



STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
*DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY*  
(<http://www.ct.gov/doiit>)

**AMENDMENT # 2**

**RFP # 10ITZ0119**  
**Inmate Telephone Service**

**AMENDMENT # 2**  
**provides the following:**

- 1. Add the Questions and Answers**
- 2. Add Revised Attachment 16**
- 3. Add Provider Commission Rate (12 Months)**

Note: A signature line has been included below. A copy of this page signed in ink is required with the Proposal to show that vendors have received this Amendment.

\_\_\_\_\_

VENDOR'S SIGNATURE ACKNOWLEDGING RECEIPT

(This page should be signed and returned WITH PROPOSAL. If vendor fails to submit signed Amendment, vendor will still be responsible for adhering to its content)

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_

JACQUELINE SHIRLEY  
DIRECTOR, IT CONTRACTS AND PURCHASING  
CONTRACTS AND PURCHASING DIVISION

Date of Amendment: **January 13, 2011**

**RFP #10ITZ0119**  
**AMENDMENT #2**  
**VENDOR QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

1Q: On page 34 “Commission Rate” is based on “commissionable revenue” which, by definition, does not include bad debt, “...amounts billed but not paid”. Bad debt can vary greatly between inmate telephone service providers. A 45% Commission Rate from one company (with a large bad debt deducted from Total Gross Revenue) may give the department much less revenue than a 45% Commission Rate from another company. In order for the DOIT to fairly evaluate Commission Rate on a level playing field, can this be changed to remove “..amounts billed but not paid” from the definition of “commissionable revenue”?

1A: RFP Attachment 3, paragraph 1.1 COMMISSION RATE of the RFP is redacted and replaced with the following:

The vendor shall pay a monthly commission to DOIT of at least, but not limited to, 45% of the Commissionable Revenue. “Commissionable Revenue” is defined as the gross billed amounts generated by every completed telephone call that is accepted by a called party using the inmate telephone service. This excludes Federal, State and local government taxes and fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. If some future regulatory development establishes a new charge, the vendor and the State will mutually determine the exemption of such charge from Commissionable Revenue at that time. The commission must be received by DOIT within 30 days of the end of each month’s billing cycle.

All revenue payments to the State for services/equipment shall be made payable to “Treasurer, State of Connecticut” and submitted to the Department of Information Technology, Fiscal Office or designee.

The vendor shall affirm it will comply with the above requirements (do not state the commission rate here).

2Q: End user fees, e.g. prepaid account setup fee, account recharge fee, account refund fee, billing cost recovery or bill statement fee, and other similar fees, can vary greatly and significantly affect the cost to inmate friends and families and commission revenues received by the DOIT. Will the DOIT require that all such fees charged to end users be defined and quantified by each responder?

2A: With regards to fees charged, the vendor shall not charge any fees except for those fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. DOC will

allow outside agencies such as Western Union and MoneyGram to be used only for International billing. DOC understands that the fees from these outside agencies cannot be waived. DOC will not require vendors to disclose the fees charged by these agencies or their share.

3Q: Attachment 5 Section 21. Putting source code into escrow is problematic to most or all providers. It also does not necessarily resolve the dilemma of a company's failure to provide service due to bankruptcy or other financial issues. Even with the source code, the DOIT would most likely still have a many months ordeal in reading, deciphering, and rewriting any required code changes, if it could be accomplished at all. In lieu of escrowing source code can the DOIT require a bond large enough to completely change the system, hardware and software, in the case of a provider default?

3A: These issues will be addressed with the successful vendor during the negotiation process.

4Q: **Page 22 Section 3.1.1 Procurement Schedule**

Would DOC please extend the due date to February 18, 2011 given the complexity of this RFP and to allow the Vendor's sufficient time to provide a more comprehensive response?

4A: DOIT has issued RFP Amendment #1 - Extension of Due Date: February 8, 2011 (posted on the State Portal).

5Q: **Page 29 Section 8.3 & 8.4 Architecture Overview & Product Architecture**

Would DOC clarify if section 8.3 is a high-level system overview and that 8.4 is a detailed description of all systems and software?

5A: Section 8.3 requires the vendor to provide a detailed design of the architecture for each of the proposed application(s)/product(s) that make up the overall solution.

6Q: **Page 29 Section 8.3 & 8.4 Architecture Overview & Product Architecture**

Would DOC provide clarification of the terms "proposed application" and "proposed product"?

6A: Section 8.4 requires the vendor to provide a detailed design of the integration of all application(s)/product(s) noted in 8.3.

7Q: **Page 77**      **Section 1.3**      **Overview**  
**Page 93**      **Section 6.12**      **Visitor Telephone Service**  
**Page 94**      **Section 7.4**      **Visiting Area Telephone Sets**  
Are there a total of 650 visitation phones (325 visitation areas) or 650 visitation areas (1,300 phones)?

7A: [There are a total of 762 phones needed for visitation purposes; this includes phones on both sides of the glass. \(See revised Attachment 16\)](#)

8Q: **Page 77**      **Section 1.3**      **Overview**  
**Page 93**      **Section 6.12**      **Visitor Telephone Service**  
**Page 94**      **Section 7.4**      **Visiting Area Telephone Sets**  
Will DOC provide the quantity and location of the visitation phones located at each facility?

8A: [See revised Attachment 16.](#)

9Q: **Page 77**      **Section 1.3**      **Overview**  
**Page 93**      **Section 6.12**      **Visitor Telephone Service**  
**Page 94**      **Section 7.4**      **Visiting Area Telephone Sets**  
Will DOC provide the physical location of where the current premised based calling platform is located at each facility?

9A: [Yes. This information will be provided to the awarded vendor.](#)

10Q: **Page 77**      **Section 1.3**      **Overview**  
**Page 93**      **Section 6.12**      **Visitor Telephone Service**  
**Page 94**      **Section 7.4**      **Visiting Area Telephone Sets**  
Will DOC provide architectural site drawings for each location to aid in understanding of the scope of work required to provide recording capabilities for visitation telephones?

10A: [Yes. This information will be provided to the awarded vendor.](#)

11Q: **Page 77**      **Section 1.3**      **Overview**  
**Page 93**      **Section 6.12**      **Visitor Telephone Service**  
**Page 94**      **Section 7.4**      **Visiting Area Telephone Sets**  
Would DOC allow for on site visits as part of the RFP process?

11A: [No.](#)

12Q: **Page 30**                      **Section 8.5**    **System Development Methodology (SDM) Practices**

**Page 149**    **Attachment 13/14**    **System Development Methodology (SDM)**

The documentation provided in Attachment 13 and 14 indicates that the application of SDM is for new systems (from Executive Order No. 19; "The Department of Information Technology (DOIT) issue and publish a System Development Methodology (SDM) and an SDM Policy for the development of information systems;" (emphasis added).

Considering that the Inmate Telephone Service software that will be used for this RFP will be utilized by the winning vendor to provide services for inmates directly, the services will be provided at no cost to the state, and are, in most cases, fully developed and do not fall under the "...acquisition, design, development, implementation, and maintenance of information systems..." section of Executive Order No. 19.

Would DOC consider eliminating Section 8.5 - Systems Development Methodology (SDM) Practices?

12A: [For acquisition of services or subscriptions where no development is required, Executive Order No. 19 would not apply.](#)

13Q: **Page 30**                      **Section 8.9**                      **Accessibility (MJH)**

This section states "All applications and pages developed for the State must be compatible...with the State Accessibility guidelines..." The guideline states: "The use of the guidelines below will ensure that web sites created by the State of Connecticut..."

The applications the vendors will be using for the Inmate Telephone Services are not web sites; would these standards be applicable to this RFP?

13A: [No.](#)

14Q: **Page 34**                      **Section 1.1**    **Commission Rate**

This section defines "Commissionable Revenue" as revenue from Operator Service Calls. DOC is allowing for reductions for unpaid bills, which enables a huge range by which vendors may deduct from the commissionable revenue, potentially reducing the commission to DOC. Also, the reference to Operator Service Calls could exclude some forms of payments.

Typically, most states and counties require that commissions be paid on "gross revenues", which is defined as "total billable minutes without any allowances or deductions for fraud, line charges, and equipment charges, other collectible or

uncollectible charges, etc. "No deductions from Commissionable Revenue will be made." Taxes are not included in Commissionable Revenue.

Would DOC consider redefining their definition of the Commissionable Revenue to eliminate any ambiguities? If not, could DOC define and explicitly state what constitutes the following: - "Amounts billed and not paid"?

14A: RFP Attachment 3, paragraph 1.1 COMMISSION RATE of the RFP is redacted and replaced with the following:

The vendor shall pay a monthly commission to DOIT of at least, but not limited to, 45% of the Commissionable Revenue. "Commissionable Revenue" is defined as the gross billed amounts generated by every completed telephone call that is accepted by a called party using the inmate telephone service. This excludes Federal, State and local government taxes and fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. If some future regulatory development establishes a new charge, the vendor and the State will mutually determine the exemption of such charge from Commissionable Revenue at that time. The commission must be received by DOIT within 30 days of the end of each month's billing cycle.

All revenue payments to the State for services/equipment shall be made payable to "Treasurer, State of Connecticut" and submitted to the Department of Information Technology, Fiscal Office or designee.

The vendor shall affirm it will comply with the above requirements (do not state the commission rate here).

15Q: **Page 34 Section 1.1 Commission Rate**

Does the current vendor add a monthly charge for each customer telephone line being billed / charged each month? If so, what is the amount of the recurring charge?

15A: No.

16Q: **Page 34 Section 1.1 Commission Rate**

Would DOC please specify what recourse it will apply when the selected vendor modifies their definition in the future by adding unforeseen charges in today's billing practices?

16A: The vendor is not allowed to modify its billing practices including adding unforeseen charges without prior State approval via a product schedule update. If the vendor were to change its billing practices by adding unforeseen charges, the vendor would be in

breach of contract if said contract did not include the charge. The vendor would be in breach of the terms of the contract and the State would avail itself of all remedies available to it including but not limited to converting to an alternate provider or going to the open market to replace the vendor and charging the vendor in breach of contract for all costs for such remedy.

**17Q: Page 34 Section 1.1 Commission Rate**

In order to ensure apples-to-apples comparisons, would DOC require Contractors to disclose all billing policies and fees charged, including those by third parties including Western Union, TouchPay, MoneyGram, etc. and require the details of their revenue sharing which is in essence and source of income?

**17A: RFP Attachment 3, paragraph 1.1 COMMISSION RATE of the RFP is redacted and replaced with the following:**

The vendor shall pay a monthly commission to DOIT of at least, but not limited to, 45% of the Commissionable Revenue. "Commissionable Revenue" is defined as the gross billed amounts generated by every completed telephone call that is accepted by a called party using the inmate telephone service. This excludes Federal, State and local government taxes and fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. If some future regulatory development establishes a new charge, the vendor and the State will mutually determine the exemption of such charge from Commissionable Revenue at that time. The commission must be received by DOIT within 30 days of the end of each month's billing cycle.

All revenue payments to the State for services/equipment shall be made payable to "Treasurer, State of Connecticut" and submitted to the Department of Information Technology, Fiscal Office or designee.

The vendor shall affirm it will comply with the above requirements (do not state the commission rate here).

With regards to fees charged, the vendor shall not charge any fees except for those fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. DOC will allow outside agencies such as Western Union and MoneyGram to be used only for International billing. DOC understands that the fees from these outside agencies cannot be waived. DOC will not require vendors to disclose the fees charged by these agencies or their share.

**18Q: Page 35 Section 1.2 Rate Structure**

What are the current calling rates for collect and prepaid today?

18A: Rates are posted on the DOIT website:

[http://www.ct.gov/doit/lib/doit/purchase/telecom/ps\\_gtl\\_inmate\\_calling\\_web.pdf](http://www.ct.gov/doit/lib/doit/purchase/telecom/ps_gtl_inmate_calling_web.pdf)

[http://www.ct.gov/doit/lib/doit/purchase/telecom/ps\\_gtl\\_advpay\\_web.pdf](http://www.ct.gov/doit/lib/doit/purchase/telecom/ps_gtl_advpay_web.pdf)

[http://www.ct.gov/doit/lib/doit/purchase/telecom/ps\\_gtl\\_inmate\\_calling\\_international\\_web.pdf](http://www.ct.gov/doit/lib/doit/purchase/telecom/ps_gtl_inmate_calling_international_web.pdf)

19Q: **Page 35      Section 1.2      Rate Structure**

Billing fees and policies both significantly impact the calling rates and commissions that providers are able to offer. Would DOC please require certain policies for prepaid collect funding that also impact cost to end-users to be fully disclosed by the Vendors as well as detail the DOC's/State's recourse in the event these are not adhered to or changed?

Examples are in the table below:

*We also respectfully request DOC to require disclosures/adherence of any billing agent associated with the vendor; i.e. disclosures/adherence would be required regardless of whether prepaid collect funding was administered directly by the vendor or through a third party:*

Minimum funding amount -by phone or mail	At most \$25
Minimum funding amount - by internet, or third party cash method such as Western Union (if allowed)	No minimum
Maximum funding amount – by phone	At least \$100
Maximum funding amount - by internet, or third party cash method such as Western Union (if allowed)	At least \$100
Prepaid collect account expiration	At least 6 months from last use
Account refund policy	(1) Process immediately upon request: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Post within 24 hours to last credit card used</li><li>• If no credit card used, mail check within 5 days of request</li></ul> (2) No cost to end-users regardless of refund method



19A: With regards to fees charged, the vendor shall not charge any fees except for those fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. DOC will allow outside agencies such as Western Union and MoneyGram to be used only for International billing. DOC understands that the fees from these outside agencies cannot be waived. DOC will not require vendors to disclose the fees charged by these agencies or their share.

With regards to policies, please refer to Attachment 6, Paragraphs 6.7 DISCOUNTED PRE-PAID SERVICE – MANDATORY and 6.7.1 DISCOUNTED SERVICE FEATURES.

In addition, the vendor is not allowed to modify its billing fees or policies, including adding unforeseen charges, without prior State approval via a product schedule update. If the vendor were to change its billing practices by adding unforeseen fees/charges, the vendor would be in breach of contract if said contract did not include the charge. The vendor would be in breach of the terms of the contract and the State would avail itself of all remedies available to it including but not limited to converting to an alternate provider or going to the open market to replace the vendor and charging the vendor in breach of contract for all costs for such remedy.

20Q: **Page 35      Section 1.2      Rate Structure**

Would DOC please use the fee/policy table below as a mandatory requirement for all Contractors' financial offer? Would DOC please require all vendors to fully disclose all revenue generating agreements (whether through their subcontractors/partners or directly) with any other entities, in conjunction with inmate telephone services, or the funding, collecting or establishing payments for the State inmate telephone service?

*We also respectfully request DOC to require disclosures/adherence of any billing agent associated with the vendor; i.e. disclosures/adherence would be required regardless of whether prepaid collect funding was administered directly by the vendor or through a third party:*

Fee type	Amount	Frequency (e.g. per transaction, monthly, per bill)	Applicable Billing type (collect, direct bill, prepaid collect, debit)	Applicable tariff type (e.g. local, intraLATA, interstate)
"Cost Recovery" fees, e.g. Equipment Cost Recovery, Federal Regulatory Recovery				

Account Maintenance Fee				
Funding through third parties, e.g. Western Union				
Collect billing fee, e.g. Bill Statement Fee				
Direct billing fee				
Account refund fee				

20A: In answer to both questions, no. With regards to fees charged, the vendor shall not charge any fees except for those fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. DOC will allow outside agencies such as Western Union and MoneyGram to be used only for International billing. DOC understands that the fees from these outside agencies cannot be waived. DOC will not require vendors to disclose the fees charged by these agencies or their share.

