

RFP 2016-02 Official Responses to Follow-Up Questions

Question Number	RFA Section	Questions Received in Writing	DOCCS' Responses to Questions
1	Q&A answer 15 RFP Section 3.5.4	<p>DOCCS response to question #15 states that it will not be conducting site visits [prior to the award of the contract resulting from the RFP]. The Unisys team has the most experience in wireless network deployments in the correctional marketplace and in the commercial environment. We know from this experience that if you survey two similar facilities – prisons or commercial buildings for WiFi infrastructure, costs for wiring, and wireless access points can vary by several orders of magnitude. With the scope of the NY DOCCS and the fact that there are 45 number of facilities that require build out of wireless networks these variances must be factored into solution cost estimation processes to ensure each bidders business model anticipates all equipment and labor costs.</p> <p>For all vendors to be able to accurately and responsibly respond to this solicitation, we respectfully request that the NY DOCCS either; 1) reconsider its position on site surveys or 2) provide adequate time to develop reasonable cost estimate for the wireless network without the benefit of site surveys. Without site surveys to validate RF transmission strengths and coverage into inmate cell blocks where tablets are to be located –vendors will have to estimate worst case scenario design and build out characteristics. Based on the DOCCS decision not to allow site visits – which was only confirmed on 1/5/17 we believe it is a reasonable business expectation that the stated extension to 1/23/17 is an inadequate time frame to conduct engineering analysis and estimate of labor and material to build out wireless networks at 45 prisons.</p> <p>Absent site-visits – which would be customary steps in budgeting for a wireless network design – to ensure bidders</p>	<p>DOCCS will not reconsider its position on site surveys prior to submission of bids. The information provided in Exhibit B provides building and cell characteristics that will allow bidders the ability to estimate the infrastructure necessary to make this function operational.</p> <p>In addition, Section 3.8.1.3 – Site Survey, requires that after notice of tentative award, which occurs on March 1, 2017, according to Section 1.7 – Schedule of Events, the selected vendor shall be responsible for performing a site survey at all of DOCCS' facilities and identify all installation and facility issues that could impact implementation.</p> <p>DOCCS will not further modify the closing date for receipt of proposals.</p>

RFP 2016-02 Official Responses to Follow-Up Questions

	<p><i>(Continued from the last page.)</i></p>	<p>anticipate expenditure for the DOCCS network with fiscal reasonableness, DOCCS should allow bidders an appropriate time frame – now that limited additional information about the targeted sites has been provided - to develop cost estimates and factor such into appropriate technical models and business cases. Absent the additional information provided in the Q&A response, no reasonable and fiscally sound business could prepare a moderately accurate cost estimate for the wireless networks. Without site surveys, bidders will be required to develop engineering plans based solely on the additional information provided in exhibit B of the Q&A responses.</p> <p>If a wireless engineering plan, labor estimate, and bill of materials were developed from a site survey, such a plan would routinely require from 4 -8 house per site. Absent details from site surveys, the engineering plans become more protracted and considerably less accurate or conversely over engineered to compensate for unknown complexities.</p> <p>In order for DOCCS to ensure the solutions bid relative to the RFP meet function design expectations, we are respectfully suggesting DOCCS reconsider your previous position on site visits. Absent a reconsideration on site visits we are respectfully suggesting DOCCS extend the RFP response due date minimally to 2/10/17</p>	
<p>2</p>	<p>RFP Section 3.8.1 Submit a proposed Project Plan in Microsoft Project format. Such plan must effect full statewide implementation within the required</p>	<p>As a condition of RFP section 3.8.1, DOCCS is requiring a 90-day transition period. In answer # 15 of the Q&A DOCCS indicated that ‘the Department will conduct site reviews at each location... to determine optimal placement of secure wireless transmitters... and will require testing and confirmation of signal strength in all areas covered by the secure wireless hubs.</p>	<p>Section 3.8.1.3 – Site Survey, requires that after notice of tentative award, which occurs on March 1, 2017, according to Section 1.7 – Schedule of Events, the selected vendor shall be responsible for performing a site survey at all of DOCCS’ facilities and identify all installation and facility issues that could impact implementation. As a result, it is anticipated that the contract will be fully</p>

