.
  - Basic facility overview: number of inmates, living units, etc.
  - The tour will access the areas where connectivity will be most necessary.

### Security Considerations:

- All Attendees shall bring driver's license and company-issued ID or credential.
- Attire: wear pants (non-jeans if possible), No bags.
- Pens/pencils to take notes, tape measure or camera are allowed, but will need to be declared to DOC staff prior to tour starting.

During the tour, DOC staff will provide a basic facility overview; number of inmates, living unit and will tour the areas where connectivity will be the most necessary. Attendees will be able to ask questions during the tour; however DOC may decline or defer to answer the questions. By close of business, February 17<sup>th</sup>, ICN will release a brief recap of the tour and the discussions held.

Question 5) Does the State currently have onsite and remote video visitation? If so, can you please clarify the amount of onsite and remote visits occur each month? Which facilities operate these services? How many onsite and remote visitation terminals does the State currently have?

ICN Response: The State does not provide a statewide video visitation service.

Question 6) Does the State desire onsite and remote video visitation in this RFP?

ICN Response: Yes

Question 7) Does the State currently do traditional face to face visits? If so, how many visits occur each month? Which facilities operate these services?

ICN Response: Every prison offers in-person visiting. The DOC had approx. 65,000 in-person visits in 2019.

Question 8) Does the State wish to do face to face visits as a result of this new RFP?

ICN Response: The State already allows face to face visits and will continue to do so.

Question 9) With the many requirements and the complexity of this RFP, coupled with site visits in the middle of February, this does not allow adequate time for vendors to create a response that will be most advantageous to the State. We respectfully ask for a due date extension to March 31, 2020 to allow for site visits to occur, data to be calculated, and formal responses to be finalized.

ICN Response: After further consideration, DOC has agreed to extend the RFP Due Date to March 31, 2020. An Amendment to the RFP will be issued.

Question 10) Will the State consider allowing vendors to visit more than just two sites to evaluate the needs of the Iowa DOC as every site could be different? This will allow for vendors to understand the full layout of facilities to more accurately calculate a cost proposal.

ICN Response: DOC understands each site will be different, RFP section 4.5.2 asks Vendors to provide its installation plan highlights and estimated timeline, resources needed, etc. 4.5.17 states Vendor shall agree to a post award meeting to determine system installation and unique requirements. Section 4.12.1 states after award the installation and implementation schedule will be negotiated with the successful Vendor. During this time, the Vendor, DOC and ICN will work through the placement of the deployed equipment.

DOC is in the process of assembling site documents that it is able to share. These documents will be shared as soon as they made available to ICN. Vendor shall review the site plans provided and plan for coverage for the following instances:

- If Vendor system will enable incarcerated individual to download texts, voice mails, music, movies and then listen to them when/where the tablet is offline or does not have a network connection, then the API coverage may only be needed in the common areas of the living units.
- If Vendors System requires the tablet to have a network connection to review, listen or access any electronic media, the API coverage would need to be increased to cover all areas the inmates have access to.

If, due to security reasons, DOC determines they are unable to share specific facility or floor plans, DOC will provide the number of living units in each facility, the number of inmates in each unit that will require coverage and other descriptive details which may assist the Vendor in determining its facility lay out. If this information is to be shared, ICN will endeavor to provide it by close of Business on February 17<sup>th</sup> along with the recap of the two site visits.

Question 11) On page 9, requirement 3.1 the State requires the phone system have no collect calling in any form during the contract. Can the State please clarify that the vendor can offer Prepaid Collect calling accounts for friends and family of incarcerated individuals at Iowa DOC facilities in addition to incarcerated individual debit calling and tablet accounts?

ICN Response: No separate collect calling accounts will be allowed. RFP section 4.9.2.2 enables funds to be added to an incarcerated individual's account to be earmarked to a certain telephone number. ICN believes this is the current equivalent to the prepaid collect calling being proposed.