21Q: **Page 35 Section 1.2 Rate Structure**

Would DOC please allow for a Best and Final Offer with fees and calling rates specified and "fixed" by DOC, so it can make a more "apples-to-apples" comparison of financial offers?

21A: No.

22Q: **Pages 57 Section 22.3 Liquidated Damages**

What is DOC's intent for Contractors' response to 22.3?

22A: These issues will be addressed with the successful vendor during the negotiation process.

23Q: **Pages 57 Section 22.3 Liquidated Damages**

Are specific liquidated damages penalties to be determined during contract negotiations?

23A: These issues will be addressed with the successful vendor during the negotiation process.

24Q: **Page 82**                    **Section 3.5.2**                    **Manual On/Off Switches**  
Would DOC provide the location and the approximate distance from the phone room where they would like the cutoff switches installed for each location?

24A: Yes. This information will be provided to the awarded vendor.

25Q: **Page 82**                    **Section 3.5.2**                    **Manual On/Off Switches**  
Are there any facilities that currently have cutoff switches installed?

25A: All facilities have cutoff switches installed.

26Q: **Page 82**                    **Section 3.5.2**                    **Manual On/Off Switches**  
Does every telephone have a cut-off switch today? If not, how many do?

26A: Yes, they all do. Some are individual telephone cutoff switches and some are for a bank of telephones.

27Q: **Page 84**                    **Section 3.11**                    **Inmate Allowed Call List**  
Would DOC please describe in detail the current process for the inmate add/drop process?

27A: Currently, inmates submit a hand written add/drop form monthly, if needed, to DOC personnel which is then forwarded to three selected facilities. The current vendor picks up these forms for processing.

28Q: **Page 84**                    **Section 3.11**                    **Inmate Allowed Call List**  
What is the allowed time period for this process as determined by DOC Security?

28A: The current vendor processing time period is 30 days from pick up but this is subject to change as determined by DOC Security.

29Q: **Page 87**                    **Attachment 6**                    **Section 4.10**                    **Inmate Tracking**  
What file type and information is contained in the current FTP feed for inmate tracking?

29A: Two daily files are created and sent through FTP.

Daily file 1 includes the Inmate Number, Facility Code, Inmate Name, Housing Unit and Facility Name.

Daily file 2 includes Inmate Number, Sending Facility, and Receiving Facility.

There is also a twice monthly file produced that looks for inmates who are no longer incarcerated within the DOC system but had been the month before. DOC takes the current date and subtracts 1 from the month and then compares the calculated date with discharged inmates last movement date. The files produced include the inmate number and the last movement date.

30Q: **Page 87      Attachment 6      Section 4.10      Inmate Tracking**  
Is this information encrypted today? If yes, what is the current encryption technology?

30A: The information is not encrypted today. Going forward DOC would be looking for the vendor to be able to accept encrypted data. The vendor should provide DOC with the various encryption technologies it can work with.

31Q: **Page 88      Section 5      Call Monitoring and Recording Equipment, and  
Page 93      Section 7      Inmate Telephone Equipment**  
Would DOC confirm that all vendors, (including the incumbent, should they be selected as the winner of this RFP), must replace the existing phones with new phones, both inmate and visitation?

31A: Yes, all vendors, (including the incumbent, should they be selected as the winner of this RFP), must replace the existing inmate telephones with new inmate telephones. Visitor handsets will be replaced with new inmate telephones should DOC decide to include visitor telephones as part of the new inmate telephone service.

32Q: **Page 88      Section 5.1      Workstations (ink cartridges)**  
Would DOC allow for a reasonable negotiation for this requirement during contract negotiation?

32A: No. This is a requirement.

33Q: **Page 88      Section 5.1      Workstations (ink cartridges)**  
Would DOC provide a usage forecast for the replacement of ink cartridges? Due to the opportunity for abuse, consumables associated with ITS ancillary equipment (e.g. printer cartridges, paper, CD-ROMs) are typically provided by the customer rather than the vendor, and the vendor does not have previous experience with which to estimate ongoing cost.

33A: No. DOC does not have this information.

34Q: **Page 88      Section 5.1      Workstations (ink cartridges)**  
Will DOC commit that the printing will only include reports and data from the ITS?

34A: Yes

35Q: **Page 89      Section 5.6      Equipment Refresh**  
For the two year refresh cycle, would DOC confirm that the old workstations replaced by the new workstations will be returned to the vendor?

35A: Yes.

36Q: **Page 89      Section 5.6      Equipment Refresh**  
Would a lease arrangement be acceptable to DOC, where a third-party leasing company would replace the existing workstations every two years?

36A: No.

37Q: **Page 91      Section 6.7      Discounted Pre-Paid Service**  
The second bullet in this section says that the State will not manage any inmate commissary/trust funds for discounted services.  
Does DOC currently have inmate prepaid (debit) calling, where the inmate is able to pay for their own calls as opposed to an external customer? If yes, would DOC please describe how the current inmate prepaid (debit) process works with the current vendor? If no, will DOC consider an option for offender prepaid (debit) calling?

37A: No, DOC does have inmate prepaid (debit) calling, where the inmate is able to pay for their own calls as opposed to an external customer. No, at this time DOC will not consider an option for offender prepaid (debit) calling.

38Q: **Page 92      Section 6.9      Calls at No Monetary Cost**  
Would DOC provide the number of calls that are placed to the State Public Defender's Office, internal security calls from confidential sources and calls place from test accounts?

38A: Since calls to the State's Public Defender's Office are placed from multiple telephone switches, including the current inmate telephone calling service, DOC does not have the

number of these calls. Monthly, there are approximately 150 internal security calls from confidential sources. There are currently no calls placed from test accounts,

39Q: **Page 92      Section 6.9                      Calls at No Monetary Cost**

Are these calls included in the calling information?

39A: Some of the calls to the State's Public Defenders may be included but the quantity is unknown. The calls to the confidential sources are not included. There are currently no calls placed from test accounts.

40Q: **Page 93              Section 6.11.1                      Intake Facility Video Capabilities**  
**Page 94              Section 7.3                              Intake Facilities Admitting and Processing Telephone Sets**

Would DOC confirm that this will occur only at the five Correctional Centers (Intake Facilities) listed on Attachment 16? If not, would DOC provide where this will occur?

40A: No. This is subject to change.

41Q: **Page 93              Section 6.11.1                      Intake Facility Video Capabilities**  
**Page 94              Section 7.3                              Intake Facilities Admitting and Processing Telephone Sets**

Would a **stand alone video system** meet this requirement as long as the video and audio recordings were synced to a single clock source?

41A: No.

42Q: **Page 93              Section 6.11.1                      Intake Facility Video Capabilities**  
**Page 94              Section 7.3                              Intake Facilities Admitting and Processing Telephone Sets**

Is the proposed video system to record all calls made from the Intake Facilities? If not, would DOC provide additional clarifying information?

42A: No, only in the admitting and processing areas.

43Q: **Page 93              Section 6.11.1                      Intake Facility Video Capabilities**  
**Page 94              Section 7.3                              Intake Facilities Admitting and Processing Telephone Sets**

Would DOC provide the expected number of phones in each of the admitting and processing areas?

43A: [Two telephones in each of the admitting and processing areas.](#)

44Q: **Page 93      Section 6.11.1      Intake Facility Video Capabilities**  
**Page 94      Section 7.3      Intake Facilities Admitting and Processing Telephone Sets**

Is the intent of this requirement to video the overall intake process or to video each individual phone conversation made from the intake areas?

44A: [To video each individual phone conversation made from the intake areas only.](#)

45Q: **Page 93      Section 6.11.1      Intake Facility Video Capabilities**  
**Page 94      Section 7.3      Intake Facilities Admitting and Processing Telephone Sets**

Will DOC provide architectural site drawings for each location to aid in understanding of the scope of work required to provide video recording capabilities in the intake areas?

45A: [Yes. This information will be provided to the awarded vendor.](#)

46Q: **Page 94      Section 6.12      Visitor Area Telephone Service**

Would DOC provide the footage between the areas where the visitation phones are located and the closest phone closet?

46A: [See revised Attachment 16.](#)

47Q: **Page 94      Section 6.12      Visitor Area Telephone Service**

Is there existing cable or conduit that is currently run back to the demarcation and telephone equipment?

47A: [No there is not any existing cable or conduit that is currently run back to the demarcation and telephone equipment, however, it will not be the awarded vendor's responsibility to install such cable or conduit. It is the awarded vendor's responsibility only to install cable and/or conduit from the closest telephone closet to the visitor telephone sets.](#)

48Q: **Page 99      Section 9.2      Implementation Plan**

This section states "order of site installation to be determined by DOC", and also

requires a proposed project plan. The range of phones per facility runs from 28 to 183, which impacts installation time, additionally, the vendor will not have a working knowledge of the wiring requirements, including the possible need to trench, until after the site inspections after contract award. With that in mind, timeframes can only be estimated. For the RFP:

Does DOC already have a site installation plan listing the order of installations? If not, would DOC like the vendor to schedule each facility in alphabetical order, with the plan to be revised after award, using a final installation order supplied by DOC?

48A: See revised Attachment 16. Implementation plan order is identified for RFP evaluation purposes only. DOC must approve the final installation order and this may not be geographic.

49Q: **Page 99 Section 9.2 Implementation Plan**

This section states “order of site installation to be determined by DOC”, and also requires a proposed project plan. The range of phones per facility runs from 28 to 183, which impacts installation time, additionally, the vendor will not have a working knowledge of the wiring requirements, including the possible need to trench, until after the site inspections after contract award. With that in mind, timeframes can only be estimated. For the RFP:

How much time should the vendor allow for DOC site acceptance testing?

49A: 30-days is the State’s normal acceptance test period however, the State reserves the right to modify this period as necessary.

50Q: **Page 99 Section 9.2 Implementation Plan**

Is the intent of the RFP proposed implementation plan to demonstrate to DOC the ability of the vendor to provide a comprehensive plan, with the understanding that post-award decisions will probably alter the times in the proposed plan?

50A: Yes.

51Q: **Page 108 Section 13 Phase-out Plan**

This section discusses the role of the vendor at the end of the contract. At the end of the next contract, is it acceptable to:

Have a “leave behind” solution whereby a fully function system is left for the State’s use.

51A: Yes.



- 52Q: **Page 108 Section 13 Phase-out Plan**  
This section discusses the role of the vendor at the end of the contract. At the end of the next contract, is it acceptable to:  
Provide a new service provider with historical CDRs and call recording in a common format?
- 52A: Yes as long as it is in compliance with RFP Attachment 6, paragraph 4.7 AUTHENTICITY OF RECORDINGS.
- 53Q: **Page 111 Section 14.6.3 Vendor Service and Support Manager**  
Does the incumbent (GTL) have a full-time Service and Support Manger dedicated exclusively to DOC?
- 53A: No.
- 55Q: **Page 111 Section 14.6.3 Vendor Service and Support Manager**  
Would DOC consider waiving the requirement to provide this individual's resume in the RFP, with the stipulation that this would be supplied to DOC after the award of the contract for DOC's approval?
- 55A: Since the Service and Support Manager is not required to be exclusively dedicated to DOC, the State will not waive this requirement.
- 56Q: **Page 111 Section 14.6.4 Vendor Technical Staffing**  
This section states that vendor technicians will report directly to the DOC Director of Security or Designee.  
  
Section 14.6.3 states - the Vendor Service and Support Manager will be responsible for on-going service and support.  
  
Would DOC please clarify the role of the Vendor Service and Support Manager if the vendor technicians are reporting directly to DOC?
- 56A: The Vendor Service and Support Manager will manage the vendor's technicians and ensure the Inmate Telephone Service is maintained and operational. It was DOC's intent to provide direction to the vendor's technicians regarding day-to-day operations/assignments.

57Q: **Page 113 Attachment 7 Contract Compliance**  
**Page 124 Attachment 9 Vendor Certifications**

Would the State please provide these two attachments in a word document?

57A: No.

58Q: **Page 157 Attachment 16 DOC Facility Profile**

Are the phones listed in the Quantity Column mounted directly on the wall? If no could DOC provide a breakdown by type of pedestals and enclosures?

58A: Yes with the exception of the two telephones at John Dempsey which are on rolling pedestals.

59Q: On page 12 of the issued RFP, Section 2.2.1, Number 12 allows the State to “Contract with one or more vendors who submit proposals”. State and governmental agencies contract with one Inmate Telephone provider to service the agency. The vendor respectfully request that this statement be removed.

On page 12 of the issued RFP, Section 2.2.1, Number 14 allows the State to “Contract for all or any portion of the scope of work or tasks within this RFP”. State and governmental agencies contract with one Inmate Telephone provider to service the agency. For this reason the vendor respectfully request that this statement be removed.

59A: No.

60Q: On page 34 of the issued RFP, Section 1.1 it states “Commissions must be based upon revenue as follows: “Commissionable Revenue” is the revenue from Operator Service Calls generated by the inmate telephones, excluding: (i) amounts billed, but not paid; (ii) taxes; (iii) credits; and (iv) amounts otherwise paid to third parties in support of regulatory programs.” The above statement defining revenue is not normal or customary within the inmate telephone industry. Amounts billed but not paid are considered bad debt and normally not excluded from commissionable revenue. The vendor respectfully requests that the State redefines commissionable revenue as “Gross Revenue shall mean all revenue generated by every completed call that is accepted by a consumer, but excludes all taxes, Federal and State or local telecommunication fees that additionally apply to a consumer’s monthly telephone bill.” This is the current payment method that is utilized in paying the State of Connecticut.

60A: RFP Attachment 3, paragraph 1.1 COMMISSION RATE of the RFP is redacted and replaced with the following:

The vendor shall pay a monthly commission to DOIT of at least, but not limited to, 45% of the Commissionable Revenue. "Commissionable Revenue" is defined as the gross billed amounts generated by every completed telephone call that is accepted by a called party using the inmate telephone service. This excludes Federal, State and local government taxes and fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. If some future regulatory development establishes a new charge, the vendor and the State will mutually determine the exemption of such charge from Commissionable Revenue at that time. The commission must be received by DOIT within 30 days of the end of each month's billing cycle.

All revenue payments to the State for services/equipment shall be made payable to "Treasurer, State of Connecticut" and submitted to the Department of Information Technology, Fiscal Office or designee.

The vendor shall affirm it will comply with the above requirements (do not state the commission rate here).

61Q: Beginning on page 36 of the issued RFP there is a matrix that vendor must fill out containing the cost per minute for calling. Normal calls also contain a surcharge that is associated with the call as well. Is it the intent of the State to solicit a rate chart that is comprised of a per minute fee only, or will the State be amending the form to include a per call surcharge?

61A: No, the State does not want a per call surcharge and will not be amending the form.

62Q: On page 79 of the issued RFP, Section 2.6 states "The solution must assure no loss of functions for up to 90 minutes loss of commercial power in the DOCs' facilities." On page 89 of the issued RFP, Section 5.5 it states "The vendor shall provide four (4) hours UPS backup to for all vendor provided equipment." Please confirm that 90 minutes of backup power, in the event of commercial power loss, is sufficient.