RFP 2016-02 Official Responses to Follow-Up Questions

	<p><i>(Continued from the last page.)</i></p> <p>90-day transition period.</p> <p>Q&A answer 15 – RFP Section 3.5.4</p> <p>As part of the deployment process the Department will conduct site reviews at each location with the selected vendor to determine optimal placement of the secure wireless transmitters. The Department will rely on the vendor's expertise and recommendations to determine final placement and will require testing and confirmation of signal strength in all areas covered by the secure wireless hubs. See Exhibit B for SHU Building, Cell and</p>	<p>Site reviews for the wireless transmitters will require design personnel access to SHU living units to confirm that wireless transmission adequately cover the cell. As such, vendors will have to place a wireless design transmitter and then gain access to each SHU living unit where the coverage will be required. Moving 2-20 SHU designated prisoners out of their cells simultaneously to test the wireless coverage will be very labor intensive for guards and will likely require a great deal of time for each verification since frequency tuning and validation will be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would DOCCs please verify that is their intent and requirement that all the site reviews, wireless designs, wireless equipment purchase, and installation would be completed in the 90 day prescribed transition period? <p>Observationally, the wireless site visits will take from 1 day to 5 days per prison depending on the size of the prison and the wireless area to be covered. Comprehensive wireless designs and development of associated bill of materials will require minimally another 5 working days – assuming the vendor has access to a very large base of qualified WiFi designers. Once materials are on hand, each prison will again require from 1 -10 working days for installation – depending on the size of installation crews and the complexity of the build out. In order to adhere to a 90 implementation schedule that includes the design, installation and testing of wireless transmission at every site, DOCCS would have to be prepared for vendors to bring in adequate engineers to conduct preliminary wireless site surveys simultaneously at all 45 prisons in a very compressed time frame of several days at the beginning of the implementation schedule; conduct virtually simultaneous installation activities at all 45 prisons, and then conduct inmate removal processes to conduct wireless RF verification tests at the end of the wireless installation</p>	<p>implemented within the 90 day prescribed transition period.</p> <p>Should unexpected implementation issues be identified as a result of the wireless site surveys, DOCCS, at its sole discretion, will consider extending the implementation dates of wireless tablets on a site-by-site basis beyond the 90 day project implementation period. Any such delay will not be extended to the implementation of the Inmate telephone service at these sites.</p>
--	--	---	--

RFP 2016-02 Official Responses to Follow-Up Questions

	<p><i>(Continued from the last page.)</i></p> <p>Cell Door characteristics for each location.</p>	<p>process. The crews supporting this process would have to be in addition to crews supporting the transition of the telecommunications equipment since each of the DOCCS 54 prison sites will require minimally ½ days of work to install the new equipment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The question associated with the above comments is to confirm (pending the answer to the question above) that it is DOCCS intent to allocate sufficient resources to address a virtual army of engineers and installation support personnel that would be required to design, build and test the wireless network along with the other transition processes in the required 90-day time frame? 	
<p>3</p>	<p>Q&A answer 9 RFP Section 8.26</p> <p><i>(Continued from the last page.)</i></p>	<p>DOCCS response to the question included the following statement: “There is the POTENTIAL that inmate e-mail services will be pursued through this contract. See Section 8.26 regarding requirements for a Secure Messaging Option.</p> <p>Section 8.26 of the RFP does not describe an inmate email system, but rather describes an requirements for an Inmate Secure Messaging Option – which as described could be provided using – as described by the requirement “utilizing the infrastructure as described in the successful bidders proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would DOCCs please clarify if the intent of requirement 8.26 is for an inmate email system or for a Secure Messaging Option? If the intent is for a secure email system would DOCCS provide additional email specific requirements? 	<p>The intent of 8.26 – Inmate Secure Messaging Option, is to provide a secure message platform via the Inmate Telephone System infrastructure and establish rules to allow for the delivery and receipt of emails.</p> <p>Information and specification requirements that are currently known are outlined in Section 8.26.</p>

