

Amendment 5 - 09/12/2024

This Amendment #5 is being issued to amend and clarify certain information contained in the above referenced RFP. All information contained herein is binding on all Offerors who respond to this RFP. Specific parts of the RFP have been amended. The changes/additions are listed below. New language has been underlined and marked in bold (i.e., **word**), and deleted language has been marked with a strikeout (i.e., ~~word~~).

Amendment 5 - 09/12/2024

	RFP Reference Number	RFP Page Number	Question	Response
101.	2.2.2.2.B	4	<p>Section 2.2.2.2.(B) of the RFP provides that Racetrax is a monitor game and that it must be supplied by the Contractor under the awarded contract. Section 6.2.1(A) of the RFP provides that monitor games generally, and Racetrax specifically, are Level 1 Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria. We understand that Racetrax is owned by TabCorp International Pty Ltd. (“TabCorp”) and that the MGCLA is not party to the current license agreement by which TabCorp licenses use of Racetrax in Maryland. We further understand that Racetrax is made available to the MGCLA by the MGCLA’s current lottery provider that holds a direct license from TabCorp.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is TabCorp’s licensing of Racetrax to the incumbent lottery provider an exclusive arrangement, meaning that no other Offeror can obtain a license for, or otherwise have access to, Racetrax? If so, how can Offerors other than the incumbent lottery provider be expected to comply with RFP Section 2.2.2.2.(B)? 2. If TabCorp will not license Racetrax to any Offeror other than the incumbent lottery provider, would the MLGCA amend RFP Section 2.2.2.2.(B) to delete the requirement that the selected Contractor must supply Racetrax under the awarded contract? If not, what will the MLGCA do to eliminate the unfair competitive advantage the RFP, as presently drafted, confers upon the incumbent lottery provider, given the current requirements of RFP 2.2.2.2.(B) and the significance of Level 1 Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The MLGCA is not a party to the agreement and is unable to advise whether the agreement is exclusive. If the Offeror is unable to provide the current Racetrax game, a comparable horse racing monitor game is required that will appeal to our players. 2. Since Racetrax is the product currently offered by the MLGCA, that is the name we use to refer to our horse racing game. If the Offeror is unable to provide the current Racetrax game they must offer a comparable horse racing monitor game that will appeal to our players. The game proposed should be described, in detail, in response to 5.3.2.4.D. <p>The RFP will be amended to reflect that Offerors may provide Racetrax or a comparable horse racing monitor game.</p>

Amendment 5 - 09/12/2024

	RFP Reference Number	RFP Page Number	Question	Response
121	2.2.2.2.B -		Who holds the IP licensing rights for RaceTrax in Maryland? Are there any penalties associated with not holding the license? It's important to clarify, as the State might be the license holder, and we will need to know license fees and any other IP constraints to properly bid this requirement	<p>Tabcorp owns Racetrax. MLGCA does not hold a license with Tabcorp, the current contractor does.</p> <p>Racetrax is not a requirement, but a comparable monitor horse racing game is a requirement. MLGCA will not pay a separate license fee for a monitor horse racing game. MLGCA requires that the costs associated with any horse racing monitor game to be included in the offeror's financial proposal.</p> <p>The RFP will be amended.</p>

2.2.2.2

- B. Draw Games. Draw games are further categorized as Daily Draw (Pick 3, Pick 4, Pick 5, and Bonus Match 5), Cash Pop (drawn four times daily), Jackpot (Multi-Match, Mega Millions, Powerball, Cash4Life) and Monitor (Keno and Racetrax®). Details about each of these games are included in Sections 2.3.3. **(Note that the term Racetrax is used to describe the MLGCA's current horse racing monitor game. If an Offeror is unable to provide the current Racetrax game, it may propose a comparable horse racing monitor game.)**

5.3.2.4

- D. Game Comparison Information - Maryland's Racetrax Offerings **(Or a comparable alternative.)**

6.2.1.A

6. Racetrax (2.3.16.4..C) **(Or a comparable alternative.)**

Amendment 5 - 09/12/2024

	RFP Reference Number	RFP Page Number	Question	Response
138	3.2.4.B.5 -		The end of contract transition-out plan knowledge transfer refers to the "current system" is it specifically referring to the actual lottery system in place at that time? If correct, would the Lottery please consider changing the wording to "then current Contractor system"?	Yes. The RFP will be amended.

5. Knowledge transfer, to include reviewing with the Agency the procedures and practices that support the business process and **the then** current system environments;

	RFP Reference Number	RFP Page Number	Question	Response
103.	2.3.7.4 The question appears to reference a different section than that identified.	17	What are the monthly call volumes and concurrent call limitations for the existing Maryland Lottery winning numbers hotline? Is there an existing database that provides the winning numbers information? How far back should winning numbers be available? Does the MLGCA anticipate any changes to the existing IVR call flow or menu options?	Winning Number Hotline Calls: Daily Average: 12,066 Monthly Average: 367,576 The MLGCA is not aware of any concurrent call limitations in the current system. There is a database of historical numbers that the Contractor will be required to keep updated. We prefer to have 2-years of data available to the public. Winning number records and reports must be retained for the life of the contract for other reporting purposes. No changes are anticipated to the existing IVR call flow or menu options.

2.3.14

- K. Winning Number Hotline. The Contractor shall support an automated winning number line that players may use to learn about recent winning numbers. Players must be able to select a particular game and a particular date within the past 24 months.**

Amendment 5 - 09/12/2024

	RFP Reference Number	RFP Page Number	Question	Response
142	6.2.1		In the Amendment #2.pdf, the Lottery has furnished Level 3 Criteria as Section 6.2.1.C. However, Level 1 and Level 2 criteria, as listed in 6.2.1.A and 6.2.1.B respectively, have section references annotated for each included area whereas the Level 3 requirements in the referenced amendment do not have reference information noted. Can the Lottery please provide the omitted reference information for each included area in the Level 3 requirements table so that Offerors can be certain they are taken into account the proper MLGCA intended references?	The RFP will be amended to reflect criteria and section references.

6.2.1

C. Level 3 Criteria

1. **Monitors (2.3.2.3)**
2. **Other Retailer Equip and Supplies (2.3.2.4)**
3. **Develop and Support Future Lottery Games (2.3.3.2)**
4. **Ticket Scanning Messaging (2.3.5.4)**
5. **Additional Game Requirements (2.3.5.5)**
6. **Website and Apps Support (2.3.8)**
7. **Third Party System and Support (includes ICS and SAS tool) (2.3.9)**
8. **Claims/Checkwriter (2.3.13.4)**
9. **Claims and Retailer Tax Reporting (2.3.13.5)**
10. **Back Office – Finance Requirements (2.3.13.6)**
11. **Subscription Program (2.3.13.7)**
12. **Sales Threshold Monitoring (2.3.13.10)**
13. **Reports (2.3.18)**
14. **Contractor-Supplied Hardware, Software, and Materials (2.3.19)**
15. **Required Project Policies, Guidelines and Methodologies (2.3.20)**
16. **Product Requirements (2.3.21)**
17. **Maintenance and Support (2.3.22)**
18. ~~Deliverables (2.4)~~