62A: 90 minutes is sufficient.

63Q: On page 88 of the issued RFP, Section 5.0 states "The vendor must supply DOC with additional hardware and related software upon request." Please define any additional hardware and software that may be needed above and beyond the defined workstations,

laptops and printers so that the vendor can provide the DOC with the best commission offering.

63A: It is dependent upon the awarded vendor's service. Additional hardware could include additional workstations/printers and additional software may include analytical software that is not included with the core service.

64Q: On page 88 of the issued RFP, Section 5.1 states "The vendor must also supply the following for each workstation:

- CD/DVD creator software
- Wireless Headset with noise cancellation (one per telephone monitor)
- Color All-In-One Laser Printer/Scanner/Fax, associated cable(s) and replacement ink cartridges
- Surge Protector (UPS 900 VA 120V or comparable alternative)"

Please clarify, if the State is looking for 29 or 30 printers? Further please clarify if the State wishes Color All-In-One Laser Printers or Inkjet Printers.

64A: The quantity of workstations may vary over the life of the contract. DOC requires one "Color All-In-One Laser Printer/Scanner/Fax, associated cable(s) and replacement ink cartridges" for each workstation.

65Q: On page 90 of the issued RFP, Section 6.6 states "All inmate calls will be "Collect Call Only" as defined in DOC Administrative Directive 10.7 Inmate Communications (<http://www.ct.gov/doc/LIB/doc/PDF/AD/ad1007.pdf>)." Currently the State allows for three types of calling under the current contract: 1) Standard LEC Collect Calling – Traditional collect calling. Call charges appear on the end users LEC telephone bill. 2) Direct Remit Billing – direct billed collect calling option. This calling option allows the end user to be billed by the current provider. This is NOT a prepaid calling plan. Statements are sent by your provider and payments are received after the fact. 3) Direct Remit Prepaid Calling – This calling option allows for end user to pre-pay for calls prior to receiving them. Please confirm if the State wishes to keep these calling methodologies in place. . Additionally, would the state consider supplementing these choices with inmate paid or debit calling?

65A: Yes, it is confirmed. The State would like to keep these billing options available to the public.

No, at this time, the State will not allow supplementing these choices with inmate paid or debit calling.

66Q: On page 91 of the issued RFP, within Section 6.7 it states “There will be no administrative fee for establishing or replenishing accounts.” During the pre-bid meeting on December 8<sup>th</sup>, an attending vendor requested that all fees, in addition to normal call cost fees, be defined within the RFP submittal. The above referenced statement from the RFP, as the vendor reads it, does not allow for fees. Under the current contract NO fees are permitted or charged by the current provider. Please clarify your intention with respect to fees.

66A: The State confirms that there will be no administrative fee for establishing or replenishing accounts.

The vendor shall not charge any fees except for those fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. DOC will allow outside agencies such as Western Union and MoneyGram to be used only for International billing. DOC understands that the fees from these outside agencies cannot be waived. DOC will not require vendors to disclose the fees charged by these agencies or their share.

67Q: On page 93 of the issued RFP, Section 6.12 states “DOC is interested in having the ability to listen and record visitor telephone conversations with the same call control and limitation features as the inmate telephones.” This requirement will result in every facility needing to be surveyed for wiring requirements. Please provide a contact person and phone number so that the vendor can coordinate these site visits.

67A: Only the awarded vendor shall perform site surveys at the DOC facilities/sites which will be coordinated at that time with the DOC Project Manager. For the visitor telephone sets, wiring distance requirements is provided in this document.

68Q: On page 93 of the issued RFP, Section 6.12 states “DOC is interested in having the ability to listen and record visitor telephone conversations with the same call control and limitation features as the inmate telephones.” To properly size the solution please provide the following information by facility:

Number of visitation booths.

68A: The count is unknown as not all facilities have booths.

69Q: On page 93 of the issued RFP, Section 6.12 states “DOC is interested in having the ability to listen and record visitor telephone conversations with the same call control and limitation features as the inmate telephones.” To properly size the solution please provide the following information by facility:

Location of Visitation Areas. If multiple locations exist within a facility please indicate all locations.

69A: See revised Attachment 16. Specific visitation locations within a facility will be provided to the awarded vendor.

70Q: On page 93 of the issued RFP, Section 6.12 states “DOC is interested in having the ability to listen and record visitor telephone conversations with the same call control and limitation features as the inmate telephones.” To properly size the solution please provide the following information by facility:

Number of phone on each side of the glass.

70A: There are a total of 762 phones needed for visitation purposes; this includes phones on both sides of the glass. (See revised Attachment 16)

71Q: On page 93 of the issued RFP, Section 6.12 states “DOC is interested in having the ability to listen and record visitor telephone conversations with the same call control and limitation features as the inmate telephones.” To properly size the solution please provide the following information by facility:

Visitation hours by day, by week

71A: Visitation schedules vary by facility and are listed on the DOC website by facility (<http://www.ct.gov/doc/cwp/view.asp?a=1502&Q=265422&docNav=1>)

72Q: On page 93 of the issued RFP, Section 6.12 states “DOC is interested in having the ability to listen and record visitor telephone conversations with the same call control and limitation features as the inmate telephones.” Does the facility wish to have the inmates utilize PIN numbers for access to the visitation system?

72A: Yes.

73Q: On page 113 of the issued RFP it states “During the evaluation process, special consideration will be given to those Bidders who provide documentation to evidence their utilization of a certified small minority or women’s business and/or demonstrate the Bidder’s commitment to, whenever possible, utilize a certified small minority or women’s business.” Please define what this special consideration will be, how will it be evaluated

and any evaluation points associated with the use of small minority or women's businesses.

73A: There will be no special consideration in the RFP evaluation for a small minority or women's business.

74Q: In responding to State DOC inmate telephone RFPs it is normal and customary to submit multiple financial offers so that the State can select the best financial offer and rate plan that meets their business objectives. Is this permissible to the State?

74A: No.

75Q: It has been the vendor's experience that answers to submitted questions may generate additional questions that need to be asked for clarification. With this in mind will the State have a secondary question period after December 13<sup>th</sup>?

75A: No.

76Q: The State defines that the financial response to the issued RFP is weighted at a total maximum pointing value of 1000 points. How many points are allocated to rates and how many to commissions?

76A: This level of detail will not be disclosed at this time.

77Q: Is the State more concerned with lower calling rates to the end user or more revenue for the State?

77A: This level of detail will not be disclosed at this time.

78Q: On page 92 of the issued RFP, Section 6.11 states "This service allows inmates to place collect calls via live operator." Currently the system that is in place does not allow the inmates the opportunity to access a live operator. The vendor respectfully requests that this statement be amended to say automated operator.

78A: RFP Attachment 6, Section 6.11 INTAKE FACILITY TELEPHONE SERVICE – MANDATORY the second sentence in the first paragraph is redacted and replaced with the following:

This service allows inmates to place collect calls via automated operator.

79Q: On page 109 of the issued RFP, Section 14.4 mandates three references must be supplied with the RFP response. Please confirm that these references must be references of the prime vendor responding to this RFP and not references from their sub-contractors.

79A: The references must be references of the vendor responding to this RFP as identified in Attachment 6, paragraph 14.1.

80Q: Is a vendor allowed to be a sub-contractor and/or prime on multiple bid responses?

80A: No. Vendors may be sub-contractors on multiple RFP responses but not as a prime on multiple RFP responses.

81Q: In order to provide the best possible offer, it is very helpful to have the rates currently being charged to called parties under the current contract. Please provide the following information as they apply in the following chart:

Call Category	Per Call Surcharge	Per Minute Charge	Other Charges
LOCAL – Collect			
INTRALATA – Collect			
INTERLATA – Collect			
INTERSTATE – Collect			
LOCAL – PrePaid Collect			
INTRALATA – PrePaid Collect			
INTERLATA – PrePaid Collect			
INTERSTATE – PrePaid Collect			

In addition, if any other calling options are available to which special calling rates apply, please provide those calling rates.

81A: Rates are posted on the DOIT website:

[http://www.ct.gov/doit/lib/doit/purchase/telecom/ps\\_gtl\\_inmate\\_calling\\_web.pdf](http://www.ct.gov/doit/lib/doit/purchase/telecom/ps_gtl_inmate_calling_web.pdf)

[http://www.ct.gov/doit/lib/doit/purchase/telecom/ps\\_gtl\\_advpay\\_web.pdf](http://www.ct.gov/doit/lib/doit/purchase/telecom/ps_gtl_advpay_web.pdf)

[http://www.ct.gov/doit/lib/doit/purchase/telecom/ps\\_gtl\\_inmate\\_calling\\_international\\_web.pdf](http://www.ct.gov/doit/lib/doit/purchase/telecom/ps_gtl_inmate_calling_international_web.pdf)



82Q: Please confirm that CT DOIT inmate telephone revenue commission is paid on gross completed call revenue, and that no deductions are made for unbillable calls or bad debt for Collect calls, or for any cost associated with providing Collect, Prepaid Collect, or Debit calls. If deductions do apply, please state the deductions being applied before calculating commissionable revenue.

82A: RFP Attachment 3, paragraph 1.1 COMMISSION RATE of the RFP is redacted and replaced with the following:

The vendor shall pay a monthly commission to DOIT of at least, but not limited to, 45% of the Commissionable Revenue. "Commissionable Revenue" is defined as the gross billed amounts generated by every completed telephone call that is accepted by a called party using the inmate telephone service. This excludes Federal, State and local government taxes and fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. If some future regulatory development establishes a new charge, the vendor and the State will mutually determine the exemption of such charge from Commissionable Revenue at that time. The commission must be received by DOIT within 30 days of the end of each month's billing cycle.

All revenue payments to the State for services/equipment shall be made payable to "Treasurer, State of Connecticut" and submitted to the Department of Information Technology, Fiscal Office or designee.

The vendor shall affirm it will comply with the above requirements (do not state the commission rate here).

83Q: Please confirm the commission rate the State is receiving from its current inmate telephone provider.

83A: 45%

84Q: Please provide the total technology grant dollars or bonuses received by the State from the current provider at the beginning of, or at any time during, the current contract period.

84A: \$0

85Q: Please provide a copy of the current inmate phone service agreement(s).

- 85A: The link to current master agreement is:  
<http://www.ct.gov/doit/lib/doit/purchase/telecom/mab03013.pdf>.
- 86Q: Please provide an average of monthly commissions received over the past year from the current vendor and copies of commission statements (if available).
- 86A: Copies of the Commission Statements, which contain the commission paid, are provided at the end of Amendment 2.
- 87Q: Section 1.4 allows vendors some latitude in how they present information; please confirm the following:
- Will the State allow each vendor to submit multiple rate and commission options for consideration?
- 87A: No.
- 88Q: All inmate telephone vendors offer some version of called party prepaid calling. With this type prepaid account, there are often fees associated with funding of accounts, account setup, refund processing, dormant accounts, etc. Some fees are charged by the vendor and others are charged through a third-party agent or subcontractor. Regardless, the amounts can be significant. Does the State require disclosure of all fees in order to ensure that the State is able to evaluate the total cost to the consumer?
- 88A: The vendor shall not charge any fees except for those fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. DOC will allow outside agencies such as Western Union and MoneyGram to be used only for International billing. DOC understands that the fees from these outside agencies cannot be waived. DOC will not require vendors to disclose the fees charged by these agencies or their share.
- 89Q: On page 34 "Commission Rate" is based on "commissionable revenue" which, by definition, does not include bad debt, "...amounts billed but not paid." Bad debt can vary greatly between inmate telephone service providers. A 45% Commission Rate from one company (with bad debt deducted from Total Gross Revenue) may give the department much less revenue than a 45% Commission Rate from another company. In order for the DOIT to fairly evaluate Commission Rate on a level playing field, can this be changed to remove "...amounts billed but not paid" from the definition of "commissionable revenue"?

89A: RFP Attachment 3, paragraph 1.1 COMMISSION RATE of the RFP is redacted and replaced with the following:

The vendor shall pay a monthly commission to DOIT of at least, but not limited to, 45% of the Commissionable Revenue. "Commissionable Revenue" is defined as the gross billed amounts generated by every completed telephone call that is accepted by a called party using the inmate telephone service. This excludes Federal, State and local government taxes and fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. If some future regulatory development establishes a new charge, the vendor and the State will mutually determine the exemption of such charge from Commissionable Revenue at that time. The commission must be received by DOIT within 30 days of the end of each month's billing cycle.

All revenue payments to the State for services/equipment shall be made payable to "Treasurer, State of Connecticut" and submitted to the Department of Information Technology, Fiscal Office or designee.

The vendor shall affirm it will comply with the above requirements (do not state the commission rate here).

90Q: Section 21, page 55, which requires putting source code into escrow, is problematic to most or all providers. It also does not necessarily resolve the dilemma of a company's failure to provide service due to bankruptcy or other financial issues. Even with the source code, the DOIT would most likely still have a many months ordeal in reading, deciphering, and rewriting any required code changes, if it could be accomplished at all. In lieu of escrowing source code, can the DOIT require a bond large enough to completely change the system, hardware and software, in the case of a provider default?

90A: These issues will be addressed with the successful vendor during the negotiation process.

91Q: Requirement 2.2.30 CORPORATE GOVERNANCE requires compliance for NYSE listed companies. Please confirm that a non-NYSE listed company is not bound by these requirements.

91A: This is not applicable to non-NYSE companies.

92Q: Systems Development Technology - Attachment 13 - Executive Order No. 19 – SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT METHODOLOGY addresses IT Systems Developed for the State of Connecticut. There is no required IT development for this project. All of the

software and systems proposed for the inmate telephone application has been developed, deployed, and operational for more than 3 years. Please confirm the system software proposed as a part of the proposal does not have to comply with this requirement.

92A: For acquisition of services or subscriptions where no development is required, Executive Order No. 19 would not apply.

93Q: Paragraph 16, page 53 requires encryption of data "...classified as confidential or restricted." Are call recording and call record details classified as confidential or restricted, and will they require encryption in accordance with CTEA requirements?

93A: These issues will be addressed with the successful vendor during the negotiation process.

94Q: Paragraph 33, page 63, is the "Continuity of Systems" requirement in place for the current provider?

94A: Yes, State Statute 4d-44 is included in the current master agreement.

95Q: In order to ensure that vendors have ample time to incorporate the State's answers to bidder questions and to prepare a thorough bid response for the State of Connecticut, will the State consider extending the RFP response deadline two weeks to January 25, 2010?

95A: The State has issued Amendment #1 to this RFP extending the due date to 2/8/2011.

96Q: Will the state permit inmates to place prepaid collect calls to cellular phones?

96A: Yes.

97Q: Are calls permitted to cellular phones today?

97A: No.

98Q: Some requirements are highlighted in yellow and the text indicates they are mandatory requirements. Yet other requirements not marked as such use terms such as "shall"

“will” & “must.” Are all requirements mandatory; or just those marked as mandatory and highlighted in yellow? Please clarify.

98A: A vendor must meet all requirements marked MANDATORY or they will not be considered. All other requirements will be evaluated and will affect the vendor’s ranking.