RFP 2016-02 Official Responses to Follow-Up Questions

<p>4</p>	<p>Q & A answer # 24</p>	<p>DOCCS response indicated, “The receipt of proposal date will be changed to January 23, 2017.” The answers provided by DOCCS from Q & A #15 above and the secondary cycle time of receiving answers to this secondary round of questions with a scheduled response of 1/12 have placed significant engineering requirements on vendors but effectively only extended the due date by 1 working day – since the proposals must be delivered in person.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the complexity and risk added to the proposal design process, would DOCCS consider extending the response due date minimally to 2/10/17? 	<p>DOCCS will not further modify the closing date for receipt of proposals.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Q & A answer #15 Exhibit B RFP Attachment B</p> <p><i>(Continued from the last page.)</i></p>	<p>See Exhibit B for SHU Building, Cell and Cell Door characteristics for each location. Exhibit B details the distribution of tablets and the associated wireless design for each location. Some locations have very substantial quantities of tablets, which could effectively result in a 12 fold increase in phones over the existing phone count – for most sites the tablets at least double the number of existing phones. Several sites indicate a distribution of tablets that exceeds the facilities ADP as defined in Attachment B of the RFP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could DOCCS confirm that the Column on Exhibit B indicates the anticipated count of tablets at each facility? • Could DOCCS define inmate usage policies and privileges when using the tablet as a phone? • Will inmates with access to tablets as a phone be granted extended calling privileges that differ from SHU privileges that exist today? [in prisons where tablet count increases phone count exponentially, if inmates have expanded freedom to call it might require additional telecom circuits that need to be planned as part of the initial implementation] 	<p>Exhibit B provides for the facilities, building and cell characteristics and does not indicate the number of tablets that may be used at any one location.</p> <p>Section 3.5.4 – Tablets, outlines, among other requirements, that the vendor’s solution must provide for tablets (tablet) for a portion of the Department’s specialty population such as Special Housing Units and Regional Mental Health Units, etc. (approximately 5,000) to allow inmates to complete phone calls via the tablet from their cell.</p> <p>DOCCS has instituted new policies in our Special Housing Units where inmates may earn, as an incentive, one call every 30 days.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that inmates will be allowed to use the tablets in areas other than their cells.</p> <p>We do not anticipate the number of tablets at a facility to exceed the average daily population of the facility. However, in responding to this questions, we have identified an error in</p>

RFP 2016-02 Official Responses to Follow-Up Questions

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will inmates be allowed to use the tablets in areas other than their cells? i.e. will the wireless network have to anticipate WiFi coverage in common areas of the cell blocks or when inmates roam into areas other than their assigned cell? • In facilities where the number of tablets exceeds the ADP can DOCCS clarify if there is an intended shift in ADP or planned expansions of the facilities? If not – for capacity planning purposes - can DOCCS clarify the intended use of quantity of tablets that exceed ADP? 	<p>attachment B of the RFP for the Upstate Correctional Facility. The correct average daily population for this facility for calendar year 2016 is 1,134.</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>Q & A answer # 23 Addendum II – revised 7.2.2 Revised Appendix H</p>	<p>Indicates a request for rates to international countries such that “The rate for each country shall be the same rate for pre-paid and collect calls.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very few – if any international carriers support collect calls. Would DOCCS consider eliminating the concept of collect international calls? <p>The reply also indicates “Also, please propose a blended rate that would be applicable for all countries at a per-minute rate.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could DOCCS please clarify what type of rates or nature of calls are being blended? 	<p>As stated in section 7.2.2, DOCCS does not currently allow international calls. However, in the event we allow such calls in the future, if the international carrier supports collect calls, then the vendor must allow that as a form of payment.</p> <p>The vendor must provide DOCCS with one international call rate regardless of which country is being called.</p>