# **Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Agency**

Wes Moore, Governor

John Martin, Director



Montgomery Park Business Center 1800 Washington Blvd., Ste. 330 Baltimore, Maryland 21230 Tel: 410-230-8800 TTY users use Maryland Relay www.mdlottery.com

# LOTTERY CENTRAL MONITORING AND CONTROL SYSTEM AND RELATED SERVICES

Request for Proposals ("RFP") # 2024-01

## **Award Synopsis**

#### I. PROCUREMENT OVERVIEW

The MLGCA issued RFP #2024-01 for a new Lottery Central Monitoring and Control System on July 19, 2024. A Procurement Officer's Determination ("POD") was issued on July 8, 2025 and signed by the Director of the MLGCA on July 9, 2025.

#### II. EVALUATION COMMITTEE

An Evaluation Committee was established consisting of subject matter experts to evaluate the proposals. The Committee visited sites where the Offeror's each operate a lottery system comparable to the Maryland LCMCS.

#### III. TECHNICAL EVALUATION

The Evaluation Committee's findings regarding the evaluation of the Offerors' Technical Proposals include applying the evaluation criteria. In Section 6.2 the RFP identified two (2) Levels of Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria to be used to evaluate each technical proposal. This was later changed to three (3) Levels of Criteria per RFP Amendment #2 (dated 08/16/2024). The Committee utilized a consensus method to arrive at a ranking for each of the Technical Evaluation Criteria. As described in the RFP, the levels are listed in descending order of importance; the sub-criteria within each Criterion level have equal weight. The results of the Technical Ranking were:

| OFFEROR  | TECHNICAL<br>RANKING |
|----------|----------------------|
| IGT      | 3                    |
| Intralot | 2                    |
| SG       | 1                    |

## IV. FINANCIAL EVALUATION

Following the evaluation of Technical Proposals, the Financial Proposals were opened. Financial proposals were ranked from the lowest (best) price to the highest price, based on the Offeror's "Estimated Total Cost.

After review of the Financial Proposals, the Procurement Officer determined that it was in the best interest of the State to permit all qualified Offerors to revise their initial Proposals by submitting Best

and Final Financial Offers ("BAFOs"). On June 11th, 2025, Financial BAFOs were requested. Results of the BAFO were:

BAFO - FINANCIAL PROPOSAL and RANKING

| OFFEROR  | Sales Threshold Values | Applied<br>Percentages | TOTAL ESTIMATED<br>CONTRACT TERM<br>PRICE | RANK |
|----------|------------------------|------------------------|---|------|
|          | Up to \$3,250,000,000  | 2.0753%                |   |      |
| IGT      | Up to \$3,500,000,000  | 1.8253%                | \$641,026,355                             | 3    |
|          | Over \$3,500,000,000   | 1.6253%                |   |      |
|          | Up to \$3,250,000,000  | 0.8300%                |   |      |
| Intralot | Up to \$3,500,000,000  | 1.5000%                | \$260,393,946                             | 1    |
|          | Over \$3,500,000,000   | 1.7000%                |   |      |
|          | Up to \$3,250,000,000  | 1.1990%                |   |      |
| SG       | Up to \$3,500,000,000  | 1.1990%                | \$371,120,165                             | 2    |
|          | Over \$3,500,000,000   | 1.1990%                |   |      |

#### V. OVERALL RANKING

Upon completion of the Technical Proposal and Financial Proposal evaluations and rankings, each Offeror received an overall ranking based on which Proposal was determined to be the most advantageous to the State.

#### **OVERALL RANKING**

| OFFEROR  | TECHNICAL<br>RANK | FINANCIAL<br>OFFER<br>(BAFO RANK) | OVERALL<br>RANK* |
|----------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| IGT      | 3                 | 3                                 | 3                |
| Intralot | 2                 | 1                                 | 1                |
| SGI      | 1                 | 2                                 | 2                |

<sup>\*</sup>Technical factors were given greater weight than Financial factors in determining the Overall ranking.

### VI. RECOMMENDATION AND NTE OF CONTRACT AWARD

The MLGCA's goal is to obtain a Contractor that, in addition to providing the basic LCMCS requirements, is focused on and has the capability to provide innovative concepts and solutions that will drive increases in sales and revenue. SG was ranked first in regard to technical factors, and technical factors were given greater weight than financial. Nonetheless, the financial offer from Intralot created an insurmountable advantage.

If approved, the Contract will be submitted with a Not to Exceed value of \$369,077,500 over the initial ten-year term. This includes:

- Base sales fee: \$260,394,000,
- Debit Card Processing Fees: approximately \$100,000,000; and
- Optional Equipment and Services: \$8,683,500.