99Q: **Section 1.2** – Identifies contract duration as a five year term with two extension options of one year each. Attachment 5, paragraph 1 indicates that three extension options are possible following a base contract term of five years. Please confirm which language is correct.

99A: Attachment 5 is a sample RFP CPD - Master Agreement. The term of the contract will be a five year term with two extension options of one year each.

100Q: **Section 2.2.1 (12)** - specifies that the State may select one or more vendors to provide the desired service. Most vendors predicate their financial offers based on the total call traffic, and a presumption that they will be the only (exclusive) provider of inmate telephone services. If this is not the case, it will substantially affect the business model. Selection of multiple vendors could also negatively impact the State’s ability to perform investigative analysis because each vendor would be using a separate call processing platform. Please clarify.

100A: The state may contract with one or more vendors who submit proposals if it deems this is in the best interest of the State.

101Q: **Section 2.2.16** – Is it necessary to include copies of proposed subcontractor agreements with the proposal?

101A: No. This is a requirement of the successful vendor.

102Q: **Section 2.2.21** - Indicates that ownership of software/code developed or customized for the contract becomes property of the state. If this interpretation is correct, vendors would not be able to offer the same/similar features to other states/county customers.

102A: Any software code, development, or customization, specific to the State and paid for by the State is property of the State. This issue will be addressed in contract negotiations.

103Q: **Section 2.2.29** - States: “Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in any warranty or warranties, the remedies available to the State under this Date/Time Compliance

Warranty shall include the obligation to repair or replace any Product and/or item whose non-compliance with this Warranty or defect is discovered by Contractor or the State, all at the expense of Contractor....*This Warranty remains in effect through the 365 days following the termination of this Contract.* This provision shall not be construed to extend the Warranty Term of this Contract, except as services for defects to the System and all Products shall be required under any Maintenance Term.”

Knowing that the selected vendor will remove their equipment following the end of the contract (and award to another vendor); under what conditions would the vendor’s equipment be subject to this requirement following the termination of the contract?

103A: See Attachment 6, paragraph 13. PHASE-OUT PLAN which states “The vendor will transfer ownership of the then current telephones, hardware, software and all associated cabling to the DOC at the end of the contract.”

104Q: **Sections 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3; 2.1.1; 2.1.2; and 2.1.3** indicate the following: “The rate proposed and charged by the vendor shall be a single flat per minute rate exclusive of all applicable fees, surcharges, and taxes for all collect calls made.”

Please confirm that the rates proposed must not include any fees or surcharges charged by the vendor (or its payment agent) for any reason short of government mandate.

104A: RFP Attachment 3, Paragraph 1.2.1 DOMESTIC CALLS PLACED TO CONNECTICUT TELEPHONE NUMBERS is redacted and replaced with the following:

The rate proposed and charged by the vendor shall be a single flat per minute rate for all collect calls made to Connecticut telephone numbers. This rate must be inclusive of all applicable fees and surcharges. This rate shall exclude Federal, State and local government taxes and fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. If some future regulatory development establishes a new charge, the vendor must submit such charge with supporting documentation to the State for its approval. The rate for the discounted pre-paid calls must be, at a minimum, 25% less than the standard collect call rate.

The vendor shall affirm it will comply.

RFP Attachment 3, Paragraph 1.2.2 DOMESTIC CALLS PLACED TO NON-CONNECTICUT TELEPHONE NUMBERS is redacted and replaced with the following:

The rate proposed and charged by the vendor shall be a single flat per minute rate for all collect calls made to non-Connecticut telephone numbers within the continental United States, Alaska and Hawaii. This rate must be inclusive of all applicable fees and surcharges. This rate shall exclude Federal, State and local

government taxes and fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. If some future regulatory development establishes a new charge, the vendor must submit such charge with supporting documentation to the State for its approval. The rate for the discounted pre-paid calls must be, at a minimum, 25% less than the standard collect call rate.

The vendor shall affirm it will comply.

RFP Attachment 3, Paragraph 1.2.3 CALLS PLACED TO INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE NUMBERS is redacted and replaced with the following:

The vendor shall propose a rate structure for international calls detailing rates by country inclusive of all applicable fees and surcharges. This rate shall exclude, where applicable, all Federal, State and local government taxes and fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. If some future regulatory development establishes a new charge, the vendor must submit such charge with supporting documentation to the State for its approval. The rates for the discounted pre-paid calls must be, at a minimum, 25% less than the standard collect call rates.

The vendor shall affirm it will comply.

RFP Attachment 3, Paragraph 2.1.1 DOMESTIC CALLS PLACED TO CONNECTICUT TELEPHONE NUMBERS (ALTERNATE RATE) is redacted and replaced with the following:

The rate proposed and charged by the vendor shall be a single flat per minute rate for all collect calls made to Connecticut telephone numbers. This rate must be inclusive of all applicable fees and surcharges. This rate shall exclude Federal, State and local government taxes and fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. If some future regulatory development establishes a new charge, the vendor must submit such charge with supporting documentation to the State for its approval. The rate for the discounted pre-paid calls must be, at a minimum, 25% less than the standard collect call rate.

The vendor shall affirm it will comply.

RFP Attachment 3, Paragraph 2.1.2 DOMESTIC CALLS PLACED TO NON-CONNECTICUT TELEPHONE NUMBERS (ALTERNATE RATE) is redacted and replaced with the following:

The rate proposed and charged by the vendor shall be a single flat per minute rate for all collect calls made to non-Connecticut telephone numbers within the continental United States, Alaska and Hawaii. This rate must be inclusive of all applicable fees and surcharges. This rate shall exclude Federal, State and local

government taxes and fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. If some future regulatory development establishes a new charge, the vendor must submit such charge with supporting documentation to the State for its approval. The rate for the discounted pre-paid calls must be, at a minimum, 25% less than the standard collect call rate.

The vendor shall affirm it will comply.

RFP Attachment 3, Paragraph 2.1.3 CALLS PLACED TO INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE NUMBERS (ALTERNATE RATES) is redacted and replaced with the following:

The vendor shall propose a rate structure for international calls detailing rates by country inclusive of all applicable fees and surcharges. This rate shall exclude, where applicable, all Federal, State and local government taxes and fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. If some future regulatory development establishes a new charge, the vendor must submit such charge with supporting documentation to the State for its approval. The rates for the discounted pre-paid calls must be, at a minimum, 25% less than the standard collect call rates.

The vendor shall affirm it will comply.

With regards to fees charged, the vendor shall not charge any fees except for those fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. DOC will allow outside agencies such as Western Union and MoneyGram to be used only for International billing. DOC understands that the fees from these outside agencies cannot be waived. DOC will not require vendors to disclose the fees charged by these agencies or their share.

105Q: **Sections 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3; 2.1.1; 2.1.2; and 2.1.3** indicate the following: “The rate proposed and charged by the vendor shall be a single flat per minute rate exclusive of all applicable fees, surcharges, and taxes for all collect calls made.”

Many vendors accept payments made via Western Union and/or MoneyGram. Each of these services assess a fee to process a payment. Will the State allow vendors to accept payments made using these methods? If yes, will the State require vendors to disclose the amount of such fees and any profit or share of Western Union or MoneyGram fees received by the vendor?

105A: DOC will allow outside agencies such as Western Union and MoneyGram to be used only for International billing. DOC understands that the fees from these outside agencies cannot be waived. DOC will not require vendors to disclose the fees charged by these agencies or their share.



106Q: **Section 7.1 and 7.2** – Please confirm that vendor is to provide one original plus six copies and one CD of the technical proposal and one original plus six copies and one CD of the financial proposal. Is it acceptable to deliver the proposal in a single package which includes two separate containers (one containing the financial proposal and one containing the technical proposal)?

106A: For both the Technical and Financial proposals, the vendor must provide one original hardcopy (original with signature) plus six (6) additional hardcopies. The original and each hardcopy must also include an electronic copy.

Yes, it is acceptable to deliver the proposal in a single package which includes two separate containers (one containing the financial proposal and one containing the technical proposal)

107Q: **Attachment 3, Section 1.1:** “The vendor shall pay a monthly commission to DOIT of at least, but not limited to 45% of the Commissionable Revenue. Commissions must be based upon revenue as follows:

‘Commissionable Revenue’ is the revenue from Operator Service Calls generated by the inmate telephones, excluding: (i) amounts billed, but not paid; (ii) taxes; (iii) credits; and (iv) amounts otherwise paid to third parties in support of regulatory programs.”

So that all vendors are clear on what the commission percentage (i.e, “commissionable revenue”) is based on, is it correct to re-state that commissionable revenue is based on gross collect and prepaid collect call revenue less items (i),(ii), (iii), and (iv)?

108A: RFP Attachment 3, paragraph 1.1 COMMISSION RATE of the RFP is redacted and replaced with the following:

The vendor shall pay a monthly commission to DOIT of at least, but not limited to, 45% of the Commissionable Revenue. “Commissionable Revenue” is defined as the gross billed amounts generated by every completed telephone call that is accepted by a called party using the inmate telephone service. This excludes Federal, State and local government taxes and fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. If some future regulatory development establishes a new charge, the vendor and the State will mutually determine the exemption of such charge from Commissionable Revenue at that time. The commission must be received by DOIT within 30 days of the end of each month’s billing cycle.

All revenue payments to the State for services/equipment shall be made payable to “Treasurer, State of Connecticut” and submitted to the Department of Information Technology, Fiscal Office or designee.

The vendor shall affirm it will comply with the above requirements (do not state the commission rate here).

108Q: **Attachment 3, Section 1.1:** “The vendor shall pay a monthly commission to DOIT of at least, but not limited to 45% of the Commissionable Revenue. Commissions must be based upon revenue as follows:

It is uncommon to exclude bad debt/uncollected funds from commission calculations; does the current vendor pay commissions on this basis?

108A: No.

109Q: **Attachment 3, Section 1.1:** “The vendor shall pay a monthly commission to DOIT of at least, but not limited to 45% of the Commissionable Revenue. Commissions must be based upon revenue as follows:

Recent media publicity concerning fees applied to prepaid calling has called attention that certain fees charged to CT residents may not be legal in the state. Please confirm which fees (if any) are being charged by the current vendor and/or their payment agents.

109A: We cannot confirm the fees that are being charged by the current vendor.

110Q: **Attachment 3, Section 1.1:** “The vendor shall pay a monthly commission to DOIT of at least, but not limited to 45% of the Commissionable Revenue. Commissions must be based upon revenue as follows:

Please confirm that the State will not permit vendors to charge any fees beyond taxes and mandated regulatory fees.

110A: This is confirmed. The vendors' proposed rates must be inclusive of all applicable fees and surcharges. These rates shall exclude Federal, State and local government taxes and fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. If some future regulatory development establishes a new charge, the vendor must submit such charge with supporting documentation to the State for its approval.

In addition, the vendor shall not charge any fees except for those fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. DOC will allow outside agencies such as Western Union and MoneyGram to be used only for International billing. DOC understands that the fees from these outside agencies cannot be waived. DOC will not require vendors to disclose the fees charged by these agencies or their share.

- 111Q: **Attachment 3, Section 1.2.3** implies that vendor is to provide international collect by stating that international prepaid collect rates must be at least 25% below international collect rates. However, Attachment 3 Financial Spreadsheet does not ask for a collect international rate(s). Please confirm that international calling is to be limited to prepaid collect only. Please provide the international rates charged by the current vendor today.
- 111A: It is confirmed that international calling is to be limited to prepaid collect only. The international rates charged by the current vendor may be found on the DOIT website: [http://www.ct.gov/doi/lib/doi/purchase/telecom/ps\\_gtl\\_inmate\\_calling\\_international\\_web.pdf](http://www.ct.gov/doi/lib/doi/purchase/telecom/ps_gtl_inmate_calling_international_web.pdf).
- 112Q: **Attachment 5, Agreement** – Much of the agreement anticipates payment for a product made to the vendor; however, the RFP is intended to obtain a “no cost” solution for the state, and to produce a commission revenue share for the State. Will the Agreement be modified to better reflect the project money flow?
- 112A: These issues will be addressed with the successful vendor during the negotiation process.
- 113Q: **Attachment 6, Section 1.3** States that there are 650 visitor handsets. Will the State provide vendors with a breakdown of visitor handsets by site? Also, it is assumed that for every visitor handset, there is an inmate visitation handset, please confirm.
- 113A: There are a total of 762 phones needed for visitation purposes; this includes phones on both sides of the glass. (See revised Attachment 16)
- 114Q: **Attachment 6, Section 4.10** - Attachment 6 indicates the DOC is currently using an inmate tracking system to update the phone system of inmate daily movements – please identify the manufacturer of the tracking system and whether it contains data such as inmate ID and inmate PIN in addition to inmate location. Does the DOC wish to change the data flow between this system and the inmate phone vendor or continue with the ftp file sharing concept in use today?
- 114A: Currently the DOC has a mainframe based system that tracks the inmates. The system is the Offender based Information System and is hosted on the mainframe at DOIT. There is no PIN number associated with the file. At a minimum the vendor must be able to continue with the existing FTP process. DOC would like to improve this process and would be interested in the vendor's proposed changes. If the proposed changes can work in the State's environment then the State would be interested.

115Q: **Attachment 6, Section 5** – specifies that equipment must be new but this requirement is under the heading of monitoring and recording equipment. Please confirm that the requirement for all equipment to be new also applies to all on-site equipment including inmate phones, workstations, laptops, etc.

115A: Yes, this is confirmed.

116Q: **Attachment 6, Section 5.3** – Please be more specific about the desired “additional software” to analyze CDRs. Are features contained within the inmate phone system acceptable; or does the DOC have a particular functionality in mind?

116A: Features contained within the inmate telephone system may be acceptable. DOC requires analytical software that may or may not be included in the core Inmate Telephone Service.

117Q: **Attachment 6, Section 5.4** – On-site backup of recording data - By including yet another data backup site at DOC Central will add another layer of equipment and also another cost component to the system which will affect commission rate. Will the state permit vendors to use their own backup site and capability to satisfy this requirement?

117A: No.

118Q: **Attachment 6, Section 5.5** – This section requires 4 hour UPS backup time which conflicts with Section 2.6 which requires 90 minutes of UPS coverage in the event of a commercial power outages.

118A: 90 minutes is sufficient.

119Q: **Attachment 6, Section 5.6** Please confirm the requirement to refresh all onsite equipment every two years of the contract. Most vendors will provide high quality, industry-standard equipment that will serve well over the contract term, and in event of a failure, the vendor would be bound by the contract to replace such equipment automatically upon failure. The requirement as written will add additional cost to the program and will impact commissions.

119A: This requirement remains as is.

120Q: **Attachment 6, Section 6.4** states that “collect only” calls will be allowed which will include prepaid collect using the price discount schedule stated in the RFP.

120A: (Attachment 6, Section 6.4 is INMATE NAME IDENTIFIER. Attachment 6, Section 6.6 is COLLECT CALLS – MANDATORY)  
DOC only allows collect calling. The vendor may have other billing options (pre-paid, direct remittance), all of which must have the recipient of the call paying for the call (collect calling only).

121Q: **Attachment 6, Section 6.6** – This section specifies that vendors may not impose any limitations to inmate calling except for those listed in the DOC handbook. Most vendors impose a monthly credit limit to LEC-billed traditional collect calls in order to minimize bad debt exposure. Will the DOC permit this practice?

121A: No.