Question 12) On page 18, requirement 4.5.5.2.3 and page 19, requirement 4.5.6.1 the State states that vendors confirm that incarcerated individuals have access to kiosks in addition to tablets at specified locations within each facility. Would the State please clarify exactly which facilities the vendor will be required to deploy the kiosks and specify how many areas / locations of each facility and how many kiosks will be needed for each area?

ICN Response: Initially DOC anticipated more of the current kiosks to be replaced, however, after further review DOC decided not to replace them. As stated in Amendment 2, Vendor may be required to install a limited number of kiosks in each institution. The number of and placement of the kiosks will be part of the post award negotiations between the State and the awarded Vendor.

Question 13) On page 24, requirement 4.6.15 states that the vendor system must allow DOC to control incarcerated individual accounts based upon privilege level, housing unit and time remaining per day/week/ month. Would the State please clarify that the "incarcerated individual accounts" refer to the system PIN account and not a phone/tablet debit account?

ICN Response: No, DOC shall have admin rights to all portions of the System: phones, tablets and applicable accounts. DOC shall have the ability to control / manage the incarcerated individual's phone, tablet and account permissions in accordance with institutional policy.

Question 14) On page 24, requirement 4.6.20.7 requires vendor call center operators to monitor calls for free. Would the State please clarify that the calls to be monitored are incarcerated individual recorded calls and would the State please clarify what percentage of calls are required to be monitored?

ICN Response: This is in a section of Investigator Tools, the Vendor may provide, which the State may consider. The tools are not required. If Vendor will monitor calls for "Free", how many will you monitor for "Free"?

Question 15) On page 33, Table 1, The System shall: 1) Quarantine all tablet communication for 3 hours prior to release, 2). Can the State please clarify the purpose of quarantining tablet communication for the specificity of 3 hours? Will the State allow vendors to propose monitoring options outside of the required 3 hours?

ICN Response: Similar to phone call monitoring and identification of flagged words, tablet communications such as texts will be held by the system, prior to release for automated or DOC review prior to release.

Question 16) Requirement 4.12.11.1, "After full System testing for a minimum 2 months, the System shall be cutover and made fully operational before midnight, September 30, 2020. Should the Vendor be unable to provide a full System for testing and subsequent cutover prior to September 30, 2020, the Vendor shall be assessed a deduction of \$1200.00 for each day of delay, which will be deducted from Vendor invoices once the System is operational. The ICN shall not hold the Vendor responsible for delays beyond the Vendor's control, however; the Vendor must take appropriate measures to mitigate any delay and shall keep the ICN fully aware of any potential issues that may cause a delay. The assessment of a deduction shall be at the sole discretion of the ICN." Will the DOC remove or extend this date of September 30, 2020 as this requirement does not favor non-incumbent vendors?

ICN Response: The State will consider adjusting the September date after Vendor selection is made. The System cutover date may be extended based upon the RFP due date extension granted in Amendment 1 and or the installation and implementation plan vendor submits with its RFP response, taking into consideration the unique requirements of the institutional installations.

Question 17) Requirement 4.6.10.1 "Rotary phone service." Please provide information on how often rotary phone service capability is necessary for the vendor to accommodate.

ICN Response: Number of occurrence is unknown; however the State does not want to preclude an incarcerated individual from calling a rotary phone.

Question 18) The current phone system is not commission based. How does the Iowa DOC calculate a fixed monthly cost and how often is this paid to the vendor?

ICN Response: The current System vendor IC Solutions charges a fixed monthly fee to provide the system.

Question 19) What specifically is Service Now being used for? What procedures and what are the expectations?

ICN Response: ServiceNow is the ICN trouble ticketing system. If ICN continues to manage the Contract and resulting System for DOC, DOC will utilize ServiceNow for identifying and tracking service issues related to the System and network connectivity.

Question 20) Why are no instant messages allowed? Please further explain what is considered a "instant message" opposed to an email or standard message.