122Q: **Attachment 6, Section 6.7** – This section specifies that vendors shall not keep funds when an account is closed. Please confirm that vendors are not permitted to absorb prepaid collect account balances due to account inactivity. It is also specified that no fee is to be charged to replenish an account. While vendors may agree to waive such fees, outside agencies such as Western Union and MoneyGram collect a fee that cannot be waived. Will the DOC permit the use of these payment alternatives? If so, please note that each vendor’s agreement with Western Union and MoneyGram vary and some vendors profit by receiving a share of the fee collected by these agencies. Will the DOC require vendors to disclose the fees charged by these agencies along with their share, if any?

122A: Confirmed, vendors are not permitted to absorb prepaid collect account balances due to account inactivity. Confirmed, no fee is to be charged to replenish an account. DOC will allow outside agencies such as Western Union and MoneyGram to be used only for International billing. DOC understands that the fees from these outside agencies cannot be waived. DOC will not require vendors to disclose the fees charged by these agencies or their share.

123Q: **Attachment 6, Section 6.11.1** - DOC is interested in having the ability in the admitting and processing areas, to video record conversations as part of the inmate telephone service. The video recordings must contain date and time stamps which correspond to the audio recording of these calls.

Please Clarify: Is the requirement for the vendor to provide the ancillary videotaping equipment and media at each intake area to visually record each inmate’s call?

123A: Yes it is a requirement.

124Q: **Attachment 6, Section 6.11.1** - DOC is interested in having the ability in the admitting and processing areas, to video record conversations as part of the inmate telephone service. The video recordings must contain date and time stamps which correspond to the audio recording of these calls. Please Clarify: Is this a mandatory requirement as implied by Section 7.3?

124A: No it is not mandatory but is an important feature that will be scored.

125Q: **Attachment 6, Section 6.11.1** - DOC is interested in having the ability in the admitting and processing areas, to video record conversations as part of the inmate telephone service. The video recordings must contain date and time stamps which correspond to the audio recording of these calls.  
Please Clarify: If not, what evaluation value does this feature represent?

125A: Evaluation value will not be disclosed.

126Q: **Attachment 6, Section 6.12 & 7.4** - DOC is interested in having the ability to listen and record visitor telephone conversations with the same call control and limitation features as the inmate telephones. The vendor shall describe how the proposed service accomplishes this.  
For vendors to calculate the number of recorders and amount of storage media to record visitation conversations, it is important for the vendor to know how many visitation stations, number of visitors, and duration of each visit for all of the facilities which allow visitation.

126A: There are a total of 762 phones needed for visitation purposes; this includes phones on both sides of the glass. (See revised Attachment 16) There were a total of 392,164 visits made January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010. Visitation sessions for all facilities, can vary between 30 and 60 minutes.

127Q: **Attachment 6, Section 7.3** – Requires an electronic identifier, video recording or snapshot of caller imbedded in the CDR. Will the DOC consider a proven voice verification solution as an alternative?

127A: No unless a legal precedence has already been established through litigation. For consideration, the vendor must fully disclose the details of such litigation.

128Q: **Attachment 6, Section 8** – Indicates that wiring, when replaced should be CAT6. Please confirm that wiring will only need to be replaced in instances where existing wiring is insufficient or damaged.

128A: This is confirmed. Where needed, the vendor must install all new inside station wiring (at least Category 6) and conduit in compliance with the most current TIA/EIA Telecommunications Building Wiring Standards for the installation of all equipment. It is the awarded vendor's responsibility only to install cable and/or conduit from the closest telephone closet to the inmate or visitor telephone sets.

129Q: **Attachment 6, Section 9.5** – Please confirm that current vendor has agreed to provide 90 days of recordings in a non-proprietary format for the DOC's future use.

129A: The current vendor has not agreed to provide 90 days of recordings in a non-proprietary format for the DOC's future use.

130Q: **Attachment 6, Section 9.6** - "The vendor shall be responsible for the removal, inventory creation/validation, storage and coordination of the return of all existing GTL equipment no later than forty-five (45) days after the successful completion of a facilities acceptance test."

It is customary for the incumbent vendor to remove their own equipment in coordination with the new vendor system acceptance. Having the new vendor remove the incumbent vendor's equipment would make the new vendor responsible for the condition of the equipment. Will the DOC agree to have the new vendor coordinate with the outgoing vendor for removal of their own equipment as part of the transition plan?

130A: Yes as long as the new vendor assumes all responsibility and manages this effort.

131Q: **Attachment 6, Section 11.5.1** – System Reliability - The vendor must provide details on all incidents of system failures in the last three (3) years, including priority levels (see above table) which resulted in an interruption of service. Identify the cause of the failure including whether it was a system malfunction (hardware or software) or human error.

Please clarify that the requirement for the vendor to list all incidents for the last 3 years for its systems at all previous/existing customers. It would seem that this would only be relevant if vendors were using the same platforms for these three years as the platform being proposed. Some vendors may be proposing newer, more advanced system technology that was not in place 3 years ago.

131A: DOC is only interested in reviewing incidents on the proposed system from the last 3 years or for as long as the system being proposed has been in place.

132Q: **Appendix 6, Section 13** - The vendor will transfer ownership of the then current telephones, hardware, software and all associated cabling to DOC at the end of the contract. The vendor will provide DOC a software license, at no cost to the State, to operate the then current system. The vendor shall provide DOC a full explanation on how it will handle a transition situation at the end of the contract period. Any DOC owned equipment located outside the DOC sites, such as recording equipment and software with applicable licenses, shall be provided to the new vendor or DOC at no cost to DOC or the new vendor. The vendor shall provide any and all data including call recordings, inmate authorized call lists, and call detail records to DOC.

Please clarify: The second sentence infers that upon contract termination, that the existing vendor will no longer have any responsibility for operating or maintaining the system once the transition process has started and that the DOC will assume all operating and maintenance operations. If this is the case, who will be responsible for billing, collections, and customer support during the transition phase.

Also, it is understood that all data and audio recordings are property of the DOC. However, some new centralized platform technologies will have the recording equipment located at the vendor's site and integrated into the vendor's prime server system. It will not be possible to detach these servers and give them to the DOC. Typically however, upon contract termination and during the transition phase between the existing and new vendor, the existing vendor will work with the new vendor to make available and help download all DOC data into the new system so that the historical data will be immediately available through the new vendor's system. This has worked well in the industry for many years and all vendors are familiar with this part of the transition process.

132A: The vendor will continue to be responsible for billing, collections, and customer support during the transition phase.

133Q: **Attachment 6, Section 14.1** – Would the DOC consider requiring vendors to provide Better Business Bureau ratings and complaint history as a means to evaluate business ethics and customer service performance?

133A: No.



134Q: **Attachment 6, Section 14.6.4** - DOC requires a minimum of two full-time dedicated vendor technicians. These individuals will report directly to and receive all assignments from the DOC Director of Security or designee.

If the two technicians are reporting directly to the Director of Security, how does the DOC envision the technicians responding to directives from the vendor's technical support center to avoid conflicts in the event of system problems or outages where the vendor's technical support center needs to direct the operations of the technicians for onsite corrective actions?

134A: It was DOC's intent to provide direction to the vendor's technicians regarding day-to-day operations/assignments. The Vendor Service and Support Manager will manage the vendor's technicians and ensure the Inmate Telephone Service is maintained and operational.

135Q: **Attachment 7** – Please confirm whether or not vendors are obligated to subcontract 25% of the project to small, woman-owned, or minority businesses or if vendors who do are simply granted an advantage in the evaluation. If the latter is true, please confirm how this aspect of the proposal impacts scoring and evaluation.

135A: There will be no special consideration in the RFP evaluation for a small minority or women's business.

136Q: **General** - Given the comprehensive requirements of this RFP, will the State consider a two week extension to the RFP due date? Assuming that an extension of time is granted, will the State allow for a follow-up round of questions and answers?

136A: The State has issued Amendment #1 to this RFP extending the due date to 2/8/2011. There will be no further questions allowed.

137Q: Will the state please provide blueprints, fire plans, or similar indication of the scope of the location of telephone rooms, phone locations, and potential visitation phone locations?

137A: Yes. This information will be provided to the awarded vendor.

138Q: What is the standard recording format and process in which the current vendor will transmit the existing recordings to the awarded vendor?

138A: GTL proprietary format. The process is yet to be determined. It is extremely important that the authenticity of the call is maintained (see paragraph 4.7 in Attachment 6 of the RFP).

139Q: What is the capacity required to store the existing recordings from the current vendor in the format in which they will be obtained?

139A: Total storage required for call details, pins, allowed lists, etc: Approximately 14 GB data storage for 1 year.

Total storage required for call recordings: Approximately 8 TB for 1 year of call storage.

140Q: To eliminate a potential competitive financial advantage by the existing vendor, please validate that there will be no cost to the awarded vendor to obtain the existing recordings from the current vendor.

140A: Correct. The recordings are the property of the State.

141Q: In relation to **Section 3.5: MANUAL ON/OFF SWITCHES**, with the vendor's IP based inmate telephones, the vendor includes the ability to instantly disable one, some or all of the inmate telephones within the entire facility via the vendor's Secure Studio system. The vendor has found that this method is preferable to a physical switching system for a number of reasons including:

- The safety and security of the facility staff is enhanced as there is no requirement for them to physically move to a single, secured location to disable the inmate telephones in the case of an emergency shutdown.
- The inmate telephones can be disabled from multiple locations in the facility.
- The inmate telephones can be disabled from remote locations.
- Access to the shut down functionality is restricted to authorized users.
- The time, date and user responsible for disabling the inmate telephones are recorded in the system ensuring user accountability.
- The potential for the accidental disabling of the system is dramatically reduced.
- There is no potential for the mechanical failure of a physical switching system.
- There is no dependency on the integrity and condition of the physical cabling to each phone.
- The need for periodic testing and maintenance of a physical system is eliminated.

Given the superiority of a software based inmate telephone system shut down, will the DOC accept a software based solution to satisfy this requirement?

141A: No. Manual on/off switches as defined in the RFP are still required.

142Q: **Section 6.11: INTAKE FACILITY TELEPHONE SERVICE**, states that collect calls are placed via live operators from the admitting and processing areas. Can the DOC tell the vendors the reason for live operators being used instead of automated operators for collect calls from these areas?

142A: In Attachment 6, Section 6.11 INTAKE FACILITY TELEPHONE SERVICE – MANDATORY the second sentence in the first paragraph is redacted and replaced with the following:

This service allows inmates to place collect calls via automated operator.

143Q: To meet the requirements of **Section 7.6: TELEPHONE SETS FOR TESTING**, the vendor's Secure Studio system provides a software based (soft) phone that is able to simulate calls from the telephone account of any inmate, originating at any phone from any facility. A telephone account at each facility can also be established specifically for testing purposes. Access to the test phone functionality is restricted to authorized users of the system.

Given this capability does the DOC consider it necessary to install a physical inmate telephone at its Security Division?

143A: No. A software based (soft) phone is acceptable as long as it replicates 100% of the functionality of the service.

144Q: Cat 6 will need to be added to the visitation phones to give them the required features, and how much of the other wiring (not for the visitation phones) that is Cat 3 or 5 are you expecting to have replaced?

144A: Where needed, the vendor must install all new inside station wiring (at least Category 6) and conduit in compliance with the most current TIA/EIA Telecommunications Building Wiring Standards for the installation of all equipment. It is the awarded vendor's responsibility only to install cable and/or conduit from the closest telephone closet to the visitor telephone sets.

145Q: **1.3 Overview** - The RFP overview identifies approximately 650 visitor handsets but does not provide inventory, equipment details and location by site. This will be necessary to determine replacement equipment and labor costs.

Can the State provide inventory and location details by site for the visitation phones? (Inventory must specify number of visitor stations and number and type of handsets for each station – i.e. will inmates be required to use a PIN which requires a key pad at the visitation stations)

145A: See revised Attachment 16. Specific visitation locations within a facility will be provided to the awarded vendor. The inmates will be required to use a PIN.

146Q: **1.3 Overview & 6.12 Visitor Telephone Service, 7.4 Visiting Area Telephone Sets**

Can the State provide floor plan details which provides vendors enough information to determine wiring configurations in order to tie visitation phones into recording equipment?

146A: Floor plans will be provided to the awarded vendor.

147Q: **2.10 Readiness of Offered Services – MANDATORY**

The RFP states “All equipment, systems and services proposed to the State through the vendor's deliverables must be available upon proposal issuance and called upon at contract award or the date the service is requested by the state.”

Can the State please clarify the intent of this requirement? Inmate telephone systems are capital extensive and require substantial telecommunications circuits both of which (generally) are not ordered until contract award. Does this requirement suggest the items must be “commercially available” or is there some other objective intended?

147A: The proposed service must be commercially available. It is understood that hardware and telecommunications circuits will need to be obtained from another provider.

148Q: **3.5.1 Emergency System Shut Down – MANDATORY**

The RFP States: “DOC requires the installation of a manual on/off switch for each facility that will disable inmate telephones in the entire facility. These switches must be located in a secured location that has been approved by the DOC Director of Security or designee.

Can the State elaborate of the specific details of what they want with this requirement?

148A: DOC requires manual switches that can be utilized to disable ALL phones in the event of a facility/statewide emergency.

**149Q: 3.5.1 Emergency System Shut Down – MANDATORY**

The RFP States: “DOC requires the installation of a manual on/off switch for each facility that will disable inmate telephones in the entire facility. These switches must be located in a secured location that has been approved by the DOC Director of Security or designee.

Is the wiring to all inmate phones within each facility currently terminated in a single location that would facilitate a single manual cut-off switch for all phones at that location?

149A: No.

**150Q: 3.5.1 Emergency System Shut Down – MANDATORY**

The RFP States: “DOC requires the installation of a manual on/off switch for each facility that will disable inmate telephones in the entire facility. These switches must be located in a secured location that has been approved by the DOC Director of Security or designee.

Can the State provide wiring diagrams that illustrate how each prison phones are configured in order to support this requirement?

150A: This information is unavailable.

**151Q: 3.5.1 Emergency System Shut Down – MANDATORY**

The RFP States: “DOC requires the installation of a manual on/off switch for each facility that will disable inmate telephones in the entire facility. These switches must be located in a secured location that has been approved by the DOC Director of Security or designee.

Are such switches currently installed at all locations?

151A: Yes.

**152Q: 3.5.2 Manual On/Off Switches Per Phone**

The RFP states: “DOC requires the installation of a manual on/off switch for each individual phone installed in a facility. These switches must be in a location(s) that has been approved by the DOC Director of Security or designee.”

Is the wiring to all inmate phones within each facility currently terminated in locations that would facilitate a single manual cut-off switch for each phone at that location?

152A: All inmate telephones go to the MDF room through various IDF rooms. DOC would not allow the switches to be installed in these locations as they are not assessable to staff

needing these switches. The switches must be installed and readily accessible to DOC staff in close proximity to the affected telephones.

**153Q: 3.5.2 Manual On/Off Switches Per Phone**

The RFP states: "DOC requires the installation of a manual on/off switch for each individual phone installed in a facility. These switches must be in a location(s) that has been approved by the DOC Director of Security or designee."

Can the State provide wiring diagrams that illustrate how each prison phones are configured in order to support this requirement?

153A: This information is unavailable.

**154Q: 3.5.2 Manual On/Off Switches Per Phone**

The RFP states: "DOC requires the installation of a manual on/off switch for each individual phone installed in a facility. These switches must be in a location(s) that has been approved by the DOC Director of Security or designee."

Are such switches currently installed at all locations?

154A: Yes.

**155Q: 2.6 Commercial Power Outages 5.5 Power Backups**

The RFP states: 2.6 "The solution must assure no loss of functions for up to 90 minutes loss of commercial power in the DOCs' facilities." 5.5 "The vendor shall provide four (4) hours UPS backup to for all vendor provided equipment. These requirements appear to contradict each other.

Can the state clarify which requirement is the actual UPS backup requirement?

155A: 90 minutes is sufficient.

**156Q: 11.3 Repair Priority Levels and Performance Requirements**

Per the RFP: "In the table below, DOC has defined repair priority levels along with its associated performance requirements. Knowing that this list is not all inclusive, DOC, at its discretion, may deem any repair as a priority 1, 2 or 3".

If the state has the ability to declare any small issue such as 1 out of service phone a priority 1, vendors will have no way to predict and anticipate repair and maintenance costs.

Would the State consider modifying the statement that “DOC, at its discretion may deem any repair as a priority 1,2, or 3” to “DOC may deem repairs that are rated as category 2 or 3 as more critical and request contractor to place additional attention and resources on such requests”.

156A: No but it is not the intent to deem everything as Priority 1.

**157Q: 3.11 Inmate Allowed Call List**

Per the RFP: “The current vendor processes approximately 1700 revisions monthly”  
Can the State clarify the current processing methods for the 1700 revisions?

157A: On a monthly basis, inmates are allowed to add or drop telephone numbers from their approved call lists. Today, this is done via ADD/DROP forms that are submitted by inmates to the facility and forwarded onto the current vendor for processing. The current vendor manually enters all add/drop changes into the system, thus updating the inmate’s allowed call list. Upon completion, the current vendor also provides DOC with a report listing the rejected telephone numbers along with the reason why the add was not completed.

**158Q: 3.11 Inmate Allowed Call List**

Per the RFP: “The current vendor processes approximately 1700 revisions monthly”  
Do inmates submit the 1700 changes all on the same day or is this a rolling dynamic process over the full 30 period each month?

158A: The State is divided up into three sections. Over a three week span, these forms are collected and forwarded to the current vendor.

**159Q: 3.11 Inmate Allowed Call List**

Per the RFP: “The current vendor processes approximately 1700 revisions monthly”  
Who is responsible for monitoring and enforcing adherence to the 30 day rule for ACL modifications by inmates?

159A: DOC is responsible.

**160Q: 3.11 Inmate Allowed Call List**

Per the RFP: “The current vendor processes approximately 1700 revisions monthly”  
If the selected vendor were to offer on-site PIN Administrative and ACL support, would the State provide office/work space for the administrator?

160A: No, at this time CT DOC can't accommodate this.

161Q: **5.1 Workstations**

The RFP includes a list of equipment the vendor must provide along with the work stations and that lists included a surge protector but no UPS.

Does the state require UPS power backup for the work stations and if so for what period of time?

161A: Yes, 90 minutes is sufficient.

162Q: **5.0 Call Monitoring Equipment**

The State indicates there are 30 existing work stations

Can the State provide an inventory of the quantity of work stations by site?

162A: Workstation current locations are as follows:

7 at Central Office

2 at Cheshire, Corrigan, Hartford, Northern, York

1 at Bergin, Bridgeport, Brooklyn, CRCI, Enfield Garner, Gates, MacDougall, Walker, Manson, New Haven, Osborn, Willard, Cybulski, Radgowski, Webster

Workstation locations and quantities are subject to change.

163Q: **5.4 Back up Call Recordings (Central Office)**

The RFP states: "vendor shall provide backup storage at DOC Central Offices that would back up all data and recording on a daily basis"

Would the State be willing to allow a centralized call processor to be placed in the DOC Central Office?

163A: A Centralized Call Processor may be acceptable if the DOC WAN (Wide Area Network) has sufficient bandwidth and provided that a backup Centralized Call Processor is provided for installation at the DOC DR site. There may be additional costs associated with providing necessary power and cooling. This concept could be beneficial and would need to be explored further.

164Q: **5.4 Back up Call Recordings (Central Office)**

The RFP states: "vendor shall provide backup storage at DOC Central Offices that would back up all data and recording on a daily basis"

Is there sufficient floor space for computer racks in the equipment room?



164A: The DOC Data Center has sufficient physical space. Any equipment would need to be installed in either an existing DOC cabinet (if available) or a new cabinet of the same type that the DOC is using in the DOC Data Center. Equipment power and cooling requirements also need to be considered. There may be additional costs associated with providing necessary power and cooling. Any storage systems need to adhere to the current State of Connecticut Enterprise Architecture (CTEA) standards. The disk storage systems currently allowed under CTEA are sold by EMC.

165Q: **6.6 Collect Calls – Mandatory**

Per the RFP – “All inmates calls will be “Collect Call Only”. This requirement appears to contradict the idea of pre-paid inmate calling accounts.

Would the State consider revising this statement to include language such as “All inmate calls will be Collect Call Only – to include traditional collect calls and prepaid collect calls”?

165A: No, a collect is defined as a telephone call in which the called party pays for the call. By definition, this includes traditional, prepaid, and direct remit.

166Q: **6.7 Discounted Pre-Paid Service**

Per the requirements for this service:

- The vendor must allow customers the option to revert to the non-discount rates after utilizing the discounted rate service

Vendors will have a difficult time knowing when a customer is just low or out of funds and plans to replenish and account, vs. when the customer wants to revert to higher rates and traditional collect calls.

Will the State consider removing this requirement?

166A: No.

167Q: **6.7 Discounted Pre-Paid Service**

Per the requirements for this service:

- The vendor must allow customers the option to revert to the non-discount rates after utilizing the discounted rate service

Vendors will have a difficult time knowing when a customer is just low or out of funds and plans to replenish and account, vs. when the customer wants to revert to higher rates and traditional collect calls.

If the State will not remove this requirement, will the State provide additional details and guidelines as to when and how a vendor will know that a pre-paid account holder intends to replenish a prepaid account vs. when that customer intends to revert to higher collect rates?

167A: If there is money in the pre-paid account, then the call must be completed at the discounted rate. Upon depletion of pre-paid fund, calls should be completed at the traditional call rate.

168Q: **6.7 Discounted Pre-Paid Service**

Per the requirements for this service:

- There will be no administrative fee for establishing or replenishing accounts

Observation; the State of Connecticut currently charges tax payers a 2.49% convenience fee for paying taxes using a credit card and a \$9 transaction fees for consumers reserving buses.

Will the State consider allowing vendors to charge convenience fees for the use of and/or recharging of funds to pre-paid accounts when customers use credit cards?

168A: No. The vendor shall not charge any fees except for those fees mandated to be billed to the called party by a regulatory government entity. DOC will allow outside agencies such as Western Union and MoneyGram to be used only for International billing. DOC understands that the fees from these outside agencies cannot be waived. DOC will not require vendors to disclose the fees charged by these agencies or their share.

169Q: **8 Wiring 8.4 Station Wiring**

Per the RFP: "The vendor must install all new inside wiring (at least Category 6) and conduit, where needed, in compliance...Per the RFP: " For initial conversion, new station wiring..."

Will the State please clarify this requirement? Does this suggest it is mandatory for vendors to replace all existing wiring and wire all telephones with new inside wiring or does it suggest that when and if additional wiring is required it must be at least Cat 6?

169A: Where needed, the vendor must install all new inside station wiring (at least Category 6) and conduit in compliance with the most current TIA/EIA Telecommunications Building Wiring Standards for the installation of all equipment. It is the awarded vendor's

responsibility only to install cable and/or conduit from the closest telephone closet to the visitor telephone sets.

**170Q: 9 Implementation 9.2**

Per the RFP: "DOC requires that vendor convert one DOC site at a time..." "Once the DOC... installation should begin at another facility..."

Observation: this process will extend the implementation/conversion time frame beyond industry typical conversion standards, increase cost and reduce revenues for the new vendor?

Would the State consider revising this requirement such that multiple sites could be under construction simultaneously but on one site will actually be converted at a time?

**170A:** For the first three sites being converted from the old system to the new, construction cannot happen simultaneously. Construction at an individual site will need to be fully completed, and then successfully activated, before moving onto the next site. It will be at DOC's discretion, as to whether or not the conversion of a site has been successfully activated or not, and the vendor must obtain DOC's approval, prior to moving onto the next site. After this conversion has occurred successfully at three consecutive sites, DOC will then evaluate the ease of conversion which occurred at these sites, and at that time, make a decision as to whether or not simultaneous construction will be allowed at future sites still needing to be converted. In addition, the old inmate phone service and/or telephones cannot be removed or deactivated at any DOC site, until conversion to the new service has been 100% successfully completed at that site.

**171Q: 9.2 Proposed Implementation Plan**

Per the RFP: "The vendor shall submit a proposed project plan in MS Project... This Plan must include at least the following elements:

- Implementation Plan
- Risk management and mitigation plan
- Acceptance test plan...

Can the State please clarify if you are expecting to receive these documents as part of the RFP submission process or is this a post contract award deliverable?

**171A:** We expect a proposed plan as part of the RFP submission. It is understood that this is a draft and subject to change.

**172Q: 2.2.16 Use of Subcontractors**

Requirement to deliver a copies of subcontracts to the CIO

Can the vendor assume that, in accordance the State's FOIA exemptions, that the vendor can redact cost information from such subcontract copies furnished to the CIO. The vendor's internal cost structure is highly proprietary and could cause great competitive harm if known by competitors.

**172A:** This is only for the successful vendor and the FOIA applies to the sub-contracting agreement as well. If this is confidential, please mark it as such in a separate envelope.

**173Q: 2.2.16 3 Use of Subcontractors**

Source Code

Can the vendors assume that the only source code being referred to is for software developed under this contract, separately and directly ordered, paid for, and, noting that many third party software manufacturers of pre-existing software (e.g., Microsoft, Oracle, etc.) will not provide source code under any circumstances, even into escrow.

**173A:** Yes.

**174Q:** Attach 1, item 3

Liquidated Damages

Liquidated Damages, as opposed to Actual Damages, are, by definition, arbitrary amounts, usually specifically set forth in contracts, which are a routine part of ensuring adherence to Service Level Agreements (SLA's) (e.g., an nominal fee imposed if a monthly report is delivered later than it is due). An example is RFP Attachment 5, Section 22.3 "Liquidated Damages". The vendors are not aware of any major Information Technology or Telecommunications provider that has not been subjected to such fees, on occasion (usually applied as a credit on a regular monthly invoice). Can this apparently disqualifying requirement be deleted, or converted to a more meaningful requirement, such as Actual Damages?

**174A:** No. You must answer accordingly. An affirmative answer may not disqualify a vendor.

**175Q:** Attach 5, Section 3

Purchase Order

Can the vendor assume the contractor would get a single Purchase Order with unspecified dollars (since the State is not paying the Contractor), incorporating the RFP and the vendor's Proposal by reference, unless there is a need for a special P.O. because there are special State needs not covered by the RFP or proposal, and which

the State would be paying for? Note that similar considerations apply throughout Section 3.

175A: The State will not be incorporating by referencing the RFP nor the vendor's responses to the RFP in the negotiated agreement nor in any resulting purchase order.

176Q: **Attach 5, Section 40**

Indemnification

Since the vendor considers its inability to bid on indemnity clauses, such as this cited clause, as proprietary, the vendor would appreciate it if the text below were not included in the Q&A discussion, and, instead, the vendor's question simply being reduced to, "Would the State, consider reasonable alternate suggestions for alternate indemnity and liability clauses, Attachment 5 discussions notwithstanding."

*Proprietary:*

The Indemnification requirement as written includes many items that are normally part of a standard indemnity clause. Standard indemnity clauses only cover bodily injury, death, and property damage (which, by statute, have no dollar limit). The vendor routinely covers such risks. Separate liability clauses normally address all other risks, and normally specify a limitation of liability, which are also no problem for the vendor.

Indemnity, however, is like auto insurance, which means the contractor has to pay, regardless of fault, and, as written in this RFP, regardless of the fault of the State! The Contractor, then, to make itself as whole as possible by pursuing those whose fault it really is, but with no sharing of liability with the State. Putting all risks in an indemnity clause, therefore, makes the contractor responsible for all of the risks, and all of the legal expenses associated all of the above, and for defending the State, regardless of the contractor's actual fault. This means, as stated, putting the entire corporation at ruinous risk, which is something a large publically held corporation simply cannot responsibly do. It is also is something that is simply not practical to insure against (The vendor is advised by its insurance companies, that, in general, the necessary policy to cover such risks for a large corporation, *for just this contract*, in addition to its substantial regular coverage, would cost the vendor an additional \$1,000,000, *annually*). This seems to be a serious, unfair, unreasonable, and overreaching by the State, and the vendor simply cannot bid on this opportunity, if this potentially ruinous risk is not substantially reduced. On the other hand, the vendor would like to know if State allow the offeror to offer industry and government standard indemnity and liability clauses for consideration, in advance of the proposal due date. Reference: *The ABA Model Procurement Code for State and Local Governments*.

A176: These issues will be addressed with the successful vendor during the negotiation process.

177Q: Are all of the communication lines on the facilities' grounds owned or leased, the wires underneath?

177A: The cabling is owned by the State. The voice circuits (network facilities) connected to the Inmate Telephone Service are provided by the current vendor at no cost.

178Q: Within the bid it is stated that there will be a specific number of points and specific categories for evaluations, and that prior to the evaluation, the State will determine what the point categories will be. Can the vendors receive a copy of that? Can the vendors be informed of what the specific evaluation criteria will be for each category prior to the bid submission?

178A: The answer to both questions is no.

179Q: It is stated that the State will evaluate the proposed commission and proposed rates among other factors within the RFP. The State also requests a secondary proposal for a zero commission with a rate. How will that be evaluated on the grand scope of things or will it be evaluated?

179A: The details of the evaluation will not be disclosed at this time.

180Q: Is it acceptable to respond with what the vendor sees as an agreement that coincides with what the standard agreement is, but customize to what the vendors think would be appropriate in a master agreement?

180A: No, issues contained in Attachment 5 will be addressed with the successful vendor during the negotiation process.

**ATTACHMENT 16 – DOC FACILITY PROFILE (REVISED)**

The following table is a complete list of DOC's current locations including DOC Central Office, Correctional Institutions, and Correctional Centers (Intake Facilities). Be advised that the number of Inmates does fluctuate, facilities may open and close and the quantity of inmate phones may also change over the life of the resulting contract.