ICN Response: For security reasons, DOC will not allow "instant messages". As clarified in Amendment 2, the new proposed Vendor System will not be providing O-mail (email) services. The tablet and or kiosk will be able to provide text or standard messaging services; however they are not to be "instant" in their transmission. All messages of the sort are to be held for the time indicated, before released.

Question 21) Requirement 4.11.7. Will the ICN want an onsite administrator at each location of the Iowa DOC that has inmate phones, video visitation and tablets? If vendors do not propose an onsite technician, how will the current support employees in place at the DOC be assigned to this new contract? What are the roles in which current State employees will transition to a new contract?

ICN Response: The State does not anticipate needing an onsite admin for each institution. DOC employees will have administrative access and rights to the system, but will not be able to get into the proprietary / confidential aspects of the Vendor System. DOC anticipates the current role(s) of its employees will be similar in the new System.

Question 22) Requirement 4.3. 18. Please explain and define what specifically is required in real time tracking and monitoring health signs of incarcerated individuals?

ICN Response: The State is curious to know if Vendor can provide health monitoring similar to what other Smart watch vendors (Fitbit, Samsung, Apple, Garmin, etc.) can offer, heart rate, blood pressure, detecting sleep disorders, etc.

Question 23) Attachment 4 of the RFP allows providers to offer various cost components in a freeform manner. How will the State harmonize and comparably evaluate the different offers from providers given the lack of a common cost proposal format?

ICN Response: The State is aware that there are various cost recoveries or sharing methodologies being used in this space. The State will not necessarily award to the vendor providing the lowest cost to the State. Rather the State will diligently work to evaluate the responses and determine what is the best value to the State while providing cost effective services to the incarcerated individuals.

Question 24) Page 6, Section 1.8 – In this section the RFP lists potential reasons a vendor may be disqualified. Specifically, 1.8.5 states that the vendor may be disqualified if "the Vendor fails to include information necessary to substantiate that it will be able to meet a service requirement. A response of "we understand" or "will comply" or merely repeating the requirement is generally not sufficient."

Further in Section 4.1, the RFP states "Vendor shall provide a positive statement of compliance or exception to each of the points listed within Chapter 4 and shall detail how the Vendor meets the requirement or proposed method for dealing with the Vendor's exception."

The combination of these two sections implies that a comply statement is not acceptable response to the requirements in Chapter 4. However, there are requirements in Chapter 4 that are simply stating facts about the current system in place at IA DOC facilities. For example:

4.9.4 *Financial Management of Incarcerated Individual Accounts.*

*Clarification:*

- *The current system is a prepaid only system, where DOC collects the funds, distributes into a commissary and secondary accounts as designated by the incarcerated individuals or by the party depositing the funds.*
- *The systems of DOC, ATG and ICS correlate the account balance and allow a phone call if there is available funds.*
- *The current telephone system provider is paid a fixed monthly fee, not based upon usage nor are there any commissions or profit sharing agreements.*

For this requirement and others that are similar that simply state facts or that don't ask the vendor to "describe," is a comply statement acceptable?

Further, could the State please elaborate on how strict they will be in enforcing this policy?

ICN Response: The intent is to avoid receiving a RFP response that is simply a "cut and paste" of "we understand" or "will comply", as that will not enable the State to consider how a vendor does what the State requires, requests or what the Vendor proposes. Section 4.1 states a Vendor shall provide the statement of compliance and detail how they meet the requirement or method dealing with the exception Vendor identifies.

RFP language in the subsections may or may not ask for information or detail, some may identify a current fact or needed characteristic of the new System; however, each section will be evaluated and scored based upon the Vendor response. In some cases, a “comply or not” response is acceptable. In some cases, the evaluation will be scored upon comply or not and how do you do what is requested. It is up to the responding Vendor to provide appropriate detail within its response so the State can make an effective evaluation of the response and the System proposed by the Vendor.

If a Vendor provides a master statement of “will comply” and does not provide any corroborating detail within Chapter 4, the response will be disqualified.

A Vendor response will not be disqualified for providing a statement of acknowledgement to a “Clarification”.