DOC Facility / Main Telephone Number	Security Level	Intake Facility	Implementation Plan Order	Number of Inmates (As of 7/1/10)	Qty of Inmate Phones	Estimated Wiring for Inmate Phones (# of Feet)	Qty of Visitor Phones **	Estimated Wiring for Visitor Phones (# of Feet)
<b>DOC Central Office</b> 24 Wolcott Hill Rd, Wethersfield, CT 06109 (860) 692-7480	n/a	No	1	n/a	0	0	0	0
<b>Bergin Correctional Institution</b> 251 Middle Turnpike Storrs, CT 06268 (860) 487-2712	2	No	5	1,009	57	12,550	0	0
<b>Bridgeport Correctional Center</b> 1106 North Avenue Bridgeport, CT 06604 (203) 579-6131	4	Yes	3	963	79	32,723	124	10,907
<b>Brooklyn Correctional Institution</b> 59 Hartford Road Brooklyn, CT 06234 (860) 779-4500	3	No	6	456	30	12,480	18	2,160
<b>Cheshire Correctional Institution</b> 900 Highland Avenue Cheshire, CT 06410 (203) 651-6100	4	No	17	1,491	183	69,363	80	23,121
<b>Corrigan Correctional Center</b> 986 Norwich-New London Tpke Uncasville, CT 06382 (860) 848-5700	3 & 4	Yes	20	1,525	107	14,880	80	8,000
<b>Cybulski Correctional Institution</b> 264 Bilton Road Somers, CT 06071 (860) 763-6500	2	No	12	included with Willard	30	2,340	0	0
<b>Enfield Correctional Institution</b> 289 Shaker Road Enfield, CT 06082 (860) 763-7300	3	No	13	725	36	2,910	0	0
<b>Garner Correctional Institution</b> 50 Nunnawauk Road Newtown, CT 06470 (203) 270-2800	4	No	2	622	60	7,320	32	2,440
<b>Gates Correctional Institution</b> 131 North Bridebrook Road Niantic, CT 06357 (860) 691-4700	2	No	22	883	69	6,978	0	0
<b>Hartford Correctional Center</b> 177 Weston Street Hartford, CT 06120 (860) 240-1800	4	Yes	7	1,134	114	14,100	108	11,900
<b>John Dempsey Hospital (UCONN)</b> 263 Farmington Avenue Farmington, CT 06030 (860) 679-2000	n/a	No	8	medical only	2	250	0	0
<b>MacDougall Correctional Institution</b> 1153 East Street, South Suffield, CT 06080 (860) 627-2100	5	No	9	2,124	113	12,724	36	6,892

State of Connecticut, Department of Information Technology  
Request for Proposals  
Inmate Telephone Service

DOC Facility / Main Telephone Number	Security Level	Intake Facility	Implementation Plan Order	Number of Inmates (As of 7/1/10)	Qty of Inmate Phones	Estimated Wiring for Inmate Phones (# of Feet)	Qty of Visitor Phones **	Estimated Wiring for Visitor Phones (# of Feet)
<b>Manson Youth Institution</b> 42 Jarvis Street Cheshire, CT 06410 (203) 806-2500	4	Yes	18	630	61	11,697	58	3,898
<b>New Haven Correctional Center</b> 245 Whalley Avenue New Haven, CT 06511 (203) 974-4111	4	Yes	4	803	72	34,050	26	11,350
<b>Northern Correctional Institution</b> 287 Bilton Road Somers, CT 06071 (860) 763-8600	5	No	15	356	30	9,000	64	4,800
<b>Osborn Correctional Institution</b> 335 Bilton Road Somers, CT 06071 (860) 814-4600	3	No	14	1,954	94	29,810	16	3,600
<b>Radgowski Correctional Center</b> 982 Norwich-New London Tpke Uncasville, CT 06382 (860) 848-5700	3 & 4	Yes	21	included with Corrigan	38	18,268	64	4,893
<b>Robinson Correctional Institution</b> 285 Shaker Road Enfield, CT 06082 (860) 253-8000	3	No	16	1,478	70	5,160	26	2,080
<b>Walker RSMU</b> 1151 East Street, South Suffield, CT 06080 (860) 292-3400	4	No	10	included with MacDougall	26	4,838	22	1,612
<b>Webster Correctional Institution</b> (closed in 1/2010) 111 Jarvis Street Cheshire, CT 06410 (203) 271-5900	2	No	19	facility closed: annex included with Cheshire	34	4,750	0	0
<b>Willard Correctional Institution</b> 391 Shaker Road Enfield, CT 06082 (860) 763-6100	2	No	11	1,160	28	3,955	0	0
<b>York-East Correctional Institution *</b> 199 West Main Street Niantic, CT 06357 (860) 739-5413	2-5	Yes	23	included with York-West	included with York-West	included with York-West	included with York-West	included with York-West
<b>York-West Correctional Institution *</b> 201 West Main Street Niantic, CT 06357 (860) 691-6700	2-5	Yes	24	1,118	146	13,420	8	640
<b>TOTALS:</b>				<b>18,431</b>	<b>1,479</b>	<b>323,566</b>	<b>762</b>	<b>98,293</b>

\* Actually 2 DOC Facilities (York-East and York-West) reported as one

\*\* Visitor Phone totals include the phones on both sides of the glass.  
The number given is the total number of phones needed for visitation purposes.





Connecticut DOC

Run Date: 02/04/2010

Monthly Commission Payment Summary

January 2010

12/26/09 to 1/25/10

Connecticut DOC (ZZCTDOC)

Site	Revenue	Commission Payment
CT_DOC-Bergin Correctional Institution	\$60,654.57	\$27,294.56
CT_DOC-Bridgeport Correctional Center	\$41,953.33	\$18,879.00
CT_DOC-Brooklyn Correctional Institution	\$17,780.08	\$8,001.04
CT_DOC-Cheshire Correctional Institution	\$41,928.18	\$18,867.68
CT_DOC-Corrigan Correctional Institution	\$27,436.81	\$12,346.56
CT_DOC-Cybulski Correctional Institution	\$31,441.49	\$14,148.67
CT_DOC-Enfield Correctional Institution	\$39,248.70	\$17,661.92
CT_DOC-Garner Correctional Institution	\$19,050.24	\$8,572.61
CT_DOC-Gates Correctional Institution	\$47,719.99	\$21,474.00
CT_DOC-Hartford Correctional Center	\$30,106.58	\$13,547.96
CT_DOC-John Dempsey Hospital	\$222.75	\$100.24
CT_DOC-MacDougall Correctional	\$49,845.64	\$22,430.54
CT_DOC-Manson Youth Institution	\$17,921.81	\$8,064.81
CT_DOC-New Haven Correctional Center	\$25,715.31	\$11,571.89
CT_DOC-Northern Correctional Institution	\$3,209.64	\$1,444.34
CT_DOC-Osborn Correctional Institution	\$57,342.22	\$25,804.00
CT_DOC-Radgowski Correctional	\$35,703.35	\$16,066.51
CT_DOC-Robinson Correctional Institution	\$79,209.57	\$35,644.31
CT_DOC-Walker Reception/Management Unit	\$26,092.87	\$11,741.79
CT_DOC-Webster Correctional Institution	\$5,824.08	\$2,620.84
CT_DOC-Willard Correctional Institution	\$19,991.83	\$8,996.32
CT_DOC-York Correctional Institution	\$46,425.27	\$20,891.37
<b>Contract Totals:</b>	<b>\$724,824.31</b>	<b>\$326,170.94</b>



Connecticut DOC

Monthly Commission Payment Summary

Run Date: 03/04/2010

February 2010

1/26/10 to 2/25/10

Connecticut DOC (ZZCTDOC)

Site	Revenue	Commission Payment
CT_DOC-Bergin Correctional Institution	\$76,210.19	\$34,294.59
CT_DOC-Bridgeport Correctional Center	\$46,576.18	\$20,959.28
CT_DOC-Brooklyn Correctional Institution	\$18,880.18	\$8,496.08
CT_DOC-Cheshire Correctional Institution	\$43,740.01	\$19,683.00
CT_DOC-Corrigan Correctional Institution	\$26,947.98	\$12,126.59
CT_DOC-Cybulski Correctional Institution	\$34,193.95	\$15,387.28
CT_DOC-Enfield Correctional Institution	\$39,645.15	\$17,840.32
CT_DOC-Garner Correctional Institution	\$20,032.61	\$9,014.67
CT_DOC-Gates Correctional Institution	\$49,196.85	\$22,138.58
CT_DOC-Hartford Correctional Center	\$32,739.82	\$14,732.92
CT_DOC-John Dempsey Hospital	\$113.14	\$50.91
CT_DOC-MacDougall Correctional	\$56,447.11	\$25,401.20
CT_DOC-Manson Youth Institution	\$19,724.85	\$8,876.18
CT_DOC-New Haven Correctional Center	\$27,937.58	\$12,571.91
CT_DOC-Northern Correctional Institution	\$3,629.51	\$1,633.28
CT_DOC-Osborn Correctional Institution	\$59,530.04	\$26,788.52
CT_DOC-Radgowski Correctional	\$32,839.05	\$14,777.57
CT_DOC-Robinson Correctional Institution	\$82,271.49	\$37,022.17
CT_DOC-Walker Reception/Management Unit	\$34,021.98	\$15,309.89
CT_DOC-Webster Correctional Institution	\$6,064.47	\$2,729.01
CT_DOC-Willard Correctional Institution	\$17,787.61	\$8,004.42
CT_DOC-York Correctional Institution	\$49,098.95	\$22,094.53
<b>Contract Totals:</b>	<b>\$777,628.70</b>	<b>\$349,932.92</b>



Connecticut DOC

Monthly Commission Payment Summary

Run Date: 04/04/2010

March 2010

2/26/10 to 3/25/10

Connecticut DOC (ZZCTDOC)

Site	Revenue	Commission Payment
CT_DOC-Bergin Correctional Institution	\$73,232.42	\$32,954.59
CT_DOC-Bridgeport Correctional Center	\$39,883.89	\$17,947.75
CT_DOC-Brooklyn Correctional Institution	\$17,104.24	\$7,696.91
CT_DOC-Cheshire Correctional Institution	\$40,949.59	\$18,427.32
CT_DOC-Corrigan Correctional Institution	\$25,260.79	\$11,367.36
CT_DOC-Cybulski Correctional Institution	\$35,046.17	\$15,770.78
CT_DOC-Enfield Correctional Institution	\$37,063.36	\$16,678.51
CT_DOC-Garner Correctional Institution	\$16,126.49	\$7,256.92
CT_DOC-Gates Correctional Institution	\$45,986.72	\$20,694.02
CT_DOC-Hartford Correctional Center	\$27,523.34	\$12,385.50
CT_DOC-John Dempsey Hospital	\$140.74	\$63.33
CT_DOC-MacDougall Correctional	\$49,445.91	\$22,250.66
CT_DOC-Manson Youth Institution	\$16,986.86	\$7,644.09
CT_DOC-New Haven Correctional Center	\$27,107.59	\$12,198.42
CT_DOC-Northern Correctional Institution	\$3,873.72	\$1,743.17
CT_DOC-Osborn Correctional Institution	\$54,177.06	\$24,379.68
CT_DOC-Radgowski Correctional	\$32,224.38	\$14,500.97
CT_DOC-Robinson Correctional Institution	\$75,955.84	\$34,180.13
CT_DOC-Walker Reception/Management Unit	\$31,780.51	\$14,301.23
CT_DOC-Webster Correctional Institution	\$6,044.88	\$2,720.20
CT_DOC-Willard Correctional Institution	\$17,128.16	\$7,707.67
CT_DOC-York Correctional Institution	\$43,894.99	\$19,752.75
<b>Contract Totals:</b>	<b>\$716,937.65</b>	<b>\$322,621.94</b>



Connecticut DOC

Monthly Commission Payment Summary

Run Date: 05/04/2010

April 2010

3/26/10 to 4/25/10

Connecticut DOC (ZZCTDOC)

Site	Revenue	Commission Payment
CT_DOC-Bergin Correctional Institution	\$80,006.74	\$36,003.03
CT_DOC-Bridgeport Correctional Center	\$43,455.66	\$19,555.05
CT_DOC-Brooklyn Correctional Institution	\$20,611.62	\$9,275.23
CT_DOC-Cheshire Correctional Institution	\$48,342.80	\$21,754.26
CT_DOC-Corrigan Correctional Institution	\$22,976.41	\$10,339.38
CT_DOC-Cybulski Correctional Institution	\$43,245.59	\$19,460.52
CT_DOC-Enfield Correctional Institution	\$38,112.05	\$17,150.42
CT_DOC-Garner Correctional Institution	\$18,016.92	\$8,107.61
CT_DOC-Gates Correctional Institution	\$54,004.51	\$24,302.03
CT_DOC-Hartford Correctional Center	\$32,749.78	\$14,737.40
CT_DOC-John Dempsey Hospital	\$462.05	\$207.92
CT_DOC-MacDougall Correctional	\$54,931.30	\$24,719.09
CT_DOC-Manson Youth Institution	\$20,598.06	\$9,269.13
CT_DOC-New Haven Correctional Center	\$28,002.00	\$12,600.90
CT_DOC-Northern Correctional Institution	\$3,737.41	\$1,681.83
CT_DOC-Osborn Correctional Institution	\$58,634.08	\$26,385.34
CT_DOC-Radgowski Correctional	\$35,375.09	\$15,918.79
CT_DOC-Robinson Correctional Institution	\$77,042.64	\$34,669.19
CT_DOC-Walker Reception/Management Unit	\$34,031.49	\$15,314.17
CT_DOC-Webster Correctional Institution	\$6,543.47	\$2,944.56
CT_DOC-Willard Correctional Institution	\$21,964.23	\$9,883.90
CT_DOC-York Correctional Institution	\$44,069.94	\$19,831.47
<b>Contract Totals:</b>	<b>\$786,913.84</b>	<b>\$354,111.23</b>



Connecticut DOC

Monthly Commission Payment Summary

Run Date: 06/04/2010

May 2010

4/26/10 to 5/25/10

Connecticut DOC (ZZCTDOC)

Site	Revenue	Commission Payment
CT_DOC-Bergin Correctional Institution	\$76,778.27	\$34,550.22
CT_DOC-Bridgeport Correctional Center	\$41,515.74	\$18,682.08
CT_DOC-Brooklyn Correctional Institution	\$19,069.05	\$8,581.07
CT_DOC-Cheshire Correctional Institution	\$44,369.14	\$19,966.11
CT_DOC-Corrigan Correctional Institution	\$21,005.90	\$9,452.66
CT_DOC-Cybulski Correctional Institution	\$42,093.24	\$18,941.96
CT_DOC-Enfield Correctional Institution	\$34,166.58	\$15,374.96
CT_DOC-Garner Correctional Institution	\$20,368.95	\$9,166.03
CT_DOC-Gates Correctional Institution	\$48,203.48	\$21,691.57
CT_DOC-Hartford Correctional Center	\$36,317.34	\$16,342.80
CT_DOC-John Dempsey Hospital	\$78.68	\$35.41
CT_DOC-MacDougall Correctional	\$56,331.99	\$25,349.40
CT_DOC-Manson Youth Institution	\$17,392.48	\$7,826.62
CT_DOC-New Haven Correctional Center	\$25,897.67	\$11,653.95
CT_DOC-Northern Correctional Institution	\$3,414.23	\$1,536.40
CT_DOC-Osborn Correctional Institution	\$55,839.76	\$25,127.89
CT_DOC-Radgowski Correctional	\$35,102.92	\$15,796.31
CT_DOC-Robinson Correctional Institution	\$71,566.86	\$32,205.09
CT_DOC-Walker Reception/Management Unit	\$33,486.99	\$15,069.15
CT_DOC-Webster Correctional Institution	\$5,542.70	\$2,494.22
CT_DOC-Willard Correctional Institution	\$20,812.64	\$9,365.69
CT_DOC-York Correctional Institution	\$47,574.81	\$21,408.66
<b>Contract Totals:</b>	\$756,929.42	\$340,618.24



Connecticut DOC

Run Date: 07/04/2010

June 2010

5/26/10 to 6/25/10

Monthly Commission Payment Summary

Connecticut DOC (ZZCTDOC)

Site	Revenue	Commission Payment
CT_DOC-Bergin Correctional Institution	\$78,201.62	\$35,190.73
CT_DOC-Bridgeport Correctional Center	\$36,896.65	\$16,603.49
CT_DOC-Brooklyn Correctional Institution	\$19,318.52	\$8,693.33
CT_DOC-Cheshire Correctional Institution	\$46,048.80	\$20,721.96
CT_DOC-Corrigan Correctional Institution	\$25,513.45	\$11,481.05
CT_DOC-Cybulski Correctional Institution	\$38,334.86	\$17,250.69
CT_DOC-Enfield Correctional Institution	\$35,029.55	\$15,763.30
CT_DOC-Garner Correctional Institution	\$19,356.32	\$8,710.34
CT_DOC-Gates Correctional Institution	\$46,255.32	\$20,814.89
CT_DOC-Hartford Correctional Center	\$31,794.18	\$14,307.38
CT_DOC-John Dempsey Hospital	\$96.54	\$43.44
CT_DOC-MacDougall Correctional	\$54,001.86	\$24,300.84
CT_DOC-Manson Youth Institution	\$17,990.92	\$8,095.91
CT_DOC-New Haven Correctional Center	\$25,538.65	\$11,492.39
CT_DOC-Northern Correctional Institution	\$3,543.99	\$1,594.80
CT_DOC-Osborn Correctional Institution	\$55,109.12	\$24,799.10
CT_DOC-Radgowski Correctional	\$35,325.62	\$15,896.53
CT_DOC-Robinson Correctional Institution	\$76,569.13	\$34,456.11
CT_DOC-Walker Reception/Management Unit	\$35,048.00	\$15,771.60
CT_DOC-Webster Correctional Institution	\$6,075.69	\$2,734.06
CT_DOC-Willard Correctional Institution	\$20,207.67	\$9,093.45
CT_DOC-York Correctional Institution	\$45,097.64	\$20,293.94
<b>Contract Totals:</b>	<b>\$751,354.10</b>	<b>\$338,109.35</b>



Connecticut DOC

Monthly Commission Payment Summary

Run Date: 08/04/2010

July 2010

6/26/10 to 7/25/10

Connecticut DOC (ZZCTDOC)

Site	Revenue	Commission Payment
CT_DOC-Bergin Correctional Institution	\$70,751.37	\$31,838.12
CT_DOC-Bridgeport Correctional Center	\$36,915.19	\$16,611.84
CT_DOC-Brooklyn Correctional Institution	\$19,231.68	\$8,654.26
CT_DOC-Cheshire Correctional Institution	\$40,904.27	\$18,406.92
CT_DOC-Corrigan Correctional Institution	\$23,120.63	\$10,404.28
CT_DOC-Cybulski Correctional Institution	\$33,845.81	\$15,230.61
CT_DOC-Enfield Correctional Institution	\$29,785.37	\$13,403.42
CT_DOC-Garner Correctional Institution	\$17,282.59	\$7,777.17
CT_DOC-Gates Correctional Institution	\$46,129.91	\$20,758.46
CT_DOC-Hartford Correctional Center	\$30,232.03	\$13,604.41
CT_DOC-John Dempsey Hospital	\$209.92	\$94.46
CT_DOC-MacDougall Correctional	\$50,841.91	\$22,878.86
CT_DOC-Manson Youth Institution	\$17,840.34	\$8,028.15
CT_DOC-New Haven Correctional Center	\$21,766.02	\$9,794.71
CT_DOC-Northern Correctional Institution	\$3,845.79	\$1,730.61
CT_DOC-Osborn Correctional Institution	\$52,240.94	\$23,508.42
CT_DOC-Radgowski Correctional	\$31,999.44	\$14,399.75
CT_DOC-Robinson Correctional Institution	\$66,092.53	\$29,741.64
CT_DOC-Walker Reception/Management Unit	\$30,737.10	\$13,831.70
CT_DOC-Webster Correctional Institution	\$5,080.14	\$2,286.06
CT_DOC-Willard Correctional Institution	\$18,599.91	\$8,369.96
CT_DOC-York Correctional Institution	\$41,823.27	\$18,820.47
<b>Contract Totals:</b>	<b>\$689,276.16</b>	<b>\$310,174.27</b>



Connecticut DOC

Run Date: 09/04/2010

August 2010

7/26/10 to 8/25/10

Monthly Commission Payment Summary

Connecticut DOC (ZZCTDOC)

Site	Revenue	Commission Payment
CT_DOC-Bergin Correctional Institution	\$66,150.37	\$29,767.67
CT_DOC-Bridgeport Correctional Center	\$38,490.15	\$17,320.57
CT_DOC-Brooklyn Correctional Institution	\$18,653.43	\$8,394.04
CT_DOC-Cheshire Correctional Institution	\$40,953.93	\$18,429.27
CT_DOC-Corrigan Correctional Institution	\$23,619.70	\$10,628.87
CT_DOC-Cybulski Correctional Institution	\$29,290.21	\$13,180.59
CT_DOC-Enfield Correctional Institution	\$32,659.48	\$14,696.77
CT_DOC-Garner Correctional Institution	\$18,433.52	\$8,295.08
CT_DOC-Gates Correctional Institution	\$43,466.73	\$19,560.03
CT_DOC-Hartford Correctional Center	\$31,565.76	\$14,204.59
CT_DOC-John Dempsey Hospital	\$537.02	\$241.66
CT_DOC-MacDougall Correctional	\$47,282.74	\$21,277.23
CT_DOC-Manson Youth Institution	\$14,987.99	\$6,744.60
CT_DOC-New Haven Correctional Center	\$23,964.77	\$10,784.15
CT_DOC-Northern Correctional Institution	\$4,317.17	\$1,942.73
CT_DOC-Osborn Correctional Institution	\$48,741.10	\$21,933.50
CT_DOC-Radgowski Correctional	\$34,632.33	\$15,584.55
CT_DOC-Robinson Correctional Institution	\$65,168.47	\$29,325.81
CT_DOC-Walker Reception/Management Unit	\$31,512.93	\$14,180.82
CT_DOC-Webster Correctional Institution	\$5,144.14	\$2,314.86
CT_DOC-Willard Correctional Institution	\$16,131.07	\$7,258.98
CT_DOC-York Correctional Institution	\$43,805.30	\$19,712.39
<b>Contract Totals:</b>	<b>\$679,508.31</b>	<b>\$305,778.74</b>





Connecticut DOC

Run Date: 10/04/2010

September 2010

8/26/10 to 9/25/10

Monthly Commission Payment Summary

Connecticut DOC (ZZCTDOC)

Site	Revenue	Commission Payment
CT_DOC-Bergin Correctional Institution	\$61,073.16	\$27,482.92
CT_DOC-Bridgeport Correctional Center	\$37,211.79	\$16,745.31
CT_DOC-Brooklyn Correctional Institution	\$18,846.93	\$8,481.12
CT_DOC-Cheshire Correctional Institution	\$37,321.61	\$16,794.72
CT_DOC-Corrigan Correctional Institution	\$25,258.84	\$11,366.48
CT_DOC-Cybulski Correctional Institution	\$32,666.27	\$14,699.82
CT_DOC-Enfield Correctional Institution	\$32,287.07	\$14,529.18
CT_DOC-Garner Correctional Institution	\$20,005.17	\$9,002.33
CT_DOC-Gates Correctional Institution	\$39,309.79	\$17,689.41
CT_DOC-Hartford Correctional Center	\$30,413.54	\$13,686.09
CT_DOC-John Dempsey Hospital	\$59.63	\$26.83
CT_DOC-MacDougall Correctional	\$40,011.99	\$18,005.40
CT_DOC-Manson Youth Institution	\$14,592.59	\$6,566.67
CT_DOC-New Haven Correctional Center	\$26,088.14	\$11,739.66
CT_DOC-Northern Correctional Institution	\$2,833.75	\$1,275.19
CT_DOC-Osborn Correctional Institution	\$53,139.48	\$23,912.77
CT_DOC-Radgowski Correctional	\$33,910.25	\$15,259.61
CT_DOC-Robinson Correctional Institution	\$66,461.03	\$29,907.46
CT_DOC-Walker Reception/Management Unit	\$27,545.72	\$12,395.57
CT_DOC-Webster Correctional Institution	\$5,050.81	\$2,272.86
CT_DOC-Willard Correctional Institution	\$17,537.20	\$7,891.74
CT_DOC-York Correctional Institution	\$42,488.83	\$19,119.97
<b>Contract Totals:</b>	<b>\$664,113.59</b>	<b>\$298,851.12</b>



Connecticut DOC

Run Date: 11/04/2010

October 2010

9/26/10 to 10/25/10

Monthly Commission Payment Summary

Connecticut DOC (ZZCTDOC)

Site	Revenue	Commission Payment
CT_DOC-Bergin Correctional Institution	\$64,965.38	\$29,234.42
CT_DOC-Bridgeport Correctional Center	\$34,628.81	\$15,582.96
CT_DOC-Brooklyn Correctional Institution	\$19,411.83	\$8,735.32
CT_DOC-Cheshire Correctional Institution	\$40,559.97	\$18,251.99
CT_DOC-Corrigan Correctional Institution	\$22,518.05	\$10,133.12
CT_DOC-Cybulski Correctional Institution	\$31,166.52	\$14,024.93
CT_DOC-Enfield Correctional Institution	\$32,852.96	\$14,783.83
CT_DOC-Garner Correctional Institution	\$17,740.98	\$7,983.44
CT_DOC-Gates Correctional Institution	\$39,343.50	\$17,704.58
CT_DOC-Hartford Correctional Center	\$29,910.70	\$13,459.82
CT_DOC-John Dempsey Hospital	\$143.16	\$64.42
CT_DOC-MacDougall Correctional	\$46,791.58	\$21,056.21
CT_DOC-Manson Youth Institution	\$15,996.92	\$7,198.61
CT_DOC-New Haven Correctional Center	\$24,926.24	\$11,216.81
CT_DOC-Northern Correctional Institution	\$3,760.57	\$1,692.26
CT_DOC-Osborn Correctional Institution	\$52,311.22	\$23,540.05
CT_DOC-Radgowski Correctional	\$32,310.35	\$14,539.66
CT_DOC-Robinson Correctional Institution	\$67,629.38	\$30,433.22
CT_DOC-Walker Reception/Management Unit	\$30,252.66	\$13,613.70
CT_DOC-Webster Correctional Institution	\$5,669.76	\$2,551.39
CT_DOC-Willard Correctional Institution	\$19,046.45	\$8,570.90
CT_DOC-York Correctional Institution	\$38,221.86	\$17,199.84
<b>Contract Totals:</b>	<b>\$670,158.85</b>	<b>\$301,571.48</b>



Connecticut DOC

Run Date: 12/04/2010

November 2010

10/26/10 to 11/25/10

Monthly Commission Payment Summary

Connecticut DOC (ZZCTDOC)

Site	Revenue	Commission Payment
CT_DOC-Bergin Correctional Institution	\$66,610.33	\$29,974.65
CT_DOC-Bridgeport Correctional Center	\$33,565.77	\$15,104.60
CT_DOC-Brooklyn Correctional Institution	\$19,991.69	\$8,996.26
CT_DOC-Cheshire Correctional Institution	\$44,355.60	\$19,960.02
CT_DOC-Corrigan Correctional Institution	\$22,975.14	\$10,338.81
CT_DOC-Cybulski Correctional Institution	\$35,929.36	\$16,168.21
CT_DOC-Enfield Correctional Institution	\$37,899.77	\$17,054.90
CT_DOC-Garner Correctional Institution	\$18,432.16	\$8,294.47
CT_DOC-Gates Correctional Institution	\$42,161.38	\$18,972.62
CT_DOC-Hartford Correctional Center	\$31,464.39	\$14,158.98
CT_DOC-John Dempsey Hospital	\$177.12	\$79.70
CT_DOC-MacDougall Correctional	\$49,025.17	\$22,061.33
CT_DOC-Manson Youth Institution	\$19,494.96	\$8,772.73
CT_DOC-New Haven Correctional Center	\$23,616.68	\$10,627.51
CT_DOC-Northern Correctional Institution	\$4,311.77	\$1,940.30
CT_DOC-Osborn Correctional Institution	\$56,314.55	\$25,341.55
CT_DOC-Radgowski Correctional	\$39,342.45	\$17,704.10
CT_DOC-Robinson Correctional Institution	\$75,641.07	\$34,038.48
CT_DOC-Walker Reception/Management Unit	\$30,219.07	\$13,598.58
CT_DOC-Webster Correctional Institution	\$6,871.34	\$3,092.10
CT_DOC-Willard Correctional Institution	\$17,425.11	\$7,841.30
CT_DOC-York Correctional Institution	\$40,996.54	\$18,448.44
<b>Contract Totals:</b>	<b>\$716,821.42</b>	<b>\$322,569.64</b>



Connecticut DOC

Run Date: 01/04/2011

December 2010

11/26/10 to 12/25/10

Monthly Commission Payment Summary

Connecticut DOC (ZZCTDOC)

Site	Revenue	Commission Payment
CT_DOC-Bergin Correctional Institution	\$62,310.86	\$28,039.89
CT_DOC-Bridgeport Correctional Center	\$34,480.95	\$15,516.43
CT_DOC-Brooklyn Correctional Institution	\$19,519.73	\$8,783.88
CT_DOC-Cheshire Correctional Institution	\$39,044.13	\$17,569.86
CT_DOC-Corrigan Correctional Institution	\$23,221.77	\$10,449.80
CT_DOC-Cybulski Correctional Institution	\$34,966.37	\$15,734.87
CT_DOC-Enfield Correctional Institution	\$41,623.29	\$18,730.48
CT_DOC-Garner Correctional Institution	\$21,456.87	\$9,655.59
CT_DOC-Gates Correctional Institution	\$44,094.53	\$19,842.54
CT_DOC-Hartford Correctional Center	\$32,701.04	\$14,715.47
CT_DOC-John Dempsey Hospital	\$181.56	\$81.70
CT_DOC-MacDougall Correctional	\$47,595.54	\$21,417.99
CT_DOC-Manson Youth Institution	\$16,714.16	\$7,521.37
CT_DOC-New Haven Correctional Center	\$24,670.51	\$11,101.73
CT_DOC-Northern Correctional Institution	\$3,388.81	\$1,524.96
CT_DOC-Osborn Correctional Institution	\$53,157.12	\$23,920.70
CT_DOC-Radgowski Correctional	\$38,136.17	\$17,161.28
CT_DOC-Robinson Correctional Institution	\$74,985.54	\$33,743.49
CT_DOC-Walker Reception/Management Unit	\$27,764.35	\$12,493.96
CT_DOC-Webster Correctional Institution	\$6,288.20	\$2,829.69
CT_DOC-Willard Correctional Institution	\$18,158.25	\$8,171.21
CT_DOC-York Correctional Institution	\$44,749.27	\$20,137.17
<b>Contract Totals:</b>	<b>\$709,209.02</b>	<b>\$319,144.06